

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 30, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Beloved, follow not that which is evil, but that which is good. He that doeth good is of God.—III John 1: 11.

O Thou who hearest prayer and answereth according to Thy wisdom, to Thee we come in this silent moment of quiet devotion. We humble ourselves in Thy presence confessing that we have done that which we ought not to have done and left undone that which we should have done. Do Thou have mercy upon us, forgive us and send us out into this day with creative minds to think clearly, with hearts warm with love to spread good will, and with hands ready to serve Thee more fully and our country more faithfully.

Help us to bridge the chasms which separate men, to heal the festering sores which infect our national life, to foster unity among our people, and to promote cooperation between the nations of the world.

Breathe upon us Thy spirit, reveal to us Thy way and give us courage to walk in it to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

LOOKING IN ON THE FIVE SIDES ADVERTISING AGENCY

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, let us once again look in on the Five Sides Advertising Agency where the chief is speaking to Dr. Strangebird:

"Strangebird, you just don't seem to understand anything. When our friends said Lenin said that, they were talking about wasting money on silly things like education, not such worthy projects as A.D.C. (aid to dependent contractors). It just gets you a lot of taxpayers who want to '... reason why...' And, believe me, that doesn't help much in the advertising game, especially when you're trying to sell this boon dog... I mean grant this boon to these worthy contractors. And they are worthy, Strangebird. They advertise in our Service Association Magazines. And we're not going to be at Five-Sides all our lives. Remember, Strangebird, 'No greater love hath a contractor than to lay down a job application in front of a retired Five-Sider.' They stick with us. And we're going to stick with them through Thick and Thin. Strangebird, we've just got to come up with a successful advertising campaign on this one."

"Well, Chief, since you put it that way, let's use the ultimate advertising weapon."

"Strangebird, you mean?"

"Exactly. Disloyalty. We could take the old

'my contractor, right or wrong' and run it up the flag pole and see if we could get the House Minority Leader to call somebody un-American for not saluting it."

"It's a great idea, Strangebird. But, believe me he'd never do it."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 29, 1969]

"Where are they going to stop?" (Minority Leader Gerald Ford) asked angrily. "Do they want to unilaterally disarm America when we face a serious threat from the Soviet Union?"

Ford said that putting all such Congressional opposition in a total package, there seemed to be a movement in concert aimed at seriously eroding the U.S. capability against attack.

OUR RESERVISTS AND GUARDSMEN DOING GOOD JOB

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the article on the front page of the Washington Post today pertaining to Army Reserve units could be misleading. The article said in effect that a Reserve Army unit called to active duty in May of 1968 has been a snafu unit contributing nothing to the war effort. This unit is stationed at Fort Eustis, Va.

Mr. Speaker, because one Army Reserve unit might have some problems let us not condemn the whole Reserve program. I rise today to commend the 43 Army Reserve and National Guard units now serving in Vietnam. These reservists are from 30 different States—one of these units being from my own State.

I can speak with authority when I say these Reserve units in Vietnam are excellent. I visited some of these citizen soldiers when I was in Vietnam 4 months ago. I made a point to ask General Abrams what kind of job our reservists and guardsmen were doing. He said:

These units are superior and after several months these reservists and guardsmen are just as good as their regular counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, in fact several Guard and Reserve units I observed in Vietnam were the best I have ever seen in my 24 years of military experience.

I suggest to the editor of the Washington Post that he send the writer of this article in today's paper to Vietnam and let him see firsthand what these Reserve and National Guard units are doing to uphold the status of the citizen soldier.

HEARINGS ON EXTENSION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled public hearings on H.R. 4249, and related measures, designed to extend for an additional 5 years the provisions of the Voting Rights

Act of 1965. These hearings will begin on Wednesday, May 14, 1969, at 10 a.m., room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building.

While progress under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has been significant, it must not obscure our need to accomplish much more. There is a substantial danger that if the prohibitions of the act on literacy tests and similar devices are permitted to expire in 1970, the conditions which existed prior to the statute's enactment would return.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building.

DR. CLIFFORD C. FURNAS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I report to the House that our country has lost one of its outstanding patriots and dedicated citizens of our time. Last Sunday, Dr. Clifford C. Furnas died, apparently as the result of a heart attack, in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. His passing is of special sorrow to the Committee on Science and Astronautics because of Dr. Furnas' long association with the committee as a charter member of its Panel on Science on Technology.

His wisdom, broad experience, and worldwide prestige, which he gave so generously to the Panel, was a product of a career few men of our Nation can match in distinction. As a scientist, engineer, educator, and university president, his influence has had an effect on American progress in science and technology that transcends any possible measurement.

He gave of himself unstintingly as the president of the State University of New York at Buffalo and as an adviser to the Federal Government. Time does not permit me to list the many private and government organizations with which he had been associated over the many years. Nevertheless, the contributions to his country will live long into the future. I extend on behalf of myself and the Committee on Science and Astronautics our deepest condolences to Mrs. Furnas and to her children over their sad loss.

THE LATE DR. CLIFFORD C. FURNAS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I learned only this morning of the death last Sunday of Dr. Clifford C. Furnas in the Netherlands. This sorrowful news has great significance not only to the scientific and academic communities, but also to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House. Dr. Furnas was chosen in 1959 to be a charter member of the committee's Panel on Science and Technology and was a tower of

strength, counsel, and wisdom over the 10 years of its existence.

Dr. Furnas brought invaluable qualities and capabilities to the deliberations of the Panel. He was a man of eminence and achievement in the worlds of education, private business, and government. Most importantly, he possessed great human qualities of generosity, spirit, mind, and body that made him an outstanding leader of men. Over the span of his career, which culminated in the presidency of the State University of New York at Buffalo, he was instrumental in the formation of Government decisions with regard to science and applied technology that have affected deeply the lives of our people, and, indeed, of peoples across the world.

We will never be able to evaluate the contributions he has made to the welfare of his generation and those to come. We do know, however, that his loss will be deeply felt not only by his associates in private life and in the committee, but also by Americans of our time and the future.

I join with Chairman MILLER and my colleagues of the committee in extending to Mrs. Furnas and her family my most sincere condolences.

CAMPUS DISORDERS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I had expressed regret at the failure of President Nixon to speak out more forcefully on the subject of campus disorders. I was pleased therefore when yesterday he called upon our college administrators and faculty members to stand fast against the rising tide of lawlessness, riots, and uprisings and made it clear to all concerned that the power and strength of his Office will protect orderly dissent but will support the majority in resisting the extension of student dissent into disruption and illegality and that he opposes a grant of amnesty for breaches of the law.

I am gratified that President Nixon has finally spoken out clearly and firmly. I am confident that his statement which was received with enthusiasm where he spoke sets an attitude on the part of constituted authority which will contribute to bringing about the desired tranquilization of the Nation's campuses and gives a concerned nation the knowledge that the Executive is concerned about this critical problem and does not hesitate to speak out on the side of sanity and justice.

MR. BLACKBURN INTRODUCES BILL DESIGNATING MAY 11-17 AS "HELP YOUR POLICE FIGHT CRIME WEEK"

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of Congress have seen the bumper stickers and banners entitled, "Help Your Police Fight Crime." The avowed purpose of this display is to

encourage our local law enforcement officials in their lasting fight against crime.

The men who wear the uniform of police officers daily display courage and dedication to the cause of lawfulness in an orderly society. At times it would seem that some members of our public do not appreciate the efforts of our police officers. The purpose of my resolution is to reaffirm to the police officers of our country that they do have the respect and support of the great mass of the American public.

I believe that if the Congress and outstanding citizens in the Nation united in support of their police, we would be on the road to solving our crime problem. Therefore, I am today introducing a joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week."

I am glad to note that District of Columbia Mayor Walter Washington, on the recommendation of Police Chief John Layton, has decided to proclaim the week of May 11 to 17 as "Help Your Police Fight Crime Week" in the District. I hope that the Congress will take favorable action on this resolution so that the whole Nation may participate in this week.

BARRY GOLDWATER, JR.

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

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding to me, and I will change the subject matter.

A few weeks ago we had an election in Wisconsin to fill the vacancy left by one of our colleagues who is now in the executive branch of the Government, and several Members on the other side of the aisle at that time made some remarks on the floor of the House pointing out that perhaps this was a trend away from the new administration.

Well, we had an election to fill a vacancy out in the State of California yesterday, and I am glad to report to the Members of the House and particularly to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the tentative results of that election are as follows: the Republican candidate had a total of about 65,000 votes and the Democratic candidate had about 49,000 votes, a margin of about 16,000. The net result is that this body will have shortly—and I am glad to welcome him—the son of a distinguished Member of the other body who, I am sure, will do as well here as his illustrious father has done in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. WYDLER. I think that the gentleman is referring to BARRY GOLDWATER, JR.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WYDLER. If I have any time left. The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the time.

Mr. ALBERT. I hope the distinguished minority leader does not think the California election is indicative of any Republican trend. In 1968 when President

Nixon was winning California and the Nation the Democratic candidate from the 27th Congressional District of California got 28 percent of the votes. Yesterday he got 43 percent. I think the trend we have been talking about in other races is still underway.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in any event, the Democratic candidate in that district is a loser.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(Mr. WYDLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

A TRIBUTE TO J. CARL DOWNING

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest, the U.S. Senate, and his many friends in the House have suffered a real loss in the passing of J. Carl Downing, who for many years was a legislative aide to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

To me, Carl was not only a friend, but a man who always was reaching out to help in any problem that arose. He was a man of humor and integrity, and he had the wonderful capacity of applying these two characteristics to his work. As a result of his years of service to the Pacific Northwest, all of us who knew Carl are richer in our own pursuits and are more knowledgeable in our endeavors.

The entire Washington State delegation always received the utmost cooperation from Carl, who will be remembered as a truly good man, a kind man, and one who was loved by all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, my deepest sympathy goes to his wife, Dora, and to the Downing family at this time of bereavement.

C-5A COST

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

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of hearings yesterday by the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, an article appeared this morning in the Washington Post which illustrates even further the nature of the legacy inherited by the new administration.

Yesterday's hearings focused on the C-5A aircraft which is presently experiencing huge cost overruns as are a number of other procurement projects initiated by an administration that prided itself upon cost consciousness, cost effectiveness, and purported excellence in program management.

Secretary Laird—who has recently undertaken a most difficult task—mentioned in his first appearance before the Congress the magnitude of these cost overrun problems and suggested there may be a number of others of which he is not yet aware.

Obviously, until further investigation goes forward on the startling disclosures

made at yesterday's hearings, I am not prepared to commit myself in support of the interpretations of the evidence as it appears in the newspaper article.

The previous administration was charged with having created a credibility gap in its news management techniques. None of us, I dare say, believed that it had originated as a result of such deceptive practices as alleged in the newspaper article. I, along with the rest of the American public, will be shocked if, indeed, these allegations should be true.

I am confident, from everything Secretary Laird has said and done in these first 3 months, that he will investigate this matter thoroughly within the Defense Department and if there is to be found any wrongdoing of the nature suggested by the article, then, appropriate disclosure followed by appropriate action will surely be taken by him in due course.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON DISTURBANCES ON OUR COLLEGE CAMPUSES

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the President of the United States speak out on yesterday concerning the violence on our college campuses. I think his remarks were very timely and I must say that I thoroughly agree with him. He stated that there should be no compromise with lawlessness and no surrender to force on our college campuses. Unfortunately, this has already occurred on too many campuses for the good of education. I think it is time for individuals charged with the administration of these colleges and universities, and this includes maintaining law and order on their campuses, to discharge their responsibilities. Should they be unable to discharge these responsibilities, they should step aside and permit individuals to take their places who possess the will and the ability to stand up to those few who seem bent on taking the law into their own hands. We can ill-afford to reward lawlessness any longer.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that there have been felonies committed on college campuses by some of these students and they have escaped prosecution; in fact, some seem to think they have a certain immunity from prosecution. I happen to believe that regardless of the individual who commits a crime in these United States, he should pay the penalty prescribed by law for that crime. Certainly students doing thousands and thousands of dollars worth of intentional and willful damage to buildings on our college campuses—buildings which have been paid for out of taxpayers' dollars in many cases—should pay for their actions—both criminally and civilly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is time for our law-enforcement officers to bring appropriate charges against those guilty of these illegal acts. In so doing, they should and must have the full support and cooperation not only of a school's administration but of its faculty as well.

PRESIDENT NIXON TO BE APPLAUDED FOR HIS STAND AGAINST CAMPUS DISORDERS

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join those who applauded the President for his very forceful statement before the chamber of commerce relating to and condemning campus disorders and calling upon college administrators to take necessary actions to quell them. This matter is obviously of major national concern. It involves the rights of the majority of students to be properly educated, and the majority of students to be kept free from violence and free from threats and as in the case of Cornell University, free from the guns and threatened physical violence on the part of a small minority in some of the colleges. Under their plan of attack and domestic turmoil to disrupt the American system, many of the militants have now changed the area of civilian disruption and violence in America to the college campuses, and are continuing their efforts to upset, belittle and eventually destroy certain American institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Attorney General to fully implement the anti-riot act which passed this Congress and is now the law, as to its applicability to those people who are knowingly and intentionally—such as Mr. Rubin and other militants—traveling from State to State, utilizing interstate facilities for the purpose of causing these violent civil disturbances on our Nation's campuses. I would hope this law would be fully implemented. And I would suggest further—and I have requested the Department of Justice to determine whether additional legislation is needed, and if it is needed I for one intend to support it.

For the record, I also announce my support of the establishment of a congressional committee on organized crime, as evidenced by my introduction of H.R. 170 on January 3, 1969, and my previous introduction of the bill early in the last Congress as H.R. 6054. I support House Resolution 17 which is up for consideration by the House tomorrow, although I think a joint committee, as proposed in my bill, would be more effective and, further, is consistent with the recommendation of the President's Crime Commission, which specifically referred to the establishment of a "permanent joint congressional committee" as the proper approach to investigate this serious problem.

Included in the resolution is the adequate authority needed to consider violent civil disturbances throughout the country, including on the campuses. I further feel that the committee should be made up of an equal number of majority and minority Members, rather than seven Members, in order that all risks of partisanship would be removed, at least as to the committee makeup.

I consider the establishment of a properly constituted committee essential to provide proper focus of attention and

factfinding relating to one of the most serious problems facing our country today—crime and campus disturbances.

I must be away from Washington tomorrow due to a longstanding commitment to be the principal luncheon speaker at the Florida Industries Exposition, which is to be attended by thousands of industry representatives in Florida and from many parts of the country. In that this is a symposium which I have the privilege of sponsoring, I find it essential to be in Orlando tomorrow, the date on which House Resolution 17 is now scheduled for consideration. However, my introduction of a similar bill clearly evidences my support and the substantial margin by which it was passed last session clearly evidences the overwhelming House support of this legislation.

NEW RECORD SET

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received as a gift a book entitled, "The Wit and Humor of Richard Nixon," the subtitle of which is "The Nixon Nobody Knows."

I would quote briefly from this book.

On page 43, the following appears:

During the campaign, Mr. Nixon recalled Mr. Kennedy said he intended to do a great deal in the first 90 days of his Administration.

"As his opponent in the campaign, I don't think it's fair to hold him to the first 90 days. I'll give him ten more days." May 1961.

On page 28, speaking at Des Moines, Iowa, on May 7, 1961, the following appears:

Speaking about the Kennedy administration, Nixon quipped:

"In the first hundred days this Administration had a greater abundance of words and a greater scarcity of deeds than any in history."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a new record has been set.

A CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON MILITARY RESEARCH BY 729 SCIENTISTS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have presented a petition to the House containing the names of 729 scientists and calling for open congressional hearings to review the substance and direction of the entire military research and development program, including the anti-ballistic-missile system. Signatures were gathered by the Scientists for Social and Political Action; and Prof. Charles Schwartz of the Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, and Prof. Robert March, of the Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, presented it to Congressmen PHILIP BURTON, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., JOHN CONYERS, JR., DON EDWARDS, DONALD M. FRASER,

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, and myself at a press conference held this morning.

Along with Senators GEORGE MCGOVERN and GAYLORD NELSON, the eight Congressmen who received the petition today were the initiators of the Congressional Conference on the Military Budget which took place on March 28 and 29.

The petition, submitted by the Scientists for Social and Political Action, care of Dr. Martin L. Perl, of Stanford University, is a clear indication of the concern within the scientific community for the implications of present military research and development programs. In view of the fact that the signers of the petition are familiar with the technical aspects of military research and development, I believe it is imperative that Congress accord the sentiments expressed by these scientists a full and open hearing. For it surely is in the interests of Congress, as well as the American public, that the views and advice of these individuals be heard and given careful attention.

The rational expression of concern by these scientists is in sharp contrast with the rhetorical overkill displayed by the House minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) who yesterday raised the specter of a conspiracy among congressional opponents of the ABM. While there are repeated assurances that public fears of conspiracy in the military industrial complex are groundless, the minority leader apparently had no difficulty in finding that the critics of such weapons systems as the Safeguard ABM and the stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons might be acting "in concert."

Apparently his argument is that opponents of the Safeguard system are acting "in concert" to unilaterally disarm the United States in order to leave it naked to the threat of Soviet military aggression. If he seriously believes that these are the motives which are moving increasing numbers of Representatives and Senators to take a careful look at military programs, he might well profit from the opportunity open hearings would give concerned scientists, many of whom have worked on numerous projects for the Department of Defense, to express their views on the consequences of adding still more weapons to the already precarious balance of mutual nuclear terror.

As the petitions presented to Congress today indicate, serious disagreement over the wisdom of the escalating arms race exists not only in Congress but among the scientific community as well. The concerns of these scientists cannot be glossed over with intimations of conspiracies. These concerns must be given the fair hearing they deserve. What is more, it is the responsibility of both Congress and the executive branch to weigh such criticism from scientists with the utmost care and deliberation.

Those of us who received this petition today fully support the call for open congressional hearings on military research and development and urge the House Armed Services Committee to schedule such hearings in the immediate

future. With expressions of concern over the military budget increasing all over the country, it is imperative that Congress have the benefit of advice of all segments of the scientific community on these issues, not just views which coincide with those of the Department of Defense.

The text of the petition follows:

A PETITION ADDRESSED TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM SCIENTISTS, ENGINEERS, AND STUDENTS IN THESE TECHNICAL FIELDS

The nuclear arms race, flourishing in the climate of fear and distrust of the past quarter century, has already passed the point of saturation where each major power has the capability to threaten total devastation of its would-be attacker. Now we are concerned that the continued development of new weapons—such as the Sentinel ABM and related systems—may do more to upset this relatively stable situation than to increase security.

Therefore, we call for open Congressional hearings to review the substance and direction of the entire military research and development program. As individual citizens with scientific training, we feel that a public, frank and rational discussion of these questions is vital to the health of the nation: for too long this debate has been shrouded in secrecy, dominated by narrow military and industrial interests and supported by the simplistic politics of 'billions for defense.'

If it can be shown that a sizable portion of our military budget is indeed a mistake, this will provide us with a great opportunity to redirect needed sums into urgent domestic programs, and to rechannel much of our technical manpower into constructive projects which will help all mankind enjoy the beneficial fruits of science rather than suffer its destructive powers.

DR. MARTIN L. PERL,
(For the Scientists for Social and Political Action (SSPA)).

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

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARMIN MEYER—AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the President of the United States on his appointment of Armin Meyer as Ambassador to Japan. My family and I have had the privilege of knowing Ambassador and Mrs. Meyer for a long time. They, and their daughter Kathy, used to be next door neighbors. They are wonderful people, and Mr. Meyer is, of course, one of our outstanding diplomats. He will, in my opinion, serve with great distinction in one of the principal embassies of the world, the American Embassy in that dynamic democracy of the Far East, Japan.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 52]

Adams	Friedel	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson,	Fulton, Pa.	Ottlinger
Tenn.	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Baring	Hall	Preyer, N.C.
Bates	Hanley	Rees
Biaggi	Hansen, Wash.	Reifel
Boggs	Hébert	Ronan
Bow	Hogan	Rumsfeld
Cahill	Kirwan	Scheuer
Carey	Kuykendall	Sisk
Celler	Landgrebe	Smith, N.Y.
Chisholm	McCarthy	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald,	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Eckhardt	Mailliard	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, La.	Meeds	Tunney
Foley	Miller, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Frey	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolf

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 51 on yesterday it was impossible for me to be present on the floor. I would like to advise my colleagues that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I request that these remarks be spread upon the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the Record.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Tuesday, April 29, I was testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the Alaska native land claims legislation which is pending, and could not return in time to answer the rollcall on the passage of the bill, H.R. 4153, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

Mr. Speaker, I regret missing the rollcall. Had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative. I request that my statement may appear in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the Record.

GRANT CONSOLIDATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-112)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In the administration of Federal programs, one of the principal needs today is to improve the delivery systems: to ensure that the intended services actually reach the intended recipients, and that they do so in an efficient, economical and effective manner.

As grant-in-aid programs have proliferated, the problems of delivery have grown more acute. States, cities, and other recipients find themselves increasingly faced with a welter of overlapping programs, often involving multiple agencies and diverse criteria. This results in confusion at the local level, in the waste of time, energy and resources, and often in frustration of the intent of Congress.

As a major step toward improved administration of these programs, I urge that Congress enact a Grant Consolidation Act.

Under our present fragmented system, each one of a group of closely related categorical grants is encumbered with its own individual array of administrative and technical requirements. This unnecessarily complicates the planning process; it discourages comprehensive planning; it requires multiple applications, and multiple bookkeeping both by the Federal agencies and by State and local governments.

The legislation I propose would be patterned in part after procedures used successfully for the past 20 years to reorganize Executive Branch functions. It would give the President power to initiate consolidation of closely related Federal assistance programs, and to place consolidated programs under the jurisdiction of a single agency. However, it would give either House of Congress the right to veto a proposed consolidation within 60 days, and it would establish stringent safeguards against possible abuse.

In order to make consolidation possible, it would be necessary in many cases to make changes in the statutory terms and conditions under which individual programs would be administered. Formulas, interest rates, eligibility requirements, administrative procedures, and other terms and conditions of the various programs being consolidated would have to be brought into harmony. The proposed legislation would empower the President to do this in drawing up his consolidation plans—but only within carefully defined limits. For example:

- Only programs in closely related functional areas could be consolidated.
- Terms and conditions could be changed only to the extent necessary to achieve the purposes of the consolidation plan.
- In setting new terms and conditions, the President would be limited by the range of those already provided in the programs being consolidated. Thus, if a program providing for a 10 percent State matching share were being merged with one providing a 20 percent matching share, he would have to propose a matching share between 10 and 20 percent.
- No consolidation plan could con-

tinue any program beyond the period authorized by law for its existence.

- No plan could provide assistance to recipients not already eligible under one of the programs being merged.
- Responsibility for the consolidated program could not be vested in an agency or office not already responsible for one of those being merged.

The effect of these limits would be to safeguard the essential intent of Congress in originally establishing the various programs; the effect of consolidation would be to carry out that intent more effectively and more efficiently.

The number of separate Federal assistance programs has grown enormously over the years.

When the Office of Economic Opportunity set out to catalogue Federal assistance programs, it required a book of more than 600 pages even to set forth brief descriptions. It is an almost universal complaint of local government officials that the web of programs has grown so tangled that it often becomes impermeable. However laudable each may be individually, the total effect can be one of government paralysis.

If these programs are to achieve their intended purposes, we must find new ways of cutting through the tangle.

Passage of the Grant Consolidation Act would not be a substitute for other reforms necessary in order to improve the delivery of Federal services, but it is an essential element. It would be another vital step in the administrative reforms undertaken already, such as establishing common regional boundaries for Federal agencies, creating the Urban Affairs Council and the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, and beginning a streamlining of administrative procedures for Federal grant-in-aid programs. Its aim, essentially, is to help make more certain the delivery and more manageable the administration of a growing complex of Federal programs, at a time when the problems they address increasingly cross the old jurisdictional lines of departments and agencies.

This proposal would permit rapid action, initiated by the President, while preserving the power of Congress to disapprove such action. It would benefit the intended beneficiaries of the programs involved; it would benefit State and local governments, which now have to contend with a bewildering array of rules and jurisdictions; and it would benefit the American taxpayer, who now bears the cost of administrative inefficiencies.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1969.

STATEMENT ABOUT PRESIDENT NIXON'S GRANT CONSOLIDATION MESSAGE TO MODERNIZE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President said in the campaign last fall that the need today was "not to dismantle Government, but to modernize it." Now his message on the consolidation of grants program offers a specific

means of doing precisely that. At a time when some people are saying that they have lost their faith in institutions, let us affirm that our institutions are still capable of doing the work for which they were created. And let us then put muscle behind our words by approving the request of the President.

If we deny the President this means of modernizing Government, then we can only expect that Government will become increasingly irrelevant to the needs of our people. Just as the ancient dinosaur grew so big and clumsy that it could no longer adapt to new conditions, so our form of Government will grow increasingly awkward and will gradually die.

The war against inefficiency and irrelevancy is difficult to wage. There is a tremendous inertia that resists even the most obvious changes. People find they like the old, familiar ways no matter how outmoded they may be. And they resist the new and unfamiliar, independent of their value. That is why we live today with what almost everyone admits is a bureaucratic nightmare. That is why it now takes a 610-page book even to catalog present Federal assistance programs. That is why some scholars have said quite seriously that it is impossible even to produce an agreed-upon count of the number of grant programs that are run by Federal machinery.

Is there any way to overcome the inertia and produce reform? Over two decades ago, Congress thought they had found such a way when they created in the Government Reorganization Act the concept that the President should be able to take the initiative in this area, so long as Congress retained the power to reverse him.

This principle has worked well in the area of governmental restructuring; just a few weeks ago we extended it again. Now the President asks us to grant him a similar power—though it would be subject to even greater limits—in the area of consolidating grants. Our experience under the Government Reorganization Act, the acute demand for dramatic administrative reform, and the obvious impossibility of achieving needed reform without such a law, all argue that we should approve the request of the President.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has challenged the Congress by putting forward an imaginative proposal of tremendous import for the future of the Nation. His request that we enact a grant consolidation measure authorizing the President to reorganize our Federal grant-in-aid programs is timely and deserves the careful study of Congress.

It does not require a superior level of intelligence to realize that we are rapidly approaching the point with our system of grants-in-aid where State and local governments will be buried in a blizzard of paper. Any incentive at the State and local level to develop imaginative responses to major problems is being relentlessly destroyed by our own unwillingness to bring a measure of rationality to our Federal aid programs.

James Reston writing in the New York Times of November 23, 1966, pointed out that even then there were some 170 different Federal aid programs on the books, financed by over 400 separate appropriations and administered by 21 Federal departments and agencies aided by 150 Washington bureaus and over 400 regional offices. In one session alone, the Congress enacted 20 new health programs; 17 new educational programs; 15 new economic development programs; 12 new programs for the cities; 17 new resource development programs; and four new manpower training programs, each with its own administrative machinery, policy guidelines, funding requirements, and application procedures. I need not go into detail about our response to social problems since that time—it would only make the picture even less appealing.

The President's proposal is bound to be controversial, but then any measure which seeks to achieve fundamental reforms will be subject to attack by those who feel they have a vested interest in the status quo. I would suggest that those who intend to criticize this particular measure, first analyze their own responsibilities for the present deplorable state of affairs. I think Congress itself should engage in a measure of self-criticism for creating a system of Federal aids which encourages confusion and thwarts imagination and initiative, seriously weakening what little vitality remains to our State and local governments.

Our traditional response to any problem is to enact a new grant-in-aid program with all of the attendant mechanisms of administration, guidelines, and requirements. It is always easier to add on another special activity than it is to adopt the statesmanlike position of suggesting changes in existing programs. We have yet to streamline our own operations to permit us to cope with complex national problems. We often give in to jurisdictional jealousies, both in the executive branch and in Congress. Rivalry between various agencies administering similar programs and the committees authorizing them has replaced a more legitimate concern with results and responsibilities.

A number of prominent individuals with varying viewpoints have addressed themselves to the difficult questions posed by our past response to solving problems.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan has called upon liberals to "divest themselves of the notion that the Nation, especially the cities of the Nation, can be run from agencies in Washington." He said:

We must attend to what the Federal Government is good at . . . (It) is good at collecting revenues, and rather bad at disbursing services.

Former Gov. Terry Sanford in his book "Storm Over the States," said:

Federal programs are uncoordinated, leading to overlapping, duplication, triplication, conflicting goals, cross-purposes, lack of consistency and loss of direction.

Tom Wicker of the New York Times:

Thoughtful men in both parties think the time has come to begin turning back both federal revenues and federal responsibilities to the states, not merely as theoretical

federalism but also in the interests of meeting more effectively the great diversity of problems Washington has taken on since the New Deal.

Finally, Walter Heller in "New Dimensions of Political Economy," has effectively articulated the urgency of the task to which the President has addressed his message:

Federal grants to serve highly specialized objects . . . once established do not yield gracefully to change or abolition. Unless this trend is reversed, Federal aids may weave a web of particularism, complexity, and Federal direction which will significantly inhibit a state's freedom of movement. . . .

We must move toward broader categories that will give states and localities more freedom of choice, more scope for expressing their varying needs and preferences, within the framework of the national purpose.

We have reached the point . . . where some restructuring of our system of Federal aids—some movement toward less conditional and less specific grants—is needed to maximize their contribution to the national interest not only in strong services but in a strong federalism.

The particular mechanism chosen to implement a policy of grant consolidation is not so much the issue as is the urgent need for a national commitment to rationality in the delivery of governmental services. Whether we adopt the President's suggestions or devise a mechanism of our own, we must face up to the challenge he has given us; we must undertake the task of grant consolidation. The proposal of President Nixon is a first step in that direction.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, George Bernard Shaw once wrote that as far as he was concerned there were only two qualities of importance in the world, "efficiency and inefficiency; and only two sorts of people: the efficient and the inefficient." Clearly the new President of the United States belongs in the former category. Because he does and because he feels so deeply about the difference efficient methods can make, there is hope that it may once again be possible to place the U.S. Government in the "efficient" category, as well.

If that were to happen, it would represent the greatest reversal of form since David slew Goliath. But it cannot happen without the cooperation of the Congress. One specific way in which we can provide that cooperation is by approving the President's recent request that he be given authority to consolidate Federal grant programs within certain carefully drawn limits.

I see no reason why we should not give the President this power and a great many reasons why we should. For too many years, too many grant programs have proliferated with too little thought to the way in which each new program related to those already in existence. The result has been an almost infinitely complex array of grants, filled with unnecessary duplications and internal inconsistencies and understood completely by no one. No wonder Government programs have so little impact. No wonder so much money is wasted in Washington. No wonder so many legislative actions seem to make so little difference in the real world.

All of this can be changed by allowing the President to consolidate closely related programs into single grants. There

are seven grant and loan programs for water pollution control with sewage treatment plants and related facilities as an example, of needed consolidation. The size of the grants, their targets, the way they are implemented, the period during which they are effective—all of these factors will not be changed. Nor will any change be made at all if Congress unwisely is unwilling to go along.

It is a sensible and reasonable proposal which the President has given to us, and one which could prove to be extremely constructive over the long pull.

The Nixon administration may well go down in history as the administration which brought efficiency back to Government. I hope this Congress will be remembered as the one that eagerly helped him do it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal on the consolidation of grant-in-aid programs could, in my opinion, do more to improve the quality and effectiveness of Government services than most proposals for extensive new programs. In fact, one cannot persuasively argue that new programs are needed until he is also doing all he can to make present programs work.

All of the qualities to which Congress gives so much importance: efficiency, economy, coordination, sensitivity, rationality, effectiveness, will be enhanced by this Presidential initiative.

A Grant Consolidation Act will strike directly at a central problem of our age. It is a problem which bears many names. Some call it hardening of the bureaucratic arteries; others see it as the curse of Government which has grown too big; still others refer to it as the breakdown of the administrative process. By any name, it produces a terrible public disease: the loss of confidence in man's ability to deal with the problems of our time.

To take the sluggishness out of our institutions should be one of our first orders of business. The proposed Grant Consolidation Act offers a ready means of accomplishing that end in an enlightened and constructive manner. It has been carefully thought out, and it merits our support.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, no present activity of the administration of President Richard Nixon will go further toward resolving our long-range problems in domestic affairs than his concerted attack on our disorderly structure of Government.

The monumental growth of the executive functions of the Federal Government in recent years has developed with careless abandon and with virtually no consideration for the duplication, waste, and inefficiency which has resulted. The fact of the matter is that the Government is unable to meet the needs of our people. The tremendous proliferation of Federal programs in the past 8 years makes it absolutely essential that our Federal governmental machinery be more intelligently managed.

President Nixon's message today on the Grant Consolidation Act is further significant evidence of this administration's determination to get our Federal house in order so that we may effectively concentrate on solving our great domestic problems.

Our grant-in-aid programs are in a mess. Local and State governmental units too often find themselves confused about what Federal programs are available and for what purpose. The Grant Consolidation Act which President Nixon discusses today makes a great deal of good sense. I would urge the House to take immediate action on this proposal.

The passage of this act, coupled with the administrative reforms undertaken by the President, would do much to bring order to American Government.

It would also help, Mr. Speaker, if Congress would promptly reorganize itself and modernize its procedures and methods of doing the Nation's legislative business.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems facing this Congress is the need for reorganization of Federal aid programs to eliminate unnecessary overlap and duplication. A message from President Nixon, presented to this House today, calls for the passage of a Grant Consolidation Act, which would be a helpful and positive step in this direction. I applaud the President's proposal, particularly because it permits immediate action, and hope that my colleagues concur with the President's stand.

We can no longer afford any delay. Already, one hears much talk about a taxpayers' revolt. I believe such a revolt will become a reality unless we take immediate steps to prove to the people back home we are making a maximum effort to spend their tax dollar more efficiently. The President's plan is the beginning of this maximum effort.

I say the "beginning," because we cannot stop there. While the act would combine programs of a similar nature, in the future we must consider whether these same programs, consolidated or individually, are indeed the best approach to helping the people back home.

To accomplish this, more than 160 of my colleagues have cosponsored my bill, H.R. 340, to establish a Hoover-type body, the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization. Such a Commission would go further than consolidation—one of its goals would be to find more imaginative solutions to the problems now dealt with by a proliferation of Federal programs.

We face now the critical domestic problems of bringing the poor into the mainstream of American life and assuring good education for all our people and revitalizing our urban and rural areas. We must simplify and we must make use of the imagination and resourcefulness of the private sector—of industry and of business. The new consensus of Government reorganization must not only strengthen the present federal structure, but must help point out the new direction. Ways and means must be found to redress the balance in our federal system and preserve our decentralized system of government.

Because daring imaginative approaches must be developed in intergovernmental relations, I propose in my Hoover bill that the Commission should find means of simplifying Federal programs through exploring the use of broad bloc grants and revenue-sharing with State, county, and city governments. I believe Federal

funds must flow into State and local communities, free of partisan politics, on a regular, orderly basis, so that local officials can plan programs and activities with assurance as to the amount and kind of Federal assistance that can be reasonably expected to sustain their efforts. Otherwise, only chaos and waste can result. The Commission would further examine the use of public or semi-private corporations, national and regional, as a means of harnessing private resources and the resourcefulness of private enterprise in solving today's complex problems.

Likewise, my bill would charge the Commission with the responsibility of establishing Government-wide criteria to assist Congress in determining the priority for Federal programs in accordance with national needs and goals. It is of the most critical importance that our Nation's assets be properly and adequately marshaled to solve the Nation's most critical problems. It is going to be difficult at best to find adequate revenue for solving our most serious problems, even with the aid of State and local governments and private sources.

The President makes one other important point in his message which should be mentioned here:

When the Office of Economic Opportunity set out to catalog Federal assistance programs, it required a book of more than 600 pages even to set forth brief descriptions. It is an almost universal complaint of local government officials that the web of programs has grown so tangled that it often becomes impenetrable.

I have said exactly the same thing many times here on the floor of the House, specifically with reference to the OEO catalog and specifically with reference to the Program Information Act, H.R. 338, which provides for the creation of a single, comprehensive catalog of Federal programs. H.R. 338 has 183 cosponsors in the House. It has been endorsed by the National Association of Counties and the National Legislative Conference. The National Governor's Conference unanimously endorsed the concept outlined in H.R. 338. The Council of State Governments and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are both on record in support of a unified catalog as envisioned in this proposal. The appropriate committees have asked for reports on this bill from the various Federal agencies. The Bureau of the Budget has the reports and is holding them up, delaying hearings on a very simple but necessary first step.

H.R. 338 is a logical, companion piece of legislation with H.R. 340 and the proposed Grant Consolidation Act. A move from the White House to permit the bill to go to hearings would set the machinery in motion, machinery which would propose concrete solutions to this crucial problem. In order to consolidate programs as proposed in the President's message, it is, of course, going to be necessary to establish what programs are already in effect. Some are created by specific legislation, other programs have developed under broad authorizations of the Congress. The executive branch is going to have to develop specific information on each of these programs irrespective of what is its legislative basis.

At the same time that this information is being developed for the purpose of eliminating duplication and overlapping, it only makes good sense that a new catalog be developed along the lines of that proposed in the Program Information Act. Past experience makes it obvious that it will undoubtedly take the remainder of the year to develop a new catalog incorporating the kind of information needed by the people back home. We cannot afford to delay the preparation of a meaningful catalog any longer. Few States, communities, or schools can afford the 30-odd members of a staff kept by Harvard to participate in grantsmanship.

Time is of the essence. The severity of the problems of the 1960's, and of those problems gathering in storms on the horizon of the future, the basic unrest and the deep-rooted concern of many people in our land, the critical financial plight of our Nation, the great growth of the Federal Government in recent years, make it imperative that action be taken now to strengthen and redirect the activities of our Federal Establishment.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of many Americans, waste and inefficiency are the qualities that characterize big government and, all too often, this attitude is more than justifiable.

In many instances, waste and inefficiency on the part of government can be attributed to a lack of coordination of its activities. Many governmental programs present a classic example of the case where the left hand literally has no idea what the right hand is doing. In no realm of government activity is this situation more serious than that of the myriad grant-in-aid programs.

This is the basis, Mr. Speaker, on which I strongly support the President's Grant Consolidation Act. This act is designed not to grant the executive branch power to legislate changes in policy, but to enable it to bring about an effective implementation of the policies expressed by the Congress which too often become frustrated by a morass of bureaucratic bewilderment.

Mr. Speaker, the case for reform in this area is urgent. At the conclusion of his exhaustive 8-month research effort designed to provide some meaningful information about Federal assistance programs, the gentleman from Delaware, WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., made the following observations:

We found that no one, anywhere, knows exactly how many Federal programs there are. We found that sometimes as many as 10 Cabinet-level departments and 15 or more agencies have programs devoted essentially to the same general area of activity, but that there is no way to cross-reference these and thus be able to see all the programs in one area at one time.

Most tragically, Mr. Speaker, the study revealed that many of the intended beneficiaries of such programs are unable to find their way through the bureaucratic maze so as to derive any benefit from them.

The legislation proposed today would allow the President to consolidate overlapping programs and organize their existing structures—subject to a veto by either House of Congress—so that such programs will be able to fulfill the pur-

poses for which they were originally intended.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BROADCAST LICENSES

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which seeks to remedy what I consider to be a serious procedural problem at the Federal Communications Commission. In times past a broadcast licensee had the expectation that, if he fulfilled his public interest obligations, he would be granted a renewal of his license. Now this expectation has been eliminated.

But, as a result of a recent FCC decision regarding a major market station on the eastern seaboard, the broadcasting industry now faces an "issuance" process every 3 years instead of a "renewal" process. It is not hard to imagine what this means to the broadcaster: his desire and expectation of continuing in the broadcasting business has no duration beyond the 3-year license period. At the end of the license period he must stand as an equal with all other groups who wish to compete for that license. In terms of continuity, this new doctrine of the Commission does not bode well either for the public or the broadcasters.

Most responsible broadcasters enter the business with the desire of remaining in operation far longer than the 3-year license period. But under the present law, they stand in jeopardy at every renewal. With the law amended to give them the expectation of operating for as long as they continue to serve the public, the responsible broadcasters will be able to devote more of their time and capital to equipment, staff, and long-range planning.

My bill seeks a change in procedure such that the FCC will be required to make a threshold decision concerning the licensee's record: if the Commission finds that the broadcaster has done what it considers to be an adequate job of serving the public interest, then it will proceed to renew the license. But, if the evidence indicates less than satisfactory performance, then something other than the normal renewal will ensue. The main point is this: if a broadcaster is doing his job and in fact serving the community he is licensed to serve, then he should be granted a preference over those groups who challenge the existing licensee. That is only elementary fairness.

We are all aware of the tremendous impact radio and television have upon our society. We depend upon our broadcasters to provide extensive entertainment and information. Today, more people rely on television than any other media for their information. It is only

fair that we allow those broadcasters who are truly serving the public interest to continue doing so.

ON CHEMICAL WARFARE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, brought to the attention of this House on April 21, 1969, facts, and just as important, unanswered questions concerning the use of chemical agents by our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Many of us had always believed that it was the established policy of our country that, as President Roosevelt said:

We shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons (chemical/biological warfare) unless they are first used by our enemy.

We must scrutinize the policy of our Government in the testing and use of chemical and biological agents and in addition examine now in Vietnam the ecological changes which have occurred in the environment as a result of our use of chemical agents. Surely, the potential dangers involved not only to those on the battleground in Vietnam but to those of use here at home were dramatically established when at the Dugway proving grounds in Utah more than 6,000 sheep in nearby Skull Valley were killed when nerve gas was carried from the testing grounds onto the pastures. While the Army has refused to confirm that the sheep died of nerve gas, they did in fact pay \$498,000 to the farmer who owned the sheep that died. There are a large number of similar illustrations which Congressman MCCARTHY sets forth in his speech which chill the blood when one thinks that it could have been people and not sheep in the way of the wind that bore that nerve gas.

Other illustrations to which our colleague referred relate to infections caused to men on the base where testing occurs in our own country and the possibility that chemical and biological agents moved by rail or air transport provide a situation fraught with danger.

In light of the danger of storage and transport of chemical and biological agents, I am pleased to note that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is undertaking an investigation in this matter.

I am today introducing with my colleague, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, a resolution which calls for the establishment of a joint commission involving the participation of the United States, the Republic of South Vietnam, and the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam for the purpose of studying the use and effects of anticrop sprays and chemical defoliants in Vietnam. The investigation by a multinational commission will enhance the credibility of its report and should be preferred to a unilateral examination by us of our own acts.

While this resolution is intended to deal solely with the ecological effects of chemical warfare, there is another issue

not covered by this resolution which must be answered; namely, the immorality of our using chemical agents not in retaliation but as a part of our offensive tactics in Vietnam.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS, AFL-CIO, ARE EXTREMELY CONCERNED ABOUT GROWING PRACTICE OF U.S. CORPORATIONS ESTABLISHING MANUFACTURING PLANTS IN LOW-WAGE AREAS OF OTHER COUNTRIES

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, members of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, are extremely concerned about the growing practice of U.S. corporations establishing manufacturing plants in low-wage areas of other countries. They have seen the number of jobs in television and radio set and component manufacturing alone decline by 48,000 from 1966 to 1968. This occurred in a period when industry sales were growing and when the need for jobs for disadvantaged citizens in our cities was becoming a matter of national concern.

Many jobs have been lost as a result of companies establishing plants in Mexico, along the U.S. border, where the Mexican Government has offered tax concessions and other inducements and where extremely low wage rates prevail. U.S. tariff regulations permit these companies to perform a part of the manufacturing operations in Mexico and to bring partially completed products back into the United States by paying a tariff only on the "value added" in Mexico. The extent of these operations is indicated by an increase of electrical imports from Mexico from \$350,000 in 1965, when the border program was started, to \$34 million last year.

In view of the harm being done to American workers, it is shocking that the U.S. Government should be actively promoting plant runaways. Yet that is what is happening. Paul Jennings, president of IUE, has rightly protested the Government's role to President Nixon.

At this very moment our Department of Commerce is meeting with Mexican tradesmen to see what they can do to expedite this runaway of American trade to these nations which now produce goods for the American market. The only restriction is that the plants must hire Mexican labor and they must not sell any of the products they produce in these plants in Mexico. All I can say to you gentlemen is that we are moving away from prosperity in employment to the greatest crisis this Government will ever face in economics.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram from Paul Jennings to President Nixon, outlining this protest and the circumstances which brought it about, be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The IUE AFL-CIO demands an immediate investigation of the role of the Department of Commerce in promoting a conference aimed at attracting U.S. manufacturers to cheap labor sources on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande River. Your administration, through the Department of Commerce, has used U.S. taxpayers' money to promote the falsely labeled "Executive Conference on World Trade" to be held April 28 at the University of Texas at El Paso. The sole purpose is to sell U.S. manufacturers with the idea that wage rates are lower on the Juarez side.

Mr. President, too many Americans, including members of my union, have lost their jobs to international runaways. Your administration should act immediately to restrain the Department from continuing to assist this conference. In addition, we demand to know how and why our Government became a sponsor of this effort to deprive Americans of jobs.

IUE has a history of working with Mexican trade unionists to improve employment conditions on both sides of the border. We urge the Government to do the same. The U.S. Department of Commerce has no business serving as a front for international cheap labor manipulators.

PAUL JENNINGS,
International Union of Electrical, Radio
and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION VOLPE PRESENTS EXCELLENT PLAN TO FINANCE BUILDING OF NEW AIRPORTS AND TO IMPROVE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL AND AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

(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, Secretary of Transportation Volpe recently presented an excellent plan to finance the building of new airports and improve our air traffic control and air navigation facilities. Under this plan, an air development trust fund drawn from user taxes on passengers, cargo and aviation fuel would provide the financing.

Now the Nixon administration has come along with an incredible decision at the White House level rejecting Secretary Volpe's plan.

What is now a serious crisis in airport congestion is inevitably escalating into a nationwide transportation catastrophe. Every day that passes, with attendant delays in building new airports and upgrading our air traffic control and navigation system not only ties up and inconveniences millions of Americans, but threatens the safety and lives of those teeming millions now using air transportation.

If the Nixon administration wishes to delay, delay, and delay while this crisis develops into a catastrophe, then this Congress has the responsibility to act. The need for Federal aid to airport funds is reflected in the size and number of requests. These requests have risen from 603 airports needing \$161.7 million in the fiscal year 1966 to 747 requests totaling \$448.5 million for the fiscal year 1970.

At the same time as these requests and the acute need for new airports and the upgrading of existing airports has increased, the Appropriations Committees have recommended a declining total of funds to meet the rising needs. Federal aid to airport funds have declined from \$75 million in the fiscal year 1966, to \$71 million in 1967, \$66 million in 1968, \$70 million in 1969, and only a paltry \$30 million for fiscal 1970. Thus in the 5-year period when the need trebled, the funds appropriated have shrunk by more than one-half.

The plan proposed by Secretary Volpe would provide \$150 million in matching grants for airport construction, as well as funds for air traffic control and navigation, and Federal guarantees for local bond issues to finance airport improvement.

Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1969, I introduced H.R. 4119, which essentially carries out the proposals recommended by Secretary of Transportation Volpe. The Federal Aviation Administration estimates that \$5 billion in Federal funds are needed in the next decade just to keep pace with current needs.

I say that this Congress must act now without waiting for further catastrophic delay by the Nixon administration.

CAMPUS VIOLENCE

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a dangerous trend seems to be spreading among university and college administrators which, if continued, could lead to the death of academic freedom in America.

In recent days we have seen the president of Cornell, faced with an armed mob, ask and receive a new vote by the faculty, agreeing not to press charges against those who seized a campus building.

The authorities of Harvard have, under strike conditions, agreed to let one small minority group select faculty for a new studies department.

The City College of New York has closed its doors, perhaps for the rest of the year, rather than take any action to clear a small group of militants from a campus they seized.

The American University president announced he would take no action against those who seized his office.

Only George Washington University has stood up against the tide. Their president, administration officials, and faculty are to be congratulated.

Moderate students, many of whom sincerely seek orderly change in university structure, appear to be applying some counterpressure at last. The continued professionally planned SDS protests, and the sight of armed militants at Cornell, are having their effect on the vast majority of level-headed students.

Yet there should be no question in anyone's mind what this is all about. Just complaints of students are being used by revolutionaries as an excuse to close down major institutions of learn-

ing. Moderate students are getting the message, but apparently it is still not getting across to many college administrators.

The American people have a stake in the outcome of this battle for control over higher education. The taxpayers of the Nation have a heavy investment in colleges and universities, including the so-called private institutions like Harvard and Columbia. We have an even bigger stake in land-grant colleges, such as Cornell and State systems, like the University of California.

Two sets of laws were passed during the 90th Congress to deal with disorders. The first provided for Federal action against those who cross State lines or use interstate communications to plan, promote or engage in unlawful behavior. The other provided for a cutoff of any Federal student assistance where an individual has engaged in an illegal campus activity.

The latter is not presently enforceable, since most universities with the notable exception of George Washington University, have refused to take any action against rioters, and HEW has not seen that the law is effective as Congress intended it to be.

The former is simply not being enforced by the Justice Department.

When violence dictates university policy, academic freedom suffers because the majority is no longer able to function in a democratic way. When a show of guns forces a university senate to change its vote, which had previously been freely and openly taken after full debate, academic freedom is hit. It has only taken 5 years for the campus unrest to escalate from the "free speech" movement at the University of California Berkeley campus to gun-carrying mobs at Cornell. And the universities themselves have been the losers. They have permitted mobs to interfere with due process and democratic discussion. When a small militant minority is permitted to dictate policy to the vast majority of other students, faculty, and university administrators, under threat of violence, it may soon lead to the complete loss of one of a university's most cherished traditions, academic freedom.

Some universities, like George Washington, have taken a stand. Too many others have just given in. But we have not seen the end of the trouble, just as appeasers in any other situation never solve a conflict by surrender. And the issue is too important to the Nation to let it continue in this way.

CRITICIZING THE UNCRITICIZABLE

(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, yesterday the distinguished minority leader waxed eloquently indignant after a White House conference, registering passionate impatience with those who dare question military expenditures. He showered displeasure upon the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCCARTHY) and the Member of this House who had temerity to question military worth of the advanced

manned strategic bomber. With suitable blushes of paternity, I admit to having hurled a syllable or two in the direction of this latest in the family of military dinosaurs, and do so inform the distinguished gentleman of that fact now.

It pains me that I have incurred the wrath of the honorable gentleman from Michigan. It seems he subscribes to the idea that opposition to ABM and a new \$12 to \$20 billion manned bomber is equal to subscribing to America's unilateral disarmament. He suggested in public print that opponents with sincere convictions are "acting in concert" to "unilaterally disarm" the United States. If anyone in this House dares oppose ABM and AMSA, as has almost all informed scientific opinion in the Nation, that Member has his patriotism called into question. If we dare question a manned bomber in an age of missiles, our Nation's press is called upon to bear witness to our betrayal of the Constitution, Revised Statutes, and Mother Filbert's Cook Book. If a Member dares question vast sums spent on chemical and bacteriological warfare, he becomes part of a "concerted" movement aimed at subverting national defense.

America is as heavily armed a national state as any in the world. Our defense budgets are at unbelievable heights, all at expense of domestic needs, which veritably shriek for attention. Few here questioned such vast budgets as they sailed through this body with a minimum of debate or public questioning—all in the name of apple pie and San Juan Hill. What have we gotten for these sums?

We have an F-111. It does not fly too well and costs billions. We possess the main battle tank. It is not fit for much combat and only costs a minimum of \$1.3 billion. We own a B-70. It cost well over a billion. The only remaining one is now a museum piece. We have a Cheyenne helicopter. After awesome cost, there are nine models. The list goes on ad infinitum, ad nauseum.

Today our society is on the brink of urban guerrilla warfare. Our air is befouled. Our waters are polluted. Our streams are running with filth. Cities choke on fumes and cars. No mass transit is worthy of the name. Slums are everywhere. Walk 10 blocks from where we now sit. Finally, we have begun to question these military budgets, and the most distinguished minority leader impugns our patriotism.

The very idea of a new manned bomber is a scientific ribsplitter, and we are asked not to question this type of inanity. We stand accused of demanding unilateral disarmament because of legitimate criticism in this House of further massive military expenditures.

For years we have spent huge sums for useless military hardware, shoving their failures under our national rug. Now we butcher urgent social endeavors—libraries, hospitals, Job Corps, and clean water programs—to buy more museum pieces as our cities' sores become cancers. Unilateral disarmament, indeed.

Just yesterday the pungent aroma of the C-5A, to which I have previously made reference, was wafted through House corridors. Are distinguished Members who questioned it working for uni-

lateral disarmament of the Nation, too? Perhaps we should purchase Lockheed rather than their plane. Is there nothing called prosecution, cancellation of contract or major financial penalties to repay Government? Was this the criticism of military projects our distinguished minority leader was referring to yesterday when he spoke of "unilateral disarmament" and "acting in concert"?

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to open a full investigation of this project, complete with hearings open to the public. No secret defense system or military plan is involved here; merely a transport plane that has cost us more than some entire wars. The General Accounting Office can and should be called upon to painstakingly examine this entire program and report their findings in public. I don't think they can be accused of acting in concert to unilaterally disarm America.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S REMARKS ABOUT THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate in part what I said yesterday at the White House news conference. But let me preface it by saying that under no circumstances do I challenge the motives or the patriotism of those who seek to strike from our defense weapons system the ABM or our efforts in chemical and biological warfare and our manned strategic bomber program.

Nevertheless, I think their decisions individually and collectively are in error.

We have heard a great deal lately about the military-industrial complex and the fact that a late great President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, warned America of possible danger in the power wielded by this complex in a speech he gave to the Nation on January 17, 1960.

As I said yesterday, we have heard repeatedly a sentence from that farewell address because it referred to the military-industrial complex. I obtained the full text of that speech the other day and I think the entire text of that speech could appropriately be read and reread by the gentleman from New York and by others.

Let me quote from another part of that speech by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 17, 1960, just before he left the White House. Let me give the gentleman from New York the benefit of some of the other passages in that speech. General Eisenhower said, and I quote:

We face a hostile ideology, global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method. Unhappily, the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration.

Then the general went on to say, when he was leaving the White House, and I quote again:

A vital element in keeping peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, and ready for instant action so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

What I said yesterday, and I am glad to repeat today, is that if all of the research and development, procurement, and deployment of weapon systems that are considered essential for national security were stopped in the 1970's, whoever is President would find himself without the necessary strength to meet the challenge represented by the kind of ideology General Eisenhower was talking about. I think it is my responsibility and I believe it is the responsibility of the elected Members of the House and Senate to be alert to that danger. I do not believe we should sit back and prevent America from being as strong in the future as it is today. Our Presidents today and tomorrow must be able to meet the challenge of anyone who wants to destroy all that we believe in the United States.

THE MILITARY

(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, I was glad to hear the gentleman from Michigan say that he did not want to impugn anybody's motives, and I am glad he said it here on the floor of the House. But when I was driving in my car, I happened to hear on the car radio the remarks of the gentleman that he made to the radio, and, I presume, before the television cameras, and it did not sound exactly as he says here he intended it to sound. It sounded to me like he did intend to impugn the motives of those who say they do not want to spend money for a system that nobody knows whether it will work or not.

The other day I made a speech about the ABM. I have not changed my mind. In fact, the more I hear about it, the more I am convinced it is something the military-industrial complex wants to build without knowing whether or not it will work, and the chances are, the experts say—who know more about it than I do—it will not work.

I am not in awe of the Pentagon, and I do not think any Member of this House should be. Here is a big, vast, bureaucratic organization that has not been able in 4½ years to win a war that they ought to have won in 4½ months. I told the preceding President, and I will throw it out to this one for whatever it is worth, that maybe he ought to take a leaf out of Abraham Lincoln's book and fire a few generals, because during the Civil War, Lincoln fired about one every 2 weeks until he finally found one who would go in there and fight and go in there and win. In fact, if you read the history of that period, you will find that he fired the man who won the first major victory for him, General Meade, about 3 or 4 days after the Battle of Gettysburg because General Meade did not go on to win the engagement to its end.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. It may in fact be true as to what the gentleman from Ohio says about some generals, but just re-

member that the generals do not make policy. They fight wars and can only do what policy permits. That is where the difference lies.

Mr. HAYS. I have heard that old refrain before. Does the gentleman know who is making the policy today? We are not doing any better today than we have done in the past.

Mr. ARENDS. I do know who makes policy today.

Mr. HAYS. If you do not, let us find out who does.

Mr. ARENDS. You do not happen to be a member of the Armed Services Committee. But if you, as a Member of the House, had sat today during the meeting of the Armed Services Committee, where we presently are holding detailed posture hearings and if you had listened to some of the testimony that was being discussed by those who have no axes to grind, and, I might add, there is no partisanship in the committee, I think you might not have made some of your statements on the floor of the House about the problem being discussed.

Mr. HAYS. I know there is no partisanship there. I have some good friends on that committee. The chairman is a good friend of mine. The gentleman must know that when the generals come before the Armed Services Committee, their word is law. If you had me sitting on the Armed Services Committee with you, you might not have that same story to tell.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the minority leader back into the limelight again, if I may, in discussing the proposed anti-ballistic-missile system.

I, too, heard the remarks of the minority leader on television yesterday when he left the conference at the White House. Usually the minority leader is calm, sedate, and very dispassionate in his comments on television, but yesterday, after he left the conference with the President, there was a touch of hysteria about him as he addressed himself to those of us who oppose the anti-ballistic-missile system.

A few moments ago the gentleman was equally nonfactual when he said we opposed research and development costs as well as actual deployment of the weapons systems.

I want to point out to the minority leader that those of us who oppose deployment of the anti-ballistic-missile system without exception, I may say, have voted in support of research and development for the anti-ballistic-missile system. We oppose its deployment because it is ineffective for the purpose, among other reasons. But let me point out to the minority leader, too, that if we had not questioned the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile system, the Army would now be deploying it around all the major cities in this country in a pattern that the President of the United States him-

self said would not defend the cities of the United States.

That is why the President suggested that the ABM system be changed and renamed.

So I say to the minority leader that it is well that we question the decisions of the military. It is well we do not accept at face value the weapons systems they say are necessary to defend this country. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS). I agree with him when he says the military does make mistakes, and we must continue to question them. The military is not infallible.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me say that we have spent approximately \$2 billion in the development of the ABM system.

Mr. YATES. We have spent approximately \$4.5 billion.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. From the initial studies to the present time—make it \$4.5 billion. At some point we have to go from research and development to some hardware and actual deployment.

Mr. YATES. That is correct, but only when the system is ready for deployment. This ABM system is not ready.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I happen to have been on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations for 12 years, and I can vividly recall in 1953 when the Army first came and asked for hardware money for the first intermediate ballistic missile. Twelve months later in the same hearings they asked for study money for the ABM. I think they were wise to be alert to the need for not only offensive capability, but also defensive capability. We have proceeded from the Sentinel to the Nike to the Nike-Zeus, and so on.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman there.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has yielded. Will the gentleman please let me continue my statement.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was going to say I could decline to yield further, but I will continue to yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman is a gentleman even though he is wrong.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Illinois is not wrong. It is the minority leader who is wrong, first in his statement of yesterday, and second in his support of the Nixon ABM. His arguments are as empty as those of other proponents of the system who make accusations about unilateral disarmament and say nothing about the worth of the system. All of us are aware of the Soviet military strength and its threat. That may be taken for granted. But that does not mean we have to buy every idea of the military whether it is good or bad—and many of them are bad. We think this one is bad. We are not convinced the Nixon ABM is a good system. We do not believe it will protect our country or that it is needed for our national security, and pointing to the growing offensive arsenal of the Soviet Union begs the question of whether or not the ABM will work. No expert, and I include those in the De-

partment of Defense as well, denies that this ABM can be overcome by the Soviets, particularly if they are increasing the number of their ICBM's as the Secretary of Defense says they are doing. Perhaps it is the threat of our building the ABM that sparked the Russian increase of offensive missiles. It was predictable and predicted this would happen in various congressional hearings.

We need less heat and more light in this argument from those who support the ABM. They have yet to make a case for it.

A REALISTIC DEFINITION OF UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it seems that today the House has engaged in an exercise in semantics with respect to the meaning of unilateral disarmament.

I would like to submit for the consideration of this body that if one side continues to develop and increase its war-making potential and the other side arrests its progress or slows down such development, that amounts to unilateral disarmament.

I would like to suggest also that those who have sincerely spoken out in opposition to the ABM system here today have based their logic upon the technological truths of the World War II period. Then a nation proved it could, within a space of months or, perhaps, a few short years develop the materiel requirements for conducting a war and get into production in time to win. But the technology of today is much more complicated because we now have a new and decisive factor called leadtime.

It now takes years between the decision to deploy a weapon and the actual deployment. And if our deployment of weaponry does not take leadtime into account while the Russians do, then we have the practical result of unilateral disarmament.

Let us not forget during this controversy that if we start the ABM deployment as requested by the administration many varied options will be open to this Nation next year and periodically thereafter. We can stop deployment or materially change our ABM concept, but in the meantime we will be gaining 1 year of precious leadtime against the crucial period of the mid-1970's.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest further that those who have spoken sincerely in opposition to the ABM today are making another very false assumption—one that I believe to be false—and that is that the intentions of the Russians are peaceful. I hope they are peaceful, but I respectfully suggest that their intentions should be judged only by their present actions.

If all the Members of this body could hear the record which is currently being laid out before us in the Committee on Armed Services, of the new Russian superiority in naval vessels, of the Russian development of offensive power, of the Russian development of missiles and development of an anti-ballistic-missile

system, of the relentless emphasis by Russia upon strictly military research and development—of the fact that the Russian military research and development effort has become even greater than our own—then I believe they would conclude, as I have, that the Russians intend to use the offensive power which they are developing, if it becomes decisive power.

So, considering leadtime and considering the facts of Russian intentions as forecast by present actions, I believe that some of the people who spoke out today, though sincere, are being totally unrealistic.

I am personally reserving my opinion on the ABM and will decide, after all the evidence is in, what I honestly believe the national security requires. I urge my colleagues to do likewise, to replace emotion and hysteria with logic and deliberation, to realistically face the technological realities of today, and to judge Russia's intent by her deeds instead of her words.

Whether we call it unilateral disarmament or by any other name, doing nothing while the other side improves its offensive ability is inviting disaster.

DEFENSE SHOULD NOT BE A PARTISAN ISSUE

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest today to the remarks from that side of the aisle on whether or not we should install an anti-ballistic-missile system, the chemical warfare activities of the U.S. Government, and the establishment of a manned bomber unit.

A majority of these voices were exceedingly silent a year or two ago. Let me say that I believe strongly that this question of the defense of the United States should not in any way be a partisan issue.

These are serious matters. The responsibility will lie with the membership of this body and not with the professors who take positions one way or the other.

Most of us on our side of the aisle, during the previous administration, supported President Johnson when he decided and thought that it was in the best interest of the country to do something about an anti-ballistic-missile system.

We supported him.

There have been research and development funds in the budget for the advanced manned bomber for a few years now. But the voices we hear now—then were strangely silent.

I would urge this body regardless of our political affiliation to study these issues very, very carefully and when we make a decision—if we do err at all to err on the side of strength. We must keep this country strong so that it will not be vulnerable to attack from anywhere in the world.

THE CASE AGAINST MILITARY MANPOWER

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I am going to risk incurring the wrath of the minority leader, too, but I would like to talk about one of the questions in regard to our military posture which has not been raised.

Of the many and varied questions that one has heard raised about our military posture recently—militarization of American foreign policy, the ABM, the military-industrial complex—one element of military power seems strangely to have escaped criticism: the sheer size of U.S. active military forces.

Our Nation's leaders are groping for ways to approach the problem. Former Vice President Humphrey has suggested a three-step process: analyze military contingencies, determine force levels, choose weapons systems. Senator MANSFIELD has suggested a similarly complex approach which would weigh the value of proposed weapons systems against each other. Senator SYMINGTON has advocated a simpler line: an overall military budget cut of \$5 billion for the coming fiscal year.

I certainly agree that in the long run development of a congressional "systems analysis" approach is indispensable. As long as we must rely almost exclusively on the estimates of defense planners—men with a precommitment to the military establishment—we will probably go on authorizing programs which are both wasteful and unnecessary. But the fact is that Congress does not now have a capability for such analysis. Far from cutting unnecessary military expenditures from budgets proposed by the Defense Establishment, the Armed Services Committees of both Houses have been known to add funds which the Secretary of Defense had not approved or had refused to spend. How, then, can we approach the problem of limiting military expenditures?

My proposal, Mr. Speaker, is that Congress simply begin to cut back the size of active U.S. military forces. We already have the largest standing armed force in the world. We have the highest percentage of military-age manpower in active military service of any major power—almost 10 percent by an estimate. And all of this at a time when Congress has declared no war and no American shore has been invaded. I propose to this body that we in Congress—the raisers and supporters of armies according to the Constitution—begin to cut back the size of the U.S. Military Establishment in the simplest and most straightforward way possible: by imposing an overall strength limitation on U.S. active military forces.

My proposal is that we place an absolute ceiling at 90 percent of the present strength of active military forces. This would mean a cut of about 340,000 troops by the end of the next fiscal year, fiscal year 1970. It could save as much as \$4.5 billion in fiscal year 1970. This cutback would be the first step toward eventual reduction of the U.S. Armed Forces to a level more consistent than at present with our real national interests—at least to the statutory limits Congress itself has

set. The advantages of the strength limitation approach are many. I have outlined them at length in an analysis which I shall insert in the RECORD following my remarks today. But the greatest advantage is obvious—the simplicity of this action would make its significance unmistakable to our own citizens and to other nations around the world.

The answer to why Congress has not imposed such limitations before this is that we have equivocated—statutory limits on all of the armed services do exist, but they have been continuously suspended since the beginning of the Korean war in 1950. The history of these suspensions, and their renewal from year to year, are also outlined in my appended remarks.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill to limit the strength of active U.S. military forces by the end of fiscal year 1970 to 90 percent of their strength at the end of the calendar 1968—over 3 million men.

Several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Nobel laureate, Professor George Wald, made a speech which by its passion and its timeliness touched the very heart of America. The Boston Globe called it the most important speech of this decade. I quote from that speech as fitting testimony to the importance of setting some congressional limitation on the size of our military forces. I hope for the sake of this Nation, and especially for the sake of its young people, that my words:

Now we have three and a half million men under arms: about six hundred thousand in Vietnam, about three hundred thousand more in "support areas" in the Pacific, about two hundred and fifty thousand in Germany. And there are a lot at home. . .

I say the Vietnam war is just an immediate incident because as long as we keep that big an Army, it will always find things to do. If the Vietnam war stopped tomorrow, the chances are that with that big a military establishment we would be in another such adventure, abroad or at home, before you knew it.

There can be no doubt about where the responsibility for America's staggering overcommitment to military manpower rests. Article I of the Constitution places that responsibility squarely upon Congress:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

Mr. Speaker, the founders intended that Congress should control and limit the size of the Armed Forces—and that our Nation's commitment of manpower to military pursuits should be reviewed not less than every 2 years. This much is plain from the words of the Constitution. I fear that the founders would find the present process by which military manpower levels are set hard to believe. Not since 1950 has a real review of active military force levels been made by Congress. Now is the time to act. Now is the time to reduce military forces to a level more consistent with our real national interests. Now is the time to begin to return to the existing statutory limits which have been ignored for almost 20 years.

SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE MILITARY STATISTICS*

1. In 1968 the United States had the largest standing Armed Forces in the world: 3.5 million as compared to 3.2 million for the Soviet Union and 2.8 million for Communist China.

2. In 1968 the United States had the highest percentage of military age men in the Armed Forces of any major power (U.S.—8.9%, U.S.S.R.—7.0%, Communist China—1.9%), and the highest percentage of any country in the world except Portugal.

3. In 1968 the United States spent more money than any country in the world on military programs, almost twice as much as the Soviet Union and ten times as much as Communist China. The U. S. military budget in 1968 was substantially more than the total military budgets of all the Warsaw Pact nations including the Soviet Union.

4. By the most recent figures, the United States, ostensibly at peace, with the highest G.N.P. of any country in the world, spends a larger percentage of that G.N.P. on military pursuits than does a country fighting for its very existence—the Republic of South Vietnam.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO ANNOUNCES AEC DECISION TO NAME NUCLEAR ACCELERATOR AT WESTON IN HONOR OF ENRICO FERMI

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform my colleagues in the House of Representatives that yesterday morning Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, announced that the nuclear accelerator now being constructed at Weston, Ill., will be named in honor of Dr. Enrico Fermi—one of the outstanding physicists of our time.

I rise today to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for his encouragement and help to me in achieving this objective.

I want especially to express my appreciation to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, who is the second ranking Democrat on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, for his guidance, advice, and assistance, which were instrumental in reaching this goal.

My profound thanks also go to Senator JOHN PASTORE, the senior Senator from Rhode Island and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for his energetic efforts on behalf of naming this nuclear accelerator in honor of Dr. Fermi.

My sincere appreciation is extended also to the Members of the House of Representatives who joined me in sponsoring legislation to name the Weston accelerator after Enrico Fermi.

I want to extend my gratitude also to Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, senior Senator from Illinois, who introduced my bill in the Senate on behalf of Dr. Fermi.

*Based on estimates of the Institute of Strategic Studies, London, as of November-December 1968.

In particular, I want to express my gratitude to Dr. Seaborg and to the members of the Atomic Energy Commission for the recognition which has finally been extended to Dr. Enrico Fermi—the architect of the atomic age.

Dr. Fermi's experiments at the University of Chicago led, as we all know, to the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction ever to take place. This historic event occurred 26 years ago, on December 2, 1942, and was announced in a code message that has now become world famous.

Arthur Compton, chairman of the department of physics at the University of Chicago and director of the group authorized by the Federal Government to study nuclear fission, telephoned James Conant, president of Harvard University and chairman of the National Defense Research Committee which had authorized the study, and said:

The Italian navigator has landed in the New World.

Conant then asked:

How were the natives?

Whereupon Compton replied:

Very friendly.

This code message, which was not prearranged, signaled the first successful nuclear chain reaction.

Dr. Fermi made a great contribution to the entire world—for by harnessing nuclear energy, he has provided the means to better and cheaper power—and this power is being used today and will in the near future develop natural resources, bring food, clothing, housing, and medicine to the peoples of the world, will accelerate the progress of newly developing nations, and narrow the gap between the have and have-not countries all over the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the press release issued by my office on this historic AEC decision, Dr. Seaborg's letter to me informing me of the decision, and the AEC release on this subject, as well as a letter I received from CHET HOLIFIELD telling me of the action taken by the joint committee on my proposal. These articles follow:

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO ANNOUNCES AEC DECISION TO NAME NUCLEAR ACCELERATOR AT WESTON IN HONOR OF ENRICO FERMI

Congressman Frank Annunzio (D-7th Dist.-Ill.) announced today that the Atomic Energy Commission plans to name the nuclear accelerator at Weston, Illinois, in honor of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi.

The accelerator is now under construction, and formal dedication and naming of the Enrico Fermi laboratory will not take place until major construction work has been completed and the facility is in operation, probably in the fall of 1972. The accelerator will have an energy of 200 billion electron volts (BEV), greater than now available at any accelerator.

"I am delighted over this historic decision," said Annunzio, "because it culminates my three year struggle to secure this well-deserved recognition for Nobel prize winner, Dr. Fermi."

Dr. Fermi is regarded as one of the greatest physicists of our time and has come to be known as the "architect of the atomic age." His experiments in Illinois led to the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction ever

to take place. This event which ushered in the atomic age, took place on December 2, 1942 in a squash court under the stands of the unused University of Chicago stadium. There, under the direction of Dr. Fermi, the first atomic reactor was built and the discovery of uranium fission took place.

Congressman Annunzio said, "I commend Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, for the action he has taken in naming the accelerator after Dr. Fermi."

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides the AEC with power to name facilities. However, the trend in the past has been to give functional names to nuclear facilities, or to name them after geographical areas, or in some cases, after universities. Consequently, Congressman Annunzio introduced legislation in the 90th Congress, and again in the 91st Congress, to name the accelerator after Dr. Fermi and to draw attention to the fact that no Federal nuclear facility in the United States is presently named in honor of the eminent atomic physicist, Dr. Fermi.

"This year," Congressman Annunzio continued, "over 100 Representatives and Senators joined me in cosponsoring this legislation and in introducing identical bills. Because of the action of the Atomic Energy Commission in naming the nuclear accelerator after Dr. Fermi, passage of my bill will no longer be necessary."

Dr. Fermi was an Italian immigrant who left his native Italy to escape the Fascist regime. A short time before coming to the United States, he won the Nobel prize in physics.

"Naming the nuclear accelerator after Fermi honors America's foreign born as well as Fermi," Annunzio said, "particularly those Americans of Italian descent who have made great contributions to the building of America."

Congressman Annunzio concluded:

"I want to express my appreciation to all of the Representatives and Senators who joined me in cosponsoring legislation to honor Dr. Fermi, to the Members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and to the Chicago press which editorially supported the naming of the Weston Accelerator in honor of Dr. Fermi."

Attached is the text of a letter Congressman Annunzio received from Chairman Seaborg outlining the decision of the AEC:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1969.

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. ANNUNZIO: I am pleased to inform you that the President has concurred in our recommendation to name the 200 BEV Accelerator Facility the Enrico Fermi Laboratory. I am sure you will agree the selection represents a particularly fitting manner in which to honor Dr. Fermi and acknowledge his many contributions to the field of atomic research, especially his work on nuclear processes.

The attached announcement reflects the Commission's plan to name the 200 BEV Accelerator Laboratory, upon completion of construction, in honor of Dr. Enrico Fermi.

We plan to release this statement on Tuesday, April 29, at 10:00 a.m.

Cordially,

CHAIRMAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 17, 1969.

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I received your letter of March 25, concerning your continuing efforts

to have the nuclear accelerator at Weston, Illinois, named after the great scientist, Enrico Fermi. I have discussed this with my colleague, Melvin Price of Illinois, and it is my understanding that recommendations were made to the White House that the naming of the accelerator be in honor of Enrico Fermi. However, to this date, no decision has been reached by the White House on this matter.

Without question, the credit for the work which went into the recommendations which went to the White House is yours, as you have worked tirelessly to see that a great American was honored by naming this 200 BeV accelerator after him.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD, *Chairman,*
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

ACCELERATOR LABORATORY TO BE NAMED IN HONOR OF ENRICO FERMI

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, today announced that the Commission will name the National Accelerator Laboratory, now under construction near Chicago, in honor of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi.

Formal dedication and naming of the Enrico Fermi Laboratory will not take place until major construction work has been completed and the facility is in operation, probably in the fall of 1972.

Dr. Seaborg, in announcing the AEC's plans, said: "It is particularly fitting that we honor Dr. Fermi in this manner, for in so doing we further acknowledge his many contributions to the progress of nuclear science, particularly his work on nuclear processes."

"Enrico Fermi was a physicist of great renown who contributed in a most significant way to the defense and welfare of his adopted land and to the enhancement of its intellectual well being. His great achievement, the first sustained nuclear chain reaction, took place in a small laboratory in Chicago. It seems singularly appropriate, therefore, that the Federal Government recognize the memory of a man who was at the forefront of science in his day by naming in his honor a laboratory near Chicago—a laboratory which will have a major international impact on our understanding of the basic structure of matter."

When completed, the laboratory will be the home of the world's highest energy proton accelerator and will cost approximately \$250 million plus outlays for experimental equipment. The laboratory is being developed on a 6,800-acre site about 30 miles west of Chicago near the town of Batavia, Illinois. By 1975 it is expected to have a permanent staff of about 1,650 scientists and supporting personnel, and about 350 visiting scientists are expected to be at the laboratory at any given time.

The Universities Research Association (URA) consisting of 49 leading universities in the United States and one in Canada, is under contract to the AEC for design and construction work and is expected to operate the laboratory. Dr. Norman F. Ramsey is President of URA, which has established the National Accelerator Laboratory on the site with Dr. Robert R. Wilson as Director.

The proton accelerator will have an energy of 200 billion electron volts (BEV), greater than now available at any accelerator. The design incorporates features to permit the energy to be extended to about 400 BEV at a later date.

NOMINATION OF ARMIN H. MEYER AS AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's nomination of the distinguished and experienced career diplomat, Armin H. Meyer, to be our new Ambassador to Tokyo augurs well for continuation of the good relationship which for many years now has existed between the United States and Japan.

The concern which some Japanese have expressed over this appointment can only mean that they are not fully acquainted with Ambassador Meyer's capabilities and background for the job. They also must be unaware of the esteem in which he is held by those of us who know him and know his work.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) noted during our colloquy on this matter yesterday, Mr. Meyer has already served two ambassadorships in the Near East and goes to Tokyo with a truly remarkable record of achievement in those posts.

I have known Ambassador Meyer since his boyhood days in Lincoln, Ill., in the 22d Congressional District. He was born in Fort Wayne, Ind., on January 19, 1914, the son of the Reverend Armin Paul Meyer, a Lutheran minister. He later came to Lincoln where he was reared by two aunts, whom I knew well. He attended Lincoln College there and later went to Capital University in Columbus, Ohio, where he earned his bachelor of arts degree in 1935. Subsequently, he received a master of arts degree at Ohio State University. From 1935 he served on the faculty on Capital University as an assistant professor and dean of men.

Ambassador Meyer began his public career in 1942 as a member of the staff of the U.S. Office of War Information, and in that capacity served in Washington, Cairo, and Baghdad. Between 1946 and 1948 he was U.S. Public Affairs Officer in Baghdad, and this was followed by service as a public affairs adviser of the Department of State between 1948 and 1952.

Between 1952 and 1957 Ambassador Meyer was posted abroad as First Secretary of Embassy in Beirut and as First Secretary and Counselor in Kabul, Afghanistan.

Ambassador Meyer became Deputy Director of the State Department's Office of South Asian Affairs in 1957, and Deputy Director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs in 1958. He was made Director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs in 1959.

Ambassador Meyer served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs during 1961, and from that assignment was made United States Ambassador to Lebanon. He remained in Beirut until 1965, when he became the United States Ambassador to Iran.

During his career in the Department of State Ambassador Meyer has received Commendable Service and Meritorious Service Awards.

Ambassador Meyer is married to the former Alice James, who was a reporter for the Washington Star. They have one daughter, Kathleen, who is a student at

Occidental College. Ambassador Meyer is known to many of his fellow amateur radio enthusiasts the world over by his own radio call-sign, W3ACE/EP3AM/. Amateur radio has been a hobby of the Ambassador's since his youth in Illinois.

I have included the above biographical information so that my colleagues, and others interested, may know the excellent qualifications of Ambassador Meyer for his new assignment.

I heartily commend President Nixon for sending him to Tokyo. He is one of the most capable and dedicated men in our diplomatic service. He displayed rare diplomatic skills during the years he was posted to the combustible Near East and I confidently predict that he will become one of our greatest Ambassadors to Japan.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL PAY RAISE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, JUDGES, AND OTHERS

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1969, I attempted to file a discharge petition on H.R. 7778—to abolish the Kappel Commission and to repeal the pay increases of high-level Government officials, including Members of Congress. Because of the Clerk's interpretation of the House rules that discharge petition was not lodged until Monday of this week. On April 14 I suggested in my remarks that it was rumored that some Members of the other body may have had some second thoughts about their vote against disapproval of the President's recommendation.

Yesterday the other body, by a vote of 64 to 21 sent H.R. 7206 back to committee after voting to abolish the Kappel Commission. H.R. 7206 was the bill passed in this body on March 18 to increase the pay of the Vice President and the majority and minority leadership of the House and Senate. Passage of H.R. 7206 was justified in this House "to adjust the salary rates of these officials in proper relationship to the salaries of the judicial and executive branch officials whose salary rates were adjusted March 1, 1969, pursuant to section 255 of Public Law 90-206."

I like to think, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are finally being heard. I urge the Members of this body to sign the discharge petition so we can vote on the bill to rescind these untimely pay increases and abolish the Commission.

As I said here on April 14, my opposition to pay increases for Cabinet members, judges, Members of Congress, and others has nothing to do with the "worth" of the services of these people. As a matter of fact, my personal opinion is that the vast majority are worth the money and could earn as much or more in the private economy today.

It is the duty of the Congress, as well as the Executive, to set the fiscal affairs of this country in order. To do this, the Congress should set the right example for all government and for the private sector as well. The inflationary impact

of the implementation of the increases of the Kappel Commission—as amended by President Johnson—is obvious. Already other Government employees who have “built-in” pay raises for July of this year are complaining that “it is not enough” even with the recent increases already received by them. It certainly takes no genius to anticipate labor’s attitude toward the Government guidelines of the 4- to 5-percent increase when they negotiate. Any union leader worth his salt will rely on Government’s own action as the answer to Government’s recommendation.

The American people have a right to know where House Members stand. Whether you—as Members—are “for” or “opposed” to the increases—you must agree that your constituents have a right to know where you stand.

This body should now permit the other body to again vote on their own pay increases. We can do this by signing the discharge petition on H.R. 7778.

THE LATE HONORABLE ED HOYT CAMPBELL

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to inform the House that funeral services were held yesterday in Battle Creek, Iowa, for Mr. Ed Hoyt Campbell, a former Member of this body. Mr. Campbell apparently slipped into deep water and drowned while fishing in a reservoir near his home Saturday; his body was found in the water near the shore.

Mr. Campbell came to this House just 40 years ago when he was 47. He served two terms from 1929 to 1933 after which he returned to the practice of law in his hometown of Battle Creek.

He was born on a farm near Battle Creek on March 6, 1882, and received his education in the public schools of Ida County and graduated from the law school of the University of Iowa in 1907. He then entered the practice of law in Battle Creek with his twin brother Jed. He married Esta Fein on October 25, 1913. She died in 1931. He married Mary Marshall in 1933 in Battle Creek.

Edward Hoyt Campbell served three terms as mayor of Battle Creek. Mr. Campbell served as Ida County representative in the Iowa Legislature in 1910. In 1920 he was elected State senator for Ida, Cherokee and Plymouth Counties, and served 8 years, during 2 of these years he was president pro tempore of the Senate. In 1928 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and was reelected in 1930.

In his first session in the Congress, Representative Campbell was a leader in the debate on the farm relief and tariff bills. He was the only Iowa Congressman to vote against the tariff bill, on the ground that the bill was written to favor big industrial interests at the expense of workers, small businessmen, and farmers. He also attracted considerable favorable attention for a series of eloquent speeches supporting the development of inland waterways.

Twelve of the counties in the old

Ninth Iowa District represented by Mr. Campbell are now in the Sixth Congressional District which I have the honor to serve. I have known Ed Campbell for many years and have always considered him a loyal friend and supporter. It is a true privilege and honor to occupy the same seat which he filled with such distinction at a much earlier period.

Only three Members are currently serving here who were in this Hall at the time of Mr. Campbell’s tenure, but in the custom of this Chamber, the passing of this honorable former Member should be noted with sorrow. Mrs. Mayne joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his dear wife Mary, his brother and three grandchildren who survive our departed colleague.

SATELLITE BROADCASTING: IMPLICATIONS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the relatively near future there will be revolutionary developments in the technology of radio and television broadcasting, made possible by space satellites.

These innovations will have a predictably significant impact on our Nation’s relations abroad and upon our foreign policy.

At this very moment it is technologically feasible—though apparently economically impractical—for the Soviet Union to put into synchronous orbit along the Equator a broadcast satellite which could reach directly into the living room television sets of our American people.

We, of course, have the same capability to broadcast into the Soviet Union. This raises the specter of a propaganda war—one in which the United States might come off second best.

Why? Simply because the United States has many times more television receivers for the Kremlin to invade than exist in the Soviet Union. The potential audience for American broadcasts into Russia is comparatively small.

Broadcast satellites raise other issues.

For example, the French plan to launch a broadcast satellite in the relatively near future which will be able to reach all of Europe, Africa, Latin America, and the east coast of the United States and Canada.

If a new French Government follows De Gaulle’s policy of encouraging French-Canadian separatism, they could bring their message to Quebec with the immediacy of television.

While the development of satellite broadcasting raises some difficult political problems, it can also be a powerful instrument for reaching large areas of less-developed countries for educational, informational, and nation-building purposes.

About 1972, for example, the National Aeronautical and Space Administration will provide the Indian Government with the use of an experimental broadcast satellite for at least a year. The Indians plan to use the satellite as the basis for a nationwide educational network.

Other countries, including Turkey,

Indonesia, Brazil, and other Latin American nations have expressed an interest in similar systems.

Because of its potential impact on world politics, satellite broadcasting will be the principal subject of discussion at a special meeting of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space scheduled for next July.

At that time, some nations, fearing broadcasting intrusions into their territories by technologically advanced nations, may propose restrictions on satellite broadcasting which would unduly hamper the development of this medium for economic and social progress.

The time clearly has come when the United States must establish a policy on satellite broadcasting and make its views known in international bodies such as the United Nations and the International Telegraphic Union.

In order to bring relevant issues to the attention of the Congress and the Nation, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments will hold hearings on the foreign policy implications of satellite broadcasting next month.

An initial schedule of witnesses is: May 13, Dr. Willard L. Pritchard, Director of Laboratories for the Communications Satellite Corporation; Mr. Leonard Jaffee, director of NASA’s space applications programs office, and Mr. Arnold W. Frutkin, NASA’s Assistant Administrator for International Affairs;

May 14, Prof. Richard N. Gardner of Columbia University, former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, and the Reverend John M. Culkins, S.J. director of the center for communication, Fordham University;

May 15, the Honorable Samuel DePalma, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, and Mr. Leonard Marks, former Director of the U.S. Information Agency and former U.S. representative to Intelsat.

Today I also have introduced a resolution regarding the foreign policy implications of direct broadcasting, about which witnesses may be asked to offer comments and suggestions.

As cosponsor for the legislation I am pleased to have the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) who is a member of the subcommittee.

It is my hope that this resolution, which is being proposed only as a working draft, may help to crystallize opinion on a national policy for the international development of satellite broadcasting.

By such efforts, I believe, Congress has a definite role to play in helping to shape the technological environment which will so intimately affect the future of the United States and the world.

The text of the resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 236

Whereas in its international relations the United States traditionally has championed the free flow of information among nations and peoples; and

Whereas the purposes of American foreign policy are served by this free flow of information; and

Whereas the scientific progress represented by broadcast satellites contains great potential for increasing international understand-

ing, thereby contributing to world peace; and

Whereas the establishment of a worldwide satellite broadcast network could be a powerful instrument of education and economic, political and social development; Therefore be it:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take the necessary steps to—

- (1) Promote international understanding of the benefits which satellite broadcasting can bring to mankind; and
- (2) Encourage and support constructive international cooperation in the development of satellite broadcasting, within the framework of international law; and
- (3) Resist any effort to give exclusive control of satellite broadcasting to an international agency operating on the basis of unanimous agreement.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY PUBLIC TELEVISION

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in late February of this year, West Virginia University put its new public television station on the air, WWVU-TV, channel 24. The station uses what is called a "totally directional broadcast antenna," claimed to be the first in the Nation. This device enables the station to serve 15 counties in the north central area of West Virginia, a comparatively large territory.

One of the counties is Lewis. It is a typical mountain county, having a population under 20,000. Important products are livestock, poultry, glass and glassware, petroleum, natural gas, and lumber. The county is noted as the boyhood home of Stonewall Jackson and as the site of the first Methodist Protestant church organized in the United States.

More than 40 percent of Lewis County people live in the county seat, Weston. Weston takes pride in three hospitals, two public libraries, a museum, and two weekly newspapers. In other words, a small city in the heart of the mountains may rightly claim to be a center of culture. And this too, is typical of mountain counties and towns.

One of the Weston papers is the Weston Democrat, edited by Robert S. Earle. The other paper is Republican, indicating that the town is not bigoted.

Mr. Earle had the following editorial in the February 27, 1969 issue of the Weston Democrat. I think it is of public interest in that it expresses the attitude of thoughtful country people toward educational television, and I would urge my friends in the House to read it.

[From the Weston (W. Va.) Democrat, Feb. 27, 1969]

NEW HORIZONS

Recently a columnist warned that Friday was fast disappearing from the work week. She said that in many places, particularly the large cities, almost any excuse is good enough to halt all productive effort after noon on Friday and scurry for the suburbs. She reminded: "Remember Saturday afternoon?"

Advance technology is bringing with it a shorter work week and the move to make

all holidays fall on Mondays is just a step on the way to a four-day week.

What worries one is what the American will do with all his leisure. Certainly one can become satiated with pure entertainment.

One answer is that he can learn new things and in the process of learning also enjoy himself in a constructive way. One of the sources of such learning would be public or educational television.

The great potential of this media became apparent to Lewis countians this week with the beginning of operations by WWVU-TV, the educational television station at West Virginia University.

Even the cursory viewing of three or four days has been enough to convince us that the people of this area have a great new resource at their fingertips.

Many who are addicted to commercial television will not find this their cup of tea. At least they will not allow themselves to give it a fair shake. But there is something there for everyone.

We have found that most people are fascinated by watching someone who knows their job do "their thing." For that reason we sat watching Julia Child prepare sauteed veal the other night. Earlier a scientist dug beneath rocks on a New England shore and explained the myriad sea life that he found there.

It is probable that public television will never capture the mass audience because most people want to be entertained. But its introduction here provides an alternative for those viewers who want something besides the banality and "under arm" advertisements of the commercial television.

Congratulations to West Virginia University and the Weston Cable system for making public education television available here.

PRESIDENT NIXON URGED TO LEADERSHIP ON CAMPUS DIS- ORDERS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the President has urged college leaders not to surrender to threats of disorder and violence from disobedient professional anarchists on the campuses.

I take this opportunity to remind our Chief Executive that the programmed campus anarchy is not being brought to the campuses—it is being taught there. And in far too many instances it is being bought and paid for by U.S. taxpayers' dollars through HEW grants and scholarships.

Therefore, on behalf of my concerned taxpayers, I respectfully call upon the President to instruct Mr. Finch of Health, Education, and Welfare to go forward with a directive cutting off all Federal funds to any college or university where anarchical conditions exist, and college leaders fail or refuse to act constructively to protect society's interest in the institution.

Further, that no Federal funds should be restored to such "subcultural institutions" until its leaders have submitted an approved plan to control violence and discipline overt belligerents, in keeping with the Nation's commitment to higher education of our youth for survival of the next generation.

The bringing of shotguns on campus, the kidnaping of educators for ransom,

and patent disloyalty to our Nation are threats to a peaceful society far more radical than racial imbalance and segregation.

A precedent for cutting off funds exists. I ask you, Mr. President, to protect the rights of American youth—those youngsters of ours who quietly seek a better life through education in a society seeking peace.

I include a current newsclipping as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Apr. 30, 1969]

"RIOT COLLEGES CAN'T BAR POLICE": PROFESSOR

CHICAGO, April 29.—A law professor said today that universities have no legal right to prevent police from taking action on the campus when a criminal act takes place.

Prof. Fred E. Inbau of Northwestern University, president of an organization called Americans for Effective Law Enforcement, said: "A policeman can arrest anyone violating the law at any time."

SEES A LACK OF COURAGE

Inbau added that many college administrations lack the courage to seek legal remedies for violent demonstrations although they are aware of these remedies.

His organization issued a statement today to explain these rights to students, and parents of students, who are deprived of their education by violent disorders.

TELLS WHO IS LIABLE

The position paper describes as liable for legal action: the private or public corporation that constitutes the legal entity of the colleges; the board of directors; the faculty members who permit or participate in violence; students and non-students who participate in violence, and the public body that is responsible for law enforcement in the geographical area in which the institution is located.

Students affected adversely by violent disruptions, their parents, taxpayers who support the educational institution, and the private or public contributors to any institution may take legal action against proponents of violence, the statement said.

FREE FOOD STAMPS TO LOWEST INCOME FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide free food stamps to the lowest income families. It would also lower the purchase price of the stamps for those above the lowest income level and increase the total stamp value so that all participants would be able to purchase an adequate diet. In addition, the bill asks for an increase in the overall food stamp program of about \$1.5 billion in fiscal 1970, raising the cost of the program to \$1.8 billion.

This legislation was introduced in the Senate by the Honorable GEORGE McGOVERN, of South Dakota. I am introducing it so that the House may also have the opportunity to consider it.

We have already seen more than enough to know that many Americans are hungry now. We have reached the point of diminishing returns so far as continued exploration of the question is

concerned. We have the facts, and the public has been aroused. What we need now is not more exposure of the problem to continued rhetoric, but action. If the administration does not want to take the initiative for action in this area, the Congress—in alliance with the American public—must.

We have talked about the problems of the poor—housing, education, and jobs—ever since we first acknowledged that we had poor in this country in 1964. We have been talking ever since about the best way to attack these problems, what the most important aspect of these problems are, and whether we have enough money because of the Vietnam war. We continue to talk without acting to meet these problems in more than a token manner. The consequence is that our cities have increasingly become battlegrounds for rioting and crime.

Within the last year, we have also discovered through the work of the McGovern committee that we have poor who not only suffer from the same social problems as the other poor, but who suffer from hunger and malnutrition as well. We are now discussing what is the best way to attack this problem, what are the most important elements of the problem, and whether we have enough money because of Vietnam.

I think it is about time to stop the talking. We know that hunger exists. We know that the overriding cause of hunger is inadequate income; and we know we must do something about it. More television cameras, even greater public indignation, and more speeches by public officials are not going to put food in the stomachs of the hungry. The Congress must act, and it must act now.

Public statements on hunger make headlines, but I believe that public action would get even more headlines. Perhaps, it might even restore a little of the public faith in the ability of our governmental system to meet fundamental problems. Certainly, the system has failed to face up to the problems of housing, unemployment, and education. Maybe at least it can face up to the problem of keeping the poor alive so that they can enjoy the luxury of suffering from these problems.

A country that spends \$3 billion to prevent food production can certainly afford \$1.8 billion to feed those in this Nation who lack food.

A section-by-section analysis of my bill and a brief summary thereof follow:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FOOD STAMP REFORM ACT OF 1969

(1) This amendment declares that it is the policy of Congress that the food stamp program should provide adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition to this nation's low income households. It amends the present law which aims only to "raise" levels of nutrition among low income households.

(2) This amendment permits participants to use their food stamps to purchase items necessary for "personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation." Present law permits purchase of food items only.

(3) This amendment would extend the food stamp program to Puerto Rico, Guam, and other Territories over which the United States has direct authority.

(4) This amendment provides for the issuance of coupon allotments of sufficient monetary value to permit recipients to pur-

chase a nutritionally adequate diet. Under the present law, coupon allotments need only provide recipients with "an opportunity more nearly to obtain a nutritionally adequate diet."

(5) This amendment removes the existing limitation on distribution of federally owned foods in areas where the food stamp program is being operated.

(6) This amendment contains the following provisions respecting eligibility to participate in a food stamp program:

(a) State agencies retain their authority to establish income standards for the purpose of determining eligibility to participate in the program. In setting these standards the State agency is to consider income levels required to permit a household to purchase a minimum adequate diet at currently prevailing local prices.

(b) The Secretary is directed to establish a national income standard. This standard is to be no less than three times the cost of purchasing a minimum adequate diet. All households whose incomes fall below this standard would be eligible to participate in the food stamp program. Participation standards set by the State agencies must permit participation by all households whose incomes fall below the standard set by the Secretary, but may permit participation by households whose income is above this standard. The Secretary is required to make an annual revision of the income standard to reflect changes in the cost of living.

These changes are designed to guarantee that no needy family shall be denied the opportunity to participate in a food stamp program, while retaining local authority to establish eligibility requirements consistent with local conditions.

(7) This amendment provides that certification of eligibility to participate in the food stamp program shall be granted upon execution of an affidavit by a member of the applicant household. Any error subsequently found in this affidavit will result only in an adjustment of the assistance granted to the applicant household.

(8) This amendment makes the following provisions concerning the face value of coupon allotments and the charges to be made for these allotments:

(a) The Secretary is directed to establish the minimum cost of purchasing a nutritionally adequate diet which must be not less than \$120 per month for a family of four (or its equivalent for families of varying sizes). All participating households are entitled to receive a coupon allotment equal in value to this cost.

(b) Households are permitted to purchase all, or any portion of the coupons to which they are entitled. Should they purchase less than their full allotment the purchase price will be reduced proportionately. This provision is designed to permit a family which is temporarily unable to pay the cost of its full coupon allotment to receive some benefits by purchasing as much of their allotment as they can afford.

(c) The price to be paid by a household for its coupon allotment is determined as follows: Any household whose income is less than two-thirds of the minimum cost of purchasing a nutritionally adequate diet will receive its coupon allotment free; no household whose income is less than the minimum cost of purchasing a nutritionally adequate diet will pay over 15% of its income for its coupon allotment (effective 6/30/70); no participating household will pay over 25% of its income for its coupon allotment (effective 6/30/71).

These changes are designed to insure that every needy household is able to participate in a food stamp program at a price which it can actually pay and that each household will receive stamps which will permit its members to meet their minimum food needs.

(9) This amendment requires that maximum effort be made to insure that needy

persons are enabled to participate in the program and that participants in the food stamp program receive the instruction they require to insure that they are able to purchase nutritious foods with the coupons they receive. These efforts are to be undertaken by the administrators of the food stamp program in cooperation with other Federal, State, local, and private agencies.

(10), (11) These amendments strengthen (9) by authorizing the issuance of coupons, and the collection of charges for coupons, through the facilities of the United States Post Office or through the facilities of participating retail food stores.

(12) This amendment permits the Secretary to administer any food stamp program where the local administering agency has failed to comply with the provisions of the Act. The present law punishes the poor for the failures of a State agency by terminating any program which does not comply with the law.

(13) This amendment gives effect to (7).

(14), (15) These amendments authorize the Secretary to reimburse a State agency for costs incurred in the administration of a food stamp program if the Secretary determines that such payments are necessary to the operation of that program.

(16) This amendment permits the Secretary to operate a food stamp program directly or through any private, local, State, or Federal Agency if local officials refuse to operate a program after being offered the payments to which they are entitled under (13) and (14) above. Under the present law, local officials, either because they oppose a program, or because they cannot afford to operate one, can deny needy residents of their area the opportunity to participate in a food stamp program.

(17) This amendment authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. It removes the present dollar ceiling on appropriations for Fiscal 1970 and the first half of Fiscal 1971.

(18) This amendment permits the Secretary to obligate up to 10% more than the amount appropriated during any Fiscal Year. This excess must be repaid during the following year. It provides the flexibility needed to meet unanticipated costs which could arise out of relatively minor changes in the unemployment rate.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF FOOD STAMP REFORM ACT OF 1969

The bill would make the following major reforms in the Food Stamp Act:

Free food stamps would be made available to the lowest income families.

The purchase price of stamps would be lowered for those who pay.

The total stamp value would be increased so that all participants are able to purchase an adequate diet.

PARTICIPATION, PURCHASE PRICE AND BONUSES

Participation in the program and the value of stamps received by participants are both based upon the fact that an American family must have a certain amount of money to spend in a year in order to purchase an adequate nutritious diet.

The Secretary of Agriculture would first prescribe, each year, the minimum cost of a nutritionally adequate diet. This could be not less than the equivalent of \$120 per month for a family of four (the amount presently set by the Department of Agriculture under its low-budget food plan).

Participation in the Food Stamp Program would be limited to households whose income is less than three times that amount. For example, if the Secretary established the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet at the stated minimum of \$120 per month for a family of four or \$1440 per year, participation would be limited to households earning less than \$4320 per year.

The State, however, could establish a higher maximum income for participation than that prescribed by the Secretary. Present State limits run as high as \$5400 for a family of four.

All participants in the program would receive stamps having a face value equal to the prescribed cost of a nutritionally adequate diet.

The provisions for free stamps and the lowering of purchase prices are phased into operation during the next three fiscal years so that the new formula is designed to help the poorest of the poor first.

In Fiscal Year 1970, those families whose income is less than $\frac{2}{3}$ the cost of a minimum adequate diet will receive their stamps free. Thus, for example, if the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet for a family of four prescribed by the Secretary is set at the \$120-a-month minimum, or \$1440 per year, and the family's income is less than \$960 per year, it will receive free food stamps.

In Fiscal Year 1971, participating families whose income is less than the prescribed minimum cost of a nutritionally adequate diet but more than $\frac{2}{3}$ that cost would be charged no more than 15% of their income. Therefore, again using the same example, a family whose income is between \$960 and \$1440 a year would pay no more than 15% of their income for stamps.

In Fiscal Year 1972, all other families, those whose incomes are above the prescribed minimum cost of a nutritionally adequate diet would be charged no more than 25% of their income for food stamps.

PURCHASE OF LESS THAN FULL AMOUNT OF STAMPS

Any family required to pay for their stamps would have the option of purchasing less than the full amount for which they are eligible. A proportionate reduction in total stamp value would then be received by the family.

COMMODITIES IN FOOD STAMP COUNTIES

The Secretary would be authorized to distribute surplus commodities in any area in which a food stamp program is in effect thus permitting a commodity distribution program and a food stamp program in the same county.

PURCHASE OF SOAPS AND OTHER SANITATION PRODUCTS

Recipients of food stamps would be permitted to purchase products necessary for personal cleanliness, hygiene and home sanitation.

COUNSELING, OUTREACH, AND AVAILABILITY OF STAMPS

All participants would be given an opportunity to receive instruction and counseling on the purchasing and use of food. Administering agencies would be required to insure that eligible households are informed of the program; and stamps would be made available through the malls, at grocery stores or in some other manner to assure continued participation of certified households.

STATE AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

While the bill retains existing requirements that food stamp programs be operated through State and local welfare departments, the Secretary would be authorized to administer the program in any area through any Federal, State or county agency or through a private non-profit organization if he finds the State has failed to comply with the Act or regulations under the Act, if the State or local officials fail to accept a food stamp program, or if necessary in a particular area to accomplish the purposes of the Act or to alleviate severe undernutrition or malnutrition.

FINANCING

There would be authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out the Act. The Secretary would be authorized to ob-

ligate an amount equal to 10% of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year to meet unanticipated increases in program participation.

COSTS

In order to implement the provision for free food stamps to the lowest income families and to raise food stamp values for all participants in Fiscal Year 1970, an appropriation of approximately \$1.8 billion would be necessary. This is approximately \$1.5 billion above the present level of food stamp program expenditures. This amount would enable every family eligible for free food stamps to participate in the program (2.3 million households). It would also enable all present participants in the food stamp program not covered by the free food stamp provision to continue to participate at present purchase requirements but with the increased stamp value sufficient to enable them to purchase an adequate diet.

Total participation in Fiscal Year 1970 could be as many as 8 million persons (3.6 million who are presently on food stamps plus 4.4 million new persons not now participating but eligible under the bill for free stamps).

FISCAL YEARS 1971 AND 1972

Additional appropriations required after Fiscal Year 1970 will depend upon the number of households and persons eligible to participate at the various income levels. This, in turn, would depend upon the income eligibility levels prescribed by the Secretary and the States, the number of households with incomes below that level, participation in the commodity distribution program and other economic and program factors. These variables make it impossible at this time to estimate costs for 1971 and 1972. However, with a reasonable increase in participation each year by households paying for their stamps as the price of stamps is lowered, increased appropriations of between \$500 million and \$1 billion could be anticipated.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARRY SHEPPARD OF CALIFORNIA

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today as dean of the California congressional delegation to pay last respects to our former colleague, the late Honorable Harry Sheppard of California. Congressman Sheppard passed away in the early morning, Monday, April 28, at the age of 84 years. He had retired from the House of Representatives in 1964 after 28 years of distinguished service.

Harry Sheppard was without question one of the legislators who helped make the House of Representatives the great institution that it is. He rose to considerable power and responsibility, serving ably as the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations at the time of his retirement. As ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, he exerted strong direction and influence in the councils of that great committee. It would not be an overstatement on my part to say that much of the prestige and power of our Nation's Military Establishment today is due to the guidance and foresight which Congressman Harry Sheppard provided from his position on the Appropriations Committee for many years. Monuments to his memory can be

found wherever outposts of freedom exist throughout the world.

For me personally, Harry Sheppard was a friend and inspiration over the years we served together in the House. At the time of his retirement, he held the position of seniority which entitled him to be dean of the California delegation in the Congress. He filled that job with energy, dignity, and imagination. When I first came to the House in the winter of 1943, I went to Harry and told him that I would seek his advice from time to time. He always responded warmly and with encouragement to me. It is only now that I realize the many cares and demands which must have been on his mind when he served as dean of the delegation, and I honor his memory for the example he set for me in this important work.

Harry Sheppard was also an example of the fact, so important in American history, that men of humble origins can contribute richly to the life and history of our Nation. Born in Alabama, he prepared himself in the law and, like many other young men of his generation, including myself, went to seek his fortune in the West.

He traveled to California, to Alaska and the copper fields, and came finally to settle in southern California. The district which he represented is now known as the 33d Congressional District, although when he first came here in the 75th Congress he was then one of only 21 Californians in the House. Now there are 38. His career in the Congress coincided with the great growth of California which he did much to bring about through his work in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a strong and able comrade in Harry Sheppard's passing. He exemplified the able legislator—diligent in committee, intelligent and perceptive, sound of judgment. He was a man whose word meant something to those who worked with him. Our compassion reaches out to his wife, Kay, whom many of us came to know and love, in this sad time. Tomorrow morning, Mrs. Holifield and I, as well as many other Members of the House will attend funeral services for our departed friend. It is fitting that Harry Sheppard's last resting place will be in the National Memorial Park in Falls Church, not far from the Washington he loved and the House of Representatives which respectfully pays him final tribute today.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our late beloved friend, Harry Sheppard, served for years in this body with great distinction and ability, as well as courage, and in an honorable and trustworthy manner. He was highly respected by all of his colleagues without regard to political affiliation. The best evidence of the deep respect and friendship and high regard that the Democratic Committee in committees and his Democratic colleagues had for him was that some years ago he was assigned as a member of the Appropriations Committee, which is an unusual honor and position of responsibility.

Harry Sheppard was a kind gentleman. He was one who could disagree without being disagreeable. He was possessed of a deep, profound, and an understanding mind in relation to his fellow human beings. Harry Sheppard, as I said, was a kind gentleman, but he was a man of strong convictions and a man who clearly evidenced that kindness and strength of character are consistent with each other. He was my dear and valued friend.

His passing takes from our midst a dear friend, a man whose nobility of character was an inspiration for all of us and always will be an inspiration for all others to follow. It takes from our midst one whose passing leaves a keen feeling of regret. I extend—and I know I voice the opinion of my colleagues—to Mrs. Sheppard and to the California delegation our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow, and I particularly emphasize in conveying to Mrs. Sheppard the deep feelings of sympathy we have for her in her bereavement.

Harry Sheppard was a great American, an outstanding legislator.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker for his kind remarks.

I yield now to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to have the gentleman from California yield to me, because for 12 years I served with the late Harry Sheppard in the House and also, more particularly, on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. Although we sat on opposite sides of the aisle, I learned what a great person Harry Sheppard was. I developed a strong affection for him as a person.

For those 12 years we used to sit from early January until May or June to hear testimony from the civilian and military leaders, through not one but many administrations, and we would be there from 10 to 12 and 2 to 4, on 5 days a week for virtually 5 months a year.

Harry Sheppard was a conscientious person. He was a fair person. He was a decent person in every respect. I developed a close personal friendship with Harry Sheppard.

I hated to see him leave the Congress of the United States. It was a loss to the Congress and to the country when he did. He did not come back to see us very often, but whenever I went back to that committee, and was there from time to time, I thought of the many wonderful associations I had with him during those many years.

His passing was a very sad event. I wish to extend to Mrs. Sheppard and to his family my deepest sympathy. Harry Sheppard was a great guy, a real statesman, and a close personal friend.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his remarks. I will recall to him the fact that when Harry Sheppard voluntarily retired he was suffering from emphysema. During the past 4 or 5 years since his retirement he has fought a valiant fight. He was constantly in need of special oxygen apparatus to maintain his breathing. Almost every breath he took was a burden to him, but he fought with great courage, and always with great humor, when one would ask him how he was getting

along. He made a valiant fight, but he suffered from lack of oxygen during the past 4 or 5 years probably more than any of us will ever know.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MOSS. I should like to observe that, as Harry's passing is a great personal loss to his wife and to those of us who had close and intimate associations with him, his retirement from this Congress was a great loss to our State and to our Nation, because during his 28 years of service in this House he left a very strong imprint upon the direction of many of the affairs of this Nation which required the interested and intelligent thought, as well as the perceptiveness, of an important member of the Appropriations Committee.

When I came here in the 83d Congress, Harry Sheppard paid me the compliment of taking a great personal interest in me and what I was doing. He gave me many an assist, which made it far easier during those years of very junior service as a Member in a body which on first arrival is certainly rather an awesome one.

He was a kind man. He was a man who represents a generation which, regrettably, is passing. On all occasions in my dealings with him he followed the tradition that his word was his bond, one upon which you could place absolute dependence.

I want to join in the feeling of loss I know his wife, Kay, is experiencing.

Harry will be remembered for many years, because he had varied interests. He was interested in the young generation. Harry never grew old in his mind. Through a foundation established by his efforts, his mark will remain.

It is very typical that in the arrangements for his funeral there is the request that there be no flowers sent, but rather that contributions be made to the foundation whose efforts are directed toward finding a means of effecting a cure for the removal of the curse of emphysema from generations of the future.

I was proud to know him, and I regret deeply his passing.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Harry Sheppard, a distinguished former Member and a great American.

As has already been said, Harry Sheppard was a kind man and one who was always ready and willing to assist others. I well remember he was one of the first members of our delegation that I met upon my arrival here in January 1955. The advice, the counsel, the help, and assistance which he rendered to me at that time proved to be invaluable in my attempts to serve my constituents.

Harry had a great deal of patience. I was always impressed, of course, with the thing that my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) brought out; namely, the fact that his word was his bond. When he gave his word, that was it. Any man who did not live up to that

standard in Harry's opinion was less than he should be.

Harry Sheppard back in the early 1920's came to my home town of Fresno, Calif., where he worked for a number of years. Many of the old-timers in my hometown today still remember many incidents that occurred, some humorous and some otherwise. They always, even in those days, thought of him as a wonderful, a very lovable person, and one who was highly respected. Reta nor I, will ever forget the wonderful friendship of Kay and Harry and their many kindnesses to us.

Let me say that when Harry retired from this body in 1964 we lost a very valuable Member. His contribution to his State and his Nation will be long remembered, because it was invaluable to the progress of our country.

At this time, of course, I wish to extend to Kay, his lovely wife, the deepest sympathy of my wife and myself on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I share the regrets of my colleagues on the passing of our good friend, Harry Sheppard, with whom we served so long here in the House.

Harry's life was an example to all Members of the House and to all Americans. He began life sort of "behind the eight ball" in a way, because at the age of 16 his father, who was a medical doctor in Alabama, was traveling home from taking care of a patient with Harry's mother, and they were both killed by a train. At 16 he started out in life to make his own way. He served for 28 years in this House, and he leaves us at the age of 84 with a record as a great American.

I served with Harry on the military construction subcommittee of appropriations. I did not fully realize what kind of a man he was until I saw him work. He utilized his talents and his training as an engineer as well as his study of the law to revise the procedures on military construction appropriations in this House and to make them more efficient and more capable of expressing the military needs of this country without waste.

He did many things to improve the operations of our appropriations for military construction. He was devoted to his country. He was devoted to his State, the people of his district. His life serves as an example to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing our sympathy to his wife Kay and to his family.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the able gentleman from California who is now in the well of the House for giving me the privilege of

joining with him and his colleagues and our colleagues from both sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our great and late friend and colleague, Harry Sheppard. He and I were friends for more than 20 years. I had an opportunity to observe the quality and the caliber of the man he was. He was a man who was ideally suited to statecraft, to congressional membership and service, because he was a student of government. He liked government. He studied its many intricacies. He applied himself with diligence to becoming a great and distinguished public servant.

Also, Harry Sheppard was a man who was very deeply dedicated to making America a better country in which to live. He saw the ordinary, average man as well as the more fortunate man, and the children and the infirm, the disabled and the handicapped, as presenting a challenge to the leadership of this country and he tried to make the country better by making their lives more rich and more meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, as some of my colleagues have said, he had a warm and compassionate heart. He regretted that he did not have more hands with which to lean down and lift up those who needed help to walk on higher ground. He was also a man who applied himself assiduously to the performance of public duties. He was concerned about his duties and the problems of his committee as well as the problems of the Congress and particularly those of the country.

In the very finest sense of the word, Mr. Speaker, our late, departed colleague whom we honor here today, deserves to be cherished and remembered as a great American statesman, and I am proud that I had the privilege to know and work with him.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and I wish to extend our deepest sympathy to his beloved and bereaved widow.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for those warm comments.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that I have served in the Congress of the United States with Harry Sheppard. We had a lot of little problems concerning defense investment in Montana during the period of his service in the Congress, but always Harry Sheppard helped with the knotty little problems. He took the time to listen to them and he took the time to correct those problems.

I want to say that Harry Sheppard was not just a Congressman from California, he was a Congressman of the United States in the truest sense of the word. He looked after the problems of his colleagues insofar as he was empowered in his committee assignments to do so. My wife joins me in sorrow at his death. We extend our deepest respect and sympathy to his bereaved relatives.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I could not remain silent at this moment when tribute is being paid to the memory of the late Harry Sheppard. I feel his loss deeply.

I had a very great personal affection for Harry Sheppard. We were very close on the Committee on Appropriations through some 26 of his 28 years of service in the Congress. We sat side by side for many years through long, long days and weeks and months of hearings.

I knew something of Harry Sheppard. He was my true friend. Unnumbered and countless are the times when Harry Sheppard was my wise counselor and firm supporter.

Harry Sheppard served on several subcommittees during his 26 years on the committee, some 24 of which involved active association with defense budgets.

He felt very strongly about the survival of our country, and about the necessity of our maintaining superior military capability. He made a continuous and dedicated study of our country's defense needs. He never was willing to compromise on matters involving the security of our Nation. He was an acknowledged expert. The country owes a great deal to this man for the leadership he provided in the field of national defense.

His lovely wife, Kay, was his constant companion and assistant. Her wonderful spirit was a great asset to him during his long and distinguished career in Congress. She is a grand person.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), who now has the floor, that Harry Sheppard took a great deal of pride in being the dean of the California delegation. He loved his country first, but he also loved the great State of California, and he loved the California delegation.

Harry Sheppard was a real patriot. It is wholly fitting that we pay tribute to him today in this hallowed hall of free government where he served so well.

Mrs. Mahon and I join with the others in sympathy and respect at this time of loss of one of our great legislators, Harry Sheppard.

May the Lord bless his memory and give strength and comfort to Kay.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks, because I know they come from many, many years of association with Harry Sheppard, and he has intimate knowledge of the dedication that Harry Sheppard had toward his committee work at all times.

The gentleman from Texas knows probably more than anyone else the many, many hours they spent in committee work on vital defense construction and other matters pertaining to defense, and the strength of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with the dean of our California delegation, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), and also our many other colleagues to say a word or two about our departed colleague, Harry Sheppard.

As the gentleman from Texas, Chair-

man MAHON, indicated, Harry Sheppard was the dean of our delegation from California. I can recall in February 1965—on February 24, 1965, to be exact—that Harry, as the dean of our delegation, escorted me to the well of the House for my swearing in as a Member of this Congress. Before we went to the well of the House, he gave me a word or two of advice. I was not only in awe then, but most impressed during the entire course of our serving in the House together, and since his retirement on those occasions that our California delegation got together socially, that Harry Sheppard was truly a great human being. In addition to that, he impressed me as being of a cut or of a mold that is found in all too few of us in Congress these days. He was of the older, experienced school. He was a man of incredible energy.

I first met Harry at the 1960 convention in Los Angeles. We spent many hours together. As a matter of fact, it was about 5 a.m., as I recall, when Harry who at that time was, I believe, in his seventies, had completely worn out this junior Member. I just simply had to leave the coffee shop where we were eating and chatting, and tell him "Harry, you are just too young and vigorous for me. I just cannot take the pace."

Harry's wife, Kay, was the queen of our California delegation. All of us who knew them both are troubled because we cannot adequately fill the void that exists in her life as the result of Harry's passing away.

But I think it is very fitting at least that we spend these few minutes today, on the floor of the House, saying aloud many of the things that occur to us and keeping to ourselves some of the fonder memories we have of this great man.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I now yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I heard of the passing of Harry Sheppard. I served here in the House of Representatives with him for many years. He was a great American and a great legislator.

He was tough when he needed to be tough and he was very gentle when the circumstances called for gentleness.

Harry Sheppard was a man's man. He was a congressman's congressman. He was strong for the United States and strong for his State of California. He was most effective on those few times when he chose to participate in the debates of the Congress.

We missed Harry Sheppard when he retired and we will miss him now, that he has passed from among us.

I join with those who served with him in extending to his wife and family the sympathy of this body and myself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to hear of the passing of my friend and former colleague, Harry Sheppard.

I am pleased to have the opportunity

to join with my colleague in paying respect to his memory.

I had the honor of serving on the Military Construction Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Harry Sheppard, and Harry Sheppard was an outstanding subcommittee chairman.

He was a kind man. He had a great knowledge of the subject over which he had jurisdiction. He had a sense of humor. He was a man that you could approach with a problem. He was always willing to be of assistance to all of us here in the House of Representatives.

After Harry Sheppard retired, occasionally he would come back to our subcommittee and pay us a visit. We always considered him the chairman emeritus of that subcommittee because he had chaired it for so long and so well.

Harry Sheppard was fortunate to have lived a long life and to have lived a full life and an honorable and useful life. He was an outstanding Member of this body and I was delighted to have been able to call him my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deepest sympathy to his wife.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California, for getting this time and giving those of us who knew and loved Harry Sheppard an opportunity to express our sorrow at his passing.

Harry was one of the first men I met when I came to the House 25 years ago and from that day I enjoyed his friendship. For 24 years I served on the same Appropriations Committee with him and for 20 of those years I served on the same subcommittee with him, sitting side by side.

You cannot be with a man that long without knowing him well. He had all of the fine qualities that I have always thought necessary for a man to become a good public servant.

First and foremost, he was ruggedly honest. Second, he was a man of ability. Third, he was a man of great character. Through all the years I served on the subcommittee which he chaired I knew him as a great chairman.

He was a wonderful Congressman. No district ever received finer representation than did his California district.

Harry Sheppard was a great American. He believed in a strong America. Our military services never had a better friend in the Congress than Harry Sheppard. I think that of the four services, the Navy was his favorite.

I feel better having known Harry Sheppard. This Congress has been better because of Harry Sheppard. He was a gentleman of the old school, and we will miss him. I had the pleasure of seeing him several times after his retirement. He hated to leave Congress. He loved Congress. I shall never forget a conversation I had with him out in the Speaker's lobby. I ask him how he was getting along. He called me "Andy." He said, "Andy, when you get out, you want to come back."

He had a sweet disposition and could master any situation. To his sweet wife I

extend my profound sympathy. I shall never forget Harry Sheppard.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I know for how many years he served on the same committee with Harry Sheppard. I know what a good friend he was to Harry Sheppard, because Harry has spoken often of him to me.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who also served on the Appropriations Committee with Harry Sheppard.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct. It was my pleasure to serve on the Appropriations Committee for many years with Harry Sheppard. He was on the committee and in a position of responsibility when I was first elected to Congress and took my seat on the Committee on Appropriations. It is a very difficult committee when one first comes to it, because the work is technical and is very detailed. I had many questions, and I found that I could always turn to Harry Sheppard for an answer to many of the problems which confront new members of the committee when they first begin to serve.

I enjoyed Harry Sheppard's company. I found him to be one of the most gracious and gentlemanly persons that I had ever known. He took a delight in going out of his way to be of service to the members of the committee and other Members of the Congress, and it was always a pleasure for me to consult with him on mutual problems that came before us on the committee. It was always a pleasure to converse with him. I found him one of the real friends that made the Congress a place in which we could live and in which we could serve with some sense of satisfaction.

I regret very much that Harry Sheppard has gone. I think that his leaving Congress was a distinct loss to the country. I am sorry now that he has passed to his great reward. I want to extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Harry R. Sheppard, a highly respected former dean of the California delegation and a Member of this austere body for 28 years.

It has been my privilege to know Harry Sheppard for many years—long before coming to Congress. He was a wonderful friend and I am deeply saddened by his death.

Harry Sheppard was a gentle mannered man but also a man of firm convictions. He worked untiringly for his constituents and continued in public service for a greater length of time than his physical condition warranted. Harry Sheppard suffered for many years with emphysema but his determination and courage kept him active until April 28, 1969.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, Kay.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed deeply saddened to learn of the death of our friend and former colleague, Harry Sheppard.

It was my great privilege to serve with him from the time I first came to the House. We were very good friends and I learned much from him in the years we served together. Harry was an extremely able Member of this body and of the Committee on Appropriations on which he served. All of us who knew him will miss him.

Mrs. Albert joins me in extending our deepest sympathy and condolences to his lovely wife.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, we have all been saddened by the news of the passing of our former colleague and dear friend, Harry Sheppard, who served with great distinction in the House of Representatives for 28 years, before his voluntary retirement in 1964.

The 84 years that Harry Sheppard spent on earth were years of accomplishment in a life of rich experience and public service. He was my dear personal friend and I shall always cherish fond memories of our work and association in this august body. He was a skilled legislator who achieved the highest performance level as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction. At the time of his retirement he had risen to be the third-ranking Democrat on the powerful Appropriations Committee. Over the years he won our acclaim and admiration for adherence to the principles in which he believed and his strict observance of them in his legislative battles.

Men of the character and strength of Harry Sheppard are always needed in public service and we were all sorry to see him retire, even though we all acknowledged that it was a well-earned return to private life. We have missed his friendly presence, his wisdom and legislative skill. At the same time we were glad that he spent his last years near Washington so that some of us were from time to time given the pleasure of his company.

I know that I voice the feelings of all of us in extending to his dear wife, Kay Sheppard, our deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our former friend and colleague, the late Honorable Harry R. Sheppard. He represented the people of San Bernardino County, Calif., known as the 33d District, in an able and outstanding manner for many, many years. Not only did he serve his district well, but he also served the State of California and the United States of America very effectively.

Harry lived a good, full life. He was a successful businessman and a dedicated statesman. He enjoyed living and was a devoted husband. We will all miss him.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing our deep sympathy to his dear wife, Kay. We hope that she will find comfort in knowing that her beloved husband has left behind him a fine example of Americanism.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of our former colleague, the Honorable Harry R. Sheppard, who passed away on April 28. Harry Sheppard was an active and vital force in the House of Representatives for 28 years from 1937 until his re-

tirement in 1965. The people of this Nation and the residents of the 33d Congressional District of California were well served by this able and distinguished public servant.

I consider it a privilege to have known him and to have been associated with him for a number of years as a member of the California delegation and also as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

We will miss our friend and former colleague, Harry Sheppard, but we remember his friendship and his many contributions and accomplishments during his long years of service in the House of Representatives.

To his wife Kay I extend deepest sympathies.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to former Congressman Harry R. Sheppard, whose death a few days ago was a shock to all of us.

I had the honor and pleasure of knowing and working with Congressman Sheppard when I came to the House as a "freshman" Congressman from his own State of California. His friendship and advice through the years that we served together were important to me, and I valued them highly.

Harry Sheppard served in Congress for 28 years, retiring just a few years ago. His accomplishments here have never been forgotten. His tireless effort in the service of his district, his State, and his Nation have served as an illustrious example to others. He had the respect and admiration of his colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, and he will always be remembered as an able and distinguished Member of Congress.

Mrs. Corman joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Sheppard.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost that an era has ended with the passing of our good friend and former colleague Harry Sheppard. His span of working lifetime stretched from the latter days of the Alaskan gold rush almost until today. He participated in a rich variety of activities which prepared him well for the remarkable service he gave to our Nation while serving for so long in this body. Harry Sheppard had much to teach us all and he did so both by word and by example. His presence enriched our personal lives and his spirit and charity enhanced the lives of many persons throughout our country. Both Mrs. Hosmer and I had great respect and great love for this fine man. We are grieved by his passing and extend to his widow, Kay, our most heartfelt condolences. We know that the burden of her loss is great, but we also know that she must realize it is lightened by the fact that it is shared with her by so very many others.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the congressional district in California which Harry Sheppard served so nobly for 28 years, my sadness at his passing is tinged with pride.

Harry Sheppard was a great Congressman, a great American. He served in this body through some of the most trying periods in our Nation's history, and he contributed to the solution of the great problems of those times. As a member of the Appropriations Committee,

and chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, he played a significant role in building the country's defenses which carried us to victory in World War II. He insisted that U.S. Armed Forces be maintained at a level of strength consistent with the Nation's worldwide obligations through the difficult cold war period.

Harry Sheppard was a builder. Most of our military installations in this country and around the world bear his stamp. I would like to quote my distinguished colleague from Florida, the Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, who described Harry Sheppard's service the last time Mr. Sheppard brought a military construction bill to the floor:

In 28 years of meritorious service, he has earned the admiration and the high regard of the entire membership of Congress. He has established a reputation for forceful deliberation and for rugged adherence to the principles in which he believes. The work he has done here establishes a performance level of the highest order.

Harry Sheppard was in a position to make sure that the taxpayer got his dollar's worth. Again quoting Mr. SIKES, who said:

A strong exponent of economy, he saved billions—literally billions—for the taxpayers. Possibly he has saved more money for the American people than any other Member now serving in Congress. This is indeed a unique accomplishment in times like these.

A native of Alabama, Harry Sheppard turned out to be one of the great Californians. Only one other Californian—the late Honorable Clarence Lea, of Santa Rosa—served longer. My colleague, the distinguished dean of the California delegation, Mr. HOLIFIELD, will soon equal Shep's record. Mr. Sheppard was the dean of the California delegation for more than 15 years, and he helped guide many important pieces of legislation through Congress so important to our State.

So great was Harry Sheppard's renown for his work in military appropriations that many may have overlooked his contributions in the field of social legislation. He first came to Congress in the depth of the great depression, and he consistently supported measures to assist in recovery. His first significant vote came when he supported establishment of the social security program. He was a strong backer of civil rights, aid to education, and other programs designed to help people. Service to the people of his district and his country was his most important consideration as a Congressman.

No one had a higher regard for Congress than Harry Sheppard, nor held his colleagues in higher esteem. He once said of his fellow Congressmen:

When you hear them referred to as dummies, don't forget the dumbest of them was smart enough to get here.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that you best described Harry Sheppard's achievements, upon his retirement from Congress:

When he leaves here, he leaves with the knowledge that he did his best for our country, and his best were marked contributions that will be chronicled throughout the legislative history of our great nation.

The people of my district agree with

you, Mr. Speaker, and we are proud that we gave Harry Sheppard to the Nation.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable Harry R. Sheppard, who represented with great distinction the citizens of California's 33d Congressional District for 28 years.

Harry Sheppard's life stands as a shining example of what young men can achieve when they fully apply their talents to the opportunities presented in this great Nation of freedom and democracy.

Undaunted by being orphaned at 16, he combined a small inheritance and the income from odd jobs to work his way through an engineering degree at Georgia Tech. After studying law for 3 years, he applied his many talents to a variety of occupations and became a success before he was 30. As a young man, he had traveled widely before settling down in California—first as a consulting engineer in Fresno, and later as head of a chemical laboratory in Yucaipa, which he operated for 10 years.

In 1936, he ran for public office and was elected to the first of 14 consecutive terms as the 33d District's Congressman. He quickly applied his business acumen to the affairs of government, and became a recognized expert in military appropriations—particularly those of the Navy.

Harry Sheppard's contributions to his constituents, his State, and his Nation will be long remembered. Time does not permit me to summarize further his many achievements. Suffice it to say that no greater praise could be accorded any man.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, although my service in the House of Representatives only partially overlapped that of our distinguished former colleague, the late Harry Sheppard, there was nonetheless ample opportunity to become acquainted with the qualities which won him the affection and admiration of the California congressional delegation and the entire membership of this body. Twenty-eight years of his life were dedicated to the service of his country, and it was service of a high order. He left his mark on the legislative history of the House of Representatives. His congressional district evidenced their confidence and high regard by returning him repeatedly to the House of Representatives. His service was marked by all those friendly and thoughtful gestures which unfailingly earn high regard and which are the mark of a man of innate kindness and humility. Our sympathies go to the family of our former colleague in this hour of grief.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for years it was my privilege to sit next to Harry Sheppard in Appropriations Committee hearings in the Capitol, both in Defense Subcommittee and in Military Construction Subcommittee work. He was ranking member of the former and chairman of the latter. I think I knew him better than most. It is not possible to sit next to a man day after day, month in and month out, over a period of years without learning a great deal about his true measure. Consequently, I feel that I am on safe ground when I count him among the really big men who have served in Con-

gress. I know that his first thought was for the security of our country, and that he was a patriotic, dedicated American who loved America with all his heart.

His was a most distinguished career in Congress. At the time of his retirement, he had long been the senior member of his delegation, and his record of service was one of the longest in the history of California. Throughout these 28 years, he was looked upon as one of the Capitol's leading authorities in matters pertaining to defense. However, he had a strong and compelling interest in other fields as well, and his contributions in many areas of legislation were meaningful and significant.

It was my privilege to share a warm and close friendship with Mr. Sheppard both during his service in Congress and subsequent to his retirement. Occasionally following his retirement, I was able to have him join the members of his old committee as a luncheon guest. There were other instances when Mrs. Sikes and I enjoyed the pleasure of visiting with Harry and his beloved wife Kay. As the years passed, and as the dread ravages of emphysema took their toll, it was a distressing thing to realize what was happening to him, but heartening to note the gallant fight he was making and the courageous attitude which he always took.

We shall miss Shep very much. He left a distinguished, statesmanlike record of service in Congress which will live on in the memories of those of us who were privileged to serve with him. Mrs. Sikes and I extend to his wife, Kay, our deep and earnest sympathies in this trying period.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in expressing sincere regrets in connection with the death of the Honorable Harry R. Sheppard.

While I never had the good fortune to serve on a committee with him, I had a high respect for his work on the Appropriations Committee, and in connection with the activities of that committee I visited with him on many occasions.

He was a hard-working, dedicated public servant, and I have missed his presence in the House of Representatives since his retirement.

I extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable Harry R. Sheppard, for 28 years an outstanding legislator in these Halls, and distinguished dean of the California delegation in Congress.

Harry Sheppard will long be remembered as a man of great strength and character, who, during a period of nearly three decades in the House of Representatives, made a tremendous contribution to the development of his State and country, as well as to the overriding cause of a firm national defense in times of war and international turbulence.

"Shep," as he was affectionately known by his many friends throughout the country, was a gentleman in the truest sense of that word, and history will record him as a real statesman and patriot.

But, personally, I will always remem-

ber Harry Sheppard as the friendly, helpful senior Member of Congress who provided invaluable assistance and advice to his younger colleagues on Capitol Hill—and as the remarkable leader of a strong and united California delegation in Washington, organized effectively and held together in fine bipartisan fashion by the unique qualities possessed by Representative Sheppard.

I would like to extend sincere condolences from Mrs. Roybal and myself to Mrs. Sheppard. She must know that her great loss is shared not only by family and friends, but also by the people of the State of California and the Nation.

His long record of service to his fellow citizens will stand as a living monument to the exemplary career of the Honorable Harry R. Sheppard—a true friend and distinguished legislator.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

IMPROVING THE JOB CORPS

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, is there a man or woman in Congress who will honestly say that we cannot improve on a 4-year-old project?

That seems to be the tenor of the arguments today against improving the Job Corps.

Back in 1964 when we were considering the antipoverty program, we agreed, it is a good idea, let us give it a chance.

Today, after several years experience, is there anyone who maintains that we have not learned anything? That we can not take the accumulated experience we have had and put it to use to make some improvements?

Every year, we review various pieces of legislation, weed out the things that are not working, improve upon the things that are and make changes to meet the changing needs. At least, that is what we should be doing.

Even the greatest document of our democracy, our Constitution, needs to be changed from time to time. And the changes benefit more and more people.

The Nixon administration is proposing a change, based on experience and evidence, that will benefit more jobless young people. These are the young people we are supposedly concerned about. But when we have the opportunity to seek a better way to do something for them, some people dig in their heels and say no, let us keep the status quo. Just whose welfare are we concerned with, Mr. Speaker?

No young person will be denied an opportunity for training or work because of the changes proposed. In fact, more

youngsters will be given the kind of help that will lead to a more productive life.

That is what I am in favor of. I hope and pray that the rest of you are, too.

I include at this point a statement by the Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor, before the Committee on Education and Labor, on April 21, 1969:

STATEMENT BY MR. SHULTZ

Mr. Chairman, members of this committee, I am glad to be here today to discuss with you our efforts to help to expand job opportunities for all Americans, and particularly the role of the Job Corps program in those efforts.

It is less than five years since the Economic Opportunity Act first came before this Committee. Since that landmark occasion significant forces have been set in motion by the Act's mandate to open "to every one the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity." These forces have had a major impact on both our institutions and our expectations concerning the abolition of poverty. Within the Department of Labor there has been a profound change in the traditional tools used to promote the welfare of working men and women.

The Department today is much different than it was five years ago. We now administer manpower programs which open the way to self-help for over one million Americans. We have redirected our efforts so that top priority is given to the needs of the poor and the unemployed.

In embarking on this course, we have learned much more about what we can and must do than we knew in 1964. We must build upon this experience and affirm our commitment to seek better solutions.

The strengths and weaknesses of individual manpower programs have become more apparent as knowledge has accumulated. We should use this knowledge to develop a national plan for action against poverty.

It is because we need a broader strategy to cope with the intractable problem of poverty in America, that President Nixon has asked the Congress for a one-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. During this year, the Administration will develop a plan for a carefully conceived approach to the problem of poverty in America.

For example, we expect, in the near future, to present a Comprehensive Manpower Act for your consideration. This measure will be designed to implement a coordinated national manpower policy by providing the services necessary to develop fully our manpower resources while assisting the individual worker to realize the full range of his abilities. The overall plan will integrate segmented manpower components into a unified and more effective system for delivering human resource services. Such a program reflects the concern of the President when he said:

"One of the primary goals of this Administration is to expand our knowledge of how best to make real progress against those social ills that have so stubbornly defied solution. We do not pretend to have all the answers. We are determined to find as many as we can."

As you undoubtedly know, we think that we have some constructive proposals to make in regard to the Job Corps. It is because I want to share our thinking on this subject with you that I would like to focus on the Job Corps today.

Two important considerations should be highlighted at the outset.

First, when the Job Corps was established, there were only 27,000 training opportunities for youth in all Department of Labor programs. In fiscal year 1969, the number of out-of-school youth served by the Job Corps and the programs administered by the Department of Labor will be 362,000. Under Presi-

dent Nixon's budget for fiscal year 1970 this total is expected to be 368,000—or an increase of 5,700 over this fiscal year. Hence, the reduction in the number of youths served in Job Corps during the course of a year will be more than offset by the increase in other manpower programs. Essentially, we have evaluated the overall design of our manpower programs and are suggesting a reallocation of resources among the programs to achieve better results in terms of benefits and costs.

Second, I pledge that every effort will be taken to afford each Job Corps enrollee in a center to be closed the opportunity to transfer to another center, to accept employment or to enroll in another manpower program.

In looking at the Job Corps it is important to understand that it was developed as one way to deal with a specific problem and was based on a limited set of ideas and a narrow design for dealing with the problem.

The problem was the large number of youths who drop out of school, many from vocational schools, without being adequately prepared for either further training or employment, and whose home or neighborhood environment prevented them from effectively utilizing other manpower programs.

The set of ideas on which this program was built include:

RESIDENCE

One central idea is that complete residential service is essential for the target population. The assumption is that these youths are so hampered by disruptive home conditions that they need a totally new environment in order to learn or acquire skills.

REMOVAL FROM COMMUNITY

The second premise is that the youth in the target group should be completely removed, not only from an adverse family situation, but a long distance from their neighborhood or home community.

INTENSIVE SUPPORTIVE SERVICE

Of equal importance is the belief that such youth need comprehensive and intensive supportive services. Here the premise is that work training alone will not remove all the obstacles to employment. The full range of services would provide for basic education, counseling, health services, pre-employment orientation and recreation.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY

And finally, Job Corps has assumed that each residential center should be substantially self-sufficient and by itself provide the full range of services needed. The location of many of the centers promotes the concept of self-sufficiency.

In reviewing the basic ideas underlying the Job Corps it is clear that some have continued merit while others should be dropped or modified in the light of experience and recent developments in our manpower programs.

First, we support the contention that residential services are essential for many youths who otherwise lack the home environment necessary to sustain effective learning. We also agree that comprehensive and intensive supportive services must be a part of any such program.

Second, we believe that complete residential services are not essential for all who have been enrolled in the Job Corps.

In addition, residential services are not always best provided at a great distance from home and community. Nor should we continue to operate the Job Corps on the principle that it should be a self-sufficient entity divorced from the other manpower programs that have been initiated in recent years.

The General Accounting Office, after a careful study of the Job Corps, raised serious questions concerning whether the Job Corps was, in fact, reaching that client group it is designed to serve. It said: "A significant portion of Corps members have not met the qualifications generally considered necessary

for participation in the program and the alternative of enrolling applicants in other less costly, and possibly more suitable, training programs, apparently were not always considered." GAO and others who have studied Job Corps have found that the main emphasis in recruiting is on "meeting quotas", not making a careful, considered decision that a costly residential training program is best for a particular individual. Moreover, the information necessary to identify those who need specific residential support is not included in the questionnaire used for selection.

This inability to identify and enroll those youths who specifically need residential support persists despite the disproportionately large expenditure of resources allocated for recruitment and selection. For example, in fiscal year 1969, about \$10 million was budgeted for recruitment compared to \$3 million for placement activities. This imbalance, and the difficulty in recruiting for the Job Corps generally, raises a serious question about the size and design of the program necessary to serve the target group.

One of the most significant factors limiting the success of the Job Corps is the short length of stay by corps members. In this respect, the long distance from home undoubtedly contributes to the high drop-out rate and short length of stay. Men's and women's urban centers located in states which "import" Job Corps enrollees have 30-day drop-out rates that average over 15 percent higher than the rates in "export" states. Similarly, the fact that 28 percent of those young people who have been accepted for the Job Corps never arrive at a center supports the inference that a general policy of moving enrollees far from their home communities has impaired the overall effectiveness of the Job Corps. OEO studies also have shown that 70 percent of all corps members were homesick and felt the lack of emotional support derived from family living. Many younger corps members apparently would have preferred being enrolled at centers near their homes and this has already been recommended in one OEO study.

Although the dedicated men and women who have operated the program have introduced useful innovations, it remains true that the Job Corps design does not respond selectively to the differing needs of youth. For example, it does not provide residential support for those who may need it *within* their own communities. Moreover, it is poorly coordinated with a total manpower program which has both increased in magnitude and improved in quality over recent years.

To build on those basis premises which have demonstrated their worth—the need for a residential component in manpower programs and a full line of services—two major changes in program design are necessary. Implementation of this new approach should go far to overcome significant weaknesses in the present Job Corps approach and practices while making good use of the constructive attributes of the Job Corps concept.

First, the Job Corps will be made an integral part of a comprehensive manpower system, rather than continued as an essentially separate program.

Such integration will greatly benefit every element of the overall program and reinforce the strengths of Job Corps. Its unique residential services will be woven into the total design of the ongoing programs. This should improve recruitment, screening and selection practices, more precisely identifying those who have a special need for residential services as against other available alternatives. For example:

Job Corps would be a part of the Cooperative Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). This will permit the use of a wide spectrum of services as an alternative to, or in coordination with residential centers.

The capabilities of the Job Corps centers could be tied into the Concentrated Employment Programs, affording another tool with which to address the work-training problems of young people. Presently, 82 individual CEP's have been funded, including virtually every major city in the country.

Youth who are already in manpower programs such as MDTA or NYC and who are identified as needing residential support, would be able to get it.

Employment opportunities available through the National Alliance of Businessmen JOBS program could be tied directly to the job needs of graduating Corpsmen. The recent expansion of this program to 125 major cities will open a great many new job opportunities. The budget proposed by President Nixon for fiscal year 1970 includes a goal of 140,000 training and employment opportunities under the JOBS program.

In short, instead of standing in splendid isolation, the Job Corps would be supported by and lend support to all other manpower programs.

A second major change is to direct part of the Job Corps resources to new organizational forms, particularly smaller "inner-city or near-city" residential centers.

While Job Corps has had in the past a few experimental centers, on the whole its structure has remained unchanged. Thus, the job Corps is comprised of very large men's centers housing several thousand youth and located about 40 miles from the nearest city; smaller women's centers housing from several hundred to a thousand girls; and small men's conservation centers located in the country. Great flexibility is needed in the kind of residential manpower programs necessary to meet the varying needs of young people.

Our plan for improving the operation of Job Corps would provide for the establishment during fiscal 1970 of new centers located in or near the city and designed to serve primarily the residents of the city.

Some of the centers would provide work training for enrollees in a residential setting close enough to the city to permit week-end commuting home.

Some would be located within the city and provide training for residents of the center and also nonresidents who need training and supportive services, but not the domicile facilities.

Other centers would provide distinctive residential service for young unmarried mothers and could include, or be linked to, child care service.

Some would provide mainly residential and supportive services with training furnished by other components of manpower programs administered by the Department of Labor.

In developing the new centers we will be as flexible and imaginative as possible. We will try to utilize the best aspects of the Job Corps experience as well as drawing upon our own experiments with residential centers. In any case, we will continue to review our efforts in this area so that we may modify the program as appropriate. A policy based on the status quo will result in inertia and not innovation.

In addition to questions of policy and emphasis, the Job Corps has been beset by a number of important operating problems. First, the Job Corps has demonstrated serious deficiencies in its ability to retain enrollees for the duration of the specified program. Experience in calendar year 1968 indicates that almost 40 percent of the enrollees dropped out in the first 90 days. For the men's urban centers, this early drop-out rate was 38 percent, for the conservation camps it was 41 percent, and for the women's centers it was 34 percent. Ultimately, only 24 percent of enrollees completed their program at the conservation centers, 43 percent in the men's centers and 38 percent in the women's centers. These data reinforce the judgment that the Job Corps, as presently

constituted, has not been able to retain many enrollees for a period of time sufficient to derive a full measure of benefits from the program.

Second, job placement, a central practical, and measurable goal of all manpower development programs, has not been outstanding in Job Corps. This consideration is highly important for a very expensive, high unit cost, residential training program.

According to OEO reports, approximately 67 percent of the young men leaving Job Corps centers are placed in jobs, return to school or join the military service 90 days after they leave. The rate in individual centers varies from slightly more than 40 percent to almost 85 percent. This aggregate placement rate for women is 54 percent. Placement success, more than anything else, depends upon the ability of the center to motivate the young people so that they complete their training program and are equipped for useful employment.

As part of our overall package, we contemplate changes that should ameliorate the problems of retention and placement:

By reducing the number of enrollees who are transported long distances from their homes we should cut down dropouts and, at the same time, make it possible to develop specific job opportunities for the corps member while he is still at the center. In this manner, the corpsman will have greater incentive to complete his course of training.

The center itself will be required to take the initiative in securing placement services. This would involve developing individual placement plans for each corps member. The services of the Local employment office in counseling and job development would be available. The center itself may engage in job development and placement work. This activity will be greatly facilitated in the proposed new centers which will be located in or close to the labor market in which the corpsmen subsequently seek employment.

More "gate houses" and readjustment aids would be provided corps members when they graduate. Relocation assistance could be provided under existing Department of Labor programs to corpsmen who wish to move to labor shortage areas after they graduate.

The essential point is that these kind of employment assistance facilities are available in other manpower programs and by bringing Job Corps into a comprehensive manpower development system they can be made more effectively available and tailored to the needs of individual corps members. Both the training and the placement process should be enhanced as a result.

Weighing all of these considerations, we are unable to support a decision to retain the present size and character of the Job Corps. Our plans for revising Job Corps are dictated, not by any arbitrary desire to reduce cost without regard to quality, but by the necessity of acting upon an evaluation of the Job Corps in relation to the other manpower programs that have been developed since its inception.

Recent discussions of the Job Corps have focused on the closing of existing centers. I recognize that such action inevitably will excite controversy and concern. However, it is important to keep a perspective of the overall magnitude and directions of our overall manpower program. The Job Corps is one of a wide variety of public programs designed to prepare young people for their life's work. This Administration has reviewed the manpower development effort proposed for FY 1970 by our predecessors. We have looked at all of the manpower programs and have proposed a change in the mix of training opportunities for young people and other persons served by manpower programs. Our analyses lead us to conclude that the size and scope of the Job Corps should be substantially changed. Once overall program levels and mix were determined, it was necessary to estab-

lish criteria for evaluating the various centers and camps at some distance from their home communities.

After discussions with OEO staff we selected criteria which in their—and our—judgments are meaningful measures of the performance of the centers in achieving their objectives. The criteria were those OEO had used in the past; the data for each criterion were compiled by Job Corps and covered the entire calendar year 1968.

The criteria are:

1. Average operating cost of the center per enrollee man-year.
2. The average length of stay, in months, of enrollees at the center.
3. The 30-day drop-out rate at the center.
4. and 5. Average reading and math gains by the enrollees. (Sufficient information was not available from the women's centers to permit valid comparison, however.)
6. The percent of tardiness that were placed 90 days after leaving the center. This criterion was given twice the weight of the others because it measures the end product of the centers' efforts.

We then ranked each center according to how it compared with centers of a similar nature for each criterion. To bring the program down to the planned level it was necessary to close about one-third of the larger centers, and two-thirds of the conservation centers. The larger reduction in the conservation camps reflected our concern with the performance and program design of these units. We kept, however, the 32 best-rated conservation centers to accommodate the need for residential training facilities for youth from rural areas which lack such resources and for urban youth for whom training for outdoor occupations will be beneficial.

Similarly, we selected the best men's and women's centers as determined by the rating system. Only one exception was made: Poland Spring which was marginal in the ratings was selected for closure upon the advice of the OEO.

We do not anticipate the demise of the Job Corps, rather we seek to improve its quality and relevance to the realities of the labor market. If we are successful, there will be an improvement in the acquisition of marketable skills and job placement. As part of our proposal there will be 30 new inner-city or near-city residential manpower centers established, providing opportunities for 4,600 youths (in man-years) and capable of recruiting, training, and placing them entirely within their home State or urban area. Both types of new centers have already been tried on an experimental basis by Labor Department and have indicated considerable promise. The net effect will be to create a more flexible capacity to deal selectively with the differing needs of enrollees.

The annual cost of this new initiative is estimated to be \$24 million for fiscal year 1970. The announced closing of the existing units and additional savings will result in a net reduction for the year of \$100 million in the Job Corps budget. However, it should be kept clearly in mind that total training opportunities for youth under all manpower programs administered by the Department of Labor will increase during the fiscal year 1970.

As reconstructed, the Job Corps will offer a wider range of services to young people. The mix of centers will have the following proportions:

1. Comprehensive regional residential skill training centers will be retained for those for whom full-time residence away from home area and family is necessary. These centers will also provide manpower services to youth largely from sparsely-populated rural areas which cannot support such programs. Four men's centers and 11 women's centers are proposed.

2. Conservation centers in rural areas will

be operated for youths needing extensive basic education preparatory to skill training, or for those who seek outdoor-work careers. The program should lead more directly to placement in skill training or some specific occupational employment. Thirty-two conservation centers would be retained.

3. Near-city residential centers will be opened for those for whom only work-week residence away from home is desirable, with work-training geared to the specific occupational needs of the area served. Ten such centers would be opened.

4. For youths unwilling or not needing to leave their city, two types of in-city residential support are planned;

One is a training facility with attached residential support which provides training in one or several skills, both for residents and nonresidents. Five medium size centers are recommended.

The other is a small residence with no training facilities of its own. It will provide intensive residential support of training using other facilities in the community and will include tutoring, special counseling, shared work responsibility and other services not available in conventional training programs. Such support is designed particularly for high-risk youths who ordinarily have high dropout rates from training programs because of home and family problems. It is suggested that 15 small centers be developed.

It is our intention to examine the new ventures as scrupulously as the old, and to review the entire program throughout the coming year and beyond. When the results begin to come in, we expect to evaluate them in a spirit of candor so that we can ascertain and make whatever further adjustments are necessary. Indeed, we have scrutinized programs already under the administration of the Department of Labor and have not hesitated to cut back and reshape programs where the evidence suggested it was necessary. Our proposed budget for fiscal year 1970 incorporates significant changes—both reductions and additions—in many important areas.

Earlier, I indicated that we will expand the opportunities for young people in FY 1970, notwithstanding the reduction in Job Corps. Although such aggregate figures are important, we must go further and concern ourselves with the individual corpsmen in the camps to be closed. Each corpsman must be afforded a constructive alternative.

Accordingly, telegrams have been dispatched to all affected centers, committing the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity to the maximum possible help to Job Corps enrollees during the transition period. This commitment includes priority in referral to and participation in other manpower programs for each enrollee who does not choose transfer to another Job Corps center.

As a first step in carrying out this commitment, the Job Corps and the U.S. Department of Labor on Friday, April 18, requested State employment security administrators to assign interviewing staff to centers to assist in the transfer of enrollees to other centers or referral to suitable jobs, on-the-job or institutional training, Neighborhood Youth Corps or other manpower programs.

Our national manpower programs must give priority to those who have not shared in the promise and opportunity that are enjoyed by most Americans. We intend to press this priority with our full resources in the period ahead. An effective residential center component is an essential part of the program and we shall fully engage the resources and expertise of the Job Corps in that effort.

The process of evaluation sometimes leads to hard choices, but we believe that this process is necessary if manpower programs are to continue to serve as a bridge to economic opportunity.

A NEW PRESIDENT AT SHEPHERD COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, Shepherd College is one of a number of the smaller institutions of higher learning which have quickened the intellectual life of this land of ours, and have made possible our preeminence in practically every field of human activity that counts in this age of the world. The college is not distinguished by wealth, by architectural magnificence, or by outstanding contributions to the development of science. It has been content, rather, to hold up the light of learning and inspiration in the more isolated spaces of the continent. And so Shepherd, along with other colleges of like nature, has awakened the dormant genius of the people, and set up a true democracy of culture and power in this Nation. It is the men and women coming out of these schools who fill the posts of influence, and who provide the leadership which makes us a great people. The small college is truly America.

A few days ago a new president of Shepherd College, in the person of Dr. James A. Butcher, was inducted into office. It was my pleasure to be present on that occasion and to note the great pride which West Virginians take in their school. Part of that pride derives from the fact that Dr. Butcher himself is a product of West Virginia institutions. He carries into the presidency of Shepherd College a distinguished career in education in our State, and his elevation to the head of the institution confers honor on him as well as on the governing board which selected him. We look forward to his administration with confidence in his ability and in his progressive leadership.

It is a pleasure to offer his inaugural address as an example of optimism and sureness of purpose in an educational world that so often seems to be succumbing to doubt and confusion:

THE PRIVILEGE TO LEAD

(Inaugural address delivered by Dr. James A. Butcher, Apr. 19, 1969)

It is with humble gratitude and dedication that I stand here today. As a native son who is a product of the depression, who has observed the agonies of three wars since 1941, and who has been tempered by the sight of affluence and poverty in the eyes of the young, I gratefully accept the privilege to lead this institution and hopefully to help this college to play a role in aiding young men and women to prepare for future living and to make a contribution to mankind.

As I look toward the majestic mountains of my beloved West Virginia, I become more aware of the diamonds still buried there beneath indifference and a lack of motivation. Then it is, that I remind myself again, that it is a privilege to be in this position and accept this challenge of leadership.

As Emerson stated, "Fear springs from ignorance." And the great Jefferson added, "Preach, sir, against ignorance." This is the challenge! Our problems cannot and will not be solved by revolutions of hate, violence, or mistrust, but rather by compassionate leaders who exercise reason and understanding.

The world is his who can see through its pretensions. There is no good reason why we should fear the future nor the challenges it presents! Though the problems may be new and the tasks before us different from those of our fathers who founded and preserved this institution, the spirit with which we meet these problems remains essentially the same. I welcome the privilege to lead historic Shepherd College which stands on the threshold of a bright and productive future. I commit myself to endeavor to do as Woodrow Wilson suggested—and that is to deliberately set out to make "this college a home for the spirit of learning."

A home for innovation and involvement and a mecca where ideas become realities. The many ideas, decisions, and attitudes a president and those associated with him make daily will in the end, determine the contribution the college makes to its constituency. Honesty and consistency are necessary in order to eliminate complacency and confusion.

We are not going to attempt to be all things for all people, this brings only mediocrity.

A course must be charted and plans must be made and then it is the duty and responsibility of the administration to see to it that concrete steps are being taken to fulfill these plans. The faculty, students, and community leaders will be consulted, and their views will become a part of the collective planning for the future. In fact, as many of you know, the process has already begun.

This college has played a major role in aiding many students in the past, but its responsibility is critical for doing more in the future. It shall be the goal of the fourth president of Shepherd College to raise questions, propose programs, and influence leaders in all walks of life to the extent that they will realize that this institution can and will make this area a better place in which to live.

It is honorable to respect tradition, but it is "wrong" to allow it to strangle programs and the teaching learning process. With information doubling about every 9 years it is certainly time for professors and programs to be eclectic in their approach to disseminating knowledge. An undergraduate college's responsibility today can be little more than preparing its students for future learning and change.

Much is televised and written about American College students, but let me say to you who are assembled here, America never had finer younger people! Yes, they are troubled and distressed by world conditions and giant powers who have the ability to destroy most of mankind. But they are also truly concerned about ignorance, disease and poverty. On occasion they have been disgraced by the radical actions of a small minority, but the fact remains that they come to our campuses better prepared than any before in our nation's history. I have faith in them! There idealism is not all bad, and their solutions to problems won't cure all our ills, but here at Shepherd we do plan to listen and consult with these fine young men and women, for they may very well have something worthwhile to tell us which would improve Shepherd College.

It is my sincere hope that together and cooperatively we will maintain a positive attitude toward our challenge for the future. Let us continue and strengthen the heritage of the mountain state for it has historically fulfilled its obligation to law and order, it served as a model in desegregating its schools after the 1954 Supreme Court decision, it laid to rest the notion that religious bigotry had a place in American national politics by making it possible for John F. Kennedy to be elected President of the United States. It has produced Nobel Prize winner Pearl Buck, la-

bor leader, Walter Reuther, opera stars, Eleanor Steber and Phyllis Curtin, world political negotiator, Cyrus Vance, a number of university and college presidents assembled here today, and presently two key leaders in American Education, Commissioner of Education, James Allen, NEA Director, Sam Lambert, Ambassador McFarland and others who have also made contributions worthy of note.

I have pride in Shepherd's past, and a confidence in its future. The mountains are there, still to be claimed; but the sky beyond keeps beckoning one upward. It is my hope and intention to face the mountains of the future with a pragmatic philosophy, for if history and the realities of life have taught us anything, it is that few things are certain, and answers to problems are not simple and concrete.

And to the faculty, which is in reality the college itself, I say, that the potential of this institution is still in its infancy. The increase in population and the advance in industrial and scientific technology in the area offers this college a great challenge and opportunity to perform a leading role in the area's development. Our human resources and physical facilities necessitate that we be the cultural and learning center for the area. So let imagination burst forth and new innovation spring up! Let us strive to produce an atmosphere in which students and citizens can be freed to learn. Freed to learn the rich heritage left us and dare to dream the dreams which will one day come true! Let actions replace words! Let Shepherd College become known as the action college. You the faculty, can set the pace for this action!

For the faculty is the lifeblood of the institution, the stabilizing feature and the facilitator of the learning involved. I am pleased that Shepherd College has many professors who are willing and capable to make learning a living part of each student, who realize and assume the responsibility for awakening or rekindling the fire of curiosity in students, and who are always aware that the student sees more in the Professor's actions than he hears in the class.

The effect of one's teaching is far reaching. Even as I was preparing my address for today I received a letter from one of my trusted friends in education, Dr. Earl R. Boggs, who admonished me thusly: "when you start the Inaugural procession, look in the direction of our native Gilmer County and realize that, greatness is not measured in size but rather in the magnitude of the concept." So it is, with this thought in mind, that I challenge you as professors on this inauguration day to dedicate your working hours toward making your classroom truly a place where learning is respected and change inevitable.

But in the final analysis it is the responsibility of the president to create and maintain a climate in which both learning and teaching will flourish. This will mean an intellectual environment in which imaginations are stirred, which fosters confidence that worthwhile things can be done, and where freedom and security go hand in hand with a sense of obligation and loyalty. This I shall strive to do. Not only do I accept the honor of the college presidency, but I am willing to assume the responsibilities which go with the office.

The principle I shall use to guide my decision making and association with others was best said by Matthew many years ago:

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The following Creed is the philosophy which I propose to perpetuate for Shepherd College—

"There is a destiny that makes us brothers; None goes his way alone;

All that we send into the lives of others Comes back into our own."

PUBLIC REPORTS OF UNITED MINE WORKERS AND UMW WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the recent discussions concerning the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund have raised several questions which have impelled me to request a full-scale congressional investigation of the financing, investments, rules and regulations, management and

benefits of this fund. Under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1962, there are certain requirements for public disclosure of data concerning salaries of employees of the fund and other matters. These data are filed with the Department of Labor and available for public inspection. I believe it is in the public interest to share these data more widely with Members of Congress, inasmuch as their filing in the Department of Labor has not necessarily made the data accessible to all Members. Under unanimous consent, there follow certain excerpts from these reports filed by the fund and the United Mine Workers of America:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT SUBMITTED TO LABOR DEPARTMENT BY UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND (FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968)

Total amount of contributions to the plan during the year covered by this report.....	\$163,089,691.21
Number of participants covered by plan:	
Employed.....	103,250
Retired.....	69,750
Total.....	173,000

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES FOR YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 1967, AND ENDING JUNE 30, 1968

Item	End of prior year	End of reporting year
Assets		
1. Cash.....	\$74,946,053.19	\$70,667,214.93
2. Bank deposits at interest or shares in savings and loan associations.....	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00
3. Common stocks.....	44,196,099.13	44,188,818.11
4. State and municipal bonds.....		15,236,717.60
5. Unsecured loans and notes receivable (other than real estate).....	125,000.00	
6. Accrued income (accrued interest purchased).....		11,910.63
7. Prepaid expenses (deposit).....	475.00	475.00
8. Travel advances.....	2,860.45	4,270.27
Total assets.....	169,270,487.77	180,109,406.54
Liabilities		
Reserve for future benefits.....	169,270,487.77	180,109,406.54
Total liabilities and reserves.....	169,270,487.77	180,109,406.54

Cash Receipts	
Contributions.....	\$163,089,691.21
Investment receipts (interest and dividends).....	4,667,882.50
Sale of assets.....	7,281.02
Loan receivable.....	125,000.00
Total receipts.....	167,889,854.73

Cash Disbursements	
Benefits provided by the trust.....	101,793,120.10
Payments to clinics, hospitals and doctors providing plan benefits.....	50,214,044.03
Administrative expenses:	
(a) Salaries.....	4,097,185.10
(b) Expenses, etc.....	196,608.26
(c) Taxes.....	128,404.45
(d) Fees and commissions.....	58,550.00
(e) Rent.....	405,266.18
(f) Insurance.....	3,866.54
(g) Other expenses.....	732,216.42
Total.....	5,622,096.95

Reimbursed by Social Security Administration.....	710,606.14
Purchase of assets (purchased from others).....	4,911,490.81
Other disbursements:	15,236,717.60
Accrued interest purchased.....	11,910.64
Travel advances.....	1,409.82
Total disbursements.....	172,158,692.99

United Mine Workers of America, Welfare and Retirement Fund of 1950, part IV, Section A, statement of assets and liabilities—Estimated contributions due but unpaid as of June 30, 1968

Judgments.....	\$2,223,281.05
Judgment and promissory notes.....	1,302,123.62
In litigation.....	391,734.60
Bankruptcy and receivership claims.....	156,372.02
Additional estimated delinquencies.....	1,608,000.00

Total estimated delinquencies¹..... 5,681,511.29

¹ The estimated amount of debts outstanding at the end of June 30, 1968, consists solely of sums due or estimated to be due from operators signatory to the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreements. None of the outstanding debts represent loans granted or investments made by the Trustees. Not only are the foregoing figures estimated, but the amount thereof which can be collected and thus properly considered as an actual asset of the plan, is not known.

THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950—FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968

Name of recipient (1)	Position (2)	Gross salary (3)	Allowances, expenses, etc.—Other direct and indirect disbursements		
			Expenses (5)	Other disbursements (6)	Total of (5)+(6) (7)
Ashley, Dona Marie.....	Stenographer-receptionist.....	\$7,366.12			
Bacon, Harold H.....	Attorney.....	30,000.10			
Ballew, Arthur R.....	Auditor.....	14,108.37	\$1,558.21	\$700.14	\$2,258.35
Barb, Dorothy Eileen.....	Clerk-typist.....	6,844.18			
Barham, Neva G.....	Stenographer.....	7,277.56			
Barry, James W.....	Accountant.....	8,634.82			
Bayrer, Constance M.....	Clerk.....	4,799.09			
Benthall, Philip L., Jr.....	Accountant.....	11,206.56			
Bernat, John E.....	Junior research assistant.....	5,825.55			
Bernat, Mary E.....	Clerk-typist.....	1,933.62			
Bigley, John C.....	Accountant.....	10,230.88			
Bigley, Margaret M.....	Secretary.....	7,980.00			
Bingman, William Newell.....	Supervisor.....	14,299.96			
Blalock, Lenora E.....	Secretary.....	7,980.00			
Blizzard, William A.....	Assistant to comptroller.....	22,838.56	279.43	276.92	556.35
Bloomfield, Fred A.....	Certified public accountant.....	17,305.12	671.83	912.83	1,584.66
Blouir, Samuel C., Jr.....	Supervisor.....	9,030.74			
Booker, Lewis A.....	do.....	13,300.00			
Bowman, Claude I., Jr.....	Data processing supervisor.....	13,683.13			
Bowman, Emma Lou.....	Key punch operator.....	7,052.28			
Boylan, Robert T.....	Executive assistant to director.....	34,999.90	352.25	86.94	439.19
Bramlett, F. LaHamer.....	Junior accountant.....	8,064.27			
Brown, John J.....	Senior accountant.....	13,095.53			
Brown, Myrtle G.....	Secretary.....	8,179.36			
Burch, Rose M.....	Clerk.....	6,752.38			
Caines, Margaret.....	Clerk-typist.....	7,453.35			
Cardoni, Michael.....	Tabulating machine operator.....	8,115.65			
Carey, Sara E.....	Administrative secretary.....	9,207.62			
Carty, Gilbert B.....	Tabulator operator.....	8,160.89			
Cheek, Robert M.....	Junior research assistant.....	5,825.55			
Chicca, Regina M.....	Secretary.....	5,902.23			
Clark, Dorothy M.....	Supervisor.....	14,299.96			
Claytor, Norma Jean.....	Stenographer.....	5,880.03			
Connors, John J.....	Research assistant.....	11,253.88			
Cortesini, Henry.....	Accountant.....	10,923.74			

THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950—FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968—Continued

Name of recipient (1)	Position (2)	Gross salary (3)	Allowances, expenses, etc.—Other direct and indirect disbursements			Total of (5)+(6) (7)
			Expenses (5)	Other disbursements (6)		
Crumit, Jacqueline Lee	Clerk-typist	\$5,618.66				
Dempsey, Anne	Key punch operator	7,052.28				
Dotzenrod, Marjorie	Stenographer	6,304.81				
Dudley, Tommie G.	Attorney	17,838.53	\$293.77	\$438.70		\$732.47
Dumick, Sandra R.	Administrative secretary	10,844.62				
Elliott, Donald D.	Accountant	9,770.82				
Ellis, Josephine Mary	Ediphone operator	7,059.12				
Fowler, Joyce W.	Clerk-typist	3,507.37				
Frabell, William C., Jr.	Clerk	5,852.96				
Frye, Margie C.	Stenographer	7,258.00				
Gabel, James H.	File clerk	5,105.50				
Garvey, William Forrest	Junior research assistant	5,745.25				
Gass, Ruby A.	PBX operator	6,079.59				
Gornick, Rita F.	Clerk-typist	2,293.23				
Gray, Deanna	Secretary	7,345.40				
Gutt, Dora	Clerk-typist	7,366.12				
Hale, Hope J.	Administrative assistant	10,352.38				
Hanson, Mattie	Key punch operator	5,845.85				
Hanrahan, Kathryn	Clerk	7,432.98				
Haynes, Margaret C.	Research assistant	9,892.32				
Hertzog, George	Supervisor	9,630.81				
Hibbitts, Charles E.	Examiner	10,990.43				
Hickey, Jerry	Clerk	6,752.38				
Hicks, Miriam A.	Research assistant	9,892.32				
Hicks, Nell W.	Administrative secretary	9,207.62				
Hicks, Penny	Clerk-typist	5,404.71				
Hobbs, Carolyn V.	Key punch operator	5,902.15				
Hoover, Herbert P.	Assistant to comptroller	21,784.52				
Hopkins, Welly K.	Counsel to trustees	50,000.08	345.30			345.30
Huey, Dolores Mae	Clerk-typist	5,591.90				
Hunter, Lorraine Odell	Clerk	5,380.89				
Insley, Charles C.	Accountant	8,634.82				
James, Anna Jean	Administrative secretary	9,327.74				
Janis, Bessie Barbara	Stenographer	7,366.12				
Johnson, Francis L.	Certified public accountant	15,683.26	408.11	252.8		660.96
Kaplan, Robert	Research director	26,346.14				
Kave, Nancy Lee	Key punch operator	7,117.81				
Kelley, Harmon, Jr.	Assistant to director	27,499.94	1,442.39	724.70		2,167.09
Kelly, Irena S.	Research assistant	9,487.56				
Kernekin, Mary H.	Secretary	7,980.00				
Kerns, Barbara Ann	Clerk-typist	4,577.45				
Kidd, Robert H., Jr.	Data processing programmer	14,029.26	213.57	61.95		275.52
Kraft, Janet E.	Junior accountant	7,853.66				
Kumper, Gail J.	Clerk	5,074.35				
Landreth, Faye M.	PBX operator	5,480.98				
Carleton, Pam S.	Clerk-typist	4,989.90				
Leaman, John H.	Senior accountant	12,443.69				
Lewis, John N.	do	13,145.52				
Lorenzen, John William	Accountant	9,363.50				
Lucas, Charles E., Jr.	Junior Research Assistant	5,725.86				
Magee, Brenda Jo	Ediphone operator	4,666.67				
Marsh, Phyllis Pray	do	6,034.63				
Martino, Leon	Messenger	1,919.73				
Milburn, Mahlon T.	Assistant comptroller	30,000.10	8.00			8.00
Morley, William M.	Accountant	10,210.69				
Moses, Barbara L.	Executive secretary	10,767.29				
Mosko, Helen J.	Clerk-typist	5,027.04				
Moss, Rosalie	Junior accountant	8,246.16				
Moyer, Paul B.	Supervisor	18,464.67	693.98	344.94		1,038.92
Muller, Peggy	Secretary	6,076.42				
McAndrew, Eugene F.	Supervisor	18,324.67	317.16			317.16
McCloskey, Rosa C.	Clerk	6,752.38				
McConkey, Sandra E.	Clerk-typist	3,499.85				
McCullough, John W.	Junior research assistant	5,745.25				
McFadden, Joseph	Attorney	17,338.52	32.75	113.37		146.12
McFarland, Donald L.	Supervisor	18,234.67	208.85			208.85
McGee, George F.	Examiner	11,503.88	538.70	831.63		1,370.33
McGinnis, Michael C.	Clerk	2,779.60				
McKoy, Kenneth E.	File clerk	4,731.88				
McMillan, Thomas G.	Legal investigator	12,787.00	1,908.16	1,430.08		3,338.24
Noell, Lowry W.	Accountant	11,240.42				
Noethe, Jewel Irene	Executive secretary	11,967.26				
Obrecht, Lillian Mary	Ediphone operator	7,059.12				
O'Connell, Walter P.	Administrative assistant	13,300.00				
Oddenino, Mary Alice	Junior accountant	8,491.50				
Painter, Patrick J.	Supervisor	15,046.08				
Peters, George D.	Accountant	10,657.25				
Phillips, Ethel A.	Secretary	7,733.96				
Pomozalski, James P.	Auditor	14,538.37	1,037.40	1,219.92		2,257.32
Prevatt, Rachel C.	Clerk-typist	7,257.64				
Price, Betty Jane	Administrative secretary	9,329.20				
Quisenberry, Billie E.	Senior accountant	12,965.34				
Radovich, Phyllis R.	Clerk	2,465.29				
Rajacich, Eve S.	Administrative secretary	10,844.62				
Rauber, Mary C.	Administrative assistant	12,692.32				
Reid, Anita Ann	Ediphone operator	5,721.73				
Riddell, James R.	Junior accountant	8,254.71				
Robilotto, John V.	Examiner	11,368.57	180.84	114.98		295.82
Roche, Josephine	Trustee-director	59,999.94				
Roggow, Louise M.	Clerk-typist	5,482.60				
Rouse, Carolyn W.	do	4,989.19				
Ryan, Thomas F., Jr.	Comptroller	50,000.08				
Rye, Zona Grey	Administrative secretary	9,207.62				
Sabatini, Dianne P.	Clerk-typist	5,455.43				
Sanders, Barkev S.	Assistant research director	13,000.00	151.15	128.52		279.67
Schlesiger, Dora D.	Clerk	6,775.22				
Segreti, Clara H.	do	7,489.22				
Seitzinger, Glenn W.	Accountant	10,990.43				
Sickle, Wm. L.	Assistant to director	27,499.94				
Reed, Karen E.	Clerk	4,989.90				
Williams, Elizabeth Mae	Key punch operator	5,766.48				
Soyars, Elizabeth B.	Administrative secretary	8,837.29				
Stewart, Dexter A.	Clerk	4,880.61				
Stratton, John A.	Auditor	14,407.20	1,020.87	1,607.55		2,628.42
Studds, Mary K.	Key punch operator	7,052.28				

THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950—FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968—Continued

Name of recipient (1)	Position (2)	Gross salary (3)	Allowances, expenses, etc.—Other direct and indirect disbursements			Total of (5)+(6) (7)
			Expenses (5)	Other disbursements (6)		
Sweeney, Margaret Ann	Junior accountant	\$8,601.48				
Taylor, William R.	Junior research assistant	7,052.28				
Thomas, Marie K.	Administrative assistant	10,915.62				
Townsend, James C.	Accountant	10,367.61				
Walker, Mavis	Secretary	7,672.32				
Ward, Harold W.	Public information officer	19,000.02	\$188.10			\$188.10
Ward, James H.	Research assistant	8,491.50				
Ward, Shirley H.	Administrative secretary	6,565.77				
Warner, Dorothy M.	Secretary	7,600.11				
Weaver, Barbara Ann	Clerk-typist	6,786.66				
Weeks, William V.	Senior accountant	12,963.78				
Welsh, Sheila A.	Clerk-typist	5,301.26				
Wetzel, Laverne H.	do	5,087.16				
White, Katherine Marie	Secretary	7,596.87				
Widman, Charles L.	Attorney	24,703.88	4,874.22	\$3,474.64		8,348.86
Williams, Gray Lamont	Research assistant	11,253.88	94.26	138.31		232.57
Williams, Warren R.	Assistant public information officer	13,499.98				
Williams, William A., Jr.	Accountant	11,235.37				
Williamson, Edith M.	Clerk-typist	6,849.63				
Wilson, Ruth F.	Secretary	7,496.81				
Wilson, Steven E.	Junior accountant	8,491.50				
Woodbury, Margaret R.	Secretary	6,164.70				
Yaukey, Jesse B.	Supervisor	15,299.92				
Schmidt, Henry G.	Trustee	34,999.90	154.73	173.25		327.98
Dalton, Thomas J.	Examiner	11,336.97				
Dickenson, Harold D.	do	11,973.88	2,088.11	311.31		2,399.42
Graham, Jack E.	Assistant supervisor	14,886.16	645.33			645.33
Hawkins, Teddy C.	Examiner	12,113.10	3,235.98	685.57		3,921.55
Hefflerly, Fred K., Jr.	Field service assistant	13,517.00	5,200.88			5,200.88
Hulguis, Joseph F.	Examiner	13,137.00	3,311.38	536.95		3,848.33
Julian, Dominic R.	do	12,867.00	1,824.78	1,327.95		3,152.73
Kieler, Carl J.	do	12,277.00				
Krempasky, Louis	do	12,603.44	2,163.19	687.66		2,850.85
Leftwich, Waller R., Jr.	do	12,073.88	3,089.29			3,089.29
Madden, John D., Jr.	do	11,923.88	2,297.32	296.33		2,593.65
Moyer, James Lenard	do	12,917.00	1,649.06	1,294.68		2,943.74
Nallin, J. Dermid	do	12,013.55				
Olds, Robert A.	do	12,083.88	2,392.53	1,069.53		3,462.06
Pheasant, Max L., Jr.	do	11,106.75		(11.23)		(11.23)
Ratcliffe, Jack F.	Assistant supervisor	14,926.16	624.28	295.43		919.71
Reid, Joseph A.	Assistant to director	16,316.94	676.55	519.75		1,196.30
Rejonis, Walter	Examiner	11,300.03				
Riley, Robert E.	do	11,236.38				
Rizzi, Irving S.	Administrative assistant	13,300.00				
Sickle, Charles A.	Field service assistant	15,573.00	4,541.49	2,546.59		7,088.08
Vicini, Leo P.	Assistant supervisor	14,986.16	841.96	161.58		1,003.54
Vowell, James T., Jr.	Field service assistant	13,597.00	4,487.85	2,477.28		6,965.13
Watley, William G.	Examiner	10,990.43				
Weis, Carl E.	do	12,787.00	1,439.77	426.22		1,865.99
Allen, Richard A.	Messenger	1,219.49				
Anderson, Rebecca L.	Clerk-typist	850.98				
Diez, Emilia	do	859.64				
Esworthy, George A.	File clerk	986.56				
Harris, Pamela J.	Clerk-typist	354.78				
Laneave, Susan Anna	do	499.04				
McGurk, Deborah Louise	do	645.00				
Miles, Willie J.	File clerk	2,477.05				
Moser, Carol A.	Clerk	870.00				
Noell, Carol Ann	do	660.00				
Radovich, Mary Jane	do	765.00				
Segreti, Joseph A.	do	645.00				
Westlin, Patricia A.	Clerk-typist	4,110.89				
Bigley, Margaret	Clerk	45.00				
Bigley, Michael	do	75.00				
Eades, Steven D.	Messenger	1,106.44				
Bogreti, Gregory J.	Clerk	30.00				
Boyer, Judith A.	Clerk-typist	532.76				
Caines, Gale	Clerk	45.00				
Clarke, Marie A.	do	180.00				
Cruit, Janis E.	Clerk-typist	221.55				
Giesler, Gail P.	do	55.39				
Lewis, Patricia B.	Key punch operator	477.69				
Marquez, M. Teresa	Clerk-typist	1,033.87				
Noell, Sandra L.	Clerk	105.00				
Reinhart, Robert W.	Messenger	480.31				
Shoulders, Carole M.	Clerk-typist	1,200.03				
Monds, Willie H.	Messenger	51.46				
Bailey, Ronald L.	Technical assistant	6,283.90	74.55			74.55
Baker, Patsy A.	Stenographer	4,041.94				
Barnes, Asa, M.D.	Area medical administrator	30,946.22	2,336.44	298.00		2,634.44
Beverley, Marlene	Secretary	5,541.88				
Brown, Clarence Ray, Jr.	Administrative assistant	11,967.73	564.31			564.31
Coram, Gwendolyn	Secretary	6,141.96				
Falconer, Wilfred J.	Assistant area medical administrator	20,461.50	876.56	43.68		920.24
Ferguson, Dana	Clerk-typist	4,041.94				
Forren, Robert L.	Administrative assistant	6,283.90	68.16	43.68		111.84
Forren, Virginia May	Clerk-typist	5,142.35				
Goodson, Wanda M.	Janitress	1,874.10				
Harris, Linda F.	Administrative assistant	7,183.77	1,336.22			1,336.22
Hickman, Magdaline	Stenographer	3,461.50				
Meadows, Eileen T.	Clerk-typist	3,791.52				
McClosky, Kathleen M.	do	5,142.35				
McDaniel, John R.	Administrative assistant	12,283.92	3,604.47			3,604.47
McGraw, Della	Stenographer	3,437.30				
McPherson, Sibyl H.	Administrative assistant	9,583.82	1,492.08	127.75		1,619.83
O'Shinski, Irene	Clerk-typist	5,212.35				
Sepkowski, Violet E.	Secretary	5,841.92				
Surbaugh, Gladys F.	Clerk	5,841.92				
Thompson, Cleo A.	Clerk-typist	4,800.12				
Whitehead, Gaye Marie	Technical assistant	6,883.86				
Randolph, Susan	Stenographer	1,517.50				
Barnes, James A., M.D.	Area medical administrator	3,461.54	787.80	119.70		907.50
Hodges, Elizabeth J.	Stenographer	210.00				
Shirkey, Laura A.	do	1,095.00				
Cassidy, Marguerite	Secretary	6,181.74				
Hampton, Geneva Moore	Clerk	2,603.05				

THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950—FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968—Continued

Name of recipient (1)	Position (2)	Gross salary (3)	Allowances, expenses, etc.—Other direct and indirect disbursements			Total of (5)+(6) (7)
			Expenses (5)	Other disbursements (6)		
Hancock, Barbara A.	Technical assistant.	\$8,983.88				
Hirsch, Albretha M.	Administrative assistant.	11,683.84	\$638.97			\$638.97
Holsombeck, Glenn F.	do.	11,083.76	164.20	\$103.43		267.63
Lee, Edna Earle	Technical assistant.	7,203.78				
Littlefield, Samuel E.	Administrative assistant.	12,283.92	1,178.45			1,178.45
Morris, Nora Jane	Clerk.	6,351.78				
McGough, Cecil	do.	6,393.12				
Spivey, Alice F.	do.	5,861.94				
Stephens, Gladys L.	do.	5,994.41				
Wentz, Merle F.	Assistant area medical administrator.	20,461.50	1,506.86	274.59		1,781.45
Bennett, Virginia I.	Technical assistant.	8,841.94				
Bumgardner, Betty C.	Clerk-typist.	4,932.47				
Maynard, Gloria Jean	Clerk.	3,297.60				
Burgess, June Kay	do.	3,283.76				
Carrow, Eileen	Stenographer.	4,277.36				
Crownover, Claudia	Administrative assistant.	11,967.73	443.76	149.70		593.46
Geissinger, Patricia A.	Technical assistant.	8,404.89				
Harper, Okey S.	Administrative assistant.	8,967.73	1,201.26	157.55		1,358.81
Hart, James Thomas, Jr.	Assistant area medical administrator.	20,461.50	760.08	263.19		1,023.27
Isaac, Betty Gay	Clerk.	4,341.98				
Jarrett, Jean L.	Clerk-typist.	5,212.35				
Lewis, Carolyn Virginia	Secretary.	5,383.78				
Mazzei, Frank J.	Administrative assistant.	12,567.69	701.97	46.83		748.80
Petersen, Willie Mae	Secretary.	4,258.85				
Roebuck, Oscar M., Jr.	Janitor.	5,241.84	12.30			12.30
Rutherford, Martha W.	Secretary.	6,141.96				
Scott, Robert K.	Medical consultant.	6,000.02				
Turner, Beulah	Clerk.	5,083.88				
Williams, Carolyn Sue	do.	4,803.46				
Workman, Opal W.	do.	4,613.61				
Jackson, Walter T.	Technical assistant.	470.76	69.17			69.17
Miller, Wanda Lee	Secretary.	1,287.67				
Farley, Louella M.	Clerk.	110.77				
Gillooly, John P.	Technical assistant.	2,990.74	198.69			198.69
Bessey, Larry T.	Administrative assistant.	9,558.43	546.90	315.24		862.14
Booth, Cherie S.	Stenographer.	2,730.00				
Clapshaw, Elaine E.	do.	4,609.71				
Crites, Violet	Secretary.	4,441.23				
Deshler, Beverly	Technical assistant.	6,600.10				
Dorsey, William A., M.D.	Area medical administrator.	30,946.22	2,746.12	1,339.22		4,085.34
Kennedy, Diana F.	Secretary.	2,439.25				
Kruger, Ada	Assistant area medical administrator.	20,461.50	4,336.95	1,538.75		5,875.70
Logan, Etha Louise	Technical assistant.	5,841.92				
Talty, Nora P.	do.	8,367.65				
Kondos, Jean	Stenographer.	2,111.58				
Simmons, Beverly Anne	do.	1,137.50				
Irvine, Jacquetta M.	do.	417.50				
Jones, Robert E., M.D.	Assistant area medical administrator.	11,538.48	471.85			471.85
Andrasko, Joseph A.	Technical assistant.	8,999.90	8.80			8.80
Arestad, F. H., M.D.	Area medical administrator.	30,946.22	635.51			635.51
Berret, Thomas J.	Assistant area medical administrator.	20,461.50	1,643.39			1,643.39
Brooks, Sandra Louise	Clerk-typist.	3,014.88				
Carbaugh, Joanne	do.	2,457.59				
Csarak, Darlene Maria	do.	3,216.83				
Drzal, Josephine C.	do.	3,875.76				
Fulton, Rose Lukens	Technical assistant.	8,999.90	709.93			709.93
Fulton, Thomas L., Jr.	Administrative assistant.	11,367.65	415.77			415.77
Goebert, Nancy Diane	Clerk-typist.	2,584.51				
Jacobs, Helen K.	do.	3,441.86				
Karoly, Eleanor M.	Clerk.	5,533.80				
Knapp, Marie Anna	Janitress.	1,793.65				
Kokoruda, Dorothy M.	Secretary.	5,091.83				
Kutchman, Margaret	do.	5,683.82				
Sheridan, Alice M.	Technical assistant.	7,783.84	1,521.76			1,521.76
Skerl, Tony J.	Administrative assistant.	11,367.65	456.75			456.75
Weir, Eleanor Irene	Clerk.	6,181.74				
Borelle, Susan	Clerk-typist.	1,401.87				
Alberter, Colleen Y.	do.	472.10				
Alvida, Linda Louise	do.	490.75				
Baers, Richard D.	Technical assistant.	1,776.93				
Koban, Mary E.	Secretary.	1,179.24				
Stumpo, Edith M.	Clerk-typist.	1,465.33				
Bates, Herbert, Jr.	Administrative assistant.	5,411.59	1,200.03			1,200.03
Bird, Bedford W.	Assistant area medical administrator.	20,461.50	1,798.71	789.13		2,587.84
Brabson, Linda	Secretary.	4,341.98				
Capps, Otis B., Jr.	Technical assistant.	9,236.43	68.10			68.10
Carroll, Dorothy L.	do.	8,841.94				
Cooter, O. Harmon	Administrative assistant.	11,367.65	2,441.63	174.04		2,615.67
Daniel, Robert R.	do.	11,083.76	2,949.66			2,949.66
Hall, Ruth R.	do.	11,083.76	1,132.18			1,132.18
Hamelin, Natalie Ann	Stenographer.	2,261.56				
Housewright, Bonnie E.	Secretary.	6,181.74				
Judkins, Mildred L.	Technical assistant.	8,999.90	2,148.12	102.90		2,251.02
Kennedy, Marie B.	Clerk.	5,861.94				
Koplin, Allen Norman, M.D.	Area medical administrator.	30,946.22	3,487.78	1,001.65		4,489.43
Dunn, Katherine D.	Secretary.	5,861.94				
Lambert, Anne W.	do.	6,181.74				
McIntyre, Eugene, Jr.	Administrative assistant.	6,182.24	1,484.48			1,484.48
Murray, Anna Frances	Technical assistant.	8,999.90	1,712.38	8.00		1,720.38
Pollard, Jane C.	Clerk.	4,175.80				
Pyatt, Sarah E.	Stenographer.	5,231.29				
Scott, Dorothy	do.	3,875.76				
Smith, Francis E.	Administrative assistant.	11,367.65	1,345.27			1,345.27
Smith, Wade Hampton	do.	10,167.63	1,473.43			1,473.43
Ward, Charlotte	Clerk.	5,541.88				
Williams, Charlotte Y.	Secretary.	6,181.74				
Wright, Carolyn Sue	Stenographer.	3,724.70				
Butler, Eunice E.	Secretary.	711.05				
McWane, June Wallace	Clerk.	1,349.98				
Corea, Charles J., M.D.	Assistant area medical administrator.	10,010.94	1,324.23	55.71		1,379.94
Barnhorst, Susan F.	Stenographer.	4,642.02				
Carter, Beverly Ann	Clerk-typist.	3,891.92				
Cheak, Bonnie Sue	Stenographer.	4,241.58				
Christian, E. G., M.D.	Medical consultant.	4,140.00				
Folan, Julia F.	Clerk.	5,083.88				

THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950—FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968—Continued

Name of recipient (1)	Position (2)	Gross salary (3)	Allowances, expenses, etc.—Other direct and indirect disbursements			Total of (5) + (6) (7)
			Expenses (5)	Other disbursements (6)		
Galandis, Martha Ann	Administrative assistant	\$10,967.65	\$2,019.61	\$561.04	\$2,580.65	
Gearhart, Ruth B.	Secretary	6,003.76				
Hadley, Ruth Stone	Administrative assistant	8,967.73				
Harper, Jeannette F.	Secretary	4,941.94				
Head, Willie V.	Technical assistant	6,583.82				
Houchin, Edward L.	Administrative assistant	9,318.51	1,212.48	770.21	1,982.69	
Hughes, Roy W.	do.	11,967.73	763.19	480.58	1,243.77	
Jensen, Lois B.	Secretary	4,991.52				
Johnson, Lucile M.	Administrative assistant	10,483.82	680.98		680.98	
Jones, Cecil Ross	Technical assistant	7,183.77				
Logsdon, Carol Ann	Clerk-typist	3,691.13				
Lyninger, Vivian	Clerk	6,303.92				
Morris, Irvin G., Jr.	Administrative assistant	14,383.09	1,697.98	577.22	2,275.20	
Mueller, Patricia Ann	Clerk-typist	2,916.86				
Musselman, Elwood C.	Assistant area medical administrator	20,461.50	1,311.05	606.76	1,917.81	
Parker, Betty Ann	Secretary	4,273.31				
Pontrich, Thelma Lee	Clerk	5,016.88				
Salyers, James Richard	Administrative assistant	10,583.78	787.89	85.05	872.94	
Shrodes, Dorothy E.	Secretary	5,241.84				
Sils, Anna Lee	do.	6,303.92				
Steele, Mary Nelle	Technical assistant	5,274.68				
Winebrenner, John D., M.D.	Area medical administrator	30,946.22	1,998.15	804.41	2,802.56	
Gillespie, John Willson	Administrative assistant	3,668.45	75.24		75.24	
Sims, Anne Louise	Clerk-typist	384.25				
Diamond, Jack L., M.D.	Assistant area medical administrator	1,592.32	120.81		120.81	
Weiter, Mary A.	Secretary	1,529.97				
Beal, George T.	Technical assistant	7,467.72	2,383.51		2,383.51	
Boord, Rose Marie	do.	7,183.76				
Bucklew, Margaret Joyce	Clerk	2,212.01				
Core, Hildred I.	Secretary	5,786.93				
Dobis, Martin A.	Administrative assistant	11,067.68	1,492.75		1,492.75	
Fleming, Virginia D.	Technical assistant	7,483.80				
Galusky, Margaret R.	Secretary	4,340.72				
Gresko, Alexis Denise	Stenographer	3,891.92				
Joseholder, Sam B.	Administrative assistant	20,461.50	438.93	125.35	564.28	
Kradlock, Mary Wharton	Secretary	5,541.88				
Lytle, Mary Elizabeth	do.	5,861.94				
Marshall, Hubert T., M.D.	Area medical administrator	30,946.22	1,075.09	407.82	1,482.91	
Myers, Richard L.	Clerk	3,883.77				
Perrine, Margaret L.	Secretary	5,761.54				
Petso, Joseph	Technical assistant	7,483.80	26.07		26.07	
Sabo, Charles M.	Administrative assistant	11,667.69	1,726.39		1,726.39	
Thomas, Carol Ann	Secretary	5,367.63				
Thompson, Patrick J.	Administrative assistant	9,341.52	2,328.47		2,328.47	
Travinski, Francis J.	Technical assistant	6,883.86	2,667.21	20.64	2,687.85	
Veach, Betty Jane	Administrative assistant	9,445.37	824.52	34.65	859.17	
Walls, Martha Naomi	Clerk	2,263.93				
Woods, Claudia	Stenographer	3,891.92				
Zolton, Mary	Janitress	2,815.57				
Sowell, Karen	Clerk-typist	1,561.48				
Talbott, Mary Anne	Secretary	661.17				
Walsh, Ann Marie	Clerk-typist	567.28				
Skidmore, Harry T.	do.	765.00				
Biagi, Pauline D.	Clerk-typist	4,420.63				
Bohatch, Betty A.	do.	5,212.35				
Davidson, Anne A.	Technical assistant	8,989.13				
Ewing, Dolores J.	Clerk	5,021.28				
Hickman, Hattie H.	Public health nurse	6,703.91	381.16		381.16	
Igo, Kenneth J.	Technical assistant	5,723.10	226.28		226.28	
Juliano, Peter	Administrative assistant	11,967.73				
Kiefker, A. Pauline	Clerk	6,883.86				
Manning, James Taylor	Administrative assistant	14,473.02	1,572.49	39.17	1,611.66	
Martin, Carol Ann	Clerk	3,641.50				
Miller, Fredericka O.	Secretary	5,215.30				
Muha, Dorothy C.	do.	5,541.88				
Nassif, Mae	Technical assistant	5,258.02				
Palmer, W. Phillips	Assistant area medical administrator	20,461.50	1,060.13	409.73	1,469.86	
Pendleton, Carrie B.	Secretary	5,441.48				
Randall, Rachel	Stenographer	3,083.02				
Rasfske, Joseph P.	Technical assistant	9,567.67	3,740.69	33.92	3,774.61	
Roth, Martha	do.	9,567.67				
Ray, M. Frances	Secretary	5,541.88				
Switzer, Mildred R.	do.	6,352.04				
Young, Constance J.	Technical assistant	7,483.80	1,344.27		1,344.27	
Falk, Leslie A., M.D.	Area medical administrator	10,807.73	74.85	69.08	143.93	
Huguley, Lilia C.	Secretary	1,764.04				
Capek, Donna	Clerk	133.27				
Garson, Warfield, M.D.	Area medical administrator	12,307.70	1,153.09	685.93	1,839.02	
Williams, Patricia	Clerk-typist	450.00				
Baruzzini, Margaret D.	Secretary	5,841.92				
Brannum, Irma Lea	Stenographer	4,624.71				
Brother, George M., M.D.	Area medical administrator	30,946.22	1,775.18	119.89	1,895.07	
Coon, Eugene J.	Administrative assistant	12,283.92	3,700.83	119.88	3,820.71	
Cooper, Betty R.	Stenographer	4,783.84				
Desmarais, M. Virginia	Administrative assistant	11,683.84	1,400.93	119.89	1,520.82	
Dwiggins, Gail L.	Clerk-typist	1,742.50				
Fern, Bonnie B.	Stenographer	5,501.84				
Girard, Dorothy M.	Clerk	5,861.94				
Goodrich, Janice L.	Stenographer	5,241.84				
Gutterres, Angelina M.	Clerk	5,530.92				
Kottmann, Elizabeth J.	Technical assistant	7,641.90				
Luther, Oscar D.	Administrative assistant	12,283.92	142.63		142.63	
Miceli, Margaret Mary	Clerk-typist	4,009.63				
Moli, Margaret Ellen	do.	1,682.50				
Moore, Francis J.	Assistant area medical administrator	20,461.50	289.16	119.89	409.05	
Nicholson, Melvin C.	Administrative assistant	10,183.90	77.60		77.60	
Ponder, Yvonne Lillian	Secretary	5,861.94				
Sandler, Clare	Stenographer	4,642.02				
Splan, Evelyn M.	Clerk-typist	3,741.90				
Stern, Irene M.	Technical assistant	7,341.86				
Underwood, Brenda K.	Clerk-typist	2,595.00				
Weselis, Geraldine M.	Stenographer	3,360.03				
Cooper, Glenda Jeanne	Clerk-typist	432.50				
Harmon, Anna Marie	do.	1,340.00				
Scheid, Darleen C.	do.	1,434.41				
Schonohoff, Jean	do.	781.92				
Fritz, Rebecca A.	do.	735.00				

THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950—FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1968—Continued

Name of recipient (1)	Position (2)	Allowances, expenses, etc.—Other direct and indirect disbursements			Total of (5)+(6) (7)
		Gross salary (3)	Expenses (5)	Other disbursements (6)	
Kanevsky, Laurie	Stenographer	\$945.00			
Winslow, Catherine A.	Clerk-typist	630.00			
Robbins, Carole L.	Clerk-typist	252.50			
Ahlin, Beverlee K.	Administrative secretary	8,279.27			
Daniels, Henry C.	Administrative assistant to executive medical officer	22,961.52	\$382.02	\$203.58	\$585.60
Draper, Warren F.	Executive medical officer	34,999.90	112.13	112.35	224.48
Fortney, George R.	Administrative assistant	12,876.96			
Glover, Robert S.	do	10,230.88			
Gooden, Opal	do	13,300.00	370.96	412.30	783.26
Hawkins, Rosemarie B.	Secretary	8,798.50			
Hipsley, Eleanor	do	7,520.06			
Howanitz, Johanna	do	6,762.04			
Kenamer, Elizabeth H.	do	7,980.00			
Kerr, Lorin E.	Assistant to executive medical officer	31,446.20	706.71	758.97	1,465.68
Kornegay, Doris B.	Secretary	8,814.50			
Mayers, Harold J.	Hospital consultant	21,961.44	359.23	178.08	537.31
McCray, Willis E.	Administrative assistant	10,230.88			
McDonough, Mary F.	Secretary	7,647.91			
Newdorp, John	Deputy executive medical officer	33,946.10	842.05	516.09	1,358.14
Pohlmann, Kenneth E.	Rehabilitation consultant	20,961.48	544.71	96.06	640.77
Robinson, Patricia M.	Secretary	5,963.07			
Streit, Paul H.	Clinical consultant	10,019.88			
Threatt, Ella J.	Secretary	7,001.50			
Eubanks, Rose B.	Administrative secretary	1,199.06			
Bailey, Donna	Clerk-typist	1,955.80			
Total		4,097,236.28			
Payments from city of Pittsburgh, Pa., for withholding of city occupational tax		4.80			
Payments from State of Missouri for withholding of State income tax		41.46			
Payment from Penn Hills Township for collection of levy		4.92			
Subtotal		51.18			
Total		4,097,185.10	155,447.23	41,079.10	196,526.33
Net debit for personal travel paid in excess of reimbursements for the period July 1, 1967, through June 3, 1968				81.93	81.93
Total			155,447.23	41,161.03	196,608.26

Note: Col. (4), no allowances paid.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND
RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950
LEGAL FEES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD JULY 1,
1967, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1968

	Fees	Expenses
M. E. Boiarsky, 511 Kanawha Valley Bldg., Charleston, W. Va.	\$13,755	\$747.25
Cooper, Mitch & Crawford, Suite 1025, Bank for Savings Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.	14,750	328.59
Clyde Y. Cridlin, Jonesville, Va.	1,200	148.24
Grant F. Knuckles, Asher Bldg., Pineville, Ky. 40977	7,200	369.43
Kramer, Dey, Greenwood, Johnson & Rayson, Valley Fidelity Bank Bldg., Knoxville, Tenn.	4,250	320.65
McCray, Clark, Statham & McCray, 810 Southern Securities Bldg., Evansville, Ind.	425	
Louis D. Meisel, Deveny Bldg., Fairmont, W. Va.	475	1.00
Louis D. Nattkemper, 506 Ohio St., Terre Haute, Ind. 47801	495	193.49
H. B. Noble, 304 Main St., Hazard, Ky.	3,475	452.45
Paul A. Pachuta, 85 East Gay St., Columbus, Ohio	25	20.00
Plowman & Speigel, 1200 Grant Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.	750	18.92
Rabil & Rabil, 403 Raleigh Savings & Loan Bldg., Raleigh, N.C.		(5.10)
Swope & Swope, Law Bldg., Ebensburg, Pa. 15931	4,275	405.75
Kenneth J. Yablonski, 505 Washington Trust Bldg., Washington, Pa.	2,450	511.00
AUDITING		
Wayne Kendrick & Co., Rust Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20005	4,650.00	
CONSULTING SERVICE		
Maurice H. Levita, consulting actuary, 2828 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20008		375.00

Report, Jan. 1, 1967, to Dec. 31, 1967, International Union, United Mine Workers of America

Investments (736,944 shares, National Bank of Washington)	\$23,777,546
Disbursements to officers:	
Gross salary (before taxes and other deductions)	648,333
Expenses (including reimbursed expenses)	165,896
Total	814,229
Disbursements to employees:	
Gross salary (for employees receiving over \$10,000)	2,518,795
Gross salary (total for all employees who, during the reporting period, received \$10,000 or less gross salary, allowances, and other direct and indirect disbursements)	966,256
Salary total for employees	3,485,051
Expenses (including reimbursed expenses for employees receiving over \$10,000)	652,673
Expenses (including reimbursed expenses for employees receiving less than \$10,000)	45,910
Total expenses	698,583
Total salaries and expenses for employees paid over \$10,000	3,171,468
Total salaries and expenses for employees paid under \$10,000	1,012,166
Grand total	4,183,634

International Union, United Mine Workers of America, year ended Dec. 31, 1967

Item 50, receipts from other sources:	
Refund from Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. on deferred annuity contracts	\$108,256
Repayments received on mortgage investments	41,581
Cash balances in treasuries of abandoned locals	2,254
Other receipts from locals	6,003
Payment on Albia, Iowa, property sold in 1964	2,040
Miscellaneous expense refunds	49,257
Total	209,391
Item 69, disbursement for other purposes:	
Anthracte Board of Conciliation	20,232
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions	11,340
Labor's Non-Partisan League	6,000
Miners International Federation	40,310
National Coal Policy Conference	75,000
Organizacion Regional Interamericana de Trabajadores	1,575
Payroll deductions forwarded	847,581
Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, rooms for use of officers	11,567
Expenses incident to attendance at meetings in foreign countries	21,131
Automobile expense and storage	6,524
Portraits and photographs	998
Labor Day rally	19,293
Organizing expense	236,178
West Virginia Nonpartisan League	1,675
Advances to locals	1,300
Other expenses	14,377
Total	1,315,081

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BLMR FILE NO. 000063, YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1967

SCHEDULE 1.—LOANS RECEIVABLE

	Repayments received during period	Balance at end of period
A. H. Bull Steamship Co.		\$334,791
Purpose: Business investment and to enhance employment opportunities of union members.		
Arrangements for payment: Due in installments beginning Jan. 1, 1963.		
Security: Fleet and real estate mortgages.		
Lewmurken, Inc.		1,451,104
Purpose: Business investment and to enhance employment opportunities of union members.		
Arrangements for payment: On demand.		
Security: Notes and other securities.		
Total		1,785,895

SCHEDULE 5.—REAL ESTATE OWNED

	Cost	Book value
(a) Land and buildings held as investments:		
907 15th St. NW., Washington, D.C.	\$875,000	\$466,000
1427 I St. NW., Washington, D.C.	550,000	550,000
Total	1,425,000	1,016,000
(b) Other land and buildings:		
900 15th St. NW., Washington, D.C.	586,580	500,000
1523-5-7 I St. NW., Washington, D.C. (cost includes buildings which were razed in 1957)	142,500	75,000
1435 K St. NW., Washington, D.C.	285,000	285,000
1437 K St. NW., Washington, D.C.	390,000	390,000

SCHEDULE 5.—REAL ESTATE OWNED—Continued

	COST	Book value
(b) Other land and buildings—Con.		
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	\$80,000	\$80,000
Ebensburg, Pa.	52,000	52,000
Hazleton, Pa.	60,000	60,000
Renton, Wash. (land only)	300	300
Terre Haute, Ind.	120,000	120,000
Charleston, W. Va.:		
1210 Kanawha Ave.	65,000	65,000
1300 Kanawha Ave.	85,000	85,000
Middlesboro, Ky.	25,500	25,500
Madisonville, Ky.	47,500	47,500

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BLMR FILE NO. 000063, YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1967

SCHEDULE 8.—DISBURSEMENTS TO OFFICERS

Name	Status	Gross salaries	Expenses	Total
President: W. A. Boyle	C	\$50,000	\$11,631	\$61,631
Vice president: George J. Titler	C	40,000	5,939	45,939
Secretary-treasurer: John Owens	C	40,000	4,946	44,946
International executive board members:				
Henry Allal	C	25,000	9,187	34,187
Louis Austin	C	25,000	7,628	32,628
C. Edward Beane	C	20,000	6,664	26,664
Arthur Biggs	C	20,000	6,036	26,036
R. J. Boyle	C	25,000	8,975	33,975
Martin F. Brennan	C	20,000	785	20,785
John H. Delaney	C	20,000	4,999	24,999
John Ghizzoni	C	20,000	7,632	27,632
Fred K. Hefferly	C	20,000	5,256	25,256
Carson Hibbits	C	25,000	8,283	33,283
R. R. Humphreys	C	20,000	3,808	23,808
Joseph Kershtsky	C	20,000	2,888	22,888
Wilbert W. Killian	C	20,000	5,632	25,632
John T. Kmetz	C	30,000	15,257	45,257
William Mitch	P	13,333		13,333
Sam Nicholls	C	19,000	313	19,313
Peter Phillippi	C	20,000	2,289	22,289
James W. Ridings	C	20,000	609	20,609
Joseph Shannon	C	20,000	6,712	26,712
Cecil J. Urbaniak	C	20,000	6,030	26,030
William Ure	C	15,000	3,579	18,579
Ewing Watt	C	20,000	3,630	23,630
Joseph Yablonski	C	25,000	12,668	37,668
International auditors:				
Ben Cicero	C	12,000	3,899	15,899
Alfred Lamo	C	12,000	5,933	17,933
Archie V. Woods	C	12,000	4,688	16,688
Total		648,333	165,896	814,229

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BLMR FILE NO. 000063, YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1967

SCHEDULE 9.—DISBURSEMENTS TO EMPLOYEES

Name	Position	Gross salaries	Expenses	Total
Walter W. Akers	Organizer	\$10,950	\$3,720	\$14,670
Louis E. Austin, Jr.	do	10,950	3,990	14,940
Lloyd Baker	District secretary-treasurer	14,600	5,888	20,488
Jesse M. Ballard	District board member	10,950	3,087	14,037
Norman A. Beck	International representative	10,803	4,623	15,426
Clarence Booth	District representative	10,950	2,637	13,587
Antoinette Boyle	Attorney	40,000	3,288	43,288
Joseph P. Brennan	Assistant to director of research and marketing	12,500	733	13,233
John E. Brown	District representative	10,950	3,110	14,060
Robert Browning	do	10,950	1,536	12,486
Michael Budzanoski	District president	18,000	6,199	24,199
J. Carl Bunch	District secretary-treasurer	17,000	2,180	19,180
Edward L. Carey	General counsel	40,000	3,243	43,243
Richard Carter	District representative	10,950	2,148	13,098
Joe Castle	do	10,950	3,540	14,490
Lewis Chaney	do	10,950	4,701	15,651
Howard W. Channell	Assistant to international secretary-treasurer	20,000	238	20,238
M. W. Clark	District representative	10,950	3,473	14,423
James W. Clarkson	International representative	11,000	7,075	18,075
Harrison Combs	Attorney	45,000	8,178	53,178
Harrison Combs, Jr.	Legislative representative	11,000	2,487	13,487
Kenneth Combs	Assistant to district secretary-treasurer	11,000	2,763	13,763
Matt Combs	District secretary-treasurer	17,000	7,399	24,399
Allen G. Condra	International representative	11,000	8,464	19,464
Elizabeth Covington	Secretary	14,600		14,600
Thomas N. Crawford	District president	20,000		20,000
Eugene A. Creany	Compensation attorney	12,000	897	12,897
Joe Davis	District representative	10,950	3,470	14,420
Richard DeAngelis	do	10,800	3,179	13,979
Mike Degretto	International representative	13,000	10,144	23,144
August DeMarco	District representative	7,200	3,688	10,888
Steve Denardo	do	10,800	2,854	13,654
Noah Doss	do	10,950	2,394	13,342
John Egan	District president	17,000	3,127	20,127
James K. Edmundson	Attorney	15,000	3,151	18,151
John W. Edwards	International representative	11,000	3,253	14,253
Joe Ellis	District representative	10,950	1,578	12,528
Lewis E. Evans	Special international representative	17,000	7,863	24,863
Leighton C. Farley	District representative	10,455	4,333	14,788
Joseph Feist	District board member	10,800	2,764	13,564
Squire Feltner	District representative	\$10,950	\$4,233	\$15,183
Charles Ferguson	Director, safety division	20,000	14,544	34,544
Clarence E. Floyd	District representative	10,950	2,278	13,228
Peter M. Flyzik	International representative	11,000	1,315	12,315
Edward Foster	District representative	10,800	5,529	16,329
Arnold Gabelli	District board member	10,800	2,231	13,031
Steve Galati	District auditor	10,950	1,808	12,758
Leonard R. Gazenski	Secretary	13,000		13,000
Edward H. Gibbons	District secretary-treasurer	17,000	956	17,956
Edgar W. Gilbert	District representative	10,950	3,009	13,959
George Gilbert	do	10,950	4,486	15,436
Ernest Goad	District president	11,375	3,265	14,640
Robert E. Gordon	International representative	11,000	10,903	21,903
Paul Gormish	District representative	10,800	4,814	15,614
Chester C. Gossett	District board member	10,950	3,009	13,959
Michael Gretchen	do	10,950	2,024	12,974
George Griffiths, Jr.	District secretary-treasurer	15,000	1,711	16,711
Gerald Griffiths	Secretary	13,600	107	13,707
Ernest Gross	District representative	10,950	6,838	17,788
John Grygell	do	11,550	1,987	13,537
Charles E. Hale	Organizer	10,950	4,478	15,428
George W. Hall	District representative	10,950	3,192	14,142
Peter Halvonik	District board member	10,950	5,973	16,923
Ray Harris	Secretary	10,950	574	11,524
Rodney Hatten	District representative	10,494	5,634	16,128
Charles H. Head	International representative	11,000	8,181	19,181
Anne B. Headley	Secretary	10,600		10,600
Howard C. Hillhouse	District representative	10,950	2,406	13,356
Noble Hobbs	do	10,950	2,348	13,298
John Hollins	do	10,950	2,029	12,979
Ernest E. Hollyfield, Sr.	District president	15,000	4,372	19,372
Ruth E. Holmes	Secretary-bookkeeper	10,000		10,000
Earl E. Houck	Director, legal department	40,000	136	40,136
Robert E. Howe, Jr.	Director, Labor's Non-Partisan League	20,000	2,190	22,190
Earl Howell	District representative	10,763	1,994	12,757
Robert L. Hutcherson	Assistant compensation director	10,950	1,010	11,960
Joseph Jashinski	District representative	10,800	3,556	14,356
Elza Johnson	do	10,950	1,261	12,211
John Karlavage	International representative	11,000	4,408	15,408
James W. Kelly	District secretary-treasurer	16,000	6,566	22,566
James F. Kmetz	Legislative representative	17,000	2,190	19,190
John J. Kmetz	Administrative auditor	12,000	7,388	19,388
Stephen Krobock	International representative	8,863	1,898	10,761

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BLMR FILE NO. 000063, YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1967—Continued

SCHEDULE 9.—DISBURSEMENTS TO EMPLOYEES—Continued

Name	Position	Gross salaries	Expenses	Total	Name	Position	Gross salaries	Expenses	Total
Steve Kubic.....	District board member.....	\$10,950	\$1,436	\$12,386	Frank Restic.....	District representative.....	\$10,800	\$4,758	\$15,558
Joseph Ladisic.....	District representative.....	10,950	7,114	18,064	Suzanne V. Richards.....	Executive assistant to international president.....	35,417	1,630	37,047
Edward Lamm.....	District board member.....	10,950	4,005	14,955	Lewis C. Riley.....	District secretary-treasurer.....	17,000	2,173	19,173
Rex W. Lauck, Jr.....	Assistant editor, UMWA Journal.....	13,000	6,239	19,239	John Roach.....	District board member.....	7,200	3,090	10,290
Donald E. Lawley.....	International representative.....	11,000	7,381	18,381	William Rogers.....	International representative.....	11,000	3,693	14,693
John Lease.....	District board member.....	10,800	2,315	13,115	Clyde Rohland.....	District representative.....	10,950	2,338	13,288
James Leebor, Jr.....	Safety engineer.....	11,550	3,299	14,849	Anthony Rose.....	do.....	10,950	2,879	13,829
John A. Lippi.....	District secretary-treasurer.....	16,000	2,706	18,706	Corwin E. Ross.....	do.....	10,950	2,061	13,011
Herman Lisse.....	District board member.....	10,950	2,495	13,445	Dorothy Rudd.....	Secretary.....	10,000	31	10,031
Joseph A. Londrigan.....	Attorney.....	12,400	1,650	14,050	Clyde W. Runions.....	International teller.....	10,727	1,100	11,827
Sylvester Lorenzo.....	District representative.....	10,950	2,166	13,116	Robert Russell.....	District board member.....	10,950	5,421	16,371
Jess Lovelace.....	District secretary-treasurer.....	17,000	3,947	20,947	Peter Rutz.....	do.....	13,000	3,181	16,181
Francis McCallister.....	District board member.....	10,950	6,318	17,268	Frank Sabolsky.....	District representative.....	9,060	4,803	13,863
Justin McCarthy.....	Editor, UMWA Journal.....	19,000	3,499	22,499	Frank J. Sacco.....	International representative.....	11,000	5,424	16,424
William J. McCormack.....	Building manager.....	12,000		12,000	Lado Srvelli.....	Secretary.....	8,333	1,683	10,016
James E. McCoy.....	District representative.....	12,000	2,049	14,049	Valerio L. Scarton.....	District representative.....	10,800	5,282	16,082
John F. McGuire.....	Administrative assistant.....	10,667		10,667	John Seddon.....	District secretary-treasurer.....	15,000	3,169	18,169
Howard Madewell.....	District representative.....	10,950	659	11,609	Joseph L. Serdich.....	District representative.....	10,950	962	11,912
Peter Mahalage.....	District board member.....	11,900	1,919	13,819	James L. Sessions.....	do.....	10,950	2,603	13,553
Charles B. Malcomb.....	Organizer.....	10,950	3,434	14,384	Wiley F. Shepherd.....	do.....	10,950	2,792	13,742
Allen Mark.....	District representative.....	10,800	5,316	16,116	Owen Slagle.....	District board member.....	10,800	2,768	13,568
James Mark, Jr.....	Legislative representative.....	17,000	2,190	19,190	Samuel Slatcoff.....	District representative.....	10,800	3,896	14,696
William Marsh.....	District president.....	18,500	4,778	23,278	Earl Stamper.....	do.....	10,950	2,101	13,051
William L. Marsh.....	District representative.....	10,950	2,568	13,518	Joseph Staples.....	do.....	10,800	5,982	16,782
Theodore Medvetz.....	do.....	9,900	5,059	14,959	Thomas J. Starks.....	International representative.....	10,950	2,831	13,781
Myrl C. Miller.....	do.....	9,120	4,103	13,223	Leonard Statkewicz.....	District board member.....	13,000	2,508	15,508
Harold E. Moon.....	International representative.....	11,000	4,683	15,683	Frank M. Stevenson.....	District president.....	10,200	3,325	13,525
Andrew Morris.....	do.....	10,950	2,367	13,317	Michael Stewart.....	District board member.....	12,891	792	13,683
Clarence Mosier.....	do.....	10,800	5,916	16,716	Jerry Stidham.....	International representative.....	11,000	1,644	12,644
Harry T. Myers.....	District representative.....	10,950	1,857	12,807	Earle Stucker.....	District representative.....	10,950	2,623	13,573
Charles A. Neal.....	do.....	10,950	964	11,914	Ernest Stults.....	do.....	10,950	4,735	15,685
Steve Nikses.....	Organizer.....	10,950	3,209	14,159	Walter Suba.....	do.....	8,040	2,314	10,354
H. B. Noble.....	Attorney.....	23,608	3,441	27,049	Edward Sweeney.....	District secretary-treasurer.....	17,000	984	17,984
Thomas B. Noonan.....	Chief compensation counsel.....	28,000	2,970	30,970	Bruno J. Telk.....	District board member.....	10,800	3,303	14,103
Roland Nuccetelli.....	District board member.....	10,950	5,273	16,223	Emmett L. Thomas.....	Administrative assistant to international president.....	20,000	4,446	24,446
Cornelius O'Donnell.....	District secretary-treasurer.....	15,000	1,523	16,523	James Thomas.....	District representative.....	7,500	2,574	10,074
Blaine Odell.....	District representative.....	10,950	1,870	12,820	Lester Thomas.....	Acting district president.....	20,000	7,247	27,247
Bruno B. Omizzi.....	do.....	9,390	1,784	11,174	Gertrude N. Thompson.....	Secretary.....	10,000	505	10,505
Andrew J. Onderko.....	Organizer.....	10,950	4,919	15,869	Raymond Thompson.....	District representative.....	9,900	2,145	12,045
Boley Overa.....	International representative.....	11,000	3,565	14,565	Ray Thornbury.....	do.....	10,950	2,974	13,924
R. C. Owens.....	District secretary-treasurer.....	25,000	3,111	28,111	William T. Turnblazer.....	District president.....	20,000	4,943	24,943
Willard P. Owens.....	Attorney.....	50,000	4,866	54,866	William Vaughn.....	District representative.....	10,950	2,120	13,070
Albert Pass.....	District Secretary-treasurer.....	18,000	4,765	22,765	Rudolph Vitter.....	International representative.....	11,000	2,841	13,841
Marion Pellegrini.....	District board member.....	10,950	5,770	16,720	Kenneth F. Wells.....	do.....	10,267	3,100	13,367
William Perkins.....	International representative.....	11,000	7,967	18,967	M. F. Widman, Jr.....	Director, research and marketing.....	25,000	6,283	31,283
Charles H. Phillips.....	District representative.....	10,950	2,271	13,221	Thomas A. Williams.....	District president.....	20,000	3,782	23,782
Chester R. Philpot.....	do.....	10,950	1,601	12,551	John Wusels.....	Compensation department manager.....	11,472	5,830	17,302
Larkin S. Philpott.....	District president.....	20,000	2,386	22,386	Leon Yablonski.....	International representative.....	11,000	8,726	19,726
Joseph Pisczar.....	District representative.....	10,950	3,625	14,575	Harvey Younker.....	District president.....	20,000	3,406	23,406
Leonard J. Pnakovich.....	do.....	17,000	1,965	18,965	Eli Zivkovich.....	International representative.....	12,000	9,129	21,129
Donald L. Poland.....	do.....	10,950	4,632	15,582	Total.....		2,518,795	652,673	3,171,468
John Popp.....	do.....	10,950	5,890	16,840					
William J. Prater.....	do.....	10,950	3,974	14,924					
Willie B. Price.....	do.....	10,950	3,068	14,018					
John Reddington.....	District board member.....	11,900	2,642	14,542					

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BLMR FILE NO. 000063, YEAR ENDED DEC. 31, 1967

Type	To whom paid	Amount
Schedule 11, benefits:		
Relief.....	Members.....	\$435,030
Medical payments.....	Officers and employees.....	9,397
Death.....	Beneficiaries of officers and employees.....	2,269
Pensions.....	Officers and employees.....	36,820
Group hospitalization insurance.....	Insuring organizations.....	211,880
Strike.....	Members.....	31,602
Total.....		726,998
Schedule 12, contributions, gifts, and grants:		
Charities.....		3,531
Safety associations.....		1,982
Labor organizations.....		5,550
Individual aid.....		259
Educational institutions.....		7,500
Total.....		18,822

JUDGE HOLTZOFF'S DECISION ON UMW WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1969, Judge Alexander Holtzoff of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia rendered a

decision which, if sustained on appeal, provides some measure of protection to certain beneficiaries of the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund. It has been very frustrating for coal miners who have worked for many years with the full expectation that their sweat and blood has entitled them to pension rights, only to have the rules changed or new rules enunciated that disqualify them from benefits. In the case in point, Shelby Collins applied in 1965 for his retirement pension, but was denied it by the UMW welfare and retirement fund because he had worked the last year of his employment in a nonunion mine. Judge Holtzoff, in awarding the pension to Mr. Collins, indicated in his decision that Mr. Collins was "constrained by circumstances to accept employment in a nonunion mine" because no other employment was available in the last year prior to his retirement. Judge Holtzoff ruled that the requirement set by the fund was "arbitrary and capricious" and that Mr. Collins "is entitled to a pension."

Mr. Speaker, for other arbitrary reasons, many coal miners of West Virginia and other States have been denied their pensions, other benefits, or had taken away from them their medical cards. Many questions have been raised concerning the management, investments, financing, and rules set up by the UMW welfare and retirement fund. For this

reason, I have asked for a full-scale congressional investigation of the fund, and hope that legislation will be enacted which will protect the working coal miner who has a clear stake and equity in the fund.

I believe that Judge Holtzoff's opinion deserves careful attention. Because of the fact that arguments of counsel referred to the royalty of 30 cents per ton of bituminous coal which was established in 1950, that figure is included in Judge Holtzoff's opinion. Since the 1950 figure was set, of course, the amount of royalty per ton which is paid to the fund by the coal operators was raised from 30 to 40 cents per ton in 1952. The royalty paid into the fund has amounted to 40 cents per ton since 1952.

In view of the public interest in the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund, under unanimous consent I include the complete text of Judge Holtzoff's opinion of April 22, 1969:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 1877-67]

SHELBY COLLINS, PLAINTIFF, VERSUS UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1950, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

OPINION

Joseph H. Newlin, of Washington, D.C., for the plaintiff.

Charles L. Widman, of Washington, D.C., for the defendants.

This case relates to the Welfare and Re-

retirement Fund established by the United Mine Workers of America, a labor union representing coal miners. Two questions are presented. The first is whether the courts have power to set aside as arbitrary and capricious, a regulation adopted by the trustees of the fund, prescribing eligibility for applicants for benefits. The second is whether a particular regulation, which is being questioned in this case, should be set aside as arbitrary and capricious.

This action is brought by a retired coal miner against the trustees of the Fund to recover a retirement pension that he claims is due him. The salient facts are not in dispute. The Welfare Fund for the purpose of paying retirement pensions and other benefits to coal miners, was created by an agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and a group of owners and operators of coal mines. The Fund is made up of contributions made by the latter. Each operator periodically pays into the Fund a specified amount based on the quantity of coal produced by his mine. The Fund originated in 1946. The creation of such funds was recognized and sanctioned by Congress in the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act), 29 U.S.C. § 186(c) (5).

A new agreement executed in 1950 between the Union and the operators is now in existence, with some amendments adopted from time to time, that are not germane to this action. This agreement established a Fund designated as "The United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund of 1950". The Fund consists of contributions made by each coal mine operator signatory to the agreement, amounting to thirty cents on each ton of coal produced by his mine. It is administered by a Board of Trustees. It is an irrevocable trust. The purposes of the Fund are to make payments of benefits to employees of mine operators, their families and dependents, for medical or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of employee, and benefits of other types specified in the agreement that are not relevant to this action. Subject to the stated purposes of the Fund, the trustees are given full authority to determine questions of coverage and eligibility to receive benefits and all other related matters. A portion of the Fund was to be set aside for pensions or annuities for retired members of the Union, their families or dependents.

The trustees in due course adopted and promulgated regulations prescribing qualifications for eligibility to receive a pension. The existing regulations involved in this case, were issued by the trustees on January 4, 1965, and are contained in what is known as Resolution No. 63. The requirements for a pension are as follows:

I. Eligibility.

A. An applicant who subsequent to February 1, 1965, permanently ceases work in the bituminous coal industry as an employee of an employer signatory to the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1950, as amended, shall be eligible for a pension if he has:

1. Attained the age of fifty-five (55) years or over at the date of his application for pension.
2. Completed twenty (20) years' service in the coal industry in the United States. . . .
3. Permanently ceased work in the coal industry immediately following regular employment for a period of at least one (1) full year as an employee in a classified job for an employer signatory to the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement, as defined in paragraphs II B hereof.

In other words, in order to be eligible to receive a pension, a coal miner who retired subsequently to February 1, 1965, must have been at least fifty-five (55) years of age; have completed twenty (20) years' service in the coal industry; and during one (1) full year immediately preceding his retirement, must

have been employed by an employer signatory to the agreement, in other words by a mine operator who made contributions to the Fund.

The plaintiff, who is a retired coal miner, applied to the trustees for a pension. He was found eligible under paragraphs 1 and 2 of the requirements, but not in compliance in respect to the third requirement, in that during the year preceding his retirement he was employed in a non-union mine instead of by an employer signatory to the agreement. It was found that the mine in which he was employed during his last year of service was a non-union mine, was not signatory to the agreement and, therefore, did not make any contributions to the Fund. This action is brought against the trustees to recover the pension which the plaintiff claims. It is contended in his behalf that this third requirement is invalid and should be set aside by the Court as arbitrary and capricious.

The following facts were stipulated in the pretrial order. On February 18, 1965, the plaintiff applied to the defendants for a retirement pension. The application was originally approved, but later its allowance was revoked. The plaintiff had been regularly employed in the coal mining industry for more than twenty (20) years immediately prior to filing his application. During the year preceding his retirement and the filing of his application, he was employed by a coal company that was not a signatory to the agreement creating the Welfare Fund and, therefore, made no contributions to it. This fact was the ground of the rejection.

The evidence shows that out of his long period of employment in the coal industry, the plaintiff worked for over twelve years in union mines that made contributions to the Fund. He testified, by deposition, that he resigned his job with a signatory mine operator because of unsafe conditions of work; and that he was compelled to accept employment in a non-union mine because no other employment was available and he had to support his wife and children.

In narrating why he resigned his employment with a contributing mine, he said in his deposition:

Q. 168. They didn't lay you off?

A. No, the top got so bad I got scared and quit and I wasn't making too good nohow.

As to the reason why he accepted employment in a non-contributing mine, he said:

Q. 89. How did you happen to continue to work for L & G Coal Company after you found out they weren't under contract and you a member of the United Mine Workers?

A. Well, I tell you buddy they wasn't nowhere to go hardly. Couldn't hardly find a job and I had a bunch of kids and I had to work.

No contradiction of his testimony was introduced. Defense counsel, however, offered in evidence some official reports that, among other things, listed a number of union mines in operation in Harlan County, Kentucky, which is the area involved in this case, during the year in question. The Court deems this evidence incompetent on this issue. While *ex parte* Government reports may be evidence of governmental policies and of general conditions, they are hearsay and are, therefore, inadmissible as proof on specific issues in controversy. Parties are entitled to testimony of a kind that can be tested by cross-examination. Even if, this evidence were competent in this instance, it would have but little probative value. It does not follow that because there were union mines in operation that every coal miner could get employment there. There may have been more miners seeking employment than the union mines could absorb. Then, too, it does not appear where any of these mines were, or whether any of them were within commuting distance of the plaintiff's home in order that he could travel daily back and forth to work, even if he could secure employment.

The trust involved in this case is of a type hitherto unknown to equity jurisprudence. The conventional and traditional trust of which equity takes cognizance and which it enforces, names specific beneficiaries, or a determinable class of beneficiaries, leaving no discretion to the trustees to decide who is entitled to the benefits of the trust. The only exception is a charitable trust by which a specific gift is left for a philanthropic purpose, or for members of an indefinite group as a free gift. In this instance, the trust is for the benefit of a general class, membership in which, however, has to be defined by the trustees, who have discretion to determine who within the class should be entitled to benefits under the trust. It is not a charitable trust, because it was created by agreement by contributions of employers. These contributions in a sense form part of the wages of employees, and are of a type known nowadays as "fringe benefits". Persons intended to be benefited rendered the creation of the Fund possible by working for employers who made contributions. They furnished a consideration for the payments. The result is that, unlike in a charitable trust, members of the class have a legal right to the benefits. They participated by their labors in the creation of the Fund. The trustees have authority to prescribe criteria for eligibility within the class.

It is part of the genius of the common law and of equity jurisprudence that they are not static but adapt themselves to shifting needs and changing conditions. Mr. Justice Cardozo summarized this doctrine in a few picturesque pointed words. He said:

"The Inn that shelters for the night is not the journey's end. The law, like the traveler, must be ready for the morrow. It must have the principle of growth."¹

When social or economic conditions change, the law must follow and adjust itself to the new requirements as they become crystallized. Justice Holmes observed that, "It cannot be helped, it is as it should be, that the laws lag behind the times."² The lag between changes of conditions and the adjustment of the law to them should not, however, be too long.³

It has been established that the courts may review decisions of the trustees on individual applications and set aside a denial, if it is arbitrary and capricious, is not supported by any evidence, or is contrary to law. The scope of review is, however, very narrow and is limited in the manner just stated. *Danti v. Lewis*, 114 U.S. App. D.C. 105, 108; *Kosty v. Lewis*, 319 F. 2d 744, 115 U.S. App. D.C. 343, 346; *Kennet v. United Mineworkers of America*, 183 F. Supp. 315, 317.

The next step to be taken is to extend this authority of the courts to setting aside and declaring invalid a qualification for eligibility for a pension, if the Court concludes that the requirement is arbitrary and capricious. No reason is perceived for not taking this additional step. In fact, the Court of Appeals in *Roark v. Lewis*, 401 F. 2d 425, has indicated that such power should exist. Naturally this authority shall be exercised very sparingly and cautiously and may be invoked only if the arbitrary and capricious nature of the regulation is clearly established.

The *Roark* case, *supra*, dealt with the same question that is presented in this action, namely, the validity of the regulation requiring a retired coal miner to have worked for a signatory mine owner during his last year before retirement. The enlightened and analytical opinion of the Court of Appeals in that case, written by Judge Tamm, contains a helpful and detailed dis-

¹ Cardozo, *The Growth of the Law* 18.

² Holmes, *Collected Legal Papers* 294.

³ See Holtzoff, *The Vitality of the Common Law in Our Time*, Vol. XVI, *The Catholic University Law Review*, pp. 23, 25-27.

cussion of the problem. He said (pp. 427-428):

"While the trustees have broad discretion in setting eligibility requirements, there are obvious limits . . . Although none of the reported cases we have found which deal with UMW pension applications has directly confronted the question of court review of eligibility requirements, we see no reason why the previously announced standard (to determine whether the trustees' conduct was arbitrary or capricious) should not apply. Trustees' action in prescribing eligibility requirements affects the rights of potential beneficiaries in the same vital way as do other trustees' actions."

"When the trust was first established, of necessity, most applicants had worked the bulk of the required time before signatory operators had begun paying into the trust a stipulated price per ton of coal mined."

"Appellants have demonstrated the peculiarities of the attacked requirement—that an employee's last regular employment before retirement be with a signatory operator. Under the requirement, employees could spend, as appellants did, practically their entire adult lives working for mine owners who had contributed to the Fund since its inception; yet if they were to work for a non-signatory operator for any period after leaving a signatory operator, they would forfeit their otherwise valid pension claims. Conversely an applicant could have worked nineteen of the required twenty years in the industry for a non-signatory operator (who had contributed nothing to the Fund) and still be eligible for a pension if only he worked his last regular employment for a contributing operator."

"If the Fund's purpose is to pay benefits to contributing employers' employees (whose work generated the contributions), it is difficult to see how such a requirement promotes that purpose. It makes employees like these appellants sacrifice an otherwise valid pension claim because they worked a relatively short time for non-contributing operators. The contributions which signatory operators made on their behalf did not evaporate as a result of their later employment with non-signatories."

In the exercise of caution, however, the Court of Appeals did not reach a final decision on the validity of the rule, but remanded the case to the District Court for a new trial in order that evidence bearing on a possible justification of the requirement might be introduced. The Court of Appeals indicated that the burden was on the trustees to show some rational nexus between the purpose of the Fund and the challenged requirement.

The brief concurring opinion added the following remarks (p. 429):

"Appellants may have been forced off contributing payrolls because their employers closed the mines and because no other job with a contributing employer was available. On those facts, we might well find arbitrary and capricious a reading of the eligibility requirements which would deny appellants their pensions."

In the instant case the trustees assumed the burden placed upon them by the Court of Appeals in the *Roark* case, and introduced evidence seeking to explain and justify the fairness of the requirement, which on its fact appears so highly unreasonable."

"The *Roark* case is on the civil non-jury calendar of this Court and is about to be reached for trial. In the interest of justice as well as to promote efficiency of its administration, the *Roark* case and the case at bar should have been consolidated for trial, especially as the civil non-jury calendar is practically current. It is to be regretted that

Counsel for the trustees called as a witness, Joseph A. Reid who is a Special Assistant to the Director of the Fund. He testified as follows:

Q. What was the purpose and the statistical information the fund had at that time that caused them to put that requirement in effect?

A. From its inception in 1946 until March 5, 1950, the fund had received in excess of 38,000 pension applications. They found through analyses and statistics of all these 38,000 pension applications that many coal miners were coming back to the coal industry who had been away from the coal mines for many years, who had lost their identity with the coal industry, but because of the liberal requirements that were first in existence they could come back in the mines and work for one day or one week or one month and receive pension benefits. In fact, they found instances of sham and non-existent coal companies. In fact, they were referred to as "pity me" mines where a man would go for a day and then apply for a pension.

So after these three years of statistics on this subject the trustees inserted the resolution that his last year of employment had to be for a signatory company. Now this was also done because any man who did not work for a signatory company for one year immediately prior to his retirement and returned to work after 1946 could have worked for a company that never paid a cent into the welfare fund. It operates much like workmen's compensation, his last year of employment must be assessed against the employer that contributes to the fund, and that is the reason this regulation was applied.

Q. Mr. Reid, following the adoption and throughout the years of administration of this welfare fund concerning this requirement of eligibility of employment immediately prior to retirement for a coal operator's signatory, what would be the percentage of the people that have been able to meet that requirement of eligibility?

A. Oh, the vast majority of the people have met that eligibility requirement. In fact, there are over 70,000 people now receiving pension benefits, and since the inception of the fund over 130,000 have been approved pension benefits.

Q. Have you in the administration of the fund encountered any difficulty in the administering of this regulation? Has it been found equitable or harsh in the administration of this welfare fund?

A. We have found that this has been an equitable regulation. It has been in effect since 1950 and that is nineteen years. There has never been a great deal of clamor upon the coal miners themselves to alter this regulation. The majority of coal miners feel that this is right.

Q. Mr. Reid, has there ever been any consideration within the welfare fund to change that requirement?

A. In various conferences that the administrative fund conducts discussions have periodically occurred on the whole regulation but it has never come to pass that this regulation should change.

Q. Has there ever been consideration to increase the number of years of signatory employment to more than a year of the last employer?

A. Yes, they have discussed the possibility of making a miner work for more than one year in signatory mines but they want to be as liberal as they possibly can so they

none of the parties made a motion to consolidate. This Court would have been inclined to direct a consolidation *sua sponte*, but unfortunately the status of the *Roark* case did not come to its attention until after the trial of the instant case started and was under way.

have never changed it. (Tr. pp. 8-9, 10-11, 12-13)

In the opinion of this Court, the foregoing explanation is not adequate. In order to prevent possible frauds and in order to confine the benefits of the Fund to retired employees whose labors brought about contributions to the Fund, all that is necessary is to require that the miner should have worked for a specified minimum period in signatory coal mines. To exact a requirement that irrespective of the number of years he may have been employed in such mines, he must have done likewise during the very last year of his employment in the coal industry, is unreasonable, arbitrary and capricious. The unfairness of the requirement is patent in respect to a person, such as this plaintiff, who for many years worked in a signatory coal mine, but during the last year of his work in the industry was constrained by circumstances to accept employment in a non-union mine. On the other hand, a person could have worked during his entire career in non-union mines and yet receive a pension if he managed to secure employment in a union mine for a single year immediately preceding his retirement although his participation in the creation of the Fund would be negligible. Such results are unfair and unreasonable and border on the absurd.

The Court concludes that the requirement in question is arbitrary and capricious, and should be set aside and held invalid. Since the plaintiff meets all the other requirements, he is entitled to a pension. Judgment will be rendered in his favor.

This opinion will constitute the findings of fact and conclusions of law. Counsel will submit a proposed judgment.

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF,
U.S. District Judge.

APRIL 22, 1969.

REPORT ON INVESTIGATIONS— HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE HOLDS HEARINGS ON URBAN INSURANCE IN CHICAGO

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, we enacted a new program providing assurance to our citizens in the inner city that property insurance would be made available at reasonable costs. This new urban property protection and reinsurance program was an attempt to enlist the insurance industry, State regulatory officials, and property owners in an effort to make insurance available through the establishment in each State of an insurance placement facility called the FAIR plan—Fair Access to Insurance Requirement.

Our colleague on the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, FRANK ANNUNZIO, brought to the attention of myself and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, WILLIAM A. BARRETT, serious problems that had developed in the State of Illinois, particularly in the city of Chicago, regarding the operations of the Illinois FAIR plan. Congressman BARRETT designated the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD to chair a special hearing in Chicago to investigate the operations of the Illinois FAIR plan. Congressman ANNUNZIO, at the invitation of Subcommittee Chairman BARRETT, participated in these hearings.

The subcommittee's hearings on April 21 and 22 revealed an almost complete breakdown of the urban riot insurance program in the State of Illinois. Instead of providing property insurance at reasonable premium rates, the Illinois FAIR plan has been a cruel hoax for the small businessman and the individual homeowner. The finger of blame must be laid on the insurance industry in the State of Illinois, the Illinois placement facility, which the insurance industry dominates and runs and the State insurance superintendent. Grave questions concerning the operation of the Federal insurance program have been raised and merit continued close attention by Congress. Thanks to the hearings conducted by the Housing Subcommittee and the work by Congressman ANNUNZIO and Congressman MOORHEAD, I believe there will be a change in the operation of the urban insurance program in the State of Illinois and in the other States with such problems. Following my remarks are a number of newspaper stories on the Chicago urban insurance hearings:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 21, 1969]
HEARINGS OPEN: HOUSE PROBES HERE FOR
LOOK AT GHETTO INSURANCE ABUSES

(By William Clements)

A congressional inquiry into insurance-writing practices in Chicago's ghetto began Monday in the Federal Building, 219 S. Dearborn.

The hearings were called at the request of U.S. Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.) to determine why many ghetto dwellers cannot get property insurance, and why those who do are being charged double or triple the usual premium rates.

The inquiry by the housing subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency will continue through Tuesday. U.S. Rep. William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.) is subcommittee chairman.

"It is my hope that these hearings will lead to a constructive approach to this serious problem and will determine what course we must take to correct the situation," Annunzio said as the hearings got under way.

Charles Weickling, head of the FAIR program for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, was scheduled to be the lead-off witness.

State Rep. Anthony Sciarano (D-Park Forest), one of the architects of the Illinois plan, was to follow Weickling.

The FAIR plan, which went into effect in Illinois last September, is a federally backed reinsurance program to help ghetto residents get proper insurance coverage.

Annunzio ordered the hearings after The Daily News disclosed in February that many ghetto businessmen and residents were unable to get insurance.

The Chicago legislator said he also has received numerous reports of sky-high premiums being charged ghetto dwellers.

Also scheduled to testify was State Rep. Otis Collins (D-Chicago), who heads the newly formed Illinois Committee for Fair Insurance Practices.

Others called to testify included John Plechoch and Joseph DeSerto, insurance brokers; Dempsey Travis, of the United Mortgage Bankers of America and Joseph Meek, president of the Illinois Retail Merchants Assn.

Henrietta Banks and other members of the Contract Buyers League also will be heard. The league is an organization of black homeowners attempting to renegotiate the contract sale of homes they say were bought at inflated prices.

James Baylor, director of the Illinois Department of Insurance, will testify Tuesday. He was expected to detail improvements that

have been made in the Illinois plan since The Daily News articles and after an investigation by his office.

[From the Chicago American, Apr. 21, 1969]

BLAST INSURANCE RATES IN GHETTO

(By Sy Adelman)

"Property owners have been paying as much as five times the premium for fire insurance as they did before urban rioting began," the federal insurance administrator for the department of housing and urban development said today.

The statement by William B. Ross said that an investigation in East St. Louis, scene of rioting and looting and burning, showed a 100 per cent increase in fire insurance premium rates afterwards.

The subcommittee opened its two-day hearing today in a federal building court room with about 50 spectators present.

ANNUNZIO ASKS HEARING

The hearing is being held at the request of Rep. Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.), who said that ghetto property owners have complained that the new insurance law is failing.

Annunzio told the subcommittee today that "If the cost of insurance cannot be brought to reasonable levels, the federal government, undesirable as such a step may be, must provide a direct program of insurance for the 'insurance indigent.'"

Dempsey J. Travis, Negro president of the United Mortgage Brokers, told the subcommittee, "My people are being victimized by a handful of insurance operators."

Travis said there has not been enough publicity in Chicago about the availability of the federally underwritten insurance. He said that only 6,057 applications for such insurance were made in Illinois up to April 15, while there had been 75,842 such applications in New York City by April 4.

[From the Chicago American, Apr. 26, 1969]

GHETTO PROPERTY INSURANCE HEARING THROUGH TOMORROW

(By Robert Glass)

A Congressional subcommittee is holding a 2-day hearing in the federal building here to probe charges that ghetto property owners are being denied insurance coverage.

The hearing, beginning today, comes as a result of a difference of opinion between an Illinois congressman and the state department of insurance.

Rep. Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.) has charged that ghetto property owners have complained to him that a government plan to provide them insurance coverage is failing.

PLAN POOLS COVERAGE

The plan, passed by Congress after last year's civil disturbances, provides that all casualty insurance companies "pool" coverage of high risk ghetto property.

Under the act, no firm can sustain astronomical losses in the event of a disaster such as a riot.

Annunzio charged that the program is not living up to the expectations of Congress through helping those it was intended to serve.

James Baylor, director of the Illinois department of insurance, disagrees.

SITUATION BETTER NOW

He called the situation "a lot better now because many persons denied coverage last year have been able to comply with special criteria and are now covered."

Baylor said that out of 3,369 insurance applications processed from potential riot areas, only 119 were found totally uninsurable.

Baylor said that property owners that comply with building and safety codes are able to obtain insurance through the pool coverage, despite being located in high crime areas that are susceptible to riots.

"Some refuse to comply," Baylor said, "and are unable to obtain insurance."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 22, 1969]

UNITED STATES URGED TO CORRECT RIOT INSURANCE INEQUITIES HERE

(By Fletcher Wilson)

Federal entry into the insurance business to correct inequities in riot-prone Chicago areas was advocated Monday by three witnesses and a congressman at a hearing in the Federal Building.

Rep. Frank Annunzio (D.-Ill.), member of a housing subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which is conducting the inquiry, said:

"I say quite candidly and quite bluntly that if the cost of insurance cannot be brought down to reasonable levels then the federal government must assert itself, and, undesirable though it be, provide a direct program of insurance for the insurance indigent."

INSURANCE INDUSTRY

"We have done this for our economic indigents, our medical indigents, our housing indigents, our transportation indigents, our small business indigents and others."

"So there is nothing new or startling about the idea that when private enterprise cannot do the job, government must step in. Even the insurance industry admitted that it could not do the job in covering riot losses when it asked for and got a federal riot reinsurance program."

Annunzio said surcharges that insurance companies are imposing lead to premium rates beyond the ability of the policyholders to pay.

He said complaints to him indicate that the Illinois Fair Access to Insurance Requirements Plan is not living up to the expectations of those it was designed to benefit.

EXTREME SURCHARGES

State Rep. Anthony Sciarano (D-Park Forest), a witness, charged that the FAIR plan permits extreme surcharges and leaves many with no insurance.

He called for federal intervention because, he said, the Illinois General Assembly will enact only bills favorable to the insurance industry and the state Insurance Department is industry oriented.

State Rep. Otis Collins (D-Chicago) also testified the federal government should step in. He said that under the present system the average man can benefit only by studying enough to learn the intricacies of the insurance business. He said he did not think anyone should have to go to school to get insurance.

SLUM PROPERTY OWNERS

Dempsey J. Travis, a real estate dealer and insurance agent, claimed 25 companies charge slum property owners insurance premiums up to 800 per cent above standard rates.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 22, 1969]

U.S. INSURANCE PROPOSED FOR GHETTO AREAS— HEARING TOLD OF HIGH RATES BY FIRMS

(By Sheila Wolfe)

Charges that insurance rates have doubled in Chicago ghetto areas since the riot last year and that policies have been canceled without reason were made yesterday before a House banking and currency subcommittee.

Several persons at a hearing in the Federal building called for government regulation of the insurance industry.

"I say quite candidly and bluntly that if the cost of insurance cannot be brought down to reasonable levels, then the federal government must assert itself and, undesirable though it may be, provide a direct program of insurance for the insurance indigent," said Rep. Frank Annunzio (D., Chicago).

COMPLAINTS ARE HEARD

Annunzio, a member of the subcommittee, asked for the hearing. He said he had received complaints that the Illinois Fair Ac-

cess to Insurance Requirements (FAIR) plan, approved last year by Congress, was not living up to expectations. The Plan, administered locally by the Illinois Property Insurance Placement facility, is supposed to make insurance available at reasonable costs, without regard to geographic location of the property.

Mrs. Barbara Triche, chairman of the Lawndale Community Interest committee, testified that the rate of the average policy in Lawndale has more than doubled since the April, 1968, riot. If not doubled, the policies have been canceled, some without inspection of the property, she said.

TELLS OF DISCRIMINATION

"We are being victimized by the assumption that our homes are not up to standards because we live in Lawndale," said Mrs. Triche.

State Rep. Otis Collins (D., Chicago) said the FAIR plan has had a negative effect. He said that insurance firms tell customers coverage is not available and then refer them to the placement facility.

"The facility was supposed to take up the slack. It was not designed as a dumping ground," Collins asserted.

Collins asked for additional state and national legislation to regulate the insurance industry.

Dempsey J. Travis, real estate dealer and president of the United Mortgage Bankers of America, recommended "federal intervention to place insurance in those areas where the cost has become prohibitive."

WANTS FEDERAL INSURANCE

Travis asked the subcommittee, headed by Rep. William Moorhead [D., Penn.], to recommend a bill which, in effect, would "put the government in the insurance business to write direct policies for the black and the poor people who are now being exploited."

A statement handed reporters in the name of Howard A. Grauff, chairman of the Placement facility, said 97 per cent of the properties submitted are being approved for fire insurance, "many of them at rates lower than the owners previously paid."

State Rep. Anthony Scariano [D., Park Forest] charged that the insurance departments of Illinois and other states are "a captive of the industry." He asked for federal regulations.

The hearing will continue tomorrow.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 22, 1969]

INSURANCE QUIZ HERE GETS HOTTER

(By William Clements)

Insurance industry representatives were called to the witness stand before a congressional subcommittee Tuesday to answer severe criticism of their insurance writing practices in Chicago's ghettos.

They were expected to bitterly oppose a suggestion by several witnesses Monday that the federal government provide insurance for ghetto dwellers as the industry itself won't do it.

One of the first scheduled to testify in the second day of hearings at the Federal Building 219 S. Dearborn, was Elmer S. Reske, manager of the Illinois Property Insurance Placement Bureau.

Some ghetto businessmen have accused Reske's agency of setting property rates so high that they eventually will be forced to flee to the suburbs.

Also scheduled to appear was Howard Grauff, director of the Illinois FAIR plan, and James Baylor, state insurance director.

The FAIR plan, which went into effect in Illinois last September, is a federally-backed reinsurance program to help ghetto residents get proper insurance coverage.

The plan, and property insurance costs in general, came in for sharply worded denunciations Monday from insurance brokers as well as the ghetto businessmen and property owners.

Manfred S. Spindel, a broker and head of the Spindel Insurance Agency, 8551 S. Stony Island, said it was impossible to get standard insurance rates for even well-maintained buildings in the Lawndale area.

He said many large insurance companies dropped him as a broker after he insisted that they write policies at standard rates.

"Standard protection doesn't exist in the Lawndale area," Spindel said. "I'm not going to charge those people rates that are sky high. I can't justify it to myself."

He said some insurance companies use maps of Chicago with the Lawndale area blocked off—or "quarantined"—as undesirable for normal insurance coverage.

David McNulty, a staff member of the Contract Buyers League, said a study of 110 home buyers in Lawndale showed that insurance rates were too high and that coverage was inadequate. It also showed that it was extremely difficult to get new policies and that there was wholesale cancellation of existing policies he said.

He said many home buyers are paying \$250 to \$300 for fire and extended coverage that normally would cost about \$125.

Clyde Ross, co-chairman of the CBI, said ghetto dwellers have reached "the limit."

"If the insurance companies don't want to take the risk in Lawndale, then put a company out there that will take the risk," he said.

U.S. Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.), who called the congressional inquiry, said the situation in the ghettos of Chicago "is very alarming."

He said there will "be a ghost city within the inner city" if the trend continues.

Annunzio also charged that insurance companies have assessed a 1 per cent flat tax on non-ghetto dwellers to help pay the cost of FAIR plan participation.

Annunzio, State Rep. Anthony Scariano (D-Park Forest) and several insurance brokers said the federal government would assume greater control of the insurance industry if the industry doesn't do a better job in the ghetto.

Annunzio scheduled the hearings after the Daily News disclosed in February that many ghetto property owners were being charged double and even triple premiums under the FAIR program.

The subcommittee is part of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Annunzio said he hopes the hearings will result in more adequate coverage of properties in the inner city.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 21, 1969]

HOUSE PROBE OPENS HERE: FEDERAL INSURANCE URGED FOR HIGH-RATE GHETTO AREAS

Witnesses at a congressional inquiry into insurance-writing practices in Chicago's ghetto urged Monday that the federal government provide an insurance program for such areas if private firms fail to reduce premium rates.

Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.) said if rates for ghetto areas are not reduced "to reasonable levels, then the federal government, as undesirable as it may be, must assert itself."

The hearings, in the Federal Building, were called at Annunzio's request to determine why ghetto dwellers either cannot obtain insurance or must pay much higher premium rates.

State Rep. Anthony Scariano (D-Park Forest) called for the federal government to step into the Illinois insurance situation "and come up with some proper legislation to help, not only with property and fire insurance, but in the automobile insurance field as well."

Scariano said "I think unless there is federal intervention, the situation will grow dreadfully worse. The consumer is being left in a dreadfully bad position."

He said the state Legislature "will always defeat bills that the insurance industry want defeated."

State Rep. Otis Collins (D-Chicago) also asked for the federal government to provide insurance in ghettos.

"Private companies deny insurance without inspection, or cancel policies without giving a legitimate reason," he said.

Another witness, Dempsey Travis, president of the United Mortgage Bankers of America, said that some property owners in ghetto areas must pay premiums eight times the standard rate for fire insurance.

"There are about 25 companies involved in this thievery," Travis said.

"I have no choice but to recommend that there be federal intervention."

The inquiry by the housing subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency will continue through Tuesday. U.S. Rep. William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.) is subcommittee chairman.

Charles Weickling, head of the Fair program for the Department of Housing and Urban Development also was scheduled to testify.

The FAIR plan, which went into effect in Illinois last September, is a federally backed reinsurance program to help ghetto residents get proper insurance coverage.

Annunzio ordered the hearings after the Daily News disclosed in February that many ghetto businessmen and residents were unable to get insurance.

The Chicago legislator said he also has received numerous reports of sky-high premiums being charged ghetto dwellers.

James Baylor, director of the Illinois Department of Insurance, will testify Tuesday. He was expected to detail improvements that have been made in the Illinois plan since the Daily News articles and after an investigation by his office.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 22, 1969]

BROKER BARES SLUM ABUSES IN INSURANCE—HEARING PROBES HIGH RATES OF FIRMS

(By Sheila Wolfe)

An insurance broker who used to do business in Lawndale told a congressional hearing yesterday that the area is "quarantined" by most standard insurance companies.

"This happened before there ever was a riot," said Manfred S. Spindel, a broker at 8551 Stony Island av. "The only coverage available in that area would be substandard companies charging excessive premiums."

Spindel told a House banking and currency subcommittee that he started writing insurance in Lawndale seven years ago. Fewer and fewer insurance companies would handle the Lawndale policies, and by three years ago it was impossible to get any coverage at standard rates, said Spindel.

STOPS LAWNDALE BUSINESS

He said he no longer does business in Lawndale because he will not charge higher rates.

Charges also were made during the hearing, which will resume today in the Federal building, that insurance rates have doubled and tripled in ghetto areas since the riots last year and policies have been canceled without reason.

Several persons called for government regulation of, or participation in, the insurance industry.

SEES FEDERAL ACTION

"I say quite candidly and quite bluntly that if the cost of insurance cannot be brought down to reasonable levels then the federal government must assert itself and, undesirable tho it be, provide a direct program of insurance for the insurance indigent," said Rep. Frank Annunzio [D., Chicago].

Annunzio, a member of the subcommittee headed by Rep. William Moorhead (D., Pa.), asked for the hearing.

He said he had received complaints that the Illinois Fair Access to Insurance Requirements plan, part of a national program approved last year by Congress, was not living up to expectations.

GENERAL ABUSES CONSIDERED

The plan, administered locally by the Illinois Property placement Facility, is supposed to make fire and extended coverage insurance available at reasonable costs, without regard to geographic location of the property. Much of the testimony did not relate specifically to FAIR, but to general insurance abuses.

Mrs. Barbara Triche, chairman of the Lawndale Community Interest committee, testified that the rate of the average policy in Lawndale has more than doubled since the April, 1968, riots. Some policies have been canceled without inspection of the property, she said.

"We are being victimized by the assumption that our homes are not up to standards because we live in Lawndale," said Mrs. Triche.

SEEKS MORE LEGISLATION

State Rep. Otis Collins (D., Chicago) asked for additional state and national legislation to regulate the insurance industry.

Dempsey J. Travis, a real estate dealer and president of the United Mortgage Bankers of America, urged the subcommittee to recommend a bill which, in effect, would "put the government in the insurance business to write direct policies for the black and poor people who are being exploited."

State Rep. Anthony Sciarano (D., Park Forest) said insurance departments of Illinois and other states are "a captive of the industry." He asked for federal regulations.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 23, 1969]

INSURANCE DIRECTOR DEFENDS RISK POOL

(By Max Sonderby)

The so-called FAIR plan for writing fire insurance was defended here Tuesday before a congressional subcommittee by the state insurance director, James Baylor.

His optimistic view failed to satisfy congressional critics, who accused insurance interests of "tunnel vision" and bureaucratic "incest."

Baylor testified at the Federal Building before a housing subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The FAIR plan, enacted last year by Congress, allows insurance companies to establish "assigned risk" pools to provide fire insurance for property owners in riot-prone areas.

Baylor said operation of the plan has improved since last fall, when policies in such areas included surcharges of "up to 100 per cent."

At present, he said, less than 10 per cent of the FAIR insurance applicants are being surcharged between 20 and 25 per cent, while the majority of policies are being written with no surcharge or surcharges of less than 10 per cent.

"The plan is currently satisfactory," said Baylor. "This does not mean that we are complacent."

Baylor added that the riots here last year had resulted in a general increase in fire insurance rates—amounting to 4 per cent in the city and 2 per cent in the suburbs.

Following his testimony, the insurance director was criticized by Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.). In a written statement Annunzio asserted:

"Mr. Baylor and the industry are unable to sense the hardship, deterioration and hopelessness engendered for ghetto citizens when their insurance becomes intolerable."

"They have tunnel vision, and at the end of the tunnel the only light they see is the welfare of the insurance industry—and the policyholders be damned."

"What we have here is a classic case of incest," said the subcommittee chairman, Rep. William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.). He added:

"The Illinois Rating and Inspection Bureau, which sets the rates, the agency which processes the applications, and the Department of Insurance which checks on them,

are industry-controlled. There has to be some way to protect consumers."

RIOTING BOOSTS RISK PREMIUMS

All fire insurance policyholders in Illinois have to pay higher premiums because of urban rioting, a United States House subcommittee was told today.

The information was given by James Baylor, state director of insurance. He said in Chicago the extra charge is 4 per cent and in the suburbs, 2 per cent.

"SPREADING THE RISK"

Baylor said the premium increases represent "the theory of spreading the risk."

The subcommittee of the banking and currency committee completed 2 days of hearings in the Federal building into charges that ghetto property owners are required to pay as much as five times the premiums they did before the rioting.

A 20-25 PERCENT SURCHARGE

Rep. Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.), subcommittee member, had requested the hearing. Baylor said that when he took office Jan. 20, the surcharge on ghetto premiums had been as high as 100 per cent.

He said it has been reduced so that 10 per cent of the applicants now pay a surcharge of 20 to 25 per cent, and the majority pay less than 10 per cent.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 23, 1969]
CLASSIC CASE OF INCEST—STATE'S INSURANCE SETUP HIT

(By William Clements)

Despite bitterness and some name-calling, two days of Congressional hearings on insurance-writing practices in Chicago's ghetto did produce this picture:

The federally-backed FAIR plan is running much more smoothly now than before State Insurance Director James Baylor took office in January.

Even though improvements have been made, there still is, by Baylor's own admission, much more to be done.

Ghetto dwellers and businessmen who do get insurance coverage are finding it difficult to meet the high premium costs.

If they flee the inner city for lack of insurance or inability to pay the high rates, the ghetto is faced with further deterioration.

If the insurance industry doesn't act to reduce property insurance rates and enlarge its base of coverage, the federal government likely will do so.

Baylor was furious when U.S. Rep. William Moorhead (D-Pa.), the subcommittee chairman, charged that insurance regulation in Illinois is dominated by the insurance industry.

Moorhead called it a "classic case of incest," pointing out that the staff of the Illinois Rating and Inspection Bureau and the Inspection Facility (FAIR plan) is financed by the insurance industry.

Labeling the charge "unfair and unwarranted," Baylor said it took someone of his insurance background to come in and straighten out a mess inherited from his predecessor, John Bolton.

"I worked in the insurance industry, Bolton didn't," Baylor snapped. "I think I understand the problems better with my background."

The heat from this exchange had scarcely died down when further testimony revealed the degree of difficulty still confronting the Illinois FAIR plan and Baylor's department, which is charged by law with overseeing the program.

James E. Vittus, finance director of the Presbytery of Chicago, said six of seven FAIR plan policies approved during the past two weeks included exorbitant rate increases.

He said the following churches' property insurance rates have been increased significantly since last year: Emerald Avenue Presbyterian Church, 670d S. Emerald, \$311 to

\$670; Emmanuel Presbyterian Church, 1850 S. Racine, \$131 to \$169; Lawndale Presbyterian Church, 1908 S. Millard, \$239 to \$774.

George Kyros, who said his family has been in the restaurant business in Woodlawn since 1918, said he has stopped investing in property improvements because he can't get additional insurance coverage at reasonable rates.

There was other testimony that property rates are increased solely because the building is located in the ghetto.

The subcommittee hearings were scheduled after The Daily News disclosed in February that many ghetto dwellers were being charged double and triple premiums under the FAIR plan.

The plan is a federally-backed program designed to help slum dwellers get proper insurance coverage.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 23, 1969]

PROBER WARNS INSURANCE FIRMS OF U.S. ACTION ON HIGH RATES

(By Sheila Wolfe)

Rep. Frank Annunzio (D., Chicago) closed a congressional hearing into Illinois insurance practices yesterday with a warning that government must "step in" if private industry cannot make insurance available in the city at reasonable costs.

"We must face the fact that there is a tragic insurance crisis in our inner cities," said Annunzio. "When we take the evidence that we have uncovered here in the past two days back to Washington, we will get new legislation protecting the consumer."

INSURANCE RATES HIKED

Witnesses had testified in the Federal building that insurance on the south and west sides was canceled on a wholesale basis, that reinsurance rates were double or more the original policy, and that first line insurance companies are "dumping" customers into a federally backed program.

Annunzio, who had asked for the hearing, asserted that the Illinois FAIR [Fair Access to Insurance Requirements] plan, which is an outgrowth of legislation approved last year by Congress, is worsening rather than improving the situation.

Almost every licensed property insurance company must participate in the plan, which is supposed to obtain fire and extended coverage insurance at reasonable rates for persons unable to obtain such insurance on the voluntary market. Government reinsurance is available to the company for riot losses.

INSURANCE DIRECTOR RAPPEL

Both Annunzio and Rep. William Moorhead (D., Pa.), chairman of the banking and currency subcommittee, criticized the Illinois insurance director and the industry for ignoring the needs of consumers.

"They have tunnel vision and at the end of the tunnel, the only light they see is that of the welfare of the insurance industry, and the policy holders be damned," said Annunzio.

Moorhead asserted the Illinois Rating and Inspection bureau, which sets basic insurance rates, the agency which processes applications under the FAIR plan, and the department of insurance which checks on them are industry controlled.

He labeled this "a classic case of incest."

FAIR PLAN DEFENDED

James Baylor, Illinois insurance director, testified the FAIR plan currently is "generally satisfactory." He said improvements were made after he took office earlier this year. Community leaders are being asked to serve on an advisory committee, Baylor said.

Baylor told the hearing that everyone in Illinois has been paying 2 to 4 per cent premium charges for riot coverage which previously was included in policies but not assessed.

He said the 4 per cent rate has applied in Chicago, and the smaller amount in the rest

of the state, since last summer when riots occurred in the city.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 22, 1969]
INDUSTRY RULES—PROBER HITS INSURANCE
REGULATION

(By William Clements)

The chairman of a Congressional subcommittee charged here Tuesday that insurance regulation in Illinois is dominated by the insurance industry.

"What we have here is a classic case of incest," said Rep. William Moorhead (D-Pa.). Moorhead is chairman of a House subcommittee that is investigating insurance-writing practices in slum areas.

The subcommittee hearings were scheduled after The Daily News disclosed in February that many ghetto property owners were being charged double and triple premiums under the FAIR plan.

He pointed out that the Illinois insurance rating bureau and the governing committee of the FAIR plan—a federally-backed program to provide insurance coverage in ghettos—are made up of industry.

"They, in turn, are checked on by the insurance director and his assistant, both of whom come from the insurance industry. Somebody has to guard the consumer. Apparently, this is not being done."

Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.) said during Tuesday's hearing that James Baylor, Illinois insurance director, "admits they are incapable of doing the job." He said state insurance officials seem insensitive to the "intolerable" insurance burden on slum dwellers.

Baylor, after testifying, said that Rep. Moorhead's attack was "unfair and unwarranted." He said he had inherited a mess with the Illinois FAIR plan in January but then had straightened it out.

Annunzio charged that the state insurance department had not properly informed ghetto residents that the FAIR plan exists.

"These poor people go to substandard markets because somebody is avoiding their responsibility," he said during a hearing before a congressional subcommittee.

Annunzio charged that large insurance companies were simply "dumping" policyholders in slum areas, forcing them to pay exorbitant premiums to other firms.

Baylor testified Tuesday that his investigation showed the FAIR plan now is working "satisfactorily" in Illinois.

The FAIR plan is a reinsurance program designed to help slum dwellers get proper insurance coverage.

Baylor said that when he took office in January there were long delays in handling applications and poor communications with the community.

He also cited a "wrong interpretation" that permitted insurers to add a 100-per cent surcharge to premiums.

But he said these problems have been corrected and a new ruling forbids a company from writing a policy with premiums higher than 25 per cent above normal.

Insurance industry representatives were to testify Tuesday. They were expected to bitterly oppose a suggestion by previous witnesses that the federal government move into the insurance field in slum areas.

Also scheduled to testify in the second day of hearings at the Federal Building, 219 S. Dearborn, was Elmer S. Reske, manager of the Illinois Property Insurance Placement Bureau.

Some ghetto businessmen have accused Reske's agency of setting property rates so high that they eventually will be forced to flee to the suburbs.

Manfred S. Spindel, a broker and head of the Spindel Insurance Agency, 8551 S. Stony Island, said it was impossible to get standard insurance rates for even well-maintained buildings in the Lawndale area.

He said many large insurance companies dropped him as a broker after he insisted that they write policies at standard rates.

"Standard protection doesn't exist in the Lawndale area," Spindel said. "I'm not going to charge those people rates that are sky high. I can't justify it to myself."

He said some insurance companies use maps of Chicago with the Lawndale area blocked off—or "quarantined"—as undesirable for normal insurance coverage.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 23, 1969]

HEARING ENDS HERE—GHETTO INSURANCE:
RAY OF HOPE

(By William Clements)

Despite bitterness and some name-calling two days of Congressional hearings on insurance-writing practices in Chicago's ghetto did produce this picture:

The federally-backed FAIR plan is running much more smoothly now than before State Insurance Director James Baylor took office in January.

Even though improvements have been made, there still is, by Baylor's own admission, much more to be done.

Ghetto dwellers and businessmen who do get insurance coverage are finding it difficult to meet the high premium costs.

If they flee the inner city for lack of insurance or inability to pay the high rates, the ghetto is faced with further deterioration.

"This shocking development," asserted U.S. Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.), "should be of prime concern to all Chicago residents, black or white."

If the insurance industry doesn't act to reduce property insurance rates and enlarge its base of coverage, the federal government likely will do so.

Baylor was furious when U.S. Rep. William Moorhead (D-Pa.), the subcommittee chairman, charged that insurance regulation in Illinois is dominated by the insurance industry.

Moorhead called it a "classic case of incest" pointing out that the staff of the Illinois Rating and Inspection Bureau and the Inspection Facility (FAIR plan) is financed by the insurance industry.

Labeling the charge "unfair and unwarranted," Baylor said it took someone of his insurance background to come in and straighten out a mess inherited from his predecessor, John Bolton.

"I worked in the insurance industry, Bolton didn't," Baylor snapped. "I think I understand the problems better with my background."

The heat from this exchange had scarcely died down when further testimony revealed the degree of difficulty still confronting the Illinois FAIR plan and Baylor's department, which is charged by law with overseeing the program.

James E. Vittus, finance director of the Presbytery of Chicago, said six of seven FAIR plan policies approved during the past two weeks included exorbitant rate increases.

He said the following churches' property insurance rates have been increased significantly since last year: Emerald Avenue Presbyterian Church, 670d S. Emerald, \$311 to \$670; Emanuel Presbyterian Church, 1850 S. Racine, \$131 to \$169; Lawndale Presbyterian Church, 1908 S. Millard, \$239 to \$774.

Also, the rates at the Olivet United Presbyterian Church, 1443 N. Cleveland, went from \$155 to \$736; those at the Sixth United Presbyterian Church, 1210 E. 62d St., went from \$114 to \$384, and the rates at the Third Presbyterian Church, 608 S. Hoyne, went from \$129 to \$202.

George Kyros, who said his family has been in the restaurant business in Woodlawn since 1918, said he has stopped investing in property improvements because he can't get additional insurance coverage at reasonable rates.

He said that in order to get proper coverage for his three restaurants under the FAIR plan, he would have to pay \$9,000 more this year than last.

There was other testimony that property rates are increased solely because the building is located in the ghetto.

The subcommittee hearings were scheduled after The Daily News disclosed in February that many ghetto dwellers were being charged double and triple premiums under the FAIR plan.

The plan is a federally-backed program designed to help slum dwellers get proper insurance coverage.

Baylor also revealed during testimony that all property insurance premiums—inside and outside the ghetto—were increased 2 to 4 per cent last September to help meet the cost of insuring high-risk areas.

Baylor said this was part of the industry policy of "spreading the risk."

CONSUMER PROTECTION IN SOFTWOOD LUMBER AND PLYWOOD

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has become increasingly aware of the plight of the American consumer and I am persuaded that there is no Member of this distinguished body who is not intent upon relieving the pressures which all our citizens are bearing—high prices, poor product performance, and unavailability.

It is my privilege to serve on the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Last month the Banking and Currency Committee, under the leadership of our outstanding chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), undertook a thorough examination of the factors which were adversely affecting the price and availability of softwood lumber and plywood. There had been allegations that producers were profiteering, that they were manipulating the market to hold the price up, and that they were charging all the traffic would bear. The significance of sharp price rises coupled with supply shortages was that the Nation's homebuilders were facing an impossible situation. While the Congress had ordained an annual average housing start rate of 2.6 million units over the next decade as a national goal, when it passed the Housing Act of 1968, it had become apparent that annual starts were not only a million below that average but faced declines from even the present estimated level of 1.6 in the first quarter of 1969.

This is, then, a matter of the gravest concern to the American consumer. You may have noted that lumber and homebuilding costs were one of the factors that caused the record increase in the cost of living index. The American home is a product—just like an automobile—and even more essential to all our citizens. Unless houses are built our people will suffer hardship of the most extreme kind. The Congress obviously must act to assure that the houses America needs will be built on schedule and at costs that people can afford.

The investigative hearings into the facts related to softwood lumber and ply-

wood supply revealed a startling paradox in the operation of our National Government. While we have, on the one hand, established goals for housing our people, the Congress on the other hand has neglected to provide the building materials manufacturing industry with the essential means to fulfill their portion of the obligation. The U.S. Government controls three-fifths of the standing softwood timber in the Nation. It is on Federal forest lands. The Government is making available only one-third of the log volume necessary to meet even our present annual requirement for softwood products. Private industrial lands, with less than one-fifth of the softwood sawtimber inventory, is exceeding the production of the Federal lands. The remainder comes from other lands which are largely in miscellaneous private ownership.

This is a ridiculous situation and one which can be corrected with dispatch by passage of the National Timber Supply Act. That act, which I submit as a bill today, will enable the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to apply its skills and energies to unleashing in ever increasing amounts the softwood timber necessary to build America's homes. Heretofore, the Forest Service, despite its high degree of competency in forest management, has been restrained from managing the forests in its charge in a fashion which even approaches the high intensity of management on better industrial forest lands. The reason has been simple—too few dollars for timber growing to realize the forest potential.

The National Timber Supply Act will provide for the reinvestment of a major portion of Federal timber sale receipts in stand improvement, access, fertilization, thinning, pruning and other woods practices which will multiply the productivity of our Federal forests. It will also remove the pressure to declassify wilderness lands. It does no violence to the appropriations process because Forest Service justifications will move through normal channels of the Congress for authorization of funds. The chief difference is that the funds will be there for a period of 2 years when, if not appropriated, they will revert to the general Treasury for such other purposes as the Congress may authorize. The Forest Service will, for the first time, be able to plan a future forest with assurances that the dollars necessary to its realization are readily available over a long period.

We can be assured, I am convinced, that the highly trained and dedicated foresters in the public service will do this job well in the public interest. All my life I have been impressed by the record of foresters in caring for the resources in their charge. They are taught to grow trees like a crop. They are highly trained to achieve maximum return from the land. They are as motivated toward tomorrow and its implications for the welfare of humanity as any professional group I could name. But they must have financial support to achieve their silvicultural miracles.

I am proud of the profession of forestry because in my own district there is one of the finest professional schools in that field. The New York State School

of Forestry at Syracuse University has traditionally graduated men of infinite ability and they have contributed materially to the Nation in both public and private forestry. There are 20,000 members of the Society of American Foresters and many of the most distinguished were trained at Syracuse. All of these fine men know what needs to be done to produce the timber our national requirements demand. They can do it; they will do it. But the Congress of the United States must provide them the means to do it and that will require the speedy passage of the National Timber Supply Act of 1969. I urge my fellow members of this legislative body to act promptly to give our public foresters the tools to do their job.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CRIME

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my vigorous support for the adoption of House Resolution 17 which will establish within the House a Select Committee to Investigate Crime. As an active supporter and cosponsor of this type of measure, I urge the House to act favorably today.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body, including myself, have felt for some time that the Congress simply does not have the tools it needs to move intelligently in the field of criminal investigation and crime prevention and control. The passage of House Resolution 17, however, will certainly be a long step in the right direction.

The distinguished author of the resolution now before us, our friend and colleague from Florida, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, has done a magnificent job not only in actively seeking the creation of this select committee but also in bringing repeatedly to the attention of every Member of the House the crying need for this legislation. We owe him a debt of thanks for his perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, I need not belabor the point of spiraling crime rates in the United States. The newspapers, the radio, and the television are filled with accounts of brutality, rape, theft, muggings, arson, and a host of equally heinous crimes. To assist local and State police authorities in turning the tide against this rise, Congress needs firsthand information on the nature and extent of criminal activities throughout the Nation. This then is the primary reason for establishing the select committee. We are all aware that this committee will not draft legislation, but it will be in a position to gather, sift through and pass on to the appropriate legislative committee vital information needed to combat criminal activities.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of the House to support this measure.

TRIBUTE TO BOB HAYES

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the citizens of my district gathered together to pay respect to one of the best basketball coaches and one of the finest gentlemen it has been my pleasure to know—Mr. Bob Hayes.

Bob has served as an inspiration to the youth of Syracuse and Onondaga County as the basketball coach of St. Patrick's School, the team which won the Parochial League championship this past season and established a record of 14-2 in the regular season.

But Mr. Speaker, Bob Hayes is more than a coach. He is a gentleman of the first order who serves as a model for not only his team but for the young people of our area in general. He is himself an all around athlete whose subtle message to the young is that in athletics, there is appropriate competition, but there is also sportsmanship, ethics and honor.

Bob Hayes would himself admit that a coach, no matter how good, must have the talent to work with and so it would be appropriate to mention at this point the tremendous young men who made the basketball season such a success for St. Patrick's School: Managers John Lehman and Bob Stewart; players Mark Regin, Michael Collins, James Dorsey, Leo Kelly, Pat O'Brien, James Kohl, Michael Ryan, Kevin Young, Charles Renders, Joseph Visconti, John Hutchinson, and David Walsh.

Mr. Speaker, I know that each of my colleagues here in the House joins with me in saluting Bob Hayes, policeman, coach, family man, and dedicated citizen.

NEVADA AND NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARIES

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I spoke on the floor yesterday regarding the serious misgivings I had about Nevada and New Hampshire engaging in a contest to have the earliest presidential primary in the Nation.

My apprehensions stemmed from two sources. On the one hand, I was disturbed by the casual and commercialistic attitudes of the State governments involved. I was especially distressed that Nevada was taking a step fraught with national implications purely and avowedly for local public relations reasons.

A second and more essential aspect of this business was my concern that the Nevada and New Hampshire actions would serve to lengthen the presidential elections. I have long urged that our presidential campaigns be shortened and I noted in my statement yesterday that a Gallup poll recorded 60 percent of the electorate concurring with my position.

I am now pleased to report that the Governor of Nevada has wisely vetoed this ill considered early primary legislation and I have telegraphed him my congratulations. Let us hope that this last-minute reprieve from an ever longer presidential campaign will serve as a catalyst for promoting action, in the Congress and in the States, to shorten the election process.

A PROCLAMATION BY AMERICANS OF POLISH HERITAGE

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning a group of Polish-American leaders headed by Mr. Aloysius Mazewski, president of the Polish National Alliance, issued a proclamation which I believe deserves the interest of Members of Congress.

The proclamation serves notice that hereafter attacks on the ethnic origin of any American—including Americans of Polish descent, will be strongly opposed.

The proclamation denounces the growing practice in the press, radio, and television and motion pictures of permitting the use of vicious ethnic humor, all to the detriment of every American whose heritage places him in the defamed group.

This proclamation was inspired by the Chicago Advocates Society, an organization of Polish-American lawyers. Attorney Mitchell Kobelinski and Attorney Marion Baruch were cochairmen of the Advocates Society proclamation committee.

This proclamation will appear in full-page ads in leading newspapers throughout the country on Friday, May 2, which is a day before Polish Constitution Day.

I believe those responsible for sick humor against ethnic groups should not take lightly this proclamation.

This is the voice of a new generation of young Americans of Polish heritage. They are successful lawyers, doctors, businessmen, industrialists, professionals of all sorts, and good solid American citizens who obviously are proud of their Polish ancestry.

There is a new era dawning in America and these Polish Americans are demanding their full share of fairplay and treatment in our Nation's growth.

The proclamation follows:

MAY 2, 1969.

A PROCLAMATION BY AMERICANS OF POLISH HERITAGE

In the shadow of "Law Day", honoring a concept which we cherish, and on the eve of the third of May, a day steeped in historical significance to our forefathers:

We, Americans of Polish heritage, break a silence of generations, elect to speak and shall be heard, in the interest of promoting greater understanding between ethnic groups in a nation of many origins, colors and creeds. By this declaration, we seek to disseminate knowledge and understanding; hoping thereby to eliminate ignorance and its consequences—prejudice, bigotry and defamation, particularly as they affect ethnic groups in our country.

We charge that those who command the press and airwaves and influence the opinions of the masses, have failed to present an honest portrayal of Americans of various origins; that they have in fact engaged in conduct diametrically opposed to the American principles of justice and equality. The mass media—literary publications, press, radio, television, and motion pictures have all too often allowed demeaning misrepresentation and defamation to spread like a cancer. This being especially true in the use of vicious ethnic humor which has worked to the detriment of every American whose heritage places him in the defamed group.

We invite an examination of our history, filled with examples of justice and the rule

of law; the charter of 1374; religious freedom as early as the 14th century, which made Poland the haven of Europe's Jews; the continent's earliest parliament; a constitution adopted on May 3, 1791; liberal leaders such as Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who were also our American Revolutionary War heroes; the heroic resistance to the Nazi invasion and magnanimous assistance to the Jews of Poland during the long and cruel occupation at great personal peril. These and so many other influencing factors have instilled in the American of Polish heritage an appreciation of freedom under the law, together with the knowledge that scorn for the law is scorn for the freedom of others.

We, Americans of Polish heritage, do hereby solemnly declare and proclaim that we will hereafter, on every possible occasion, expose, deplore, and denounce those powerful rulers of the pen and airwaves who violate our right to truth and accuracy. We refer to those who, by the use of vicious ethnic humor and malicious misrepresentation of our cultural heritage, deform and vilify our public image or the heritage and image of any other ethnic group.

We re-dedicate ourselves to "freedom under the law" and demand justice and fairness with respect to each man's public image. To deny this is to close the door of opportunity to every ambitious member of any ethnic group whose public image has been maligned and distorted, and thereby deny a basic "civil right" which our American Constitution so zealously protects.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS.

SCHNITTKER STUDY ON PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in today's RECORD I am placing the full text of the now-famous "Schnittker study" which last November concluded:

Payments to producers under existing price support and acreage control programs for feed grains, wheat, cotton, wool, and sugar could be limited to around \$20,000 per farm for all payments, or to \$10,000 per program without serious adverse effects on production or on the effectiveness of production adjustment programs.

The study, prepared under the direction of John A. Schnittker, then Under Secretary of Agriculture, also concluded:

Budget savings ranging from \$200 to nearly \$300 million could be made with limits at levels examined here, if the law could be administered firmly—

And also found that—

none of the administrative problems are decisive . . . and they are not good reasons for opposing payments limits.

The study was completed on November 27, 1968. Shortly thereafter, on December 18, 1968, comments on the same study were made by Horace D. Godfrey, then administrator of the ASCS within the Department of Agriculture, and now employed privately by cane sugar interests.

Because payment limitations were opposed by Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman, neither the Schnittker study nor the Godfrey response circulated beyond the top echelon of the Department until a few weeks ago when news reports drawn from the study and comments were published.

These documents, especially the

Schnittker study, have since become important items in the literature of payment limitations. I have asked permission to include the full texts in my remarks, because they have not previously been made available except to a select few.

These documents have special interest to Members of this body, because sometime during the month of June, probably mid-June, the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies will be before the House.

At that time I will seek recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment limiting to \$20,000 aggregate annual payments to any farmer for the 1970 crops of feed grains, wheat, cotton, wool, and sugar.

This will renew efforts I have made repeatedly over the past 4 years to place a ceiling on farm payments. These efforts reached an advanced point last year when a similar amendment was accepted by the House on a record vote. It was subsequently dropped in the conference report.

It is my belief that public support, including broad support among farmers for this type limitation, is at least as high now as last year and probably higher. If the parliamentary situation permits a record vote on the amendment, I am confident it will carry by a comfortable margin.

Members will find the Schnittker study worth reading. It adds impressive support to my amendment. It provides a savings estimate that must be taken as authoritative, concludes that the limitation would not have serious adverse effect on production adjustment programs, and states that administrative problems should not be decisive.

With the exception of a map showing the geographical distribution of payees, the Schnittker and Godfrey documents are reproduced here in their entirety.

In presenting the Godfrey comments, it might seem that I am providing free ammunition to those who oppose my amendment.

Careful study of his comments will, however, cause any objective reader to conclude that his review, which Godfrey himself acknowledged to be quick, to be actually overly quick.

The heart of his criticism is that the limitation would cause land to be planted to other crops and therefore create new problems elsewhere, and that administrative problems would be such as to reduce budgetary saving to a negligible level.

His comments about the consequences of a \$10,000 limitation of course do not apply to consideration of my planned amendment, as it will be at the \$20,000 level.

Would land now planted to cotton be diverted to other crops and thereby increase Government costs there? Mr. Godfrey's affirmative conclusion is disputed by a recent study at Louisiana State University. The university study of cotton practices in Louisiana implies that, due to economic factors, farmers there would continue to plant cotton even though a payment limitation is imposed. This was clear in the study's analysis

of competitive crops to which cotton farmers could turn. In other words, the limitation would not reduce profit in cotton production to such an extent that the land would be planted to other crops. Said another way, taxpayers need not make payments over \$20,000 in order to get cooperation in the cotton program.

The same economic factors obviously apply throughout the land of cotton. Most farm units—over 90 percent—would fall within the limitation and thus be unaffected. The large units would stay in cotton, even though denied some of the payments they now receive.

The administrative problems noted by Mr. Godfrey, through which farm splitting might be attempted to avoid the payment limitation, can be overcome by firmness on the part of the ASCS organization. A requirement that all changes which might conceal farm splitting can be approved only in Washington should effectively discourage this practice.

The adoption of a payment limitation would clearly make the present commodity programs less vulnerable to criticism. Taxpayers are furious over big payments to millionaire farmers and justly so. On the other hand they understand the need for income support for small farmers who are financially less able to deal with the alarming cost-price squeeze now afflicting agriculture.

Annual payments as high as \$4 million to a single farmer bring these programs into such disrepute as to threaten their survival. At the same time they tend to accelerate the trend toward bigness in agriculture, handing to well-financed large operators extra money which can be used to absorb the small farmer.

Mr. Godfrey forecasts that producers leasing cotton allotment acreage would cease to do if a limitation is established. Although the Louisiana State University study would seem to dispute this forecast, let us assume Mr. Godfrey is right.

By reversing the trend toward bigness—corporation-type operations—the limitations would actually serve a worthwhile purpose by strengthening the position of smaller operators.

The payment limitation will thus actually help to strengthen the family-farm structure of agriculture. It will also release, according to the Schnittker report, up to \$300 million annually which surely can be put to more constructive use than to pad the bank accounts of wealthy farmers.

The Schnittker study takes note of the unusual "snapback provision" in the cotton program. This provision in effect repeals the whole program if a limitation on payments is established, and this conceivably would reinstate the 1958 cotton act, which had no expiration date but was superseded by the present program.

The "snapback provision" is so unusual as to raise constitutionality questions. However, assuming it took effect, and the present program were thereby wiped from the statute books, more than one possibility would remain. First, as Mr. Schnittker indicated, the 1958 program might once more become effective. In

my opinion, this would be a desirable development. The 1958 act was working well and, in the opinion of economists, in a year or so with good administration would have had cotton on a solid economic base without problem surpluses. The program requires price supports only high enough to assure adequate supplies, not at the surplus-building levels mentioned by Mr. Schnittker. Unfortunately, Secretary Freeman violated both the spirit and letter of the program early in his administration by raising price supports to unrealistic levels—similar to his subsequent destructive action on soybeans—and quickly had cotton in deep trouble. The present cotton program evolved from this Freeman-made crisis. With good administration, the 1958 program would work fine.

More likely, however, would be something new. If the "snapback provision" took effect the House Committee on Agriculture would likely be in session the next morning to put together a new program.

In my considered judgment, the payment limitation amendment deserves the full support of all segments of American agriculture, and especially those, like myself, who wish to see Federal farm programs in some form continue. I do not believe it will be possible to pass agriculture legislation in the future which authorizes large payments to individual farmers. The budgetary demands, especially for urban and defense needs and the limitations on amounts provided for relief purposes under various acts are only two of the factors which cause me to come to this conclusion. It is wise to face reality and take steps to restore public confidence.

The texts of the Schnittker study and the Godfrey comments follow:

[Schnittker study, Nov. 27, 1968]
LIMITING FARM PROGRAM PAYMENTS
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Payments to producers under existing price support and acreage control programs for feed grains, wheat, cotton, wool, and sugar could be limited to around \$20,000 per farm for all payments, or to \$10,000 per program without serious adverse effects on production or on the effectiveness of production adjustment programs. Difficult administrative problems would arise, however, as producers would seek to avoid the limits by dividing large farms into smaller units.

Whatever the level of payment limits, cotton producers would be affected in greatest number. Few wheat and feed grain producers would be affected, and the impact on the industry would be negligible at the maximum payment levels examined here.

Budget savings ranging from \$200 to nearly \$300 million could be made with limits at levels examined here, if the law could be administered firmly. However, if either Congress in amending the law to authorize payment limits, or the Secretary of Agriculture in his administration of the law, took a relaxed attitude toward dividing farms into smaller units to avoid payment limits, much of the potential savings would be lost.

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural price and income support programs originally were undertaken in the 1930's to improve prices and income for the average family farmer. They continue to be primarily supply adjustment and price support programs designed to achieve higher

incomes for farm families producing the bulk of farm commodities marketed. Clearly, the more a farmer produced, the more he benefited from the higher prices per unit achieved through price support operations.

The farm programs have not generally been considered by the Congress as welfare programs, to be adjusted to the income needs of individual families. Some program changes in recent years, however, have moved in this direction.

Direct payments geared to output became important in the 1960's. By this time, however, there were far more large farms than in 1930—hence an increasing concentration of payments. Recent efforts to limit farm program benefits have arisen both out of this increase in farm size and greater use of direct payments.

Limitations on farm program benefits have been proposed from time to time, and some have been adopted. Congress provided a sliding scale, but no upper limit, for payments under the Sugar Act of 1934. Statutory limits on the size of Agricultural Conservation Program payments, and administrative limits established by the Secretary of Agriculture have been in effect from time to time since 1938. A \$2,500 limitation per producer is in effect for Agricultural Conservation Program payments. There also were payment limitations in the Conservation Reserve Program of the Soil Bank in the 1950's, and in the pilot Cropland Conservation Program in the 1960's.

Proposals were made largely in the 1950's to limit the size of price support loans. In the 1960's efforts have been made to limit the amount of direct cash payments to individual producers (apart from loans)—but none have been successful. In August 1968, however, the House of Representatives approved an amendment to the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1968, which would have limited combined payments to any individual under all the farm programs to \$20,000 per year. This amendment was not accepted by the Senate and was deleted by the Conference Committee; it generated a great deal of interest, however. Payment limitations will probably be on the Congressional agenda for 1969.

Effective opposition in the Congress and the Executive Branch to proposals to limit loans and payments under the commodity programs in recent years has been based on two factors:

Limiting price support loans could make price support less effective in some years, if eligible smaller farmers did not place enough of their products under loan to bring market prices up to support levels. Resulting lower market prices would have an adverse effect on all producers—large or small. This objection is valid but not very important, since most producers would have full access to price support.

One cannot build a strong economic case for or against limiting the size of price support loans. Limiting price support loans may have merit, however, as public relations for farmers. It would limit direct benefits to large growers, but would scarcely affect actual benefits to them.

Refusing to make fairly large acreage diversion and price support payments to individual farmers would reduce the effectiveness of voluntary production adjustment programs, slow surplus disposal, and delay price recovery.

This argument was most valid when the surplus disposal task was greatest in the early 1960's. It is less important in 1969 than it was in 1965, for example. For reasons cited later, this line of argument is no longer a conclusive objection to payment limitations, unless they were to be applied at levels much lower than examined here.

One additional example is useful as background. In the Sugar Act Program, payments have been made on a sliding scale. No upper

limit is set and a few individual payments are around \$1,000,000 each year.

Producers who plant within the sugarcane or sugarbeet acreage allotment set by the Secretary, and meet specified conditions with respect to farm labor, qualify for payment at the rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds of sugar produced up to 350 tons per farm or per person.

The statutory rate of payment per 100 pounds of sugar for larger producers is:

350 to 700 tons.....	\$0.75
700 to 1,000 tons.....	.70
1,000 to 1,500 tons.....	.60
1,500 to 3,000 tons.....	.55
3,000 to 6,000 tons.....	.525
6,000 to 12,000 tons.....	.50
12,000 to 30,000 tons.....	.475
More than 30,000 tons.....	.30

This schedule provides some disincentive to large growers, although not enough to prevent considerable concentration of sugar production.

INCREASED USE OF PAYMENT PROGRAMS

The use of direct Government payments to producers has increased sharply in recent years. Payments were added to existing price support programs as a shift was made from relatively high price support levels to price supports at or near world price levels.

One key reason for direct cash payments was to maintain farmer income. Payments were also the main incentive for farmers to reduce their acreages of certain crops, as a voluntary acreage reduction program became the first effective production restraint for feed grains, replaced mandatory acreage allotments for wheat, and supplemented the long-standing mandatory program for cotton.

These differences in approach for the three big commodities arose more out of history than from differences among the crops or the areas producing the crops. Congress had provided for mandatory acreage allotments for corn in 1938. The procedure had never been used, however, because of the likelihood that less than two-thirds of the producers would vote for the mandatory quota penalties necessary to enforce acreage allotments. It was repeated in the late 1950's. Thus, when corn surpluses had to be curbed in 1961, Congress approved the voluntary, payment-based approach recommended by the Administration.

In the voluntary acreage adjustment programs, wheat marketing certificates, price support and acreage diversion payments for feed grains and cotton, and non-recourse price support loans are available only to growers who meet the acreage diversion requirements established for that year by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Payment programs for wheat and cotton have similar origins, although the legislative struggle in cotton was limited to recent years, while it dates back many years for wheat. Market prices for both crops were supported far above world levels in the 1960's. U.S. wheat and cotton could sell abroad in this period only with large export subsidies.

Wheat growers had agitated for many years for a "2-price plan"—a shorthand term meaning relatively low prices in the market supplemented by payments on that part of the crop used as food in the U.S.

In addition, manmade fibers were fast replacing cotton in the U.S., and it was argued that lower cotton prices would stop or slow that trend. In both cases, farm income would have dropped sharply when price supports were reduced, except for the introduction of direct payments.

Viewed functionally, most payments under the cotton and wheat programs today are income supplements. They are set by law at substantially higher levels than would be re-

quired as incentives to assure enough participation by farmers to stabilize commodity carryover. In both cases, either total payments, or payments to large farms, could be reduced substantially (by about one-third) with little effect on acreage and production.

Feed grain program payments, however, are closely scaled to the incentive levels required to achieve the objective of a fairly stable reserve carryover. If total payments to feed grain growers were to be reduced in the years just ahead, larger surpluses would soon accumulate, unless the level at which market prices were supported was also reduced, in order to increase feed grain utilization.

Utilizing these programs, stocks of farm commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) were reduced from \$5.6 billion in July 1961 to less than \$1 billion in July 1968. Production has not been reduced for each crop each year. But production has been held below potential levels. Coupled with expanding demand, especially for grains, reducing the acreage harvested has been one of the chief engines of surplus disposal.

Direct payments to farmers increased from \$702 million in 1960 to an estimated \$3.4 billion in 1968. Much of the increase in Government payments was offset by reductions in CCC expenditures formerly associated with price support loans and acquisitions, and export subsidy activities.

It was noted earlier that payments became an integral part of the commodity programs in the 1960's, farmers were also rapidly increasing the size of their operations. The number of farms with sales of \$40,000 or more increased from 113,000 in 1960 to about 183,000 in 1967. There were 227,000 farms with sales of \$20,000 to \$39,999 in 1960, and 318,000 in 1967.

The 501,000 farms in these two groups produced 68 percent of all farm products marketed in 1967. Farmers affected by payment limitations at levels examined in this report fall primarily in the larger farms of these two size groups, although some in the other group would be affected.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

Farm program payment data only recently available, make it possible to estimate the probable effects of alternative payment limitation levels on producers, and on key agricultural commodity sectors.

Four alternatives are examined in this memorandum:

A \$20,000 limit on total payments.

A \$10,000 limit administered commodity by commodity.

A sliding scale with total payments limited to \$17,500 per person.

A sliding scale without an upper limit (like sugar).

We have found only one rule for selecting the best payment (or loan) limitation plan, if one is to be adopted. That is, it should not render the acreage diversion (or price support) programs ineffective. Beyond that, there is little to guide us. One could begin from an amount of budget money to be saved, or from a fixed limit on the total to be spent for payments. Setting a limit high enough to exempt most bona fide family farmers is probably a better approach; the examples used here certainly meet that test.

Inevitably, any approach to limiting farm program payments will be fairly arbitrary. It could be made effective in one sharp move, but there is no reason other than costs in any limitation adopted to be fully effective in the first year. A producer's payment might be reduced by one-third the amount by which it exceeds the limit in the first year, two-thirds the second year, and the full amount in the third year. There is no limit to the possible formulas.

For the levels studied here:

1. Farm program payment records for 1967 indicate that a \$20,000 limitation on total payments to a farmer would affect 9,789 producers in the U.S. This is .4 percent of all producers receiving payments. In this group, 8,157 received cotton program payments, 3,304 received wheat certificate payments, and 4,878 received feed grain program payments (Item 1, attached Table 1). Many received payments under several programs. Total payments in excess of the \$20,000 limitation totaled \$206 million (the maximum potential saving). A state by state listing of the number of affected producers is in an attached table.

2. A maximum limitation of \$10,000 for each producer, administered separately for cotton, wheat, feed grains, etc., would affect about 23,000 producers. Of these, 18,054 would be affected through the cotton program, 4,579 through wheat, and 850 through feed grains. In most cases, the feed grains are produced in combination with cotton or wheat (Item 2, attached Table 1). The amount paid out in excess of \$10,000 per farm per program in 1967 totaled \$293 million.

3. A sliding scale could provide for full payment of the first \$10,000 payments earned under present laws, one-half of the next \$10,000 and one-fourth of the third \$10,000. Payments in 1967 in excess of these limitations totaled \$215.2 million. About 23,000 producers would be affected. (Item 3, attached Table 1).

4. A sliding scale starting at the level of the alternative (3) above, but with more moderate graduations has also been considered. It could either have a set limit, or it could be open ended. A schedule which provided full payment up to \$10,000 per farm, 90 percent payment for the next \$10,000—ending with 10 percent of the regularly computed payment for 100,000 or more would be one possibility.

Over half of those who receive payments in excess of \$10,000 in 1967 produced more than one of the price supported crops. Thirty percent received cotton program payments only, 1.5 percent received feed grain program payments only and 11.3 percent received wheat certificate payments only (Table 2).

Clearly any limitation on payments to an individual producer would affect primarily cotton producers. A limitation as low as \$20,000 per farm in total, or \$10,000 per commodity would affect those who produce one-third of the U.S. cotton crop, although even on the farms affected, much of the cotton crop would be eligible for price support payments.

One of the serious administrative problems sure to arise would result from proposed division of farms into smaller units if a limitation were imposed, in order to evade the limit. This would reduce the savings levels indicated in Table 1.

Any payment limit set by Congress would need to be backed up by a firm policy against such farm-splitting. There would need to be strict, uniformly administered regulations to back up the law. As much as one-third to one-half of the potential savings might otherwise be lost.

It is possible that a substantial part of the indicated savings would be lost in any case for reasons related to the nature of farm proprietorships. Many large farms are family or other partnerships, or corporations operated as a small business by a few owners. In any year there are hundreds of bona fide revisions of these arrangements.

It would be impossible for Washington, for a state administrative committee, and especially for a farmer-elected county committee to distinguish charges for causes other than those which would be a direct result of payment limits.

A second serious administrative problem could arise under options (1) and (3) above, since most producers receive payments for participating in more than one commodity program. In such cases, a producer would need to consider his participation in all of the programs simultaneously. Yet, some programs normally are not ready to be announced when other program decisions are made, since planting and harvest dates vary.

Some changes in administrative procedure would be required. Simultaneous announcement of the basic features of wheat, feed grain, and cotton programs for the year ahead would help. Also, in order to avoid overpayment to large growers, a prepayment audit with direct personal attention to each affected farm, would be useful. Final payment would need to be somewhat later than at present, and the present policy of making advance payments might have to be reconsidered.

None of these administrative problems are decisive, however. Some would be avoided in option (2) above. They are not good reasons for opposing payment limits. The number of producers affected would be so small that each could be handled as a special case with little additional expense.

CHANGES NEEDED IN BASIC COTTON LEGISLATION

Since limitation on payments would affect primarily cotton producers, certain changes should be made in that program to discourage or prevent actions by producers to avoid the payment limit, and to maintain program effectiveness. These include:

1. Legislation authorizing sales of cotton allotments should be amended to prevent sales of allotments for the express purpose of avoiding the payment limit. (This, too, would require a Solomon-like determination by administrators).

2. The "snapback provision" in the 1965 Act (Section 402(12)), P.L. 89-321 must be repealed if the limit is to be effective. This provision requires that if payment limitations are authorized, the old permanent (and obsolete) cotton price support system goes into effect. This would include high price supports, with CCC acquiring most of the cotton, and selling it back into the market at lower prices. This would seriously disrupt the cotton industry. By shielding cotton from any payment limit policy, it would avoid the intent of Congress.

3. The mandatory features of the cotton acreage adjustment program could either be terminated or modified, in order to give producers affected by the payment limit an opportunity to expand their acreage.

With U.S. producers facing world level cotton prices for a large part of their output on the acreage allotment, it appears that mandatory acreage controls backed up by marketing quota penalties are no longer needed to achieve a cotton supply-demand balance. The industry has little incentive to overproduce at this price level. Low prices may be enough of a deterrent.

However, present acreage allotment procedures, based on past acreage, do slow down the further westward shift in cotton production. Most of the cotton producers and interested Congressmen want them continued, since they value the cotton acreage allotments in the state, either for economic or political reasons.

Therefore, an intermediate step short of terminating acreage allotments would probably be best. This could provide for waiving marketing quota penalties for producers who overplant their farm acreage allotments by specified percentages.

Producers who were receiving full payments as calculated under the law, for example, could be required to plant within their farm acreage allotment.

Producers losing only a small percentage of their payment could overplant their acreage allotment only a little.

Producers losing most of their payment (being reduced from \$150,000 to \$10,000 for example) might plant up to double their farm acreage allotment.

The Secretary of Agriculture would need a lot of discretion in setting such percentages from year to year, since the results could not be accurately estimated in advance. It does seem clear that large producers who would be touched by payment limits do value the opportunity to expand acreage. Thus a satisfactory *quid pro quo* may be possible.

CHANGES NEEDED IN WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN LEGISLATION

Few wheat or feed grain producers would be affected by payment limitations, at levels examined in this memorandum. Yet modest changes in these programs would reduce inequities, and might avoid adverse effects on program participation.

Existing legislation could be amended to provide that wheat and feed grain producers subject to payment limitations would either get a larger acreage allotment (in the case of wheat), or would have their acreage diversion requirements reduced in the case of feed grains. For example, if payment limitations reduced a feed grain producer's payment by one-half, the diversion otherwise required to become a cooperator in the program could also be reduced by half. Again, the Secretary would need some discretion in administering such a provision, in order to maintain program effectiveness.

EFFECT OF LIMITATION IF APPLIED TO SUGAR PROGRAM

Roughly 100 to 125 sugar producers received payments in excess of \$20,000 in 1967. About 1,500 producers were above the \$10,000 mark.

Payments under the Sugar Act provide sugarbeet and sugarcane growers with an incentive to restrict their acreage. Acreage limits are set by the Secretary when supplies or potential supplies are large, based on formula in the law. Without loss of payments to provide an incentive to keep acreage down, quota limits might be ignored and the Sugar Act in its present form could become ineffective in limiting U.S. sugar production.

A maximum of \$20,000 per payee would have no effect on growers who produce less

than 1,000 tons of recoverable sugar per year and only a small effect on those who produce as much as 1,500 tons per year — percent of all sugar producers with — percent of all production would thus be exempt.

At the other end of the scale is the question of whether or not payment limits at levels examined here would discourage production. For the larger producers, the 30 cents per 100 pounds received in Sugar Act payments for production in excess of 30,000 tons equals about 4 percent of the current price of raw sugar in New York. Program payments are less than 5 percent of gross receipts for large producers; are only one of several factors which influence output, and which encourage compliance with allotments. Even if payments were reduced to a maximum of \$20,000, the largest sugar companies probably would continue to produce at about present levels, and to comply with acreage allotments.

EFFECTS OF LIMITATIONS IF APPLIED TO WOOL

Payment limitations applied to wool growers would affect few producers, and would not reduce program costs appreciably.

There is no price support loan for wool. Income support to wool growers is entirely in the form of direct payments equal to the difference between average market prices and a target set by law. Payments were intended to encourage increased wool production, but they have, at best, served to slow the decline of the U.S. sheep industry.

A limitation of \$20,000 applied to all programs would affect about 125 wool producers with 4 percent of total U.S. wool production in 1967. Wheat, feed grain or cotton payments also were involved in 98 of these cases.

A limit of \$10,000 for wool payments alone would have affected 165 producers in 1967. They received about \$2.6 million and accounted for about 9 percent of the total U.S. wool and mohair production. A \$10,000 limit would have reduced total wool payments about a million dollars.

The sliding scales in alternatives (3) and (4) would reduce payments a little over one-half million dollars for (3) and by a negligible amount under (4).

Payment limits would reduce the incentive for wool production in the U.S. slightly, but even present payments provide only a limited incentive. Limitations would not have any decisive impact on the sheep and wool industry.

TABLE 1.—EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM PAYMENT LIMITATION PLANS

Payment limitation plan	Program ¹			
	Cotton	Wheat	Feed grains	Total
\$20,000 total for all programs:				
Number of payees affected.....	8,157	3,304	4,878	^a 9,789
Payments in excess of limitation ^b				\$205,600,000
Production on farms affected.....	^c 3,780,000	^c 74,600,000	^c 113,800,000	
(1) Percent of U.S. total production on farms affected ^d	34	5	2	
\$10,000 per program:				
Number of payees affected.....	18,054	4,579	850	^a 23,017
Payments in excess of limitation.....	\$261,900,000	\$26,400,000	\$4,500,000	\$292,800,000
Production on farms affected.....	^c 5,440,000	^c 69,400,000	^c 151,800,000	
(1) Percent of U.S. total production on farms affected.....	49	10	1	
(2) Percent of U.S. total production affected which is in excess of limitation.....	29	3.6	0.4	
Sliding scale per program:				
Number of payees affected.....	18,054	4,579	850	^a 23,017
Payments in excess of limitation.....	\$196,400,000	\$16,000,000	\$2,800,000	\$215,200,000
Production on farms affected.....	^c 5,440,000	^c 151,800,000	^c 69,400,000	
(1) Percent of U.S. total production on farms affected.....	49	10	1	
(2) Percent of U.S. total production affected which is in excess of limitation.....	22	2	0.3	

¹ Includes all payees who received \$10,000 or more from all ASCS programs. The 3 commodity programs account for about 90 percent of total payments.

² Net figure—since some producers participate in more than 1 commodity program.

³ Impossible to calculate excess by program since exact amount will depend upon how a producer who participates in more than 1 program decides to allocate his program earnings between programs.

⁴ Bales.

⁵ Bushels.

⁶ Full payment for 1st \$10,000; $\frac{1}{2}$ of next \$10,000; and $\frac{1}{4}$ of 3d \$10,000.

TABLE 2.—PAYEES RECEIVING \$10,000 OR MORE AND \$20,000 OR MORE IN PAYMENTS FROM ASCS WHO RECEIVED COTTON, FEED GRAIN, AND WHEAT PAYMENTS IN SPECIFIED COMBINATIONS, 1967

Source of payment	\$10,000 or more		\$20,000 or more	
	Number	Percentage of total	Number	Percentage of total
Cotton only.....	8,882	29.8	3,494	37.3
Cotton and feed grain.....	7,316	24.5	2,557	27.3
Cotton and wheat.....	1,196	4.0	511	5.4
Cotton, feed grain, and wheat.....	4,626	15.5	1,545	16.5
Any cotton payments.....	(22,020)	(73.8)	(8,107)	(86.5)
Feed grain only.....	453	1.5	80	.8
Feed grain and wheat.....	4,000	13.4	646	6.9
Any feed grain payments.....	(16,395)	(54.9)	(4,828)	(51.5)
Wheat only.....	3,367	11.3	542	5.8
Any wheat payment.....	(13,189)	(44.2)	(3,244)	(34.6)
Total.....	29,840	100.0	9,375	100.0

DISTRIBUTION OF PAYEES RECEIVING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS OF \$20,000 AND OVER, BY MAJOR COMMODITY, BY STATE, 1967

State	Major commodity				State total
	Cotton	Feed grains	Wheat	Wool	
Alabama.....	289				289
Arizona.....	586	2	1		589
Arkansas.....	862				864
California.....	931	3	18	7	959
Colorado.....	5	9	124	7	145
Florida.....	4				4
Georgia.....	177	2			179
Idaho.....			55	4	59
Illinois.....	2	20			22
Indiana.....		13			13
Iowa.....		12	1	1	14
Kansas.....	2	13	143		158
Kentucky.....		6	2		8
Louisiana.....	321				321
Michigan.....		1			1
Minnesota.....			5		5
Mississippi.....	1,411				1,411
Missouri.....	98	17	2		117
Montana.....		4	75		79
Nebraska.....	1	15	5		21
Nevada.....	3	1	2	1	7
New Jersey.....		1			1
New Mexico.....	119	14	39	1	173
North Carolina.....	70	1			71
North Dakota.....		1	26		27
Ohio.....		3	1		4
Oklahoma.....	65	1	39		105
Oregon.....			76		76
Pennsylvania.....		1			1
South Carolina.....	217				217
South Dakota.....	2	1	17		20
Tennessee.....	102				102
Texas.....	2,365	84	193	11	2,653
Utah.....			5	2	7
Virginia.....		1			1
Washington.....		1	175		176
Wyoming.....			3	5	8
Total, United States.....	7,638	223	1,007	39	8,907

1 882 additional payees received payments of \$20,000 and over from other ASCS programs.

NUMBER OF PAYEES RECEIVING \$10,000 OR MORE FROM COTTON, FEED GRAIN, WHEAT, OR WOOL PAYMENTS, BY STATES, 1967

State	Cotton	Feed grains	Wheat	Wool
Alabama.....	808	3	0	0
Alaska.....	0	0	0	0
Arizona.....	870	11	9	5
Arkansas.....	2,098	2	6	0
California.....	1,728	12	70	16
Colorado.....	11	26	449	17
Florida.....	10	0	0	0
Georgia.....	604	7	1	0
Idaho.....	0	4	290	18
Illinois.....	5	76	6	0
Indiana.....	0	50	1	0
Iowa.....	1	67	3	1
Kansas.....	4	47	647	0
Kentucky.....	22	2	2	0
Louisiana.....	814	3	1	0
Michigan.....	0	4	2	0
Minnesota.....	0	17	25	0
Mississippi.....	2,510	1	2	0
Missouri.....	330	54	6	0
Montana.....	1	11	613	7
Nebraska.....	1	72	55	0
Nevada.....	12	1	2	0
New Jersey.....	0	2	0	0
New Mexico.....	371	58	72	8
New York.....	0	0	1	0

NUMBER OF PAYEES RECEIVING \$10,000 OR MORE FROM COTTON, FEED GRAIN, WHEAT, OR WOOL PAYMENTS, BY STATES, 1967—Continued

State	Cotton	Feed grains	Wheat	Wool
North Carolina.....	217	10	0	0
North Dakota.....	0	2	262	0
Ohio.....	0	13	3	0
Oklahoma.....	200	9	226	0
Oregon.....	0	1	316	2
Pennsylvania.....	0	5	0	0
South Carolina.....	574	6	0	0
South Dakota.....	4	6	90	3
Tennessee.....	419	1	0	0
Texas.....	6,439	256	474	46
Utah.....	0	0	28	3
Virginia.....	1	2	0	0
Washington.....	0	2	905	3
Wisconsin.....	0	7	0	0
Wyoming.....	0	0	12	32
Total, United States.....	18,054	850	4,579	165

COMMENTS ON STUDY DATED NOVEMBER 27, 1968, "LIMITING FARM PROGRAM PAYMENTS" BY H. D. GODFREY FOR ASCS

This study concludes that payments to producers under existing price support and acreage control programs for feed grains, wheat, cotton, wool, and sugar could be limited to around \$20,000 per farm for all payments, or to \$10,000 per program without serious adverse effects on production or on the effectiveness of production adjustment programs. Admitting that difficult administrative problems would arise, the report leans toward concluding that they could be solved. Budget savings, it is averred, would range from \$200 to \$300 million if the law could be administered firmly. The range of savings would depend upon the kind of limit adopted. Four are discussed: (a) a \$20,000 payment limit per farm; (b) a \$10,000 limitation per commodity; (c) a \$17,500 total payment limitation per person, based upon a sliding scale; and (d) a sliding scale payment provision without an upper limit, somewhat like the sugar provision.

A quick review of the salient points and arguments which the report makes causes us to conclude that the study is overdrawn, with much of the narrative not providing firm support for the report's conclusion. The following detailed comments embrace our views:

1. The report indicates for cotton and wheat that a payment limitation would have little effect on acreage and production. For feed grains, it indicates that a limitation would soon lead to larger surpluses unless the level at which market prices were supported was also reduced.

In the case of wheat and feed grains, our data indicate the imposition of a \$20,000 payment limit probably would not seriously disrupt the voluntary wheat and feed grain supply adjustment programs. Under the 1967 wheat program, payees receiving payments over \$20,000 accounted for about 2.5 million acres, or 4 percent of the wheat allotment.

Most producers could of course, continue to participate in the program. Further, by 1970 a wheat farmer would have to overplant his allotment by almost 70 percent in order to pocket the same returns as a program participant.

In the case of feed grains, payees receiving over \$20,000 in a 1967 program payments comprised about 2.6 million acres of the total feed grain base, made up of about 0.8 million base acres of corn and 1.8 million base acres of grain sorghums; the total comprises only about 2 percent of the feed grain base. The estimated corn base attributed to payees receiving over \$20,000 of payments in the 10 leading corn (grain) producing States approximated a little over 200,000 acres; most of these payees also received payments under the wheat program. The remaining corn base involving 0.6 million acres was widely distributed primarily in the Southeast and Mississippi Delta cotton producing areas, where corn payments are minor relative to cotton. In general, feed grain payments in the sorghum area are small relative to cotton payments on cotton-feed grain farms. In this context feed grain production would not be expected to increase materially under a \$20,000 limitation.

But the case for both wheat and feed grains begins to unravel as the payment limitation drops—for example, a \$10,000 or lower limitation would importantly change the situation.

For cotton our data show that payees receiving over \$20,000 in 1967 program payments accounted for more than 30 percent of the potential production; about 4.4 million allotment acres were on farms affected by this limitation. Further, the study indicates that a \$10,000 program limitation would affect payees producing about 5½ million bales, or more than 40 percent of a normal crop. These figures are significant; our interpretation of them is different than that taken by the report, which is inclined to conclude that, while difficult administrative problems would arise, nonetheless they could be worked out so as to result in budget savings of from \$200 to \$300 million, and at the same time provide adequate supplies of cotton with little disruption to most producers. In our judgment this is *unrealistic*, and *in fact is not supported by the report itself*. Table 1 of the study indicates the range of savings under the alternative limitations, *provided* any limitations were 100 percent effective. At the same time the body of the report indicates that from one-third to one-half of the potential savings might be lost unless the limitations were "backed up by a firm policy against farm-splitting," going on to say that "it is possible that a substantial part of the indicated savings would be lost in any case for reasons related to farm proprietorships". The study goes on to conclude that "it would be impossible for Washington, for a State administrative committee, and especially for a farmer-elected county committee to distinguish changes for causes other than those which would be a direct result of payment limits".

As we see it, a cotton payment limitation would result in only negligible budgetary savings simply because of the cotton farm infrastructure. In explanation, a great majority of the legal entities which receive the larger cotton payments involves more than one person. Many of them are partnerships, corporations, or joint ventures involving a fairly large number of individual producers and landowners. The large farms have been operated as one unit in order to increase efficiency, but if limitations were to be put into effect, most of the large farms could be divided—legally—into smaller units with each individual operating a separate farming unit.

Very few of the producers who have received payments in excess of \$20,000 own all

the land that they operate. Most of them rent or lease some of the land they are working, and many of them also have leased or purchased allotment acreage from other farms. If a limitation is made effective, those producers who have been leasing would not continue to lease the additional land or allotment.

By 1970 cotton payments are likely to average about 20 percent smaller than in 1967 as diverted acreage is greatly reduced or eliminated. This would reduce the number of farms affected by a \$20,000 limit. In 1967, about 8,900 payees received a payment of

over \$20,000 on cotton, wheat, feed grains, and wool. By 1970, it is estimated this number would be reduced to around 6,500 payees even if they continued to operate the same land in the same manner as in 1967.

The list of large cotton payees (over \$25,000) in 1967 has been reviewed for a few counties by some of our people who are knowledgeable about farms and farming in these counties. The following summarizes the actions which our people think these payees might take in 1970 if a limitation were in effect.

County	Number of payees over \$25,000	Action that would likely be taken			
		Increase number of payees ¹	Rent out owned land	Release rented land	Sell or lease part of allotment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Yuma, Ariz.	46	34	3	29	10
Maricopa, Ariz.	175	105	52	27	136
Reeves, Tex.	65	24	11	23	13
Sunflower, Miss.	82	38	21	16	2

¹ Includes cases where farming operation would be divided between present owners and/or partners, and where operation would be changed from hired hands to share tenants or cash tenants.

Note.—Cross totals do not add to col. 1; many payees would take multiple actions.

Thus, a central question relating to making a payment limitation work for cotton involves action which the Government could take to enforce a limitation. Realistically we doubt that legal actions could be taken to, in effect, freeze the number of payees, deny producers the right and opportunity to rent land which they own, release land which they have rented, or even to sell or lease portions of their allotment. In this connection, we note the report's suggestion that legislation authorizing sale of cotton allotments should be amended to prevent such sales for the express purpose of avoiding a payment limitation, commenting that this would require a "Solomon-like" determination by administrators. Indeed it would!

Furthermore, the study does not give any serious consideration to the impact on other programs if limitations were applied to cotton and who could administratively enforce such limitations. It is possible throughout the cotton area to grow alternative crops, but the alternative crops are also in surplus. Thus, any limitations which would affect cotton would naturally lead the producers to adopt farming practices which would involve the growing of other price supported crops, all of which are now in surplus. Thus, any savings as a result of limitations on cotton would for all practical purposes be largely offset by increased cost of price supported operations for feed grains, wheat, soybeans, dairy, etc.

It is true, as the report states, that certain payment limitations have been in effect in past years, mentioning the Agricultural Conservation Program and the Conservation Reserve Program. These limitations are described in enclosure 1. It is important to point out here, however, that a clear distinction must be made between a limitation involving voluntary participation in acreage adjustments, as contrasted to a program which sharply limits payments to producers for a crop that is their main livelihood. In a word, little useful comparison can be drawn between a payment limitation on the ACP.

Much of the above comment relates to a limitation of around \$20,000. The problems we describe, and their effect on overall program results, would bear down much more forcefully if the payment limitation were \$10,000—and the impact of a \$5,000 limitation would obviously be much greater yet. I believe we can agree that as the payment limitation drops, the number of producers affected would sharply increase, and there would be less opportunities for producers to legally avoid the limitation. This brings up

another serious problem—the ability to provide an adequate cotton production involving participation by the family farm, countrywide, with price support at about world price levels.

In sum, I am seriously concerned with a report which contemplates savings of from \$200 to \$300 million through a payment limitation. Realistically, I do not believe the necessary steps could be taken, either by statute or administratively, to make the program effective enough to result in important savings. And further, if the limitation were dropped to the point where large numbers of smaller producers were affected by it, program savings would be made at the risk of jeopardizing the entire program with resultant damage to the family farm enterprise. There would be serious question as to whether or not adequate quantities of cotton would continue to be produced.

2. The Sugar Program: The study would apply the limitations described above to the sugar program as well. This program, however, now embraces limitations on sugar act payments, based on a sliding scale, but with no absolute limitation. The statutory rate of payment per 100 pounds of sugar starts at 80 cents for the first 350 tons per farm or per person, but drops to a rate of 30 cents per 100 pounds for quantities in excess of 30,000 tons. The report states that the limitations "provide some disincentive to large growers although not enough to prevent considerable concentration of sugar production." We see no problem on the sugar program; it has a long history and it is working well. We seriously doubt the wisdom of embroiling the sugar program in any new limitations, of the kind the study contemplates. The study indicates that 1,500 producers received payments in excess of \$10,000, and from 100-125 obtained payments in excess of \$20,000 in 1967. For the larger producers, program payments amount to less than 5 percent of the gross receipts. The study conjectures that if payments were reduced to a maximum of \$20,000 the larger sugar companies probably would continue to produce at about present levels, and to comply with acreage allotments. It's our view that enactment of sugar legislation is time consuming, tortuous and difficult; it usually has been handled separately. We do not believe the problem of payment limitations for sugar is sufficiently serious to warrant further consideration at this time.

3. The Wool Program: Here again we doubt the wisdom of applying a payment limitation. The study shows that 125 wool producers would have been affected by a \$20,000

limitation under the 1967 program. A limitation of \$10,000 would have affected 165 producers that year; they received about \$2.6 million and accounted for perhaps about 9 percent of U. S. production. A \$10,000 limitation would have reduced payments about \$1.0 million. But the wool program payment is considered an "incentive payment" designed to increase domestic wool production, make consumers less dependent upon imports. It is financed from tariff receipts on imports, thus is somewhat different from our other programs. For these reasons we doubt that action to impose a limitation would serve a really useful purpose.

4. Changes in basic legislation for wheat, feed grain and cotton: The study suggests the possibility of amending wheat and feed grain legislation so as to provide either for a larger acreage allotment, or a reduced diversion requirement for those participants who would be affected by a payment limitation. For cotton, it suggests that marketing quota penalties might be waived for producers affected by the limitation, who overplant farm acreage allotments by specified percentages.

We see little need for the wheat and feed grain proposal which has serious shortcomings. We are inclined to doubt the acceptability of a program which would offset payment limitations with the opportunity to produce larger quantities with the benefit of price support. Administratively, the provision would give rise to difficult problems.

The cotton proposal apparently stems from the belief that producers whose payments are drastically reduced under the limitation ought to have the opportunity to produce extra supplies with the benefit of the loan. This is a laudable objective particularly if there is reason to believe that production otherwise would not be adequate. At the same time we have serious doubts both as to its general acceptability or the need for it. For example, if a \$50,000 price support payment were reduced to \$20,000, this amount could be earned on perhaps 40 percent of the domestic acreage allotment. If the domestic allotment percentage was set at 65 percent, this means the \$20,000 could be earned on 26 percent of the allotment. In this situation the producer already would be able to grow the remaining 74 percent of his allotment with benefit of price support. Administratively, the suggestion for extra acreage to such a producer would raise serious and complex problems. Allotments are made to farms, not individuals. Many allotments embrace situations under which a large payment accrues to one or two individuals, but much smaller payments accrue to others. This might involve basing the extra acreage on a person's intention, ahead of planting time. We see numerous problems with this, and at the same time we are not sure that the provision would be needed.

The earlier comment in this memorandum related to the provision which would amend legislation authorizing sales of cotton allotments.

THE CHARLESTON HOSPITAL WORKERS STRIKE

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the strike of hospital workers in Charleston, S.C., which has now continued for over a month, points out a glaring inadequacy in Federal labor policy. While workers in private industry have been guaranteed the right to bargain collectively through union representatives for over three decades, employees of nonprofit or government-operated hospitals enjoy no such

right to collective bargaining. This is the central issue in the strike of the hospital workers in Charleston, and it is an issue which must be given a high priority by Congress if we are to prevent a recurrence of future confrontations in other areas of the Nation.

In order to provide a background for the present status of the Charleston strike, let me briefly summarize events as they have transpired since the initiation of the strike.

On March 20, some 600 Negro members of local 1199B of the Drug and Hospital Union went on strike to protest the dismissal of 12 Negro nonprofessional workers employed by the South Carolina Medical College Hospital, and the Charleston County Hospital, to gain recognition for purposes of collective bargaining, and to obtain an increase in the wages presently paid to hospital workers in these two hospitals.

For the first 2 weeks of the strike, the situation remained relatively calm. In the past 2 weeks, however, the State's response to the strike has been repressive, and hundreds of union members and sympathizers have been arrested.

Since an injunction was obtained by the hospitals early in the strike forbidding demonstrations of more than 10 people near the two hospitals, strikers have been forced to risk arrest in order to maintain the momentum of their strike. Since April 11, 30 Negro women and the president of local 1199B have been held in jail after being arrested for violating this injunction. Countless others have been arrested, many of them school-age children, since that date.

As of April 25, approximately 1,250 have been arrested. Leon J. Davis, president of local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Union in New York City, and the Reverend Ralph Abernathy who, as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, has lent his support to the strike, have also been arrested and at this moment are still in jail.

The issues for which these workers are fighting are substantive and imperative. The hourly wage which the hospital workers are presently receiving is only \$1.30. This is the current national minimum wage set for hospital workers. The rate is \$0.30 below the national minimum wage for workers employed by private industry—except for agricultural workers—and \$0.56 below the national average hourly wage paid to nonsupervisory hospital workers throughout the country. Thus, the economic needs of the workers in these two hospitals, and the fact that their present wages are not only considerably below the national minimum wage for workers in private industry but also more than \$0.50 below the average wage paid to other hospital workers in the Nation, provide ample justification for their effort to obtain a pay increase.

The basic issue at stake, however, is the right of these workers to unionize and to bargain with the hospitals for wages and working conditions as a collective unit. Although neither South Carolina State law nor Federal law prohibits nonprofit employers such as these

hospitals from entering into agreements with organized unions, the hospitals have thus far refused to even negotiate with the striking workers. Instead the authorities have resorted to mass arrests and the use of police and the National Guard in an attempt to crush the union and end the strike.

It is long past the time when negotiations with the union over the issues of the strike should have begun. A year ago, in Memphis, Tenn., the entire Nation bore witness to what can happen when local government fails to respond to the grievances of public employees. We cannot stand by idly while a situation already marked by strife and tension escalates beyond control and settlement.

The Federal Government must also play a role in alleviating situations such as the one now continuing in Charleston. I have introduced legislation in past Congresses, as well as this Congress—H.R. 637—which would end the present inequity by enlarging the definition of an "employer"—and his accompanying responsibility to accept collective bargaining agents approved by workers as their legitimate representatives—to include nonprofit organizations operating hospitals.

I call upon the Committee on Education and Labor to bring this legislation to the floor of the House and the Congress to act favorably. The Congress must act now to extend rights guaranteed workers in private industry for over 30 years to nonprofessional hospital workers such as those engaged in the current strike in Charleston, S.C.

WESTERN AEROSPACE MUSEUM PROPOSAL

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of my California colleagues, Congressman DON EDWARDS, PAUL McCLOSKEY, JERRY PETTIS, ALPHONZO BELL, and myself, I am introducing a bill which would direct a feasibility study of an aerospace museum to be located in the western United States.

There is no major aerospace museum outside Washington, D.C., and since the western United States has contributed so much to aerospace technology, westerners should have an opportunity to see aerospace artifacts and have access to technical information in the aerospace field. We are confident that this museum would not only be of great advantage to science and serve to promote space technology, but it would also be a tremendous tourist attraction. It is quite possible that the fees charged could make the museum a profitable venture for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the U.S. Treasury.

We have not designated a specific location for this proposed museum since such designation would restrict the feasibility study and might prevent the best possible site from being selected.

Naturally, it is inappropriate to suggest a name for such a museum before it is determined to be feasible, but I think it only fair to inform the House that we

as authors of the legislation respectfully suggest and sincerely hope that the museum can be named for the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. Our colleague from California has done much to promote the development of science and the conquest of space. We are justifiably proud of his accomplishments and sincerely hope that when the time comes the Congress will authorize this great addition to the West as the George Miller Aerospace Museum.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND SECTION 1903(c) OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act in order to prevent a fiscal crisis from arising in Kentucky and possibly a few other States.

This proposed legislation is purely transitory in nature. It is designed to avoid a problem resulting from an accidental conflict of timing under existing law. It will have no long-range impact upon the medicare program established under title XIX of the act.

Let me explain briefly the background of the problem, and the need for this legislation will become clear.

This problem relates to a provision of title XIX, section 1903(c) to be specific, which was included in the law at the time the medicare program was first established to assist States in certain situations in financing the introduction of the new program.

Section 1903(c) provides an alternative method of determining the Federal percentage in the payment of medicare benefits prior to July 1, 1969. This alternative method is open to use by all States, but in fact has been used by only eight States, presumably because it offered no substantial advantage to the States that did not use it.

The financial impact of this provision has been very limited in relation to the total title XIX program. For example, in fiscal year 1968, when total Federal expenditures under title XIX amounted to \$1.8 billion, the alternative method of determining Federal participation under section 1903(c) resulted in an estimated additional \$21 million in payments to all of the eight States operating under the section over what they would have received under the regular Federal percentage formula. For my State of Kentucky, the difference in treatment for fiscal 1968 resulted in an additional Federal payment of around \$2 million.

The problem now facing Kentucky, Mr. Speaker, and possibly some of the other States—I am not certain of the situations existing in all of these States—is that no provision has been made to meet the additional financing that the State will have to assume beginning July 1 of this year and, unfortunately, the Kentucky Legislature will not meet to appropriate these funds prior to the

time they will be needed. The State Legislature of Kentucky is not scheduled to meet until next year.

The only possible way for Kentucky to avoid having to reduce payments under its medicaid program in order to keep it operating within the funds available is to convene a special session of the legislature—a very difficult and costly move. In view of the limited purpose of such a session, there are very grave doubts that one could be called.

The bill I have introduced would take care of this unfortunate problem in timing by providing that no State which has received Federal matching under section 1903(c) will have its Federal percentage reduced until a reasonable time has expired to allow its State legislature to act to appropriate additional funds that will be required to shift over to the regular title XIX Federal percentage formula. The bill provides that none of the States involved will have its Federal percentage reduced by reason of the July 1, 1969, termination date in section 1903(c) until 90 days after the conclusion of the first regular session of its legislature held after the date of enactment of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, although this bill is very limited in its application and effect, it deals with a problem which is quite important to States like Kentucky, which might have to curtail benefits solely to stay within available financial resources. I, therefore, urge that it be given prompt consideration.

HALL ADDRESSES POLICE

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the excellent address of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL, which he delivered last Friday, April 25, at graduation exercises for 98 foreign police officials who have been attending the International Police Academy in Washington.

The 98 police graduates, representing 20 nations, had been in training for more than 3 months at the police training facility, which is under the supervision of Mr. Byron Engle, Director of the Office of Public Safety, Agency for International Development, and Mr. Michael G. McCann, Director of the Police Academy.

Congressman HALL spoke from the experience of a distinguished record of service in World War II as Chief of Personnel Service, Office of the Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as a physician and surgeon in private practice for many years, and in recent years as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives whose outstanding public service is widely recognized in the Nation. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. HALL

Thank you very much Mr. Director, distinguished class advisors and director of the International Police Academy. It is obvious that Director Byron Engle comes from the hill country that is my home. By now you must know that I am his Congressman. His

introduction was not as much as I deserved but from him, more than I expected. If it is true that a man can live for one month on a single compliment, you have indeed assured me of immortality.

Speaking of me being a surgeon and a physician who came to Washington to serve in the congress to doctor my people collectively instead of individually, I am convinced that that is more necessary than ever but I am reminded of a very diplomatic office nurse who noted a very nervous patient in the waiting room waiting to see the physician of his choice and sought to reassure him and said, "Don't let the Doctor frighten you, don't be nervous my dear. Doctors are like politicians, they view with alarm so that thereafter they may point with pride."

I certainly congratulate the International Police Academy as well as Spanish-speaking Inter-American general classes 40 and 41 and the English-speaking general class 24 and particularly those who have spoken representing you. I know there are other classes in the audience. I am proud to be here this morning because I know that you people realize that training involves administration, leadership and organization. That you are trained in municipal and rural police operations and in internal security while here, on a seminar basis.

And I am proud that the International Police Academy goes on field trips and across the length and breadth of the land and that we gain from what you offer and submit, as well as what we may offer. It is a pleasure to be here among those of you who have dedicated your lives to security. Those of you who realize that justice must support and back-up the constabulary and the security forces, if as some of your speakers have said so well, we are to remain free people, considerate people, who share and have confidence one with the other.

I am glad to be here as a member of the committee on armed services of the congress if for no other reason than to hear Mr. Harpham and this segment of the Marine Band again. I am proud of our representatives and the service that they perform.

I like to think of your seminars as in the words of Sir Thomas Moore, one of the famous poet laureates who wrote of the coming together of the waters. I believe in the ancient Gaelic or the Irish dialect they called it the "aboca"—the coming together. Here we come together in seminar so that we may learn and profit and cooperate more fully in the future and as it was so well said, around the world, where the twain do meet in this day of shortened communication and increased transport.

May it always be thus. And it's also wonderful for me to appear before your group in particular today. I think it would be wonderful indeed if we could all conduct our governmental affairs in the spirit of cooperation and good will from our hearts and possibly even the forbearance but always with understanding that you have shown these past weeks.

Our backgrounds may be different, our national origins possibly unrelated, our speech in need of translation, but we still have so much in common. Our very presence here today demonstrates a commitment to the idea, that only through law and order will peace and justice prevail. I speak not only for my country, but for all of the twenty-one countries represented here this morning.

It was Santa Anna who said people who forget the lessons of history are destined to relieve their tragedies. Thinking again from history that in the year 372 B.C., Plato issued one of the most acclaimed books ever written. It was called "The Republic." In it Plato wrote—and I quote—"All forms of government destroy themselves by carrying their basic principles to excess. The first form is monarchy. The principle of monarchy is unity of rule. Carried to excess, the rule be-

comes too unified and the monarch takes on too much power. The aristocrats rebel and the second form of government is established, called an aristocracy. The main principle of an aristocracy is, that selected families should rule. When this principle in turn is carried to excess, large numbers of able men are left out. Then the middle class joins them in a rebellion and a third form or a democracy is established.

Now, the principle of democracy is liberty and universal referendum of every man. To be sure, however, Plato continues "If Democracy is not carefully nurtured, it too, can be carried to excess. Democracy can become too free, in politics, in economics, in morals, in literature, yes even in art—until even a household puppydog will rise on its hind legs and demand its rights," unquote. Adding parenthetically whether it demonstrates or not responsibility then Plato writes further: "Disorder grows to such a point that society will abandon all its liberty for security to anyone who can restore order. Then, my friends, comes the fourth form of government—tyranny and dictatorship."

I would like to add here, that out of all this has come what we jealously call an "American Way," be it North or South, our system of representative government under a limited constitution—a government by law and not deceit—a government whose genius is its way of being changed from within—a government of due process, of change through ballots and evolution not bullets and revolution.

Sir Edmund Burke spoke 188 years ago and his words are right on the button today. This great British parliamentarian resolved the dilemma of true representative government in a republic under a limited constitution thusly: it ought to be to the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union and the closest correspondence, the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wish ought to have great weight with him, their opinions high respect, their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions to theirs and above all ever and in all cases to prefer their interests to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man or to any set of men living. They are a trust from providence for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you not his industry alone but his judgment and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion. What Plato wrote in 372 B.C., could just as well be written in 1969.

I need not tell you gentlemen that all the world over, in country after country, in city after city, yes, in university after university, the tides of human emotion are moving. Wherever we turn, excesses are greater. Education is brought to a standstill. Buildings are taken over, teachers are literally thrown from their classrooms. Private files are ransacked, traffic is snarled, and whole city blocks burned to the ground, stores looted, and human life snuffed out by snipers or arsonists. A handful of militants, and anarchists and communists are working overtime to create disorder, and to destroy by excessive demands—the very foundations of good government. They may be few but they are dedicated and certainly well organized.

Thomas Jefferson, the second President of this republic said in 1814, over 150 years ago: "No government can be maintained without the principle of fear as well as of duty. Good men will obey the last, but bad ones the former only. If our government ever fails it will be from this weakness." Then I ask you what is to be done? Patience and forbearance do not appear to have worked; you cannot legislate morals into the hearts and minds of men, speeches fall on deaf ears, and well some of them should, but in the final analy-

sists when you get right down to it, when you get to the "nitty-gritty", as some say, the local and security police must be called on to defend the majority rights and property—even must defend the lives and the very freedoms of those involved. And the police, while in the process of doing their task, that is preserving the peace by maintaining law and order, backed up by the judiciary, are this day and age paradoxically vilified by the very people they are trying to help—after the fact.

So in this sick and in this excessive world the security force officer takes his life in his hands almost daily, even in the regular duties of patrolling a beat or stopping a car for routine traffic check and especially intervening in family arguments. Let me relate a few items taken from the April 15 edition of our local newspaper here.

Milan, Italy: Ten policemen were injured when fifteen hundred convicts rioted, held eight guards hostage, and set fire to a number of prison buildings.

Chicago, Illinois: Two policemen were killed and five persons injured in an hour long battle with a berserk gunman armed with rifles and grenades.

Mexico City, D.F.: Police arrested more than 70 students after breaking up a rally calling for a renewal of demonstrations held last year for a bigger voice by students in running the country.

San Juan, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: Police headquarters said Monday night that a state of emergency had been declared on the Island on Montserrat after a police station had been attacked by an armed band of men.

You may read any news report on any day. The names of the cities and people involved may be different, but the content is never-ending, a pattern of shameful sameness attributed only to the evolving mores and the deteriorating will, faith, patience and even moral stamina of man.

So the life of a policing officer is not an easy one. Most departments are understaffed and underpaid. The ever-increasing dangers they are required to face may make it difficult to attract good men. For example—one study has shown that the majority of American Cities between fifty thousand and a hundred thousand population have less than 100 policemen. Of those with over 100,000 population, 71 per cent have less than 500. Even these figures are deceptive, for at times when trouble occurs, only about 13 percent of the force may be on duty. What I am trying to say by this cutting self-analysis to you men who will enforce the law is that the prescription is preventive maintenance before the fact, not after the fact. Isn't this the essence then, of citizen respect for law being in direct proportion to its equitable but just enforcement? I think it is.

In a summary just released by our Department of Justice, F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover reports that crimes of violence are up 19 percent, led by robbery up 29 percent, murder and forcible rape up 14 percent each, and aggravated assault up 12 percent, and these increases were reported by all city population groups.

At the same time, we read these figures put out by the F.B.I.: in the 8-year period from 1960 to 1967, 411 law enforcement officers have been murdered in the line of duty. A review of the criminal histories of the offenders involved shows that 77 percent of them had a previous criminal charge. These same figures also tend to point up to the problem of law enforcement and what police face with the "permissive" trend in the courts' interpretation of the law. Therefore, I say part of the solution is not only preventive maintenance but the judiciary backing up the constabulary and it must be so.

Now, I am well aware that what I am saying to you today is not new. Those of you who are assembled here are considered to be the top men in your country, and each

of you has labored for many years in the vineyards of law enforcement.

My hat is off to you and to those in the security forces. To my mind comes Josiah Holland's "Ode to Good Men": "God give us men. A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands. Men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy; men who possess opinions and a will; men who have honor and men who will not lie. Men who can stand before demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking. Tall men, uncrowned, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking. For while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds, the large professions and their little deeds mingle in selfish strife, lo, freedom weeps, wrong rules the land and waiting justice sleeps."

Our languages may differ, but we do speak a common language in relation to our common problems. A law enforcement officer today is expected to act with the patience of Job and yet the wisdom of Solomon. Perhaps it was Solomon, who in Proverbs said, "Who-soever keepeth the Law is a wise son, but he that is a companion of riotous men, shameth his father."

You have indicated participation as individually responsible citizens. This is what makes the greatest form of government regardless of what you call it: true representation at all levels percolating up from the grass roots, never "tricolating" down from the doctrine and dogma developed by dictatorship or the other forms of government. You have participated because you know that not gold but only men can make your nation great and strong—

Men who for truth and honor's sake

Stand fast and suffer long.

Brave men, who work while others sleep,

And dare while others shy.

You build a nation's pillar deep

And lift her to the sky.

So, I congratulate you on your graduation, wish for you all success, a binding together of the world's problems with a common prescription and solution thereof as you return to your own lands.

May I say as best I can, Farewell, Aloha, Au revoir, Vaya con Dios, Amigos.

NEW YORK STATE MOURNS ROWAN D. SPRAKER, SR., FORMER EDITOR OF FREEMAN'S JOURNAL OF COOPERSTOWN, N.Y.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in these times of trouble and change it is heartening to reflect on people who devote their lives to hard work and quiet accomplishment, to neighborliness and civic duty, and to making their communities better places in which to live.

Such people are indeed the backbone of America. Such a man, whom I had the honor to know over the past 21 years, was Rowan D. Spraker, Sr., of Cooperstown, N.Y., who died last week at the age of 79.

Rowan Spraker was editor for 30 years of Cooperstown's leading weekly newspaper, the Freeman's Journal, one of the oldest weeklies in the Nation, founded in 1808. He was a civic leader in the best meaning of the term, serving his community as mayor, village trustee, water commissioner, zoning appeals chairman, and village historian.

He was a prime mover in instituting

the village's world-famous Baseball Hall of Fame and Doubleday Field, where each summer the Hall of Fame exhibition game is played by outstanding players of our national game.

I include in the RECORD at this point an article printed in the April 26 issue of the Oneonta, N.Y., Star about Rowan Spraker's long and fruitful life, as an example to all of us of what this warm, kindly, dedicated American contributed not only to his community, to his State, and to his Nation, but also to those of us who were fortunate enough to be able to call him our friend:

[From the Oneonta (N.Y.) Star, Apr. 26, 1969]

ROWAN D. SPRAKER SR.: COOPERSTOWN
EX-EDITOR DIES

The death of Rowan D. Spraker Sr., who retired in 1955 after 30 years as editor and president of the Freeman's Journal of this village, occurred Friday morning at the Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital where he had been admitted the day before. He was 79 years old.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Monday at Christ Episcopal Church here with the rector, the Rev. George F. French, officiating. Burial will be in Lakewood Cemetery, Cooperstown.

A Masonic funeral service is scheduled to be held at 8 p.m. Sunday at the Tillapaugh Funeral Home here, conducted by members of Otsego Lodge.

He had been in ill health for some time, but his death came with unexpected suddenness a little less than two weeks after he and Mrs. Spraker had arrived at their home on Nelson Avenue after spending the winter months in Florida.

Mr. Spraker guided the destinies of the Journal as its fifth editor from 1925 until his retirement 14 years ago. He also retired as president of the Freeman's Journal Company, and became chairman of its Board of Directors, a post he held at his death. His son, Rowan D. Spraker Jr., assumed the editorship on his father's retirement, and also as president of the Journal Company.

Mr. Spraker began his long career in the newspaper profession 60 years ago, right after his graduation from Cooperstown High School in 1909. Right after he received his diploma, he went to the late George H. Carley, then editor of the Journal, and asked him for a job on the Journal and also on the Glimmerglass, Cooperstown's little summer daily, which Mr. Carley was launching that year.

After working that summer on the papers, he entered Cornell University where he received a bachelor of Arts degree in 1913. He came back to Cooperstown each summer to work on the Journal and the Glimmerglass, and following his graduation from college, he joined the staff permanently. He became a part owner in 1915.

In 1925, upon the retirement of Mr. Carley, Mr. Spraker became head of the printing company and editor of the Journal.

He was born in Cooperstown on April 17, 1890, a son of Ferdinand W. and Fannie (Dunkel) Spraker.

During his long career with the Freeman's Journal, one of the nation's oldest weeklies (it was founded in 1808), Mr. Spraker was active on the state and national level in the weekly newspaper field. In 1933 and 1934, he was president of the New York Press Association, trade organization of the weekly press in the Empire State. From 1949 until 1951, he was president of the American Press Association, national advertising representative at that time for some 5,000 weekly newspapers all over the country. During the War years 1942-46, he represented the National Editorial Association on the War Advertising Council, and in 1943 received the Amos Award for outstanding service to the weekly press of the nation.

He was in the first group of professional newsmen who were taken into the Syracuse University chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national newspaper fraternity.

In addition to his many and varied activities in the field of the weekly press, he had been prominent throughout his lifetime in the civic, business and fraternal life of his home community.

He served six terms as president (mayor) of Cooperstown, in 1931, and 1932, from 1939 to 1941, and in 1956. While he was head of the village government, Doubleday Field was reconstructed as a national baseball shrine and it was the scene in 1939 for the focal game in the summer-long celebration of the national pastime's centennial. The Hall of Fame game has been staged there annually since that time.

He took an active part in the staging of the Baseball Centennial program in 1939, and since 1945 had been chairman of the Cooperstown Baseball Committee which makes local arrangements for the Hall of Fame game each year.

Mr. Spraker had served as a member of the Board of Directors and a vice-president of the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum since its organization in 1937.

In 1964, at the suggestion of Paul S. Kerr, president of the Hall of Fame, he wrote a short history of the facts concerning Doubleday Field and how Cooperstown came into the baseball picture, in collaboration with his long-time partner in the publishing business, Frank C. Carpenter, president and editor of the Otsego Farmer. They also wrote the 1929-62 supplement to "A History of Cooperstown," by Cooper, Shaw, and Littell, a volume, which chronicles life in the village from the time of the first visit to the area in 1785 by its founder, Judge William Cooper, to the present.

During Mr. Spraker's 1941 term as mayor, the village purchased the old Cooperstown Aqueduct Association, which is today a profitable village-owned facility.

Mr. Spraker served a total of 17 years on the Village Board of Trustees, and also as a member of the Board of Water Commissioners. He also had been a chairman of the Zoning Board of Appeals, and at his death, was historian of the village and also of the town of Otsego.

He was elected a director of the old Second National Bank in 1930, and in 1941 became chairman of the Board. In 1956, when the bank merged with National Commercial, he became chairman of the local Advisory Board of NCB. He retired as chairman in 1964, but continued as a member until his death.

Mr. Spraker was a member of Christ Episcopal Church of this village and was a warden from 1942 until 1954.

He had been a member of Otsego Lodge, F&M of this village since 1916, and was its master in 1922. In 1943, he was appointed district deputy grand master of the Otsego-Schoharie District. He also was a member of Otsego Chapter, R.A.M., and a past high priest. He had been a member of Otsego Commandery, K.T. since 1923, and of Ziyara Shrine Temple of Utica since 1938.

He was a charter member of the Cooperstown Rotary Club, and was its president in 1930. He also was a former member and president of the Chamber of Commerce; a charter member of Susquehanna Tribe of Red Men; a member of Oneonta Lodge, BPOE; a member of the Mohican Club; a life member of the Cooperstown Fire Department, and a past foreman of Engine Company No. 2.

For nearly 40 years, Mr. Spraker served as a trustee of the Lakewood Cemetery Association, and also served as a trustee of the Clara Welch Thanksgiving Home.

He had been a member of the Board of Trustees of the Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital since 1955, and had been a member of the Board of Governors of the Cooperstown Country Club since 1940. He was a former treasurer of the latter.

Mr. Spraker was one of the organized Dozen Dads which founded a forest of that name in the town of Middlefield, and for 40 years was treasurer of the old Otsego Forestry Company.

A life-long Democrat, he was a former member and treasurer of the Otsego County Democratic Committee.

For many years, he was a member of the Cornell Plantation Committee which has done much to beautify the campus of that institution. For more than 40 years he was a school director of the town of Otsego, and had been a member of the Board of Trustees of Hartwick Academy, the former Hartwick Seminary. He also was an honorary member of the Wedocandors Club.

As editor of the Freeman's Journal, he had a life-long interest in the history of the community it served. He also was an amateur archeologist, and his collection of Indian artifacts is now at Hartwick College in Oneonta.

Colgate University honored Mr. Spraker in 1957 with its annual Civic Award for outstanding service to the village of Cooperstown.

Mr. Spraker married the former Miss Inez C. Fay of Cooperstown on Sept. 6, 1918. She died on Oct. 30, 1959.

On June 14, 1961, he married Mrs. Gertrude Lueder Lyon of Cooperstown. She survives together with a son, Rowan D. Spraker, Jr. of Cooperstown and two granddaughters, Miss Ann B. Spraker of San Diego, Calif.; and Mrs. Richard A. Rohlack of Oneonta. A daughter Mrs. Inez Spraker Hoffman, was killed in an automobile accident on Dec. 25, 1940.

STRATTON LEGISLATION NEEDED TO SAVE CATV AND HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF RURAL RESIDENTS SERVED BY CATV IN THE FACE OF DAMAGING FCC RULINGS

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last December the Federal Communications Commission handed down a series of rulings, both proposed and interim dealing with CATV, or as it is generally referred to, cable television. The net practical, immediate effect of the Commission's actions, especially its unusual procedure in issuing certain interim rules, which are in reality almost identical with its proposed permanent rules which it cannot legally enact without some delay and public hearings, has been to bring all CATV to a complete standstill—a complete freeze. All existing arrangements can continue, but there can be no growth, no change, and no progress.

This action has had the most unfavorable and damaging effects in my congressional district, as it has in many other districts. The district I have the honor to represent has no TV broadcasting facility located within its borders, so that much of the quality TV reception in my district must come by cable, through the mechanism of community antenna television.

The first result of the FCC action has been to prevent existing cable TV stations from undertaking any expansion of their service or their coverage. People on one side of a street may have cable TV; but those across the street are now to be forbidden indefinitely—if the FCC's rulings are allowed to stand—from obtaining the same kind of public service. This

is outrageous, ridiculous, contrary to the public interest, and, in my judgment, it goes well beyond the proper authority of the FCC as Congress initially delegated it.

Second, if CATV cannot expand or grow, then no new CATV facilities, antennas or other electronic equipment can be used; hence it will not be purchased; and hence those whose livelihood depends on manufacturing this equipment will be out of work. This is precisely what has happened in my congressional district—as it has doubtless happened in other congressional districts—where one of the largest CATV manufacturers in the country, the TACO Co., of Sherburne, N.Y., has been forced to lay off almost half its work force, thereby creating an economic emergency in Chenango County, N.Y. This, too, Congress surely never intended that the FCC should be able to do just by administrative fiat.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that "where there is no vision the people perish"; it has also well been said, "he who does not go forward, must go backward; there can be no standing still." These principles apply most certainly with regard to CATV. If it cannot grow, if it cannot progress, if it cannot innovate and improve, then it will surely decline, collapse, and disappear. In other words by freezing CATV the FCC has in fact begun to strangle this important industry, with the result no less sure or certain simply because it is being applied slowly and deliberately by Chinese water torture methods, so to speak.

This opportunity to murder CATV surely was not intended to be delegated to the FCC by Congress and we must work quickly to rescue the victims.

What the Commission has done is all the more unfortunate and surprising in view of the fact that a Presidential task force has already completed and submitted to the White House a detailed study of CATV which recommends precisely the opposite, that CATV should be improved and expanded, not stifled and suffocated. The FCC has flown in the face of the recommendation of this task force.

To correct this serious situation, Mr. Speaker, requires rather drastic legislation. I introduced such legislation in the House on April 23, H.R. 10510. I believe that this bill, if promptly enacted, can put an end to the damage the FCC has done to CATV and will help this great industry, which is performing and must continue to perform such a vital service for the people of the Nation, especially those in the rural areas beyond the range of satisfactory direct broadcast television.

I urge speedy action on H.R. 10510.

Specifically my bill would limit the authority of the FCC in regulating CATV to the following areas: First, to establish reasonable standards for technical operations and reporting by CATV systems; second, to prevent a CATV system from carrying programs from outside its immediate area which duplicate programs being carried simultaneously by local broadcast stations; third, to require a CATV station to carry programs from all television stations in the im-

mediate area; and, fourth, to provide procedures for protecting a local television broadcaster from being driven into bankruptcy as a result of the importation of distant signals by a CATV system within its own broadcast area. My bill would also nullify any existing FCC rules and regulations which deal with matters outside these specific areas, which would, of course, include much of the interim rules set forth last December on CATV.

The cable television field is of course a tremendously complex matter. H.R. 10510 may not be a perfect or complete solution to the many problems created by the development of CATV. But what it does is to provide a vehicle which Congress can use not only to rescue CATV as an emergency measure but also to establish policies that will be fair to both CATV and broadcast television.

The public interest requires that Congress move swiftly in this vital field.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOREMAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for Thursday, May 1, 1969, on account of official business for Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PASSMAN, for period May 1, through May 7, on account of official business in Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through May 6, 1969, on account of House Foreign Affairs Committee Investigation trip to Europe to study the unsettled conditions there.

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. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. RUTH), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS), for 60 minutes, on May 1; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS), for 60 minutes, on May 1; to revise his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIEGLE (at the request of Mr. ROTH), for 15 minutes, on May 1; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include a speech by the chancellor of the University of Syracuse.

Mr. BENNETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DADDARIO following remarks of Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. ALBERT and to include a letter.

Mr. BENNETT to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter when H.R. 9825 is under consideration.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin immediately following the message of the President today.

Mr. KYL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. SKUBITZ.

Mr. BETTS.

Mrs. MAY in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. PETTIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLOWERS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

Mr. GILBERT in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. BIAGGI in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. MIKVA.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 1, 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:

716. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the stated convention of

the 70th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 240, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 91-111); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

717. A letter from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration; transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize additional appropriations to the Small Business Administration for economic opportunity management assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

718. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on a survey of transportation and traffic management activities in the Far East and Southeast Asia, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

719. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a report on applications for orders of wire or oral communications, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 2519; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

720. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the conditions under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to effect recoupment from disability compensation otherwise payable to certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

721. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 10710. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10711. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 10712. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10713. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10714. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 10715. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter dollar pieces with a likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower on one side; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the present dollar limits on the amount allowable as a child-care deduction, to eliminate all income limits on eligibility for such deduction, and to increase the maximum age of a dependent child with respect to whom such deduction may be allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10717. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property in the District of Columbia owned by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10718. A bill to amend the National to extend the life of the Commission so that Commission on Product Safety Act in order it may complete its assigned tasks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10719. 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.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 10720. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the use of industrial development bonds to rural areas, to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job-training programs in rural areas, and otherwise to encourage fuller and more effective use of the human resources of such areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10722. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 10723. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the infiltration or management of legitimate organizations by racketeering activity or the proceeds of racketeering activity, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10724. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 10725. 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 Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of commuter fare revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 10727. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 10728. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, and other acts, to provide adequate food and nutrition among low-income households, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10729. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 10730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to returns and deposits of the excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 10731. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits thereunder by 20 percent, and to provide that full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 10732. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 10733. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the development of nonlethal methods and devices for crowd and riot control, and to provide for the acquisition of, and instruction in, such nonlethal methods and devices by State and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 10734. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 10735. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at 1481 West 10th Street, Indianapolis, Ind., as the "Kennedy Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10736. 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.

H.R. 10737. A bill to amend and clarify section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10738. A bill to amend and clarify section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to review of certain determinations and certifications thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10739. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the definition of the phrase "test or device"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10740. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1958 with respect to control and eradication of obnoxious aquatic plants; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 10741. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the rating of certain service-connected disabilities as total for the period during which veterans with such disabilities are entitled to disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10742. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide additional beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals for the care and treatment of veterans afflicted with alcoholism; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10743. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10744. A bill to designate the Alexandria National Cemetery, Pineville, La., as the "Pineville National Cemetery"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10745. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10746. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10747. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10748. A bill to increase from \$150 to \$300 the maximum amount allowable under section 213(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as a deduction for medical insurance to a husband and wife filing a joint return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY (for herself, Mr. STEED, Mr. RHODES, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 10749. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to certain beekeepers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 10750. A bill to limit the strength of active duty military forces of the United States to a level approximately 10 percent less than their strength on December 31, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 10751. A bill to amend section 358(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to extend the authority to transfer peanut acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10752. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10753. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10754. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase, in certain cases where an individual entitled to a widow's or widower's insurance benefit remarries, the portion of such benefit which such individual may continue to receive after the remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 10755. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter dollar pieces with a likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower on one side; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 10756. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 with respect to the appointment of State advisory councils; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 10757. A bill to improve and clarify certain laws affecting the Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10758. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to help secure safe community water supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 10759. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make certain secondary boycotts, regardless of motive, an unfair labor practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 10760. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 10761. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 10762. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to continue for an

additional period in certain cases the special provision fixing the minimum Federal assistance percentage for a State under the medical assistance program at 105 percent of the Federal share of such State's medical expenditures under all of the public assistance programs during 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 10763. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to any individual who may not make a joint return but maintains his own household as his home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10764. 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. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10765. A bill to authorize the President, subject to congressional disapproval, to raise or lower income tax rates by not more than 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 10766. A bill to make Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 10767. A bill to extend, strengthen, and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10768. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the classification of positions on the special security police force of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 10769. A bill to rename a pool of the Cross Florida Barge Canal "Lake Oklawaha"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 10770. A bill to provide relief for the clothing industry by making special immigrant visas available to certain skilled tailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. McCloskey, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 10771. A bill to provide that the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing a permanent National Aeronautics and Space Administration Aerospace Museum; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 10772. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide a more equitable standard for awarding the gold star lapel button; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10773. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to deem certain U.S. Coast Guard Reserve service during World War II as active service for the purpose of determining eligibility for benefits under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FRIEDEL, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period May 11 through May 17, 1969, as "Help Your Local Police Fight Crime Week," to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.J. Res. 689. Joint resolution designating July 5, 1969, as "Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 690. Joint resolution establishing the Federal Committee on Nuclear Development; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

H.J. Res. 691. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Commission of the United States, the Republic of South Vietnam, and the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam to study the ecological effects of chemical warfare in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 692. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the selection, term of office, and qualifications of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the popular election of the Judges of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.J. Res. 694. 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. DUNCAN:

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution,

support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to international policy on satellite broadcasting; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Res. 384. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H. Res. 385. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 386. Resolution authorizing under certain circumstances the broadcasting and telecasting of public hearings conducted by House committees; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10774. A bill for the relief of Adriana Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 10775. A bill for the relief of Boleslaw Juchniewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 10776. A bill for the relief of Dr. Percyvaldo Fonesca Wendler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 10777. A bill for the relief of Ugo Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10778. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Di Pasquale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10779. A bill for the relief of Luis Enrique Silva-Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 10780. A bill for the relief of Gino Magliocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

99. Mr. RYAN presented a petition of Prof. Charles Schwartz, University of California (Berkeley), and 728 other members of Scientists for Social and Political Action, calling for open congressional hearings on the entire military research and development program, including the anti-ballistic-missile system, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THOMAS A. EDISON, AS I KNEW HIM

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow in which he provides some interesting insights into the life of Thomas A. Edison:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON, AS I KNEW HIM

(An address by George E. Stringfellow of Arlington, Va., former daily business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the Rotary Club of Palm Desert, Calif., February 14, 1969)

Mr. Edison was born in Milan, Ohio on February 11, 1847. He died in West Orange, N.J. on October 18, 1931—84 years ago.

February, in my opinion, is one of the most important months in the history of our Republic, for it was in February that Washington, Lincoln and Edison were born.

Washington looked after the welfare of our country as a father looks after his child. He guided it when it was young and gave leadership in developing the greatest form of government—in the words of Gladstone—"ever stricken off in a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Lincoln held the nation together in one of the most trying periods in our history, and thus made it possible for Edison and others to contribute not only to the progress of our country, but to the betterment of the world.

It was my high honor to have been selected by Mr. Edison to assume the management of