

by the day. And the United States, by being "even-handed" when no one else is, makes another Israeli victory that much more uncertain.

Israel, unlike Egypt or the other Arab nations, cannot afford a defeat. If it loses a war it loses its nation, and no good intentions of the UN or the U.S. could then restore it.

As Mrs. Meir said in her criticism of Mr. Rogers' policy, it misses the main point. "There's no recognition of statehood in these documents."

That is the whole key. Egypt's Nasser and the Jordanian commandos are both still vowing to destroy Israel and drive the Israelis into the sea. Until the Arabs are convinced that they can't do it and will only lose by trying, no peaceful settlement can be obtained. No outside force can impose a lasting peace, and no armed occupation can end the hatred.

The United States, by drawing back, serves neither its own interests nor the cause of peace.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.

TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 28, 1970, at 10:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, January 27, 1970:

##### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admirals:

James A. Palmer  
Ellis L. Perry  
John F. Thompson, Jr.

Edward D. Scheiderer  
Albert A. Neckman

The following-named officers to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy as a professor in the grade of captain:  
Otto E. Graham, Jr.

##### IN THE ARMY

I nominate the following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

##### To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Edward Pickett, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roger Merrill Lilly, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Gilbert Hume Woodward, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Glenn David Walker, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Melvin Zais, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Charles Gribble, Junior, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Leon Rowney, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Norton, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter James Woolwine, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James William Sutherland, Junior, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Elmer Hugo Almqvist, Junior,

xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leo Bond Jones, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Albert Becker, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frederick Carlton Weyand, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, xxx-xx-xx... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Orwin Clark Talbott, xxx-xx-xx... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter Philip Leber, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Hancock Hay, Junior, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Joe Seitz, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Clarence Joseph Lang, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ellis Warner Williamson, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. William Eugene DePuy, xxx-xx-x... Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Thomas Knowles, xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Russell Deane, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

##### IN THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

John R. Blandford.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Louis Conti.

Verne C. Kennedy, Jr.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 27, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Myroslov J. Lubachivsky, of the Immaculate Conception Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O God and Heavenly Father of us all, the Creator of the entire universe, turn Your merciful eyes upon this earth and upon us, Your unworthy children. We dare to call upon You, our loving Father, asking humbly that You grant us, and the entire world, lasting peace and freedom.

Bless, all-powerful Creator, these United States of America, which so willingly opened its heart to so many persecuted refugees. Advise, infinitely wise Father, the Government, enlighten the minds of the leaders that they may always make the right decisions; help them to find the best ways to overcome all difficulties, so they may further enhance the well-being of this entire Nation.

Thanking You for the freedom and liberty we enjoy in this country, we pray to You for all the enslaved peoples and nations. We implore You today, on this,

CXVI—85—Part 1

the 52d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, to turn Your benevolent eyes upon our enslaved and suffering people, and help them to carry their heavy cross of bondage. Comfort them, give them strength, and permit that their Golgotha may finally come to an end, so that they may soon rise as a sovereign nation among the free nations of this world. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1653. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE HARVE TIBBOTT

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of 1969, my predecessor who served the people of Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana Counties in the old 27th District of Pennsylvania, passed away quietly at his home in Ebensburg. He was 84. Former Representative Harve Tibbott served in the 76th and four succeeding Congresses from January 1939 to December 1948, and was a member on the Interstate Commerce, Flood Control, and Appropriations Committees.

In addition to serving as an elder, trustee, and president of the official board of the First Christian Church, Harve served as chairman of the Cambria County chapter of the American Red Cross and as president of the Ebensburg YMCA and Kiwanis Club of Ebensburg. He was illustrious potentate of Jaffa Shrine Temple of Altoona, and was elected president of the Pennsylvania

Shrine Association, receiving an emblem for 50 years of Masonic service in October 1957. He had been elevated to the 33d degree, the highest level bestowed in the Masons, and in 1955 became a Knight of the Red Cross of Constantine in the Scottish Rite Masonry.

Congressman Tibbott attended the public schools in Pennsylvania and was a graduate of the School of Pharmacy of the University of Pittsburgh. He received an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Francis College of Loretto in 1967.

Engaged in the retail drug business and as a pharmacist, he established what is now Tibbott's Corner Drugstore in his hometown. He was elected a director of the First National Bank of Ebensburg and became president in 1938. At the time of his death, he was still active as the bank's chairman and was a director of the Cambria Thrift Corp. Mr. Tibbott also served as treasurer of the William Penn Highway Association and as treasurer of Cambria County.

Harve was famous throughout the district for a booming baritone voice that is now stilled. But, the memory of the man and his good works for all people will never be forgotten. He was a source of inspiration to Republicans, his constituents, and myself. Whether in Congress or out, he was extremely close to and always interested in the problems and the concerns of the people. We will all miss him.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to learn of the death of our former colleague, Harve Tibbott. During the many years he spent here he was one of my close personal friends. He was not only a great legislator; he was an outstanding American citizen, a man of exemplary character and of moral stature. I was proud to call him my friend.

Mr. Speaker, one of my fondest memories of Harve Tibbott was his fondness of music. He loved to sing and was one of the finest singers I have known, certainly one of the finest that ever came to this Congress. At one time, we had on this side of the aisle what we called a Republican quartet, and they had a Democrat quartet under the leadership of Percy Priest of Tennessee on the other side of the aisle. We had some great times together in competitive fun. On occasion we appeared publicly, although we did not win prizes, nor did we try for any. Nothing pleased Harve Tibbott more than to be involved in music, in which he excelled. This in itself bespeaks the character of the man.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of Harve's death. He was indeed a great American, and everyone will miss him.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of this distinguished

American, our late departed friend and former colleague, with whom many of us served here in the House of Representatives for a number of years.

Harve Tibbott was a gentleman to the core. He went about his way quietly but effectively. He was a good man.

In his 10 years in the service of the House, half of which was as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, Harve Tibbott assumed committee responsibilities in a number of important fields. He was a diligent legislator. He wrote a record that did honor to himself, his constituents, and to his country. He was truly one of the great characters in the House of Representatives.

May God bless his memory and give comfort to his family and friends.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the late Honorable Harve Tibbott.

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

There was no objection.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON WILLING TO SAY "NO" TO THE SCHOOLCHILDREN; BUT NOT TO THE BANKERS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a national disgrace for a President to go on network television and claim that the education of our children is inflationary. The Republicans have always had a fetish about budgets, but never did I realize that they would mortgage the future—the youth of this Nation—to promote a cheap public relations pitch to prove their great concern about "inflation."

We are all against inflation, Democrats and Republicans alike. The difference: the Democrats are willing to do something about it.

On December 19, this House of Representatives passed H.R. 15091—Public Law 91-151—which gave the President the broadest powers possible to control interest rates, inflation and the excessive use of credit in the inflationary areas of the economy. These anti-inflationary powers can be triggered at a moment's notice by the President.

The President has done nothing despite the fact that this law gives him full authority to roll back interest rates and to control the inflationary use of credit. In other words, he could effectively roll back the prime lending rate which was raised by Bankers Trust Company of New York last June 9 from 7½ percent to 8½ percent. However, to activate these controls, President Nixon would be required to step on the toes of the big bankers and big business. That is something that a Republican Chief Executive never does.

President Nixon is willing to say "no" to the Nation's schoolchildren. He is unwilling to say "no" to the bankers.

A rollback of interest rates could reduce the Federal budget by billions of dollars—more than enough to cover the entire appropriations for education.

#### INFLATION

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one cannot help but be a bit amused by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I do not recall that he made such comparable demands of previous Presidents when the inflation problems of the country were really getting out of hand. As a matter of fact, the tendency on the part of the gentleman from Texas has been to add to the fuels of inflation rather than to moderate them.

I must say I am a little surprised that the gentleman from Texas would make such comments concerning the President's message to the American people last night—which was an effective way and a dramatic way to point out the problems of inflation and the need and necessity for affirmative action, constructive action, rather than the irresponsible kind of action heretofore taken by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us here listened to the President talk on television last night with consuming interest. It was a forthright and convincing speech and the American people will support it. It was a speech which recognized the value and the need not only for educational programs and for other social programs as well—it was a speech that also made absolutely clear what the real issue is—and what it is not.

Certainly, the issue is not a debate on the merits of education or whether Federal funds should be spent on education. The issue is not one of whether or not we should have an impacted aid program—although I think the record is replete with previous messages by President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson, as well as President Nixon, that the program needs extensive reform.

The issue was, very simply, inflation. The duty of the President of the United States as the national leader is to use every weapon at his control to do something about it.

In the President's mind, and I am sure in the minds of most of us here, inflation is an overriding domestic problem and issue at this time. This being so, the President recognized that it is his duty and his obligation to take the necessary steps, every single one of them, to bring it under control.

One of those steps is to keep Federal spending under Federal income and, this, too, the President is determined to do. That is why we have a balanced budget this year and why we will have one next year.

Frankly, the problem is that we must control inflation. The veto of this appropriation bill was a very valid exercise of his prerogative to fight the battle of

inflation from beginning to end. That is why those of us who recognize the overriding need to control inflation will vote to sustain the veto.

#### PRESIDENTIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR INFLATION

(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, the statement of my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, to the contrary notwithstanding, the question before the House—and it will be before the House tomorrow—is who is going to have to assume the burden of controlling inflation? Is it, as my distinguished friend from Texas said, going to be the corporations, or is it going to be the poor, the sick, and the children?

Last night the President sought to justify his veto of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill on the ground that it was inflationary. He has exercised the privilege of veto to deny the nondeferrable health and education needs of the American people. You cannot defer education any more than you can defer nutrition for children, if you are going to give children the benefit of a complete program to meet their needs.

Should the President's veto be sustained, the American children will suffer a loss of mental enrichment which can never be replaced. They will bear the scars of the President's shortsighted action into adulthood. The veto would also assure less hospital construction, less research on cancer, and less research on heart disease—but assure more air pollution.

The President, of course, denies that he is opposed to health or education, but says he must veto the Labor-HEW bill because Congress in acting to increase his appropriation request by \$1.260 billion has been inflationary.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the President's veto is the opening gun in a campaign on his part designed to place the blame for our almost unprecedented inflation upon the Congress. Nothing could be further from the truth. Congressional action produced a budget surplus of approximately \$3 billion in the fiscal year 1969. Latest estimates project a surplus in the neighborhood of \$5.9 billion for 1970. We reduced the President's overall appropriation request by some \$5.6 billion. Tax provisions of the tax reform bill, a product exclusively of congressional initiative, will bring in \$6.4 billion more during the calendar year 1970 than in 1969. A prudent fiscal policy on the part of the Congress is obviously no guarantee against inflation.

Abdication of Presidential responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is the paramount cause of current inflation. Had President Nixon utilized the great symbolic and moral power of the Presidency, as did his predecessors, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, to dissuade those gigantic corporations which dominate our economy from raising prices, the Nation's economy would be in an immeasurably healthier and more stable position today.

The President's refusal to intervene in

the price decisionmaking process to protect the consumer stems from an oversimplistic view as to how large corporations in this year 1970 determine prices. He sees the facts of economic life through a prism, the product of outmoded copy book maxims about the law of supply and demand, and imagines a world described by Adam Smith in the 18th century, where many small producers compete for buyers and prices are set in the marketplace. Such a picture bears no resemblance to the real economic world in which we find ourselves. Without exception, every major segment of the American economy is now dominated by a handful of giant, in many cases supergiant, corporations.

The prices which they set for their products are all but impervious to traditional marketplace forces. Their prices are set to maximize their profits. And maximize them, they certainly have. Corporate profits are still running at an all-time high.

Mr. Speaker, Congress could refuse to vote a single dime for health or education and it would not affect the administered prices of our large semimonopolistic corporations one iota.

The President is the people's major shield against price exploitation. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson acted as the people's advocate against the forces of naked economic greed. President Nixon disdains this role and thus leaves the consumer defenseless.

The evidence is clear. Prices have skyrocketed during the first year of the Nixon administration. The Wholesale Price Index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for example, shows that metals and metal products increased by 9.8 percent in 1969 as against a 1.3 percent increase in 1968. In 1968 steel mill products increased by 2.2 percent, in 1969 by 6.7 percent. Nonferrous metals which skyrocketed by 21.5 percent in 1969, had actually decreased by 1.8 percent in 1968. Aluminum ingot was up 8.7 percent last year, as against a 3-percent rise in 1968. For 8 years, 1961 through 1968, this item actually declined by 1 percent. Copper wire was up by 24.3 percent during the past year. Lead decreased by 7.1 percent in 1968, only to rise by 23.1 percent in 1969. Zinc rose by 14.3 percent in 1969, in the 8 previous years it rose by but 7.6 percent. Nonferrous scrap down 4.3 percent in the last Johnson year, was up by 40.9 percent in the first Nixon year.

The effect of the rise in these basic industrial prices is all pervasive throughout our economy, affecting virtually everything which you or I as consumers purchase.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President to utilize the awesome power of his office, not against the children, the sick, the aged, and the poor of this Nation, but rather against the giant monopolies which are the true culprits causing inflation.

#### HEW BILL IS POOR SYMBOL FOR VETO

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I listened, as we all did, to the television broadcast last night, and after the President's remarks to the people of America, I listened to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), in a colloquy with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS), refer to the veto as a "symbol veto."

It seems to me and the impression in my mind is that the HEW bill certainly is a very poor symbol for veto in connection with inflation. There are so many other bills, if the President wanted to use, that he would have had more of a case on than simply using the HEW bill as a symbol in connection with the fight against inflation.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has well stated the case, so I will not repeat it.

There is one brief observation I want to make. I, for one, have profound respect for the President, and I can disagree with him but never question the motive of any President. At the outset the President stated that it was a most difficult question for him to decide. Then he repeated it again, emphasizing how difficult the question was for him to decide. When he made those statements, I stated, "Well, Mr. President, if it is a difficult decision for you to decide, when you still have 3 years in office, how much more difficult it is for the 86 Republicans who voted for the conference report to decide, when they are coming up for election next fall?"

#### VETO PRIORITIES

(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, we hear a lot in the news media these days about priorities.

I was a little bit amused, shall we say, by the President's sorting out of priorities in vetoing the HEW bill. He said it was inflationary because the Congress added a billion dollars. I assume somebody told the President that the Congress took a billion dollars out of his foreign aid request. As far as I am concerned, that could be the same billion dollars we put in the HEW bill, for a far better purpose.

As one who has lived with foreign aid for 21 years, I could suggest to the President that if he vetoed the whole ball of wax he would have another billion and a half dollars that would have been fighting inflation, and foreign aid would go merrily on its way, because, according to the figures of the gentleman from Louisiana, if I am quoting correctly, there is \$11 billion in the various pipelines that can still be used for foreign aid.

So if the President really wants to fight inflation I suggest that he take a look at his foreign aid request from here on and pare it down substantially, perhaps to under a billion dollars.

#### ECONOMIC AID AS A MEANS OF FIGHTING CRIME

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as a New Yorker, the senior member of the Education and Labor Committee, I cannot resist the opportunity to say just a word on the President's veto of last evening. I very much regret his action. I believe the President is badly mistaken.

He did not veto the Labor-HEW economic opportunity bill; the President mistakenly vetoed the crime bill. As a big city resident, I can say the best weapons we have, the most effective instrument we have against continuing crime, continuing delinquency, continuing rending of the fabric of our society, are the aids we have gotten from the Federal Government in fighting poverty, fighting deprivation, fighting lack of education, fighting the breakdown of our society. This bill would step up their fight against drug addiction, alcoholism, disease, and ignorance—but Mr. Nixon wants us to step back.

I must say that the President is sadly mistaken also when he looks upon this as a symbol of inflation, as the Speaker has just suggested.

Does anyone familiar with our educational finance patterns in this country doubt that someone is going to have to spend more money, anyway? The Governor of my State, of the same party as the President, Governor Rockefeller, has indicated that if the Federal Government does not send the money into the cities and suburban areas to assist in relieving the overcrowding of schools, the double sessions, the breakdown of classes, then the individual community must ante up the money. The money will be spent by those least able to bear increased taxes and to meet the demands on them. These demands will fall in middle income families, on taxpayers who are already overburdened with high taxes. The answer to this situation is that the President, if he wants to select priority items to veto, already has an item veto before him—he has an item veto power in his hands. He can select those items that we do not need now and those items which we do not need tomorrow. I do not want to bear down on the SST or the ABM or the expansion of various other programs which call for technological advances to be made for 50 years from now, but we have had some experience with these technological advances which are to be made 50 years from now. The Government is wasting money in airplane overruns and overkills to ward off specters of tomorrow. But problems with our children are here now, facing us now and they deserve positive action now, not a veto.

Mr. Speaker, the President talks about the impacted area part of the bill. He did not say one word about the new advances among handicapped children, which was also something that he vetoed. This is the highest commitment that we have ever made, \$100 million, and still it is a minimal one. In this portion of the bill which was passed by the House and the Senate without dissent, everyone agreed that we needed this money for mental retardation and for advances about the deaf, dumb, and blind. He vetoed that part of the bill, also.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the President made a big error in vetoing

this bill. He is calling for a war across the board against crime, and in vetoing this bill he vetoed the crime bill last night. You know, sometime ago I recall in the history of our President as a Congressman and a Senator when he said he thought it was wise to vote against the Murray-Metcalf bill. The President, who voted against the Murray-Metcalf bill, voted against the biggest school bill that we ever had in our history last night, one which we needed very badly. He cast a vote which I think was reminiscent of those speeches that we used to hear when we heard that the Democrats wanted to help the people in this country to go from the cradle to the grave. We are spending a lot of money in this country in creating new graves all over the world. Last night the President decided that it was more important to keep on paying for graves than for the children in the cradles.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in a short while, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) will call up for consideration the conference report on the bill H.R. 15149, making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes. I wish to take this means of thanking my fellow colleagues of the committee of conference on behalf of both the House and the other body for including the amount of \$650,000 for the hospital and home for the aged, Zichron-Yaakov, Israel.

There are many, many people residing in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn who are very much interested in this appropriation. It will immensely help deserving people who greatly need help at their time of life.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

#### THE ALL-AMERICAN, TERRY BRADSHAW

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is about time to change the tempo because we all have concerns about whether the President's veto should be sustained or overridden.

However, I want to talk to the Members about another matter that perhaps a few of you are interested in.

For all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, the 1969 football season is over, but the last shot has not yet been fired. The all-conference teams have been named, the all-American teams have been chosen, and special award winners such as the Heisman Trophy winner have been named.

Mr. Speaker, the national news media, the Associated Press, the United Press, and the coaches have all picked their all-Americans. The Super Bowl is over and done with.

A number of Members of Congress have stood in this well in recent weeks and bragged about their team being No. 1. The President even has chosen his No. 1 team. However, today, when the real pros, the coaches and owners, sat down to draft future pros, Pittsburgh had the No. 1 pro draft choice as the result of a flip of the coin, and Pittsburgh in its wisdom I believe saw fit to pick a relatively unknown boy as the best pro prospect in America, a young all-American boy 6-foot, 3 inches tall and weighing 215 pounds, all man, by the name of Terry Bradshaw from Shreveport in my District and from my school, Louisiana Tech, as the best pro prospect in America today. Many of you will recall my prediction last fall that he would be No. 1.

If you read this morning's paper you have read already that 16 pro teams are already trying to trade Pittsburgh out of him. However, I would say that if the people of Pittsburgh cannot trade him for a full football club, they should keep him because he will get rid of the smog for them and they will be able to see the sun for a change. Brighter days are coming.

Now, you do not have to take my word for it because I admit I am a Bradshaw fan and I am more than partial to this boy. But I am, with justifiable reason.

Gil Brandt, the director of player personnel for the Dallas Cowboys, has said that Terry is the best college quarterback prospect since Joe Namath. And there are men who know Terry as I do who will tell you that he is better than Namath. Certainly you could not find a cleaner all-American boy than Bradshaw. He is the kind of youth who addresses a church congregation and says:

I am known as a football player who is also a Christian, but I would rather be known as a Christian who is also a football player.

This is my kind of man.

Who else says Bradshaw is the greatest thing since the invention of metal tips on shoe laces? Well, Jim Lee Howell, personnel director of the New York Giants for another. Howell says Bradshaw is a big Sammy Baugh; the best quarterback he has seen in a long while. He added:

You just don't see these kids around any more.

That is the way we grow 'em in Louisiana, gentlemen.

#### VETO ON HEW BILL

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President yesterday received some unexpected support in his veto action from two national columnists, Mr. Frank Mankiewicz and Mr. Tom Braden, who in this morning's Post went into considerable ecstasy about the President's action, and among other things said:

A truly scandalous increase is \$200 million in funds for vocational education.

They said further:

A sounder move would have been to strike out the more than \$200 million already in the bill.

And to compound their illogic, they added:

The vocational education program is the most entrenched of the school lobbies, dating back to the early years of the century, and consists largely of the purchase of shop equipment and the training of students for long-vanished jobs.

It is ironic that these two national correspondents know so little about the Nation's vocational education program and the changes that have been enacted both in 1963 and 1968 to bring vocational education up to the requirements of the 1970's.

I would like to remind this House that by his action yesterday, Mr. Nixon has thrown the whole vocational education program in America into turmoil. This House, on both sides of the aisle, by unanimous vote, adopted in 1968 amendments to the Vocational Education Act which require mandatory set-asides of 15 percent of Federal aid to States for disadvantaged communities; 15 percent for vocational education in community colleges, junior colleges, and an additional 10 percent for the handicapped.

All over this country, time is running out on vocational educators who must between now and June start scuttling a whole series of ongoing vocational education programs in order to meet the set-aside requirements of the law that you wrote in 1968.

In my own city, it is entirely possible that School Superintendent Redmon will have to shut down part of the Washburn Trade School and other vocational schools because he has to meet the mandatory requirement to redirect Federal funds to be used within the formula of the 1968 amendments. So I suggest that Mr. Nixon realize the turmoil he has created by his veto in the vocational educational circles of this country.

#### PRESIDENT'S VETO OF HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a statement that I have prepared which sets forth the reasons I will support the President in his veto of the HEW appropriation bill.

But in addition, I should like to say something that I think is necessary. There will be a good deal of political "hot air" involved in this discussion in the next 24 hours, and I only regret the fact that the distinguished Members on

the majority side whom I respect for their ability, energy, integrity, and many other virtues, did not have the occasion in the 8 years of the administrations that preceded Mr. Nixon to rise above political prejudice and occasionally challenge a Presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in supporting the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill. This decision might be more difficult if the President's commitment to the ultimate objectives of the HEW mission were not so well known: his 1970 HEW budget exceeded the 1969 budget by more than a billion dollars, and his 1971 budget will show an additional increase.

But because HEW's total spending is so large and because it has such an impact on the economy, in times of economic unrest and uncertainty, its budget must be carefully arrived at. In my view, the President's HEW budget took us close to the brink of inflationary waters, without getting us wet. But the additional \$1.3 billion added to it by the Congress would certainly inundate us.

It is the judgment of the President that the additional money makes this budget clearly inflationary. This being so, those to whom HEW owes its ultimate allegiance—the 25 million persons on social security, the 9 million persons receiving public assistance, and the aged and the poor who are dependent on medicare and medicaid—stand to suffer more from the inflationary pressures which would result from an increase in the HEW budget, than will be gained by those—mostly in the educational system—who might benefit from the increase.

But, inflation is not my only reason for supporting the veto.

Late as it is in the fiscal and school year, the money is very likely to be hastily misspent. Many officials have questioned the wisdom of huge spending programs, especially in the field of education, forced on Government bureaus and local school boards before they are ready for them, before the essential planning has been done. I doubt that the 3 or 4 months which will be left in the fiscal year—and less than that in the school year—when this budget is passed is time enough to spend this money judiciously.

Let us instead strike a blow against inflation by supporting the President's veto—and then get on with consideration of the 1971 budget and pass it in time to give Government and school board officials adequate time to prepare for their new funds.

#### PRESIDENT'S VETO OF HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has already referred to some of the thermal updrafts that we have felt here in the Chamber this morning on the subject of the President's veto.

We have listened to the gentleman

from Texas lament, as he just did, about the fact that we have high interest rates in this country. Then in the very next breath he completely renounces the responsible use of fiscal policy as a tool to restrain inflation so that we do not have to rely exclusively on monetary policy and see interest rates continue to rise.

We have heard the President of the United States excoriated for an abdication of Presidential leadership in one breath and as being responsible for inflation, although one has yet to prove what responsibility there could be for the \$25 billion deficit in fiscal 1968. But in the next breath, after accusing him of an abdication of leadership, we hear the charge made that in vetoing the bill last night, he acted irresponsibly, although he demonstrated an act of courage, an act that did require political courage, that did assert the prestige, the majesty, and the leadership of his office.

Finally, we have an attack on the giant corporations of this country. They are the ones, we are told, who are responsible. Well, as to that argument, I would say that the responsibility begins here at home. It begins in the Congress. And maybe if we practiced some restraint, maybe if we set the example, we would then be in a far better position to tell both labor and management to use some restraint in the conduct of their affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record today as one who supports the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill.

Like the President, I believe that providing education to American children is a very high priority.

But, also like the President, I believe the overriding priority today is halting inflation so that we can truly afford to provide adequate Federal funds for our educational system. This is the real villain in the piece, but my Democratic friends seem obvious to the danger.

There is ample proof that the entire educational system of our Nation is one of the chief victims of inflation. Studies show that school districts are not receiving enough funds from all sources to keep up; that their only hope is an end to rising costs.

Yet there are those who would go blithely on saying the answer to inflation is to spend more and more of cheaper and cheaper dollars.

Mr. Speaker, that is the wrong answer, wrong for education, wrong for our Nation. The right answer is taking the tough, hard steps now to end the inflation.

The President is willing to do this. There are some here who will oppose him for political reasons, there are others willing to sacrifice him for political expediency. But I am sure most of those who look at the long-range good of all the people will certainly vote to support him.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the big arguments being thrown at us to override the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill is that the Congress cut \$7½ billion from the President's budget, so it is all right to add another \$1.26 billion.

Of course, this is nonsense.

There is not time in a 1-minute speech to go into the details of what the Congress actually did with the President's budget, but let me advise my colleagues, "not to be taken in."

The Bureau of the Budget says bluntly:

Our tabulations show that Congressional actions actually added \$4.4 billion in budget authority and \$3.5 billion in outlays to what President Nixon proposed for the 1970 budget. The Congress actually added to spending in its actions thus far on the fiscal 1970 budget.

Certainly, there is more for all involved this year, than in last year's actual appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, juggling figures is an art and the artists in Washington who practice it have no equal.

But no amount of juggling can change the fact that we have an inflation gnawing away at the cost of living and that tough decisions must be made if that inflation is to be stopped.

The President has made one of those decisions in vetoing the fiscal year 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill. He has responsibly decided between expediency and responsibility. I intend to support him in that decision.

#### VETO OF UNBUDGETED \$1.3 BILLION

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's veto of the HEW appropriation bill compels me to point out several items which must be considered in this most important area.

First of all, it must be obvious that the easiest course—and most politically expedient—would be to vote for every cent requested by all educators and school administrators. Believe me, it is not easy to "be responsible" and thus pull back over a billion dollars that is unbudgeted and that we simply do not have.

But, let us look at the facts: No school will be closed because of the veto; no child will be denied an education due to the veto; a billion dollars poured into the same old programs will not improve the quality of education; it is unfair and compounding gross inequity to provide \$6 million for a half million children in the richest county of America, such as Montgomery County, Md., while we provide only \$3 million for 3 million children in the 100 poorest counties.

The veto, contrary to some wild claims by some of the more enthusiastic lobbyists, will not shut off all funds for education. The continuing resolution is still operative and funding will continue. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, only 5 months remain in this fiscal year, and without the \$1.260 billion budget-buster, 13 percent more was programed for HEW in 1970 than in 1969.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, educators and all

Americans from other walks of life, suffering from inflation, cannot afford to have the flames doused with the "gasoline" of the additional \$1,260,000,000. As the President pointed out, from 1960 to 1970 our Government spent \$57 billion more than it received in taxes. The increased cost to the average family of four is \$2,400 per annum. This trend must be reversed.

In my opinion, the President exercised the only responsible and statesmanlike option available; he vetoed the bill, and I intend to support his position and vote to sustain the veto.

#### A VOTE TO KEEP DOWN THE COST OF LIVING

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, when I go home to my district the next time, certain narrow interests will attempt to make much of the fact that I voted to sustain the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill.

For that is what I intend to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, my response will be that while I did not vote to make the education lobby rich, I did vote to keep down the cost of living for all Americans, whether they are teachers, parents or schoolchildren or the elderly and the infirm who live on fixed incomes.

I will tell them that I have a greater constituency than the education lobby and that I have responsibilities that go beyond excess Federal spending for education.

I, like all of us, have a constituency that already has been terribly hurt by the rapid increase in the cost of living, brought on by too much Federal spending.

I have an obligation to these people—all of them—an obligation to vote against inflation, to vote against the special interests.

When I go home, Mr. Speaker, I will have met that obligation and I will be able to tell all the people of my district, whether or not they are educators, whether or not they are students, whether or not they are lobbyists, that I have voted in their best interests.

I wonder if those who vote for inflation will be able to say the same.

#### EDUCATION REFORM WITHOUT INFLATION

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to call to the attention of the members of the education lobby who have been tromping the Halls this week some remarks from the President's veto talk of last night.

I think they are important to those who have panicked over illusory dangers to education.

The President said:

You can be sure that no school will need to be closed. No school child need be denied an education as a result of the action I take tonight. I will work with the Congress in developing a law that will ease the transition

to education reform and do so without inflation.

Mr. Speaker, those are not the words of a President who is callous to needs of education or to the values of education.

Indeed, they are the words of a man who is concerned for education, and who intends to see that the needs—perhaps not the desires, but certainly the needs—of education shall be met in our land even during a time of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I share the President's concern for education. But I also share his concern about what a continuing inflation will do not only to education, but also to all America. I urge my colleagues to support the President in that overriding concern, as I intend to do.

#### CONGRESSIONAL CONTACT PROCEDURE

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read the instruction yellow sheet to participants in Operation Override. This sheet includes instructions to the educators, librarians, parents, taxpayers, and businessmen who profit from education, and all of those concerned, in the trip to Washington.

I am not going to argue the merits. I am going to vote to sustain the President because I think he is right.

But in my almost 20 years in the Congress, never have I seen anything as brazen by any group coming here trying to influence legislation, and if we bow to pressure, if we bow to these threats, God help this legislative body.

Three things on the list I would like to mention. No. 9 on the yellow sheet states as follows:

If he is unable to make a favorable commitment, ask if he will commit himself to be absent during this vote.

In other words, abdicate your responsibility, take a powder, duck it.

Item No. 10:

Tell him that you plan to be in the gallery throughout the debate and the voting on the veto override.

In other words, Big Brother will be watching.

Then, No. 11:

Thank him for taking the time in his busy schedule to see you and (if the visit has been favorable) tell him that you and your associates will do everything you can to assist him locally.

In other words, in his next election. By inference, if you do not vote with them, you know what they are going to try to do. I think this is a disgrace to the good name of education.

The instruction sheet referred to follows:

INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS IN "OPERATION OVERRIDE," WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 1970

Educators, school board members, librarians, parents, taxpayers and businessmen and all others concerned with the future of American education are encouraged to come to Washington for the fight to override President Nixon's anticipated veto of H.R. 13111, the HEW-Labor appropriations bill for 1970. The presence of substantial numbers of con-

cerned individuals in Washington during the veto fight is critically important.

**When to come:** Plan to arrive in Washington on Sunday, January 25 and to stay through January 30, if necessary.

**What to do upon arrival:** After checking in to your hotel, go to the offices of the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs in Suite 302 of the Congressional Hotel, New Jersey Avenue and C Streets, S.E., Washington (Telephone 202/547-8383). There you should register, and receive instructions about the briefing schedule and other matters. If possible, try to check in at the Emergency Committee office by 4:30 P.M., Sunday, January 25.

**Hotel reservations:** The Congressional Hotel is sold out beginning January 25. Other Washington hotels generally have space available during the period. The other two hotels which are located closest to the House of Representatives are the Skyline Inn, 10 I Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., Telephone 202/547-7500 and the Capitol Hill Hotel, 301 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., Telephone 202/543-3140.

**Daily briefings:** Briefings will be held twice a day, beginning at 5:30 P.M., Sunday, January 25. A complete schedule of the briefings, with times and locations, will be provided to you when you check in at the Emergency Committee office on arrival. Be sure to attend each of these briefings; only in this way can you be fully informed and in position to participate effectively.

**State-by-state meetings:** State-by-state meetings of persons present in Washington from the various states will be held throughout the day on Monday, January 26. At these meetings, the positions of individual members of the state delegations will be reviewed and additional contacts and activities agreed upon. A schedule of these meetings will be provided to each participant upon arrival.

**Payment of expenses:** This entire operation is on a "dutch treat" basis. Neither the Emergency Committee nor its constituent organizations are in a position to pay the expenses of participants.

**Instructions for contacting members of Congress:** On your way to Washington, please review the instructions for contacting members. These instructions appear on the reverse side of this sheet.

#### CONGRESSIONAL CONTACT PROCEDURE

1. To locate a Member's office, ask the guard inside the door of any of the three House office buildings. 3-digit room numbers are in the Cannon Building; 4-digit numbers beginning with 1 are in the Longworth Building; 4-digit numbers beginning with 2 are in the Rayburn Building.

2. It is a good idea to telephone for an appointment before you go to the Congressional office. Call CAPitol 4-3121 and ask for the Member's office.

3. You should make it clear that you want to see the Member himself and that you are entirely willing to wait, to come back, or to go to see him on the House floor, if necessary.

4. In your interview with the Member, be sure to express appreciation for his support of education legislation in the past.

5. Then tell him that you are concerned about the President's impending veto of H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. Ask him to vote to override the President's veto.

6. Give him any special local reasons why he should vote to override—shortages of school funds, etc. *This is important.*

7. Ask him for a commitment as to how he will vote. Try to avoid accepting noncommittal wording such as a promise to "consider the matter"; tell him that you need to know what he will do.

8. If he is unable to make a favorable commitment in the first visit, ask him if there is any information you can obtain for him and tell him you would like to come

back and discuss the matter with him again prior to the vote.

9. If he is unable to make a favorable commitment, ask if he will commit himself to be absent during this vote.

10. Tell him that you plan to be in the gallery throughout the debate and the voting on the veto override.

11. Thank him for taking the time in his busy schedule to see you and (if the visit has been favorable) tell him that you and your associates will do everything you can to assist him locally.

12. Fill out a Congressional Contact Report and turn it in at the office of the Emergency Committee, Suite 302 in the Congressional Hotel. This is very important.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the 50th anniversary of the Junior Chamber of Commerce is an occasion well worth remembering: I take great pride in adding my voice to those of others in marking this date.

The Jaycees are one of the most effective contributors to the development of good citizenship among our Nation's young men—citizenship which encompasses social, civic, economic, and political activities. The Jaycees stand foremost in promoting the traditional American ideals of free enterprise, democratic government, and individual human worth.

The ancient Greeks knew that the city, the State, the Nation, cannot function—indeed has no real meaning—without the concerned involvement of its members. The Jaycees seek to perpetuate this knowledge as the only way toward assuring the survival of the American Republic and the truths in which it was conceived and upon which it was established.

Though we have seen it before, I think the Jaycee creed worth repeating—so simply and yet with such strength does it summarize not only the goals of the Junior Chamber of Commerce but all of conscientious, dedicated Americans:

We believe that faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;

That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations;

That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;

That government should be of laws rather than of men;

That earth's great treasure lies in human personality,

And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

I think there is no finer code by which to live and to work; and I wish to offer my prayer for the continued success of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in the years ahead—a success, may we all hope, as truly meaningful as that achieved in years past.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1049, ANADROMOUS FISH CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 1049, to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of October 30, 1965, relating to the conservation and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fishing resources, to encourage joint research and development projects, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15149, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. PASSMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 15149) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-800)  
The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15149) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 10, 14, 29, 30, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 12, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$353,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$166,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$81,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$105,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$13,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as

follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"American schools and hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program): For assistance authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, \$3,000,000 for the University of North Africa, Tangier, Morocco, in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$395,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$255,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$300,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$37,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$51,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 8, and 31.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JEFFERY COHELAN,  
CLARENCE D. LONG,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
GARNER E. SHERIVER,  
SILVIO O. CONTE,  
CHARLOTTE T. REID,  
DONALD W. REIGLE, JR.,  
FRANK T. BOW,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

GALE W. MCGEE,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
JOSEPH MONTTOYA,  
HIRAM L. FONG,  
NORRIS COTTON,  
JAMES B. PEARSON.

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15149) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT ACTIVITIES  
*Funds appropriated to the President*  
Economic Assistance

In complying with the Senate instructions to rewrite the legislation in compliance with the authorization bill, the conferees are in no way conceding that their prior action was not legal and valid based on precedent. But in an effort to expedite the business of the Congress, the Committee of Conference has made every effort to conform this bill to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, which was enacted subsequent to action by the House and Senate on the appropriation bill.

Amendment No. 1—*Technical assistance*: Appropriates \$353,250,000 for Technical Assistance instead of \$313,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$396,870,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount will be distributed as indicated in amendment numbers 2, 3 and 4 below.

Amendment No. 2—Appropriates \$166,750,000 for Worldwide Technical assistance instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$183,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Appropriates \$81,500,000 for Alliance for Progress technical assistance instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$90,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Appropriates \$105,000,000 for Multilateral organization technical assistance instead of \$88,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$122,620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Provides that not less than \$13,000,000 of the appropriation for Multilateral organization technical assistance shall be available only for the United Nation's Children's Fund instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which permits the initiation of unjustified projects or activities relating to the reduction of population growth.

Amendment No. 7—Restores limitation proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate to preclude the transfer of funds among the three technical assistance appropriations contained in amendments 2, 3 and 4 above.

Amendment No. 8—*American schools and hospitals abroad*: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$25,900,000 instead of \$24,050,000 as proposed by the House and \$24,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$1,350,000 above the appropriation recommended by the Senate is the result of the conference agreement on Amendments Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

The Committee of Conference agrees that if the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) ascertains that any institution contained in these amendments has received funds previously under this bill under another name, it shall not be eligible to receive the funds provided by this appropriation.

In addition, the Committee of Conference agrees that the appropriations for the various institutions for which the Executive did not request funds are of a "one-shot" nature

and are not to be considered as continuing annual appropriations by the institutions concerned. It is further recommended that the Appropriations Committees not approve funds for any institution under this program unless a budget estimate has been submitted by the Executive for that purpose or unless the Committees involved decide in their wisdom that such a project is sufficiently meritorious to justify an exception to the above recommendation.

Amendment No. 9—Appropriates \$2,500,000 for the Weizmann Institute as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Appropriates \$1,900,000 for Merkaz Lechinuch Ichud as proposed by the House instead of \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Appropriates \$4,850,000 for Hadassah (expansion of medical facilities in Israel) instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Appropriates \$1,200,000 for Beth Yaacov Avat Girls School; \$800,000 for the Educational Center of Galilee; and \$500,000 for a hospital in Chemke, Nigeria, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—*American schools and hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)*: Appropriates \$3,000,000 in excess foreign currencies for the University of North Africa, Tangier, Morocco. The Committee of Conference deleted the appropriation of excess local currencies for the following institutions: \$1,000,000 for the Vocational School for the Underprivileged in Israel; \$500,000 for the Weizmann Institute, Israel; \$500,000 for the Merkaz Lechinuch Ichud, Israel; and \$1,000,000 for Hadassah (expansion of medical facilities in Israel) as proposed by the Senate due to the lack of authorization for this purpose.

Amendment No. 14—*Prototype desalting plant*: Restores the appropriation of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate, to finance planning, design, and specifications only of a prototype desalting plant in Israel. No part of the recommended appropriation is to be used for construction until the proposed project has been reviewed by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Amendment No. 15—*Supporting assistance*: Appropriates \$395,000,000 instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$414,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—*Contingency fund*: Appropriates \$12,500,000 instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—*Alliance for Progress, development loans*: Appropriates \$255,000,000 instead of \$200,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$337,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18—*Development loans*: Appropriates \$300,000,000 instead of \$265,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$350,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—*Overseas Private Investment Corporation, reserves*: Appropriates \$37,500,000 to the insurance and guaranty fund of the new corporation instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20—*Overseas Private Investment Corporation, capital*: Authorizes the use of development loan fund receipts (estimated to be \$20,000,000 in fiscal year 1970) for the establishment of a Direct Investment Fund for use by the Corporation to make loans to firms privately owned or of mixed private and public ownership for development projects in the developing countries as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—*Administrative expenses, A.I.D.*: Appropriates \$51,000,000 instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$51,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22—*Administrative ex-*

penses, State Department: Appropriates \$3,700,000 instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,730,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**Military Assistance**

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26—*Military assistance*: Insert appropriate section numbers; appropriate \$350,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$454,500,000 as proposed by the House; delete House language earmarking \$54,500,000 for the Republic of China as proposed by the Senate; and insert clarifying language proposed by the Senate with reference to the earmarking of funds for Korea.

In view of the reduced authorization for the military assistance program for fiscal year 1970 (\$75,000,000 below the budget estimate), the Committee of Conference directs that, with the exception of the \$50,000,000 earmarked for Korea, the remaining \$300,000,000 shall be allocated by the administrators of the program according to priority and need. Such action is in keeping with the concept that the military assistance program is presented to the Congress on an "illustrative" basis.

**General Provisions**

Amendment No. 27.—*Sec. 107 (b)*: Deletes language proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate prohibiting the furnishing of economic assistance to any country which provides economic assistance to Communist China.

Amendment No. 28.—*Sec. 113*: Makes available not to exceed \$9,000,000 for research under Sec. 205(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29.—*Sec. 119*: Restore language proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate directing the withholding of economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems.

Amendment No. 30.—*Sec. 120*: Conforms section number.

Amendment No. 31.—*Sec. 121*: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the language proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate precluding the transfer of development loan funds to international lending institutions, with an amendment conforming certain section num-

bers in this bill to appropriate section numbers in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969.

**TITLE II—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES**

Amendment No. 32.—Deletes language proposed by the House appropriating \$275,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Military Sales Act. Due to the lack of authorization for this program for fiscal year 1970, the Committee of Conference reluctantly agrees to the Senate proposal to delete without prejudice this item from the bill.

**TITLE III—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)**

Amendment No. 33.—Conforms title number.

**Funds appropriated to the President  
Peace Corps**

Amendment No. 34.—Appropriates \$98,450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$95,000,000 as proposed by the House.

**Department of the Army—Civil Functions  
Ryukyu Islands, Army, Administration**

Amendment No. 35.—Appropriates \$18,790,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 36.—Makes available \$3,151,000 for administrative and information expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,100,000 as proposed by the House.

**TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES**

Amendment No. 37.—Conforms title number.

Amendment No. 38.—*Limitation on program activity*: Makes available \$3,427,413,000 for the program of the Bank in fiscal year 1970 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,537,343,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39.—Makes available \$2,420,000,000 of the Bank's program activity (amendment number 38) for equipment and services loans as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,972,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40.—*Administrative expenses*: Makes available \$5,548,000 for administrative expenses of the Bank as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,280,000 as proposed by the House.

**TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Amendment No. 41.—Conforms title number.

Amendment No. 42.—Deletes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the expenditure of any funds in excess of those author-

ized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1970.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JEFFREY COHELAN,  
CLARENCE D. LONG,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
GARNER E. SHRIVER,  
SILVIO O. CONTE,  
CHARLOTTE T. REID,  
DONALD W. RIEGEL, Jr.,  
FRANK T. BOW,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15149) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. GROSS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time we are crossing over the same bridge we crossed on December 20, when the House conferees brought back a conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, but so that it may be in the RECORD at this point, I should like to read some statistics that may be of interest to the Members of the House, and in the extension of my remarks I shall insert a table on the conference action on the various items in the bill:

**FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1970 (H.R. 15149)—CONFERENCE SUMMARY**

**TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE**

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>									
<b>Economic assistance</b>									
Technical assistance.....	\$337,300,000	\$463,120,000	\$313,800,000	\$396,870,000	\$353,250,000	+\$15,950,000	-\$109,870,000	+\$39,450,000	-\$43,620,000
Worldwide.....	(167,000,000)	(224,500,000)	(150,800,000)	(183,500,000)	(166,750,000)	(-250,000)	(-57,750,000)	(+16,750,000)	(-16,750,000)
Alliance for progress.....	(81,500,000)	(116,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(90,750,000)	(81,500,000)		(-34,500,000)	(+6,500,000)	(-9,250,000)
Multilateral organizations.....	(88,800,000)	(122,620,000)	(88,800,000)	(122,620,000)	(105,000,000)	(-16,200,000)	(-17,620,000)	(-16,200,000)	(-17,620,000)
American schools and hospitals abroad.....	14,600,000	\$ 12,900,000	24,050,000	24,550,000	25,900,000	+11,300,000	+13,000,000	+1,850,000	+1,350,000
Special foreign currency program.....	(5,100,000)			(6,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-2,100,000)	(+3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	(-3,000,000)
Indus Basin Development Fund, grants.....	17,600,000	\$ 7,530,000	7,530,000	7,530,000	7,530,000				
Indus Basin Development Fund, loans.....	12,000,000	\$ 820,000					-12,000,000		
Supporting assistance.....	365,000,000	\$ 514,600,000	300,000,000	414,600,000	395,000,000		-119,600,000	+95,000,000	-19,600,000
Multilateral organizations.....	19,600,000						-19,600,000		
Prototype desalting plant.....			20,000,000		20,000,000		+20,000,000		+20,000,000
UNRWA (Arab refugees).....			1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		+1,000,000		
Contingency fund.....			10,000,000	15,000,000	12,500,000		+7,500,000		+2,500,000
Alliance for Progress, Development loans.....	255,000,000	\$ 437,500,000	200,000,000	337,500,000	255,000,000		-182,500,000	+55,000,000	-82,500,000
Development loans.....	300,000,000	\$ 675,500,000	265,000,000	350,000,000	300,000,000		-375,500,000	+35,000,000	-50,000,000

Footnotes at end of table.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1970 (H.R. 15149)—CONFERENCE SUMMARY—Continued

## TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE—Continued

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with—				
						New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1970	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Con.</b>										
<b>Economic assistance</b>										
Overseas private investment corporation.....		\$75,000,000		\$75,000,000	\$37,500,000	+\$37,500,000	-\$37,500,000	+\$37,500,000	-\$37,500,000	
Administrative expenses:										
Aid.....	51,000,000	54,250,000	\$50,000,000	51,125,000	51,000,000		-3,250,000	+1,000,000	-125,000	
State.....	3,500,000	3,800,000	3,500,000	3,730,000	3,700,000	+200,000	-100,000	+200,000	-30,000	
Subtotal, economic assistance.....	1,380,600,000	2,285,020,000	1,194,880,000	1,676,905,000	1,462,380,000	+81,780,000	-822,640,000	+267,500,000	-214,525,000	
Military assistance.....	375,000,000	<sup>10</sup> 425,000,000	454,500,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	-25,000,000	-75,000,000	-104,500,000		
Sec. 504(e)—China.....			(54,500,000)					(-54,500,000)		
Sec. 504(d)—Korea.....			(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)			
Total, title I, new budget (obligational) authority, foreign assistance.....	<sup>11</sup> 1,755,600,000	2,710,020,000	<sup>12</sup> 1,649,380,000	2,026,905,000	1,812,380,000	+56,780,000	-897,640,000	+163,000,000	-214,525,000	

## TITLE II—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

Military credit sales.....	296,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000			-296,000,000	-275,000,000	-275,000,000		
----------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	--	--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--	--

## TITLE III—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)

<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>										
Peace Corps.....	102,000,000	<sup>14</sup> 101,100,000	95,000,000	98,450,000	98,450,000	3,550,000	-2,650,000	+3,450,000		
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(29,500,000)	<sup>15</sup> (30,600,000)	(30,100,000)	(30,100,000)	(30,100,000)	(+600,000)	(-500,000)			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS</b>										
Ryukyu Islands, Army, administration.....	20,772,000	20,651,000	14,000,000	18,790,000	18,790,000	-1,982,000	-1,861,000	+4,790,000		
Reappropriation of unobligated balances.....			1,847,000	1,847,000	1,847,000	+1,847,000	+1,847,000			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE</b>										
Assistance to refugees in the United States.....	69,774,000	87,282,000	87,282,000	87,282,000	87,282,000	+17,508,000				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</b>										
Migration and refugee assistance.....	5,511,000	5,511,000	5,511,000	5,511,000	5,511,000					
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>										
Asian Development Bank.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000					
Inter-American Development Bank.....	505,880,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	-205,880,000				
International Development Association.....	160,000,000	<sup>16</sup> 160,000,000	160,000,000	160,000,000	160,000,000					
Total, title III, new budget (obligational) authority, foreign assistance (other).....	883,937,000	694,544,000	683,640,000	691,880,000	691,880,000	-192,057,000	-2,664,000	+8,240,000		

## TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Limitation on program activity.....	(2,552,050,000)	<sup>17</sup> (3,427,413,000)	(2,537,343,000)	(3,427,413,000)	(3,427,413,000)	(+875,363,000)		(+890,070,000)		
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(4,932,000)	<sup>18</sup> (5,548,000)	(5,280,000)	(5,548,000)	(5,548,000)	(+616,000)		(+268,000)		
Total, title IV, Export-Import Bank.....	(2,556,982,000)	(3,432,961,000)	(2,542,623,000)	(3,432,961,000)	(3,432,961,000)	(+875,979,000)		(+890,338,000)		
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles of bill.....	2,935,537,000	3,679,564,000	2,608,020,000	2,718,785,000	2,504,260,000	-431,277,000	-1,175,304,000	-103,760,000	-\$214,525,000	
Consisting of:										
Definite appropriations.....	2,935,537,000	3,679,564,000	2,606,173,000	2,716,938,000	2,502,413,000	-433,124,000	-1,177,151,000	-103,760,000	-214,525,000	
Reappropriation of unobligated balances.....			1,847,000	1,847,000	1,847,000	+1,847,000	+1,847,000			

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$238,620,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>2</sup> Includes reduction of \$2,500,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>3</sup> Includes reduction of \$134,820,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>4</sup> Includes reduction of \$18,180,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>5</sup> Includes reduction of \$400,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>6</sup> Includes reduction of \$10,000,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>7</sup> Includes reduction of \$52,500,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>8</sup> Includes reduction of \$44,500,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-132.  
<sup>9</sup> Estimate requested in H. Doc. 91-132.

<sup>10</sup> Estimates for programs in Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, free world forces in Vietnam, NATO infrastructure, and International Military Headquarters are now contained in Defense Department estimates.

<sup>11</sup> Includes \$50,000,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-140.  
<sup>12</sup> Unobligated balances as of June 30, 1968, reappropriated.  
<sup>13</sup> Unobligated balances reappropriated.  
<sup>14</sup> Includes reduction of \$8,700,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-100.  
<sup>15</sup> Includes reduction of \$300,000 requested in H. Doc. 91-100.  
<sup>16</sup> Estimate requested in H. Doc. 91-117.  
<sup>17</sup> Includes \$890,070,000 requested in S. Doc. 91-43.  
<sup>18</sup> Includes \$268,000 requested in S. Doc. 91-43.

Title I of the conference bill—the so-called foreign aid program—is \$56,780,000 above the appropriation for fiscal year 1969. However, there are several items in title I of the bill this year that were not in the bill last year, such as the new Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the prototype desalting plant, and several schools in Israel that are being funded for the first time by this bill. So by any true comparison, title I of the bill is lower than the appropriation for the same purposes for fiscal year 1969.

In comparison to the budget request for title I, the conference report now before the House is \$897,640,000 below the budget estimates—one of the larger reductions made in the so-called foreign aid program since its inception.

Contrary to the belief of some Members, we have upheld our record this year by not yielding as much money to the Senate as they yielded to the House. Title I of the conference bill is \$163 million above the House bill, but it is \$214,525,000 below the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is necessary to explain again to the Members of the House that it was not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations that we are now considering the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal 1970, 7 months after the fiscal year started.

The Appropriations Committee waited patiently for many long, long months for the legislative committees to act.

We waited until December 8 and then it became necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to go before the Rules Committee to ask for a rule waiving points of order so we could bring this appropriation bill to the floor before the first session of the 91st adjourned sine die.

The authorization bill was then going through the Congress but final action on that bill was subsequent to the passage of the House resolution waiving points of order on the appropriation bill. The Senate passed the appropriation bill on December 18. We went to conference on December 19 and after we had reached a complete and fair agreement with the Senate conferees—and I believe they were unanimous in accepting the conference agreement—we brought the conference bill back to the House. The House approved the action of its conferees but the other body turned down the recommendation of their conferees. It was not necessarily because of any controversial item in this bill which prompted that action, even though the other body used that as an excuse to some extent in turning down the bill. In my opinion it was simply because of their inaction on the authorization bill, which forced us to take action earlier than the normal legislative process.

What is the point? We realized we could not legislate on two bills and that we should either move on the House appropriation bill which passed with a rule waiving points of order, or we should move on the authorization bill that was signed into law subsequent to our departure for home on sine die adjournment on December 23.

Realizing we should expedite the business of the Congress, I went back into

conference with our great House conferees. We were unanimous that we must make some compromise if we were to have this bill enacted into law before the end of this fiscal year. We took two exceptions to the conference bill which was before the House last December. One was that we reduced the military assistance program appropriation by \$54.5 million—to \$350 million—so as to bring it into compliance with the authorization bill. In making that reduction we also deleted the language which earmarked the \$54.5 million for the Republic of China.

I believe it is fair to say that never in the history of the Congress can I find any record where the legislative bodies, as well as the subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, and the conference committee had 10 separate and distinct votes supporting the earmarking of \$54.5 million for the Republic of China. Each time this item was singled out the vote was about 2 to 1. In the House subcommittee the vote was 2 to 1 to keep the money for China in the bill.

It was the same vote to keep funds for the Republic of Korea out of the bill. We moved to the full committee and the vote again was 2 to 1 to keep the funds for China in the bill, and the same vote to keep funds for Korea out of the bill. A motion to recommit the first conference report on December 20 was soundly defeated. However, the House conferees, were willing to make a compromise, and the conference report before you reflects that compromise—the earmarking of \$54.5 million for the Republic of China is not in the bill.

I am inserting a table which reflects the 10 separate votes concerning the earmarking of funds for our great ally, the Republic of China:

HISTORY OF FUNDS FOR REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES		
	Yeas	Nays
Authorization bill (H.R. 14580):		
Nov. 20, 1969—Adopted Sikes amendment to include \$54,500,000 for China	176	170
Nov. 20, 1969—Final passage, including China funds	176	163
Appropriations bill (H.R. 15149):		
Dec. 3, 1969—Subcommittee—Motion to include \$54,500,000 for China	8	4
Dec. 8, 1969—Full committee—Motion to delete China funds	11	21
Dec. 9, 1969:		
House floor—Motion to retain \$54,500,000 for China (Broomfield substitute for Conte motion to delete)	250	142
Final passage, including China funds	200	195
Dec. 19, 1969—Conference action—agreement to retain China funds:		
House conferees	9	3
Senate conferees	8	0
Dec. 20, 1969—House action on conference report:		
Conte motion to recommit deleting China funds	136	220
House adopted conference report including China funds	181	174

I believe the Republic of China is one of our strongest allies. The President of the Republic of China is one of our great world leaders and has done much for the cause of freedom. Nationalist China is becoming very important to the security of the United States because of its location in the Far East. In my opinion it is very important that we give as much assistance as we can to one of our

staunchest friends to help them help themselves.

Another compromise we made, Mr. Speaker, was on funds for some schools in Israel. Both the House and Senate appropriation bills contained funds for schools in Israel—generally speaking, pursuant to what the authorization bill of each body recommended. To get this matter under control, when we went to our second conference on this bill, we reluctantly agreed to strike out all schools in Israel that were not authorized. The schools that were authorized are properly funded.

Mr. Speaker, we also insisted on preserving the integrity of the House. The conference report before us today contains the following statement:

In complying with Senate instructions to rewrite the legislation in compliance with the authorization bill, the conferees are in no way conceding that their prior action was not legal and valid, based on precedent. But in an effort to expedite the business of Congress, the Committee of Conference has made every effort to conform this bill to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, which was enacted subsequent to the action by the House and Senate on the appropriation bill.

I believe this is as good a conference report as we could possibly bring back to you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I hope it will be adopted by both bodies so that it can be signed into law and we can commence our hearings on the fiscal year 1971 appropriation report.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I only want to say in connection with this conference report that I am thankful for small favors. I realize that the legislative committee of which I am a member did a poor job on this bill insofar as cutting it down is concerned with respect to the needs of this country, and the financial crisis it faces. In the short time that I have had to look at this conference report, I note that apparently the House knuckled under to the Senate about 14 times and the Senate knuckled under to the House about once. I note that the gentleman previously stated this conference report provides about \$56 million more than was appropriated last year instead of a cut in foreign aid.

Thus, instead of cutting foreign aid this year, an action which the country needed so badly, this bill is \$56 million higher than last year, for a total of more than \$1.8 billion. Again I say that I am thankful for small favors—that the foreign handout program was not increased even more, but I most certainly will vote against the conference report.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

At the risk of being repetitious, I can say that there are several items in this year's bill that were not in last year's bill. For example, \$37.5 million for OPIC, funds for schools in Israel, the prototype desalting plant, and so on, which is why this year's bill is higher than last year's.

I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that if I had my way the bill would have been lower, but, of course, I am only one of the 12 members of the House conferees and we do have to compromise.

However, I can say to the gentleman that since I have been a Member of the House I have never voted for a foreign aid authorization bill which the Congress, in its wisdom, passes each year authorizing and establishing a foreign aid program funding ceiling.

Due to this fact and because I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, it is necessary for me to spend many hours looking for areas to reduce the amounts authorized by law. But I must recognize the fact that with the privilege of serving as chairman comes the responsibility of doing a good job. During my tenure as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the aggregate reduction below the budget requests for foreign aid has been approximately \$12 billion. However, I must also give credit to other committees and to other Members of Congress for their contribution to this reduction.

As I stated earlier, I would have voted for a lower bill. One of the reasons is due to the large amount of foreign aid authorizations and appropriations requests for the current fiscal year that the Executive requested. The bill before you is only one "spigot" of the total, as can be seen in the table below:

*New budgetary requests for authorization and appropriation for selected programs of foreign assistance*

Foreign assistance (mutual security) .....	\$2,710,020,000
Receipts and recoveries from previous programs .....	274,785,000
Military assistance (in Defense budget) .....	2,230,900,000
Economic assistance (in Defense budget) .....	76,600,000
Foreign military credit sales fund .....	275,000,000
MAAG's, missions, and mill-groups .....	168,800,000
Export-Import Bank:	
Long-term credits .....	1,872,200,000
Regular operations .....	570,423,000
Export expansions program .....	100,000,000
Public Law 480 (agricultural commodities) .....	986,600,000
Inter-American Development Bank (FSO) .....	300,000,000
International Development Association:	
1. Regular .....	160,000,000
2. Supplemental .....	160,000,000
Asian Development Bank:	
Regular contribution .....	20,000,000
Special funds .....	25,000,000
Peace Corps .....	101,100,000
Permanent military construction—Foreign nations .....	255,300,000
Contributions to international organizations .....	130,187,000
Educational (foreign and other students) .....	43,614,000
Ryukyu Islands .....	20,651,000
Migrants and refugees .....	5,511,000
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands .....	41,612,000
<b>Total new requests for foreign assistance...</b>	<b>10,528,303,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>S. Doc. No. 91-43, dated Nov. 24, 1969, increased the total amount requested for the Bank by an additional \$890,338,000.

Before yielding to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) I want to say that we have a very wonderful subcommittee. Each one is a hard worker. Occasionally we disagree, but we do so without being disagreeable. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), the ranking minority member, for the wonderful cooperation he has given to me in handling this very complex and controversial bill.

On the majority side I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), who has been a staunch supporter of the program. The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG), and the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), each in his own way, has been of material help to me and cooperative in our endeavors to write a good piece of appropriation legislation.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), who evidently understands this legislation as well as any other Member of this House. It would appear occasionally we have disagreements. He is a very hard worker and able Congressman. I want to thank him for his cooperation.

I want to also thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), who have been very cooperative and have made my job a lot easier.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to our chairman, who has been hardworking and diligent throughout the year on this bill. He, too, is very wise and familiar with all of the provisions contained in the bill.

I rise to concur in the statement made by the chairman concerning this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take much time, because it would be a replay of what was said in December when this conference report was before this body.

The main change from the prior conference report on this bill is that the House recedes relative to military assistance for jets for Taiwan. This is in keeping with a very decisive vote on this matter in the other body. And I might add that in my judgment this is a good compromise, and I urge all of you to support the conference report.

Before we vote on the conference report I would remind you of other items than economic assistance and military assistance which are contained in this bill and which in my opinion are important to this country.

With reference to a question just asked of the chairman by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) relative to reductions and increases, I might say that one increase was for supporting assistance. I think this is important, particularly in connection with the Vietnamization of the war in Vietnam. The sum of \$395 million is appropriated here for Vietnamizing the war in Vietnam and directed toward assisting the President in connection with the culmination of that war.

I would also remind the Members that when we voted for some of these specific items contained in this bill they were passed by overwhelming votes on the authorization acts. For instance, with reference to the Peace Corps, when we voted on this item the vote was 282 to 52; for the Ryukyu Islands, 284 to 80; for the Cuban refugee program, that was adopted on a voice vote; for the migrants and refugees, that was adopted on a voice vote; for the Asian Development Bank the vote was 293 to 80; for the Inter-American Development Bank the vote was 275 to 122; for the International Development Association the vote was 247 to 150; and for the Export-Import Bank the vote was 376 to 19.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of other things contained in the bill besides military assistance and economic assistance in connection with foreign operations.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished and honorable chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), for his kind remarks. We have worked together for 12 years now on one of the most difficult bills that any committee has to bring before the House. Not only is it one of the most vexing bills, but it is also one of the most unpopular bills.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with this conference report. I know that a lot of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle voted against the one that we considered in December 1969. This conference report is, however, different, and for this reason I urge them to vote for it. The bill before us now for consideration is much better than the one we debated in December. It no longer contains the earmarking of \$54.5 million for Phantom jets for the Republic of China.

The military assistance appropriation has been reduced from the earlier House-passed level of \$454.5 million to \$350 million.

We fought hard to delete the money for those jets to China. It was a good victory for the American taxpayer and for the appropriation process itself.

I argued over and over again that these planes were never officially requested. Therefore, I maintained that we should wait for such a request and then hold hearings on it.

Moreover, in the meantime it was disclosed that Taiwan was scheduled to receive a squadron of older F-104 Starfighter jets this year. The F-104 is a jet interceptor, which is a defensive aircraft, and this seems logical because the argument for the Phantoms was that they were needed as a defense against a possible attack from Red China. The Phantoms, however, were fighter-bombers, or offensive aircraft, so I failed to see why they were needed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add a personal comment. Last time we considered this bill, I voted against it for the first time

in my 12 years in this body and on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. I did so because I strongly objected to the procedures employed in getting the jet planes in the bill.

I am going to vote for this bill now, but in so doing, I think a few things should be said about foreign aid generally.

Last year saw the famous Pearson Commission report and the Jackson report. This year will see the Peterson report. I am encouraged by the efforts that have been, and are being, put into such reports because the time for a new approach to foreign aid is here.

One such approach would be to minimize the political friction that can exist between donor and donee when we have aid on a bilateral basis.

A broader approach that would also minimize this friction would be to emphasize multilateral rather than bilateral aid. This is something that I have argued for for many years. I think this is an essential step to a more effectively run aid program.

Another approach concerns military aid. I have long believed that economic assistance should take priority over military assistance. The problem with the foreign aid bill as we have known it over the years is that it greatly underplays the real extent of military assistance. The scales of aid are lopsided in favor of the military program, and this has meant, in many cases, reductions in economic programs.

To be more specific, the bill for fiscal 1970 contains \$1.4 billion in economic assistance under title I, Military assistance totals \$350 million in title I. But when you add the nearly \$2.5 billion that is funded by Department of Defense appropriations, you come close to \$3 billion in military assistance, or about twice the money set aside for economic assistance.

I think we should give serious thought to handling the military assistance program in a new way. Perhaps, it should be lumped together with all the other military assistance programs. It could then be looked over with a fine-tooth comb in connection with a reappraisal of total U.S. commitments abroad.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that it is high time for new ideas and new thinking in our foreign aid program.

The Pearson Commission noted that we are at a turning point in the drive for economic development. Let us turn in the right direction and keep the lights burning for the developing world.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent

Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 162, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]  
YEAS—202

Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Alexander  
Anderson, Calif.  
Anderson, Ill.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Arends  
Ashley  
Aspinall  
Ayres  
Barrett  
Beall, Md.  
Belcher  
Bell, Calif.  
Blaggi  
Blester  
Bingham  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Bolling  
Bow  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brotzman  
Brown, Mich.  
Buchanan  
Burke, Mass.  
Burton, Calif.  
Bush  
Button  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Carey  
Cederberg  
Celler  
Chisholm  
Clark  
Clay  
Cohelan  
Conable  
Conte  
Corbett  
Coughlin  
Culver  
Daddario  
Daniels, N.J.  
Davis, Wis.  
Delaney  
Dellenback  
Dennis  
Diggs  
Donohue  
Dulski  
Edmondson  
Edwards, La.  
Ellberg  
Erlenborn  
Esch  
Evans, Colo.  
Fallon  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Findley

Fish  
Foley  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Ford, William D.  
Friedel  
Fulton, Pa.  
Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Gialmo  
Gibbons  
Gilbert  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Gubser  
Gude  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hastings  
Hathaway  
Helstoski  
Hicks  
Hogan  
Horton  
Howard  
Jacobs  
Johnson, Calif.  
Jones, Ala.  
Karth  
Kastenmeyer  
Kee  
Keith  
Kling  
Kluczyński  
Koch  
Kuykendall  
Kyros  
Leggett  
McCarthy  
McCloskey  
McDade  
McEwen  
McKneally  
Macdonald, Mass.  
MacGregor  
Madden  
Mahon  
Mathias  
Matsunaga  
May  
Mayne  
Meeds  
Mikva  
Miller, Calif.  
Minish  
Mink  
Moorhead  
Morse  
Morton  
Mosher  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Nedzi

NAYS—162

Abernethy  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Baring  
Bennett  
Betts  
Bevill  
Blanton  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brock  
Brown, Calif.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Burleson, Tex.  
Burlison, Mo.  
Burton, Utah  
Caffery  
Camp  
Carter  
Casey  
Chamberlain  
Chappell  
Clancy

Flowers  
Flynt  
Foreman  
Fountain  
Frey  
Fuqua  
Galifianakis  
Gaydos  
Gettys  
Goldwater  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Griffin  
Gross  
Grover  
Hagan  
Haley  
Hall  
Hammer-schmidt  
Downing  
Duncan  
Edwards, Ala.  
Fisher

Hull  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jarman  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, N.C.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kazen  
Kleppe  
Kyl  
Landgrebe  
Landrum  
Langen  
Latta  
Lennon  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Lowenstein  
Lujan  
Lukens  
McClary  
McClure  
McDonald, Mich.  
Marsh  
Martin  
Meskill  
Michel  
Miller, Ohio

NOT VOTING—68

Mills  
Minshall  
Mize  
Mizell  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Myers  
Natcher  
Obey  
O'Konski  
Olsen  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Pickle  
Poage  
Poff  
Pollock  
Purcell  
Quillen  
Randall  
Roberts  
Roe  
Rogers, Fla.  
Roudebush  
Ruth  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Scherle  
Scott  
Sebelius  
Shibley  
Sikes

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- On this vote:
- Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
- Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Berry against.
- Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Adair against.
- Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.
- Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Cramer against.
- Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Clancy against.
- Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. Vander Jagt against.
- Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Reifel against.
- Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
- Mr. Ewins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.
- Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Eschleman against.
- Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Pettis against.
- Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Blackburn against.
- Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina against.
- Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Abitt against.
- Mr. Harrington for, with Mr. McMillan against.
- Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Vanik against.
- Mr. Wolf for, with Mr. Nichols against.
- Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Rarick against.
- Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.
- Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
- Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Fraser against.
- Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Ullman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cunningham.  
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.  
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Teague of California.  
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Smith of New York.  
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. Mailliard.  
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. McCulloch.  
 Mr. Symington with Mr. Lloyd.  
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Hosmer.  
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Scheuer.  
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."  
 Messrs. LONG of Maryland and SAYLOR changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

#### AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement. The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 2, line 20 insert the following: ", except projects or activities relating to the reduction of population growth."

#### MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 3, line 7 strike out "\$24,050,000" and insert "\$24,750,000."

#### MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$25,900,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: On page 16 strike out lines 21 through 23.

#### MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 121. None of the funds contained in title I of this Act may be used to carry out the provisions of section 401(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969.

"Sections of this title which refer to authorizing legislation are hereby amended to conform to the appropriate sections of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

#### EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS FOR JOINT INDUSTRY PROMOTION OF PRODUCTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 791 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

#### H. RES. 791

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 860) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 791 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 860 to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances.

H.R. 860 would authorize a trust to consist of equal numbers of representatives of employers and employees whose sole purpose would be to finance the promotion of products used in the construction industry in such areas as public relations, research and development, market development, and publication of technical information about the product.

It would be financed by employers through contributions arrived at by mutually agreeable labor and management collective bargaining agreements on an agreed upon "cents per hour, per employee" basis. Bargaining over the establishment of such a fund would be permissive for both labor and management. Refusal to bargain would not be an unfair labor practice violation.

The language in H.R. 860 and the re-

quirements of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act guarantee fiscal integrity of such trust funds.

Similar legislation passed the House in 1965 and 1968, but has never been acted upon by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 791 in order that H.R. 860 may be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no opposition to the rule which would make in order the bill, H.R. 860, which would amend the present section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act. However, I take this time to express my very fundamental opposition to this legislation, as I did in 1965, and as I did in 1968, I believe, which was the last time this bill was before us—and I do so again today. Because I think it would be highly unfortunate if the House would act on this legislation without having a full appreciation of what the significance and what the consequences of the passage of this bill would be.

I have outlined my views in a letter which I have addressed to all of my colleagues and which I believe you received on your desks this morning. In that letter I drew your attention to the position taken by the administration, by the Nixon administration, through Labor Secretary George P. Shultz.

Mr. Shultz in his statement, I think, very wisely counseled that we postpone action on this bill until an in-depth study has been made of all types of funds which are of joint concern to management and labor.

I would certainly agree with the distinguished Secretary of Labor. This legislation today represents merely a piecemeal approach to the overall problems of the administration of joint funds, and it would be very unwise to proceed with the passage of this bill until we have had the kind of in-depth study that Secretary Shultz recommends.

Let me quote from his letter to the House Subcommittee on Labor:

However, we know little of the financing, administration, objectives, accounting and reporting practices, or size of such funds. Under these circumstances, we are unable to predict the likelihood of abuses or the additional protections which may be necessary.

Let me quote one additional statement from the Assistant Secretary of Labor W. J. Usery, Jr. He said this:

Although industry promotion is clearly a laudable purpose, considerable opposition to joint management of such funds has been expressed primarily because of a fear that unions might prevent desirable improvements in construction methods and materials and that jurisdictional disputes would be increased.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at the very time when we are trying to concentrate all of our efforts in meeting our housing goals, and we are trying to do that through the introduction of new methods and new technologies, that we can ill afford to pass a bill that might have the effect of frustrating that very purpose.

Last year under the housing amendments of 1969, I sponsored what you will

recall was Operation Breakthrough which called on Secretary Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to eliminate restraints against the use of new technologies and materials in producing low cost housing.

I find it of singular interest, and I think it is of some significance, that the very same people who fought me on that simple amendment—the very same people who filtered through the corridors around this Chamber inciting opposition to that amendment against restraints on new technologies—are the people today who are circulating letters in opposition to my position on this bill and saying that we should forthwith give our approval to the bill, H.R. 860.

This, I think, adds considerable substance to the argument I have just made that if we pass this legislation, we may well be giving a toehold to the very groups in our society today who are foot dragging in this business of introducing new technologies and new methods.

I could quote to you, if you need any more proof, a statement that was in the 1968 hearings on a virtually identical measure by Mr. David Barr, counsel to the Brotherhood of Painters. Here is what he told the House Committee on Labor at that time—that his membership was concerned about “anticipated advances in prefabrication and technology.” He went on to explain, and I quote:

Advances in prefabrication and technology have and will continue to have severe adverse impacts on this affiliate. We feel strongly that this threatened attrition can be warded off, at least in part, by an effective promotion program.

That is not the purpose of an industry promotion program at all. It is not supposed to be there to ward off the introduction of new, cheaper, and better methods. But that is the purpose to which this particular union would like to see this bill placed.

Let me call your attention very briefly to another example that came to my attention only within the last day or two in one area of our country where there was a requirement that there be lead stubs in connection with the installation of plumbing fixtures. The mechanical contractors in that particular area saw that this was a wasteful practice, that it was an expensive practice, so they were able to go in and get the building code changed, to get the code changed and eliminate a requirement for the use of these lead stubs in the installation of plumbing fixtures. As a result, they were able to reduce the cost of construction. Do you want to know what happened? The union in that area became so incensed over what had been done by management in this regard that they torpedoed the negotiations that were then going on for a new contract, and they insisted that before they would sign a labor agreement, a contract with the mechanical contractors in that area, that there be included a provision that if this bill, H.R. 860, passes, should that bill pass, then that industry promotion fund that had been set up previously in this area had to be jointly administered by labor and management.

Do not tell me, do not stand on the floor of this House, anyone, today and tell me that there is not a very sinister and insidious purpose behind the passage of this legislation, and it is to give this kind of wedge, this opening wedge, this kind of bargaining tool to those unions who for selfish reasons want to preserve the narrow craft jurisdiction of their members quite irrespective of what impact this attitude would have on the overriding public interest of meeting our housing goals.

If I thought for 1 minute that this was necessary to keep men from being unemployed, I would be willing to support them. But when I got the figures that we had here on the floor last year that we need something like 120,000 or 130,000 new skilled tradesmen a year to meet the pent-up housing demand of this country, and that we are training something like 20,000 or 25,000, I think it shows how ridiculous and how out of date and how completely unreasonable are the fears of those who see the bogey man of being put out of work because of new methods and new technology, and so they very jealously hang onto the existing jurisdiction of their particular craft. I submit that we are doing no favor at all to those people, that as we broaden the opportunities for construction of housing, we open up new jobs that these people can step into at very high-paying wages. So I would certainly hope in our consideration of this legislation—and it is a very innocent sounding little bill—that we would have some appreciation of what kind of circumstances we are setting in motion here and what this kind of legislation can lead to, as far as the efforts that we are now making to get better methods and get cheaper housing and better housing constructed for the people of our country.

Let me say this: The argument is that the proposed legislation is permissive. It is permissive, and is not a mandatory item of bargaining. Therefore, why worry that you give the unions the right to go in and bargain for joint management of an industry promotion fund? Anyone who has even a scintilla of knowledge about the bargaining process knows that you can easily offset the mandatory demands that you are entitled to make under the statute against the so-called permissive demands that you can make. You can trade off one against another in order to get your way to do, as this particular union did, in connection with the issue of lead stubs for plumbing fixtures, to say, “We will not give in on these negotiations unless you write in here language that we are to jointly control the use of these funds”—funds to which management alone contributes, funds that are used for product promotion, which I think is inherently a prerogative of management.

I had no objection to Mr. THOMPSON's bill last year. He came to me and said, “Won't you agree that we ought to carve out an amount under section 102 of the joint management funds set up for educational scholarships for the children of workers?” I say I agree. I think this is a legitimate issue. It ought to be bargained over. I think there ought to be

joint administration of a fund set up to provide scholarships for the children of workers. But when you talk about product promotion, you are talking about something, I repeat, that is inherently within the jurisdiction of management.

I saw a labor agreement the other day that provided that management should deduct 1 percent of a man's salary if he belonged to the union and pay that money over into a plumbers' and steamfitters' building fund. I think that is all right. That is a perfectly acceptable thing to be in a collective bargaining agreement. I do not suggest to this House that management then should have a right to say they want to be a coadministrator of that fund and say what kind of building ought to be put up with this building fund to which the people are contributing. That is a matter that ought to be and should remain within the sole discretion of the bargaining unit of the labor union. Management does not have and should not have anything to do with that.

By the same token, when we talk about a product promotion fund, I think this is something labor has no right to insist on as being within its boundaries or jurisdiction with respect to its administration.

First of all, because this represents an unwise way to legislate piecemeal on a very important matter that is fraught with consequences we cannot possibly appreciate under this kind of segmented approach and, second, because of the impact this would have on the housing industry, that it could have in possibly restraining the introduction of those new methods we desperately need if we are to fulfill our housing goals, I would submit this is a bad bill. It has been before the Congress since 1962, and it has never passed the Congress. It dies every time. It ought to die this time, and I hope Members will join me in voting against it.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 860) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 860, with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and

the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of H.R. 860, an amendment to section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act. The bill would permit employer contributions to jointly administered trust funds for industry promotion of products or their application in the building and construction industry.

Joint administration of collectively bargained programs is nothing new and is in wide use today where permitted by law. Indeed, this Congress gave its approval to this common practice when it approved joint administration of programs involving school scholarships and child care centers—Public Law 91-86. The principle involved there and here is identical: that as long as appropriate safeguards exist to protect against diversion of the funds, labor and management should be left free from Government interference in their private negotiations to establish mutually desirable methods of administering programs having perfectly lawful objectives.

The House has passed this legislation on two previous occasions: in 1965—H.R. 1153—and again in 1968—H.R. 15198. Each time, however, the other body failed to complete action on the legislation before adjournment. I note that the Senate Labor Committee recently voted overwhelmingly to report their bill, S. 1369, a companion bill to H.R. 860, so the other body should shortly be considering it as well.

The only major difference between H.R. 860 and the bills previously passed by the House in 1965 and 1968 is the committee amendment defining the word "product."

The word "product" as used in the bill was the subject of a colloquy on the House floor between the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and the able gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) during the debate on this legislation in 1968.

The contractors specifically wanted the definition of "product" set forth in the bill rather than in the legislative history. Our committee agreed and H.R. 860, as amended meets the questions raised by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), in 1968.

H.R. 860 and its predecessors have received the wholehearted support not just of the construction unions but of many contractors and contractors' organizations. A list of these organizations appears at pages 4 and 5 of the committee report. These management organizations have stated that the participation of labor is desirable and necessary if the vitally important educational and promotional programs are to be effectively fulfilled. They have described the highly successful experiences with jointly administered promotion programs for a number of years in their industries prior to the time the courts started applying section 302 to prohibit them.

By way of example, the organized

painting industry is now awaiting the passage of this legislation to effectuate an already prepared product promotion joint trust fund on a national level. The industry—management and labor—hopes thereby to encourage the use of the safest and most technologically advanced products and their application. And the following is what the representative of several plastering and lathing management associations has had to say about the 10-year—1952-62—experience with joint administration by the Southern California Plastering Institute:

We opened up, I think, one of the most enlightened experiences that I have ever had in the entire field of public relations. There was an expression of interest here on the part of labor that it is pretty hard to describe unless you were close to it. There was an awakening of the fact that there was a direct relationship between the job opportunity and the man, the mechanic, and the employment opportunity of the employer.

And all of these things were linked to the need for satisfying an end customer—architects and homebuilders and public agents who specify building materials in their construction projects, developed a confidence in the industry because they began to feel that labor was as much concerned with the ultimate outcome of the performance of the product as the contractor was who was selling it.

We had the introduction of mechanized and automated equipment accepted without question on the part of labor because it would serve the purpose of reducing the end price of the product and make it more competitive and, believe me, at this time of spiraling construction costs, this can become an important thing. (Hearings on H.R. 1153 Before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, 89th Congress, 2d Session, 31 (1966).)

It should be emphasized that the joint administration of industry promotion funds has not been proscribed as a matter of public policy. Rather, it has been held by courts to be illegal because of the method chosen by the draftsmen of section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, which failed to specifically exempt joint industry promotion programs from the general prohibition of the act. In my opinion, this was an oversight and not the intent of Congress. This method of drafting necessitated a 1959 amendment to section 302(c) to permit jointly administered funds for apprenticeship training programs, and for pooled vacation, holiday and severance benefits. Last year's further amendment has already been mentioned.

It should also be emphasized that thousands of promotion programs are in existence and operation today and are perfectly lawful. Although these programs are part of a collective bargaining agreement, they are unilaterally administered by the employers. The collective bargaining agreement provides that the employers contribute a certain number of cents per employee hour worked, and the payments are usually treated by employers, for tax purposes, as a deductible "labor" cost of doing business. How can it be contended that labor should be prohibited from participating when the existing programs are themselves the product of the collective bargaining process and the payments to these programs are an integral part of

wages? Furthermore, as the National Labor Relations Board recognized in the case of *Detroit Resilient Flood Decorators* (136 NLRB 769, 771, enforced, 317 F. 2d 269 (7th Cir.)):

The ability of an employer or an industry to meet changing conditions may . . . affect employees' opportunities in the long run, and labor organizations are understandably concerned with the future of the industries from which their members derive their livelihood.

The bill is replete with important and adequate safeguards, including reporting requirements which do not presently exist in the unilateral administration area though abuses are also conceptually possible there. I would specifically point out that language has been included to insure that joint administration will be permitted only when management agrees. Management may not be forced by labor to even discuss the issue. In other words, the subject is a nonmandatory subject of bargaining in keeping with the *Detroit Resilient* case just mentioned. And contrary to some who say that the unions can easily circumvent this rule by conditioning the disposition of truly mandatory subjects on the disposition of this issue, the labor law decisions clearly render such attempts at evasion as unfair labor practices.

For the foregoing reason, H.R. 860 clearly deserves your support.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, has mentioned the major details contained in this legislation. As most of us know who were here in the previous Congress, this bill formerly passed the House. Now, there have been several statements made regarding the legislation, one by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), in speaking on the rule, that the passage of this bill, in all probability, would bring about problems even to the point, as he said in his remarks, of slowing down homebuilding and making less houses available for our people. He failed to mention, however, the main thing holding back home construction today is not the shortage of skilled employees, not the shortage of brickmasons or the shortage of plumbers, but the shortage of moneys to finance the homes. It very well could be that under the promotional provisions of this bill there would be ways and means found through promotion to use some of the products that are more easily assembled for less money. This bill does not go as far as some would like to have it go and it goes farther than others would like to have it go.

The minority views in the report are very complete of those who object to the passage of the bill. It came out of the committee overwhelmingly, and when it passed the House previously the same arguments that are being used against the bill today were used then. I hope the bill passes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield

the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

#### 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.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS FOR JOINT INDUSTRY PROMOTION OF PRODUCTS

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the purpose of this legislation, and in my opinion a lot of heat generated unnecessarily by some of its opponents. It seems to me they want to read something very sinister, as my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) said a few minutes ago, into something which is really very simple.

H.R. 860 amends section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products. It applies only to employers of the construction industry.

H.R. 860 merely states the principle that if both labor and management of a construction industry unit agree that it is in their mutual best interest to set up a joint trust fund to be administered by representatives of both for the purpose of financing the promotion of products used in that particular industry—in such a situation as just described—labor and management may not be prohibited by law from entering into such a collective-bargaining agreement.

Why should Government prohibit the establishment of such jointly administered programs if both labor and management agree that they are beneficial in the promotion of their legitimate economic interests?

The original prohibition provisions of section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act had as their purpose the elimination of bribery, extortion, "sweet-heart contracts," and other corrupt practices made possible by employer payments to employee representatives. However, Congress included five exceptions in the original language of section 302(c).

A sixth exception dealing with pooled vacations, holiday, severance, apprenticeship, and training programs was added in 1959 and last year we enacted Public Law 91-86, adding a seventh exception to permit employer contributions to joint trust funds providing scholarships or day care centers for dependents of employees. That was the one to which the gentleman from Illinois referred earlier.

The exception provided here in H.R. 860 as well as the two previous exceptions added by Congress to section 302(c)

have been made necessary by court decisions holding that, however laudable the objectives of such joint trust funds, they must be specifically authorized by Congress because of the restrictive wording of the original section 302 of the act. In *Cement Masons against Paramount Plastering*, the court of appeals for the ninth circuit stated with respect to these joint funds:

We do not quarrel in the slightest with the laudable objectives of the trust amicably created by labor and management to solve a vexing industry problem. . . .

But like so many of our present-day problems, our duty is to rule in accordance with that which the Congress has seen fit to enact . . . the relief sought by appellants herein must be found in congressional and not judicial action. (310 F.2d at p. 191.)

Mr. Chairman, again, I stress that the provisions of this legislation are permissive. If either side did not desire to bargain on the establishment of such a joint trust fund for product promotion, its refusal to bargain would not be considered an unfair labor practice.

Mr. Chairman, I also point out that we have taken great care to provide for adequate safeguards to preserve the fiscal integrity of such trust funds, is established by mutual agreement. H.R. 860 specifically sets forth these safeguards:

First. Payments must go into a separate trust.

Second. The funds may be used only for the authorized purposes.

Third. Funds cannot be commingled with any other funds.

Fourth. Funds cannot be used for programs that are employer or management functions or labor organization functions.

Fifth. Applicable requirements of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act also apply to these trust funds.

Sixth. The provision of section 302(d) also applies:

Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and be subject to a fine of not more than \$10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

That would seem to me to destroy the assertion that this is sinister and that there will be mishandling of these funds.

I would like to make one last point, Mr. Chairman. We have included in H.R. 860 a definition of the word "product" to meet certain objections raised during the debate in the last Congress and by some of the witnesses.

To make certain that the precise purpose of this legislation can leave no room for doubt, our subcommittee wrote into the bill a definition of the word "product," as used in H.R. 860 in lines 11 to 14 of the bill as follows:

The word "product", as used herein, means tangible building materials or substances physically incorporated in buildings or other facilities, or the application of such materials as in plastering, lathing, painting, or decorating.

Mr. Chairman, the interest of the employer and the union in such products promotion appears clear to me if an industry successfully promotes the use of its products.

If the industry successfully promotes

the use of its products—and incidentally its objective in promoting the use of its products has implicit in it that it will obviously build in the course of promoting the use of its products. It cannot promote them if they are not building. The essential element, of course, is that they want to build. They want their products, plaster rather than drywall, or drywall rather than plaster, paint rather than aluminum siding or aluminum siding rather than paint, but the objective is to build and to sell the products that they are jointly sponsoring.

How conceivably this could slow down the housing industry I do not know.

It is customary with most bills relating to labor and management that there have been claims that I would like to address myself to in conclusion. First, this bill cannot possibly and will not increase labor strife in the construction industry. It has no bearing on the secondary boycott. The jurisdictional dispute, to which the gentleman from Illinois alluded is in another part of the act, and other unfair labor practices, all of which are under section 8 of the act, which is untouched by this.

I really would be persuaded, I suppose, if it were not for the long history of this bill, by the plea from the Secretary's office that it be the subject of further study.

As the gentleman from Illinois said earlier in the debate on the rule, this bill has been before the Congress since 1962. Now, it might well be that the writers of those two letters pleading for further study do not know what it is all about, but the Congress does, and we do. The record is replete with every minute ramification of this. I am sorry that the Under Secretary has not read those things, or if he has I am sorry that he has read them and has not understood them. Given an opportunity, I would be glad to explain this uncomplicated thing to him.

This bill does not intrude on labor management functions. There is specific language which protects against such intrusion. The bill will not require any employer to contribute to one of these funds, nor will it require any employer to agree to set one up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, it will not require employers to change their current unilateral programs, nor prohibit their expansion in the future. It specifically provides the establishment of the use of funds as a permissive subject in the collective bargaining process.

In sum, H.R. 860 would amend section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions to jointly administered trust funds. That is all it does. It would permit such voluntary labor-management cooperation, but would not require it. It would put the decision of whether to establish such funds where it belongs—not with the Federal law, but with the private parties operating within the well-tested procedures of free collective bargaining.

Some employers and some unions want to set up these programs, some do not. There is no sound policy reason why the law should continue to inhibit them from doing so.

During the debate in the last Congress, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) raised a number of questions as to the scope of the exceptions to section 302(c). I assured them, as I do now, that it deals only with the validation of product promotion plans administered jointly by labor and management, and does not affect the so-called industry advancement programs that are unilaterally administered by management, nor would it impede their operation in any way.

During the colloquy on the previous bill on August 25, 1968, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) complained that the term "product" was not defined in the bill. It later was in the form of a colloquy.

He was presumably unwilling to rely on the legislative history that clearly sets forth many instances of the specific limitation of the bill to joint industry product promotion programs.

To make certain that the precise purpose of the legislation may leave no room for doubt, the subcommittee wrote into the bill a definition of the word "product" which is in the bill, H.R. 860, lines 11 to 14, and the language is as follows:

The word "product", as used herein, means tangible building materials or substances physically incorporated in buildings or other facilities, or the application of such materials as in plastering, lathing, painting, or decorating:

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey. I think this point is important, the language contained in the bill in the amendment that was agreed to by the subcommittee and reported by the full committee certainly, I think, goes a long way toward clearing up any possible misunderstanding.

I am correct; am I not too, that when the definition of the word "product" is contained in the legislation as it is here, we can further state that those who have been concerned about industry advancement funds as they were in 1968 ought now to be even more reassured than they were when we had the colloquy 2 years ago about what it is that is intended by this bill.

I commend the gentleman for having gone the route of placing the language, a definition of the word "product," in the legislation so that there can be no question.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is exactly correct. The unilateral programs carried on by the manufacturers, the products used in building such as various types of wallboards and materials such as tile, clay pipe, plumbing fixtures, and so on, will continue absolutely untouched by this.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. There is

one other point on which I would like to have the gentleman's comment, and that relates to the letter of the Secretary of Labor which is to be found on page 72 of the hearing record.

I noted with some interest that the Secretary did not oppose the bill, but he simply said that it ought to be studied further.

But in that letter he went on to say:

However, if action is taken, we recommend that additional safeguards \* \* \* be contained in the legislation.

Now my question to the gentleman from New Jersey would be, Am I correct that the Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act, the Landrum-Griffith Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act that relate to control are all also applicable so far as possible to this joint promotion fund, if it is agreed to in the collective bargaining process?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is exactly correct. Section 302(d) of the act applies—and I quoted that earlier, as the Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act—as do other applicable sections of the act which this does not touch.

Every safeguard requested or suggested by the Secretary is incorporated in the language of the existing law and in this legislation.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for further clarifying that point and urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In sum, Mr. Chairman, I think every possible study that can be useful has been made. This has a long history. Every safeguard requested is contained in the legislation and the bill has been very narrowly defined, particularly as it relates to the definition of "product" and I urge its passage.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN).

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman, if I might get his attention, what is to keep this bill or this philosophy, so to speak, from becoming a part of labor negotiations?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Nothing would keep it from becoming a part of labor negotiations if this legislation were passed and if labor and management want it to do it.

If, however, either labor or management did not want to do it, it could not be a part of their collective-bargaining agreement.

Mr. WINN. Let us say that one of the two parties did not want to do it but the other one did. Then it certainly would become a part of the labor negotiations?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No; it would not.

Mr. WINN. I think the gentleman is kidding himself—

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is not kidding himself. The gentleman has studied this law, and prides himself at least on understanding what this bill provides.

Mr. WINN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) referred to remarks by Assistant Secretary W. J. Usery, Jr., in which he said that unions might prevent desirable improvements in construc-

tion methods and material. I wondered if the gentleman is aware of the case decided by the State of Missouri Supreme Court where the Plumbers and Pipefitters Unions would not use, and refused to use plastic pipes and they were taken to court. The Builder's Association and the Home Builders Association and the unions spent a great deal of money in going to the Supreme Court to get the decision that plastic pipe was an acceptable new method of technology in the building field.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, I am familiar with that case, and the Court decided against the union. The law exists now which can prohibit such activities. This would not change it in the slightest. All this would allow would be for the development; if the gentleman will yield, all this would do would be to allow the workers in the plastic pipe industry, with their employers, as part of the collective-bargaining process, to establish a trust fund so that they could advertise their product as being better than some other product.

Mr. WINN. I think it is a little obvious that in this case the unions did not want to do that and did everything possible to obstruct the new technology. I hope the gentleman is aware of the housing program called Operation Breakthrough, in which the whole philosophy is to have new technologies and new techniques to streamline the construction industry.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is very much aware of it, and the gentleman considers and is convinced that the adoption of this legislation would go very far toward promoting a new and innovative means of construction and advertising.

Mr. WINN. Could the gentleman advise me, then, if this is going to accomplish everything that he says it is going to accomplish, why the other body has not taken it up over the periods of time indicated?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. You know, the gentleman from New Jersey is extremely confused by the action and lack of action in many instances in the other body, but I can assure the gentleman that the appropriate subcommittee of the other body only last week reported this out, as did the full committee in the other body.

Mr. WINN. Will the gentleman advise me, then, what his own personal feelings, might be if possible, in relation to having both the unions and management contribute equally to this promotion fund?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They will.

Mr. WINN. May I ask the gentleman how he figures that they will?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes, in this sense: To use an analogy that would be familiar, industry's part would be reflected in the cost taken from the dividends to the stockholders. The union's part would be reflected in the moneys taken from their pay envelopes for their contribution.

Mr. WINN. This would enter into labor negotiations again because it goes back to the original process of labor negotiations. Is not that the point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is exactly what we are trying to do. We are trying to make this a permissive subject of collective bargaining, not a mandatory subject.

Mr. WINN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the committee.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important phases of this bill is the jurisdictional situation and what this bill might lead into. I do not think it has been fully discussed or fully evaluated. As we know, in the construction trade we have some very strong unions and some very proud unions. As negotiations would develop, and during open negotiations, we would have these unions trying to strengthen their own position.

This could inevitably lead to more strikes and more litigation and to higher costs of construction. That would, in turn, mean favoritism to one union or another. If we adopt this bill, we are going to have more jurisdictional strikes, which are the worst types of strikes, and we will have more union problems, which will be multiplied and tripled.

Those who are friends of labor and want to keep labor differences to a minimum and want unions to develop and solve their own problems will be opposed to this bill.

There is one other thing I do not understand. This is an advertising fund. As an advertising or promotional fund, whatever we call it, it should be a management fund. Management should look after advertising. It seems no more consistent that we would bring in employees to become half of such a committee, than it would be consistent on matters that relate to union labor relations to have half the committee made up of employers. What concerns employees should be handled by the employee representatives, and what is the prerogative of management should be handled by the employers. As long as we have that, we will have good labor-management relations.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against the bill H.R. 860. I would like to take a few moments to explain why.

The stated purpose of this bill is to amend the Taft-Hartley Act by authorizing employer contributions to trust funds created for the promotion of products in the building and construction industry. On the surface, this appears to be a harmless enough provision. But the real significance of this proposal can be evaluated only in light of the history of labor-management relations in the United States and the original purposes behind the prohibition on joint labor-management funds which is now sought to be modified.

The reason the Taft-Hartley Act prohibited joint funds and activities among employers and employees is precisely because it was too difficult to separate the legitimate, beneficial activities from those in which payoffs, kickbacks, and other underhanded dealing were involved. I do not charge that the purpose of this bill is to encourage such activities

detrimental to employees, but I fear that such might be the bill's effect.

Promotion of an industry's products is so clearly the responsibility of management that it is difficult for me to justify a bill which would allow—and by repealing an existing prohibition actually encourage—employee contributions to industry promotion efforts. Advertising and sales promotion is management's responsibility. I do not believe that we should make employees liable to assessments for such activities, nor do I think we should authorize union leaders to make their members so liable.

I have practiced labor law in Chicago for many years, and I am a longtime friend of the labor movement. I believe that the union leaders in my State of Illinois will certify my credentials in that respect. Based on my experience in the labor field, I believe that this bill will create more problems for union members than it will solve, and that it will subject thousands of union members to assessment for promotional efforts which are really the responsibility of their employers.

At the very least, we should wait—as the Department of Labor has recommended—until the comprehensive study of joint labor-management funds now underway is completed. That study might well provide recommendations for safeguards which would make the kind of joint funds proposed in H.R. 860 less objectionable than in the present bill. Without such safeguards, I must vote "No."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 860

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out "or (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(6)", and by adding immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; or (7) with respect to money or other thing of value paid by any employer of the construction industry to a trust fund established by such representative for the purpose of a joint industry promotional program: Provided, That (a) in relation to a joint industry promotional program such payments as are intended to be used for defraying the cost and expenses thereof are made to a separate trust which provides that the funds held therein cannot be used for any purpose other than for product and product application research and development, product and product application market development, promotion of product and product application with architects, engineers, and Government contracting officials, product and product application public relations, publication of product and product application technical information and data: Provided, That no labor organization or employer shall be required to bargain on the establishment of any such program, and refusal to do so shall not constitute an unfair labor practice. (b) Such funds shall not be commingled with any other funds or used in any manner to share expenses or otherwise defray the cost of programs that are employer or management functions or labor*

organization functions, and that the requirements of clause (B) of the proviso to clause (5) of this subsection shall apply to such trust fund as well as the requirements of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act (except any which the Secretary determines are not applicable to trust funds of the type to which this clause applies)."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 1, lines 4 and 5, substitute (7) for (6) and in line 6, substitute (8) for (7).

On page 2, line 11, after the word "data", insert the following:

"The word 'product', as used herein, means tangible building materials or substances physically incorporated in buildings or other facilities, or the application of such materials as in plastering, lathing, painting, or decorating."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia: Page 1, strike out lines 7 and 8, and insert in lieu thereof "(8) with respect to money paid jointly in equal parts by any employer in the construction industry and its employees or employees' union to a trust fund".

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to serve notice at this time that should this amendment be agreed to and should the bill pass, I will have an amendment to offer to the title which will simply be a conforming amendment in view of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to provide a little bit of equity in this bill. There is an old saying that he who pays the fiddler shall call the tune. I think that is perfectly proper, and I think sometimes it may well be that the interests of management and labor and the means by which these funds may be used may be diverse.

This obviously may be true if we get into more of the prefabricated products, particularly in the construction field. I think perhaps all Members may recall the Philadelphia door case which may be one of the better known cases.

If we are to solve the housing problems in America, we are going to have to adopt innovations and change our laws and building codes throughout the country. In many areas this is going to be resisted by forces that prefer the status quo. But we have a tremendous housing problem in America which is going to require new laws and new codes,

and many of the people who have these particular funds would like to use these in order to promote the changes which would promote the conditions for mass construction of housing.

All this does is simply to state that if there is to be a joint administration of the fund then there shall be joint funding of the fund in coequal parts by the management and by the union. If the union is to have an equal voice then they should have an equal opportunity to participate in funding the fund. It is that simple. I believe perhaps it needs no further explanation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Here again, Mr. Chairman, we are operating on familiar ground. This amendment is almost precisely that offered by my distinguished colleague and friend from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) in 1968. The answer is the same.

It should be pointed out that the amendment really goes against the basic thrust of the Federal labor law, which establishes a legal framework under which private parties can work out their own agreements.

I would point out, under existing law, if the parties so agree in the collective bargaining process—and they do not have to—there is nothing to prohibit a union from contributing to the fund. This legislation simply puts the decision on whether to establish these funds where it belongs, with the parties at the bargaining table.

The effect of such an agreement, I might point out to my friend from Georgia, assuming that there is an agreement by an employer and an employee to negotiate for the establishment of one of these funds, is that it amounts to a fringe benefit for the working people, and a part of their total pay will be deducted because it will be excluded from their compensation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. If this is a fringe benefit, would not the union receive a direct benefit by being able to direct that these funds be paid? Therefore, they would be contributing, so they would have a voice in how it is to be paid.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is making my argument. Of course if they enter into such an agreement they will be paid. One would be totally naive to think that to establish—

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I cannot understand the gentleman's objection to making this a joint participation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Because it is unnecessary.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. If it is unnecessary perhaps the gentleman would accept the amendment, since it is just a matter of form.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is rather proud of, shall we say, the words of art in legislation. This would be redundant and offensive to my sense of draftsmanship.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I do not believe it is necessary to gild the lily and to add a great deal to what the gentleman from New Jersey has said about this amendment, but let me point out the nature of the section we are amending.

Section 302(c) sets up a list of exemptions from the provisions of section 302. Section 302 punishes payments to employees, members of a labor organization or officers of a labor organization and so forth, and section 302(c) sets up the circumstances under which such payments are permitted. It says such payments may be made if they are compensation for services rendered, if they are payment for goods purchased at the regular market value in the course of business, if they are payments for a welfare and pension plan, and so forth.

In none of these exemptions do we say the payment for one of these permitted purposes shall be valid only if matched by a payment of a certain equivalent amount out of the employees' wages.

We leave that question to the collective bargaining process. For instance, we do not validate only pension and welfare funds in to which there are payments from both the employer and the employee. If it is a legal welfare and pension plan, payments to that plan by the employer are permitted whether or not its payments from employee's wages are also made to the plan.

The proposed new exemption is a valid addition to the list of exemptions now found in the law. All section 302 was intended to do was to prevent the payment of bribes. If an employer is paying into a joint industry promotion fund, this is not a bribery situation and therefore it should not be prohibited, and we are right to include it in section 302(c).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia) there were—ayes 15, noes 18.

So the amendment was rejected. The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 860) to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances, pursuant to House Resolution 791, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to. The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHERLE. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHERLE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 860 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 190, noes 186, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—190

Addabbo	Donohue	Koch
Albert	Eckhardt	Kyros
Anderson,	Edmondson	Long, Md.
Calif.	Eilberg	Lowenstein
Anderson,	Erlenborn	Lujan
Tenn.	Esch	McCarthy
Annunzio	Fallon	McDade
Ashley	Fasell	McEwen
Aspinall	Feighan	McKeenly
Ayres	Findley	Macdonald,
Barrett	Ford,	Mass.
Beall, Md.	William D.	MacGregor
Bennett	Fraser	Madden
Bevill	Friedel	Matsunaga
Biaggi	Fulton, Pa.	Meeds
Blester	Garmatz	Melcher
Bingham	Gaydos	Miller, Calif.
Blanton	Gialmo	Mills
Blatnik	Gilbert	Minish
Boggs	Gonzalez	Mink
Bolling	Gray	Mollohan
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Moorhead
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Brooks	Grover	Morse
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Murphy, Ill.
Burke, Mass.	Halpern	Murphy, N.Y.
Burlison, Mo.	Hamilton	Natcher
Burton, Calif.	Hanley	Nedzi
Button	Hansen, Wash.	Nix
Byrne, Pa.	Hastings	Obey
Carey	Hathaway	O'Hara
Celler	Hays	O'Konski
Chisholm	Hechler, W. Va.	Olsen
Clark	Helstoski	O'Neill, Mass.
Clay	Hogan	Ottinger
Cleveland	Hollifield	Patman
Cohelan	Howard	Patten
Conte	Hungate	Pelly
Conyers	Ichord	Perkins
Corbett	Jacobs	Phillbin
Culver	Johnson, Calif.	Pickle
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Pike
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Tenn.	Pirnie
de la Garza	Karth	Podell
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Powell
Dellenback	Kazen	Price, Ill.
Diggs	Kee	
Dingell	Kluczynski	

Pryor, Ark.	Ryan	Tiernan
Pucinski	St Germain	Udall
Quile	St. Onge	Ullman
Railsback	Saylor	Vigorito
Randall	Shipley	Whalen
Rees	Sisk	White
Reid, N.Y.	Skubitz	Widnall
Reuss	Slack	Wilson,
Riegler	Smith, Iowa	Charles H.
Rivers	Smith, N.Y.	Wright
Rodino	Stafford	Wyder
Roe	Staggers	Wyman
Rogers, Colo.	Steed	Yates
Rooney, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.	Yatron
Rooney, Pa.	Stokes	Young
Rosenthal	Stubblefield	Zablocki
Roundbush	Sullivan	Zwach
Rouybal	Thompson, N.J.	

**NAYS—186**

Abernethy	Fountain	Myers
Adair	Frey	Nelsen
Alexander	Fuqua	O'Neal, Ga.
Anderson, Ill.	Gallfanakis	Passman
Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	Pettis
Andrews,	Gibbons	Poage
N. Dak.	Goldwater	Poff
Arends	Goodling	Pollock
Baring	Griffin	Preyer, N.C.
Belcher	Gross	Purcell
Bell, Calif.	Gude	Quillen
Betts	Hagan	Reid, Ill.
Bray	Haley	Reifel
Brinkley	Hall	Rhodes
Brock	Hammer-	Roberts
Broomfield	schmidt	Robison
Brotzman	Hanna	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Idaho	Roth
Broyhill, Va.	Harsha	Ruppe
Buchanan	Harvey	Ruth
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Sandman
Burton, Utah	Hicks	Satterfield
Bush	Horton	Schadeberg
Byrnes, Wis.	Hosmer	Scherle
Caffery	Hull	Schneebeil
Camp	Hunt	Schwengel
Carter	Hutchinson	Scott
Casey	Jarman	Sebelius
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Chamberlain	Jonas	Sikes
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Keith	Snyder
Clausen,	King	Springer
Don H.	Kleppe	Stanton
Clawson, Del	Kuykendall	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Kyl	Stephens
Collins	Landgrebe	Stuckey
Colmer	Langen	Symington
Conable	Latta	Taft
Coughlin	Lennon	Talcott
Cowger	Long, La.	Taylor
Crane	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Daniel, Va.	McClary	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, Ga.	McCloskey	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McClure	Utt
Denney	McDonald,	Waggonner
Dennis	Mich.	Waldie
Derwinski	McMillan	Wampler
Devine	Mahon	Watkins
Dickinson	Marsh	Watson
Dorn	Martin	Watts
Dowdy	Mathias	Weicker
Downing	May	Whalley
Duncan	Mayne	Whitehurst
Edwards, Ala.	Meskill	Whitten
Edwards, La.	Michel	Wiggins
Evans, Colo.	Mikva	Williams
Fish	Miller, Ohio	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Minshall	Winn
Flowers	Mize	Wold
Flynt	Mizell	Wylie
Foley	Montgomery	Zion
Ford, Gerald R.	Morton	
Foreman	Mosher	

**NOT VOTING—56**

Abbutt	Eshleman	Mailliard
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Mann
Ashbrook	Farbstein	Monagan
Berry	Flood	Moss
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Nichols
Boland	Fulton, Tenn.	Pepper
Bow	Gallagher	Price, Tex.
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Rarick
Broyhill, N.C.	Harrington	Rostenkowski
Burke, Fla.	Hawkins	Scheuer
Cabell	Hébert	Stratton
Corman	Heckler, Mass.	Teague, Calif.
Cramer	Kirwan	Tunney
Cunningham	Landrum	Van Deerlin
Dawson	Leggett	Vander Jagt
Dent	Lipscomb	Vanik
Dulski	Lloyd	Wolf
Dwyer	McCulloch	Wyatt
Edwards, Calif.	McFall	

So the bill was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Mann against.  
Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Rarick against.  
Mr. Wolf for, with Mr. Moss against.  
Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Cramer against.  
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.  
Mrs. Heckler for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.  
Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Vander Jagt against.  
Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.  
Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Berry against.  
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Abbutt against.  
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Nichols against.  
Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Cabell against.  
Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Blackburn against.  
Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.  
Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Until further notice:  
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Bow.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Teague of California.  
Mr. Boland with Mr. Cunningham.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Wyatt.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Stratton.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Dawson.

Messrs. EDWARDS of Louisiana, BELL of California, SPRINGER, BROTZMAN, and STANTON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE VERSUS PRESIDENTIAL VETO**

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic steering committee met this afternoon, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Democratic steering committee.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the President has vetoed the Labor-HEW appropriations bill on grounds that it is \$1.26 billion above his budget request;

Whereas Congress has acted responsibly in the fight against inflation by reducing the Administration's appropriations budget for Fiscal 1970 by \$5.6 billion;

Whereas the President has refused to utilize the new anti-inflationary authority provided by Congress last session;

Whereas adequate funding of programs to meet our nation's pressing education and health needs must be given top priority;

Whereas a majority of Republicans as well as four out of five Democratic Members recognized the priority needs of education and health by voting in support of the increased funds disapproved by the President;

Whereas a reduction in these funds would be especially detrimental to the educational needs of American children, college students, health research and would also necessitate school closings or local property tax increases in many jurisdictions; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Democratic steering committee strongly urges that the veto of the President be overridden.

RAY J. MADDEN,  
Chairman, Democratic Steering Committee.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution was passed unanimously by the Democratic steering committee.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1969, on rollcall No. 288, on the Gross amendment to delete authorization for study of extending District of Columbia rapid transit to Dulles Airport, I was in my district on official business and missed the vote. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

Also, on this same date, on rollcall No. 289, on passage of the bill to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, I would have voted "yes."

Also on November 24, on rollcall No. 290, on passage of the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia, I would have voted "yes."

And further, Mr. Speaker, I was absent on December 20 and December 22 for the purpose of returning to Alabama to attend the funeral of Mrs. Carlton Betenbaugh, wife of my longtime friend and staff member.

On December 20, on rollcall No. 345, on the Conte motion to recommit the conference report on H.R. 15149 with instructions to delete funds for supplying Nationalist China with a squadron of fighter planes, I would have voted "no."

On December 22, on rollcall No. 350, on the adoption of the conference report on the fiscal 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill, I would have voted "yes."

**DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-216)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, H.R. 13111, an Act, "Making Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1970, and for Other Purposes."

The issue is not whether some of us are for education and health programs and others against.

There are no goals which I consider more important for this nation than to improve education and to provide better health care for the American people.

The question is how much can the Federal Government afford to spend on those programs this year?

The enrolled bill is \$1.3 billion over my budget request for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW).

It is the largest increase over my budget recommendations of any appropriations bill for 1970.

It is the largest excess over a Presidential request ever provided by the Congress for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have taken this action for four reasons:

*One*, these increases are excessive in a period of serious inflationary pressures. We must draw the line and stick to it if we are to stabilize the economy.

*Two*, nearly nine-tenths of these increases is for *mandatory* programs which leave the Executive Branch no discretion whatever either as to the level or the purpose of the added expenditures. This fact sharply differentiates this appropriation from other inflated measures that I have approved.

*Three*, the added funds are largely for lower priority programs.

*Four*, because of the lateness in the fiscal year, increases of this magnitude cannot be used effectively in many cases.

#### DEFICITS FEED INFLATION

The inflation we have at the start of the Seventies was caused by heavy deficit spending in the Sixties. In the past decade, the Federal Government spent more than it took in—\$57 billion more. These deficits caused prices to rise 25% in a decade.

That is why I ordered Federal spending cut this year.

In April 1969, I reduced the 1970 budget proposed by President Johnson by \$4 billion. In July, I cut another \$3.5 billion. Seventy-five percent of new direct Federal construction projects were deferred.

But Congress increased other spending by three and a half billion dollars.

#### PRIORITIES HAVE BEEN REASSESSED

Of the \$7.5 billion reduction I proposed for 1970, \$4.1 billion was in defense spending. We are reducing defense spending to the minimum consistent with our national security. Defense spending went down from 1969 to 1970. It will go down again in 1971.

HEW spending is rising. Outlays for the Department are presently estimated to increase in fiscal 1970 by \$6.1 billion above 1969, a 13% rise. They will increase further in 1971.

For the first time in twenty years, next year's budget will provide more funds for human resources than for defense.

#### THE FISCAL 1970 BUDGET

For the Congress and the Nation to understand my decision on the HEW appropriations, I must report today on current budget estimates for fiscal year 1970.

There are essentially two kinds of Federal Government spending:

—*uncontrollables*, which are already committed either because a program is automatic or because contracts were let before the fiscal year began and now payment is due; and

—*controllables*, where budget decisions can be made to have programs reduced or eliminated to hold spending down.

Although we made deep cuts in "controllables" in 1970, the overruns in "uncontrollables" have fully absorbed these cuts and now far exceed them.

The original spending ceiling set by the Congress in July was \$191.9 billion, plus \$2 billion allowance for designated uncontrollables. Actions taken by the Congress since then, and those now anticipated, would increase the ceiling another \$1.8 billion. The result is an automatically revised Congressional ceiling of \$195.7 billion.

It is the "uncontrollable" outlays—driven upward by the very inflationary forces we were trying to contain—that have frustrated the efforts of both the Executive and the Congress to hold down spending.

Since I submitted my budget estimates in April, interest on the public debt has increased \$1.5 billion. Spending for health insurance has increased \$7 billion, in large part because inflation requires us to pay higher hospital and doctor bills for the senior citizens entitled to care.

Taking into account all the changes which we can presently assess, we now estimate 1970 outlays at close to \$198 billion, more than \$2 billion in excess of the ceiling. All of this overrun is attributable to "uncontrollables."

We faced these difficult budgetary facts of life in preparing the 1971 budget which I will send to the Congress on February 2. I will submit a budget for fiscal 1971 which will sharply reduce "spending momentum," evidence of my determination to restore price stability.

#### THE DECISION ON H.R. 13111

Confronted with these budget overruns in 1970, I reached my decision in December to veto the HEW appropriation unless it was reduced by the Congress, and publicly stated my position.

Over four-fifths of the increase in H.R. 13111 is for education. Even without this large increase in education funds, the Federal Government in 1970 will spend over \$10 billion for education—the most in our history. We care deeply about the need to improve our Nation's schools. But we must ask two questions:

*First*, will the \$1.1 billion which the Congress added for education go to those who need it most?

*Second*, will it increase the quality of American education? This is the appropriate role of the Federal Government in a system in which Federal aid for public schools is 8% of the \$40 billion total spent by State and local governments.

My answer is that these congressional increases do not target the scarce resources of the Federal Government in ways I can accept in this period of budget stringency. I must veto H.R. 13111.

Schools have as much at stake as anyone in our efforts to curb inflation. As an official of a major school system recently wrote: "the Cost-of-Education Index makes it abundantly clear that inflation itself is far more damaging than any of the attempts to bring it under control."

Another 6% rise in prices this year would add more than \$2¼ billion to the costs of public schools without any improvements in either quality or quantity. Twice as much as the \$1.1 billion in increases for education proposed by the Congress will be swept away if we do not hold firm in our resolve to curb inflation.

#### IMPACTED AREAS AID

Nearly \$400 million of the HEW increase would be for grants to schools in federally-impacted areas. In 1968, this program paid \$5.8 million to the Nation's richest county (which had a population of 500,000) and a total of \$3.2 million to the 100 poorest counties (with a combined population of over 3 million).

For many school districts, these payments exceed the cost to local schools of educating the children of Federal employees. Often, the program enables wealthy districts to exert a lower tax effort than other districts in the same State.

Four successive Presidents have tried to reduce or reorient this program. Yet the Congress in this bill not only perpetuates this unfair program, it adds money to it. It is wrong to sharply increase the impacted school aid program in the face of the need to make long-overdue reforms in this law. The Administration will make recommendations for reform of this program based on a study requested by the Congress. I will submit these recommendations shortly.

#### EXCESSIVE INCREASES

The Conference Bill would increase the 1970 budget by \$575 million for vocational education, equipment and other categorical education grants, and for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This is a 34% increase over the 1969 appropriations for these programs. In 1970, these increases—some for worthy programs—are just too large. Moreover, they come at a critical time in the development of education policy. The present system of Federal aid to education is much too inflexible; it frustrates planning by local officials and the development of creative new programs. Results—in terms of improved student performance—have fallen far short of our expectations.

That is why in my education message which I will shortly be submitting to the Congress I will propose a new and searching look at our American school system.

We are placing new and strong emphasis on experimentation and evaluation to learn about more effective approaches to education. We have undertaken a thorough review of the Title I program for disadvantaged children to repair its deficiencies. I have proposed consolidation of grant authorizations to give States and localities more flexibility and responsibility for action. I will recommend other actions in the coming weeks.

#### INEFFICIENT USE OF LIMITED FEDERAL RESOURCES

The Conference Bill provides \$100 million in Federal appropriations for college construction grants and capital contributions for National Defense Stu-

dent Loan funds above my request. For both construction and college student aid, the Congress has already authorized Federal interest subsidies for loans by private lenders. This is a much more efficient method of financing, which takes advantage of the loan placement and collection machinery of private lending institutions, while reserving Federal appropriations for other purposes where loans cannot be used.

#### FAILURE TO RECOGNIZE PRIORITIES

At the same time that the Congress was adding large amounts to these existing education support programs, it refused to vote the \$25 million I requested for innovation in elementary and secondary education. These funds would have been used to develop and test promising approaches for improving student achievement—such as new ways to teach reading and the use of older children to teach younger children.

The refusal to grant these modest research and development funds comes at a time when the Nation is devoting less than one-half of one percent of its total investment in education to research. We do not know enough about how to get more for our education dollars; we must intensify our efforts to find out.

#### THE PROBLEM OF CONGRESSIONAL DELAY

The lateness of congressional action on the appropriations for HEW creates serious problems.

School budgets are prepared in the early months of a calendar year. Teachers are customarily employed in the Spring and early Summer before academic sessions begin in September. Large, unplanned Federal grants coming only a few months before the close of the year will, if experience is a guide, be used disproportionately to substitute for other school revenues and to make hasty purchases, not essential for school improvement.

The Nation has had bitter experience with the waste of large amounts allocated to education late in the school year. This was particularly true in the first year of funding for Title I. Money to help educate poor children went—not for teachers and well-planned programs—but often for unneeded equipment. A pattern of spending was established that has plagued this program ever since, creating management and operational problems that are still unsolved.

Not only does late funding result in waste when a full year's appropriation is crammed into three or four months, it also creates a spending rate bulge. This is the kind of "on-again, off-again" relationship with States and localities that we are trying to avoid, because it hampers intelligent community planning.

#### MISDIRECTED HEALTH FUNDS

For HEW in 1970, the Congress also added \$104 million above my request to the Hill-Burton appropriation for grants to build and modernize community hospitals. This increase was voted despite the growing awareness that a more pressing need is to fund ambulatory care facilities which offer an alternative to expensive hospital care. This is what was proposed to the Congress last April. While this point is recognized in the report of the Senate Appropriations

Committee, the appropriation bill itself allocates most of the increased funds to grants for lower priority purposes rather than for needed out-patient facilities.

For hospital construction, the Administration has recommended legislation authorizing guaranteed loans, which would create a program much more responsive to today's needs. Combined with the reimbursement formulas for construction under Medicare and Medicaid, this approach is efficient and equitable, and avoids having the Federal Government pay twice for hospital beds.

The amounts added by the Congress for health research represent less than one-half of 1% of the total appropriation. Taken separately, I would not have vetoed these increases. On the contrary, when the budget for 1971 is submitted to the Congress it will make a strongly increased commitment for health research, where advances can be made to serve the health needs of the Nation—cancer, heart disease, population research and environmental health.

#### FORCED SPENDING

Nearly nine-tenths of this congressional increase—about \$1.1 billion—is for *mandator* programs. The Executive Branch would have no control over these appropriations once H.R. 13111 was signed into law.

Left without any latitude in these areas, we may be faced with the need to make offsetting and disproportionate reductions in high-priority programs. Because so much of the budget at this time of the year is already committed, the areas remaining where offsetting reductions can be made are limited. To a disturbing degree, they consist of health service programs, scientific research, manpower training, food and nutrition, and other programs that continue to be identified by the Administration and the Congress as vital to the Nation's needs.

#### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY EARMARKING

One issue remains to be dealt with that has arisen since my decision of last December to veto H.R. 13111. I am very concerned about a provision which was struck from the bill last week. The effect of this action would be to require the Executive to allocate funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) according to specific earmarks.

The amount available for OEO programs is *not* at issue. Rather, the issue is the effective use of resources.

To set requirements upon the use of OEO funds with less than 5 months of the fiscal year left will disrupt many of its programs. We will be forced to increase some programs well beyond planned spending levels and to make damaging reductions in others, particularly Head Start, Legal Services, VISTA, JOBS, and programs for migrants and senior citizens.

I ask the Congress to reconsider its action, and restore the flexibility necessary to enable OEO to use its funds to the best advantage of the poor. The Congress will shortly begin its review of my 1971 budget recommendations. This will provide an opportunity for a timely and orderly examination of the objectives of OEO, its performance and program levels.

#### WHAT NEXT?

I have vetoed this bill because the increases for HEW voted by the Congress are mandatory, and because in the context of present efforts to curb inflation they are misdirected and excessive.

If the veto is sustained, I will immediately seek appropriations which will assure the funds necessary to provide for the needs of the nation in education and health. No school will need to be closed, no child need have his education interrupted or impaired as a result of this veto action.

Another approach to a solution would be for the Congress to remove the requirement in the law that all formula grant funds must be spent, leaving it to the Executive Branch to take the necessary action. (In its actions setting ceilings on obligations and expenditures for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, the Congress provided such flexibility.)

Provision must also be made so that impacted area aid funds are not cut off for hardship-case school districts. Until we come to agreement on a basic reform of this program, I believe we should work out a temporary solution which involves full funding for children whose parents live and work on Federal installations and partial funding for children whose parents do not live on Federal installations. In addition, I favor a specific "No Hardship Clause" which will guarantee that no school district will, as a result of these changes in the impacted school aid program, have a school budget less than 95% of what it had in 1969.

In working together to resolve this appropriations problem, care must be taken to avoid the extreme rhetoric which freezes positions. All Americans are "for schools" and "against inflation." The suggestions which I have made will do much to meet both objectives.

I believe this action is in the long-range interests of better programs for education and health. Above all, it is in the vital interests of all Americans in stopping the rise in the cost of living.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 26, 1970.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is: Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill H.R. 13111, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further consideration of the veto message from the President be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is recognized on his motion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have made this motion to postpone after consultation with the leadership of both sides of the aisle.

This is a matter of great importance to the country and to all Members. Deferral

of action on the veto message until tomorrow will give Members the opportunity to study closely the veto message of the President.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Speaking for our side of the aisle, the gentleman is accurate. We are in full concurrence with the motion made by the gentleman from Texas.

I should like to ask this: Is our understanding correct that this will be the first order of business tomorrow?

Mr. MAHON. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state, this is highly privileged business and it will be the first order of legislative business tomorrow.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I assume that on tomorrow there will be 1 hour of discussion on the veto message.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And is it the intention of the distinguished gentleman to, as nearly equitably as possible, divide the time?

Mr. MAHON. An effort will be made to be fair with all Members in the division of time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FEDERAL GRAND JURY TO RECEIVE EVIDENCE OF ALLEGED POSTAL FRAUD INVOLVING PUBLISHERS OF LOOK

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to a grand jury investigation scheduled to begin in Des Moines, Iowa, on February 17, 1970. On that date, the U.S. postal inspection service, in concert with the Justice Department's Criminal Division, will begin to present evidence and testimony relating to allegations of postal fraud involving magazine subscription sales agencies wholly owned by Cowles Communications, Inc., publishers of Look magazine.

The grand jury will examine sales practices of five subscription agencies, all owned by Cowles, whose selling practices I have criticized throughout the past year. At issue in the investigation are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of magazine subscription contracts sold by the five Cowles subsidiaries over a period of years.

I expect that the grand jury will be asked to return indictments of key corporate officials on criminal charges of postal fraud. I am pleased that a substantial portion of the information which will be presented to this grand jury has derived from an investigation

carried out in my congressional office within the past 12 months.

This postal fraud investigation is part of a two-prong Federal crackdown on unscrupulous practices in magazine subscription sales. Never, until now, has the industry been subjected to such an in-depth examination of its modus operandi. This type of investigation was long overdue and I am pleased that my own inquiry could provide the spark that set the fire.

Many examples of consumer trickery which exist today in magazine selling have been industry hallmarks for more than 30 years. Millions of American consumers have been victimized, often without ever discovering that they were.

Deception and fraud have become so commonplace in magazine selling that many industry personnel have begun to question whether magazine selling in some of its forms can survive. I am concerned in only one respect—if the industry is to survive, honesty must replace trickery as the magazine sales industry's hallmark.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter from Chief Postal Inspector W. J. Cotter relating to this matter. Because certain statements require confidential treatment, I have deleted one sentence and part of another.

The letter follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1969.

HON. FRED B. ROONEY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: Thank you for your letter of November 26, 1969, concerning our investigation of Cowles Communications, Inc., Des Moines, Iowa (our file 242-82003-F).

I want you to know that I appreciate very much your interest and cooperation in this investigation and the assistance rendered Postal Inspector G. L. Ludtke. He has told me of the valuable information made available by your staff. I appreciate also your generous remarks regarding the Inspector's attention to this very complex and involved investigation.

As you are no doubt aware, Inspector Ludtke visited Headquarters this week and briefed us on his investigation to date, preparatory to interviews with certain magazine dealers to be conducted in your office. During his visit, arrangements were also made for a conference with officials in the Criminal Division, Department of Justice, so that all phases of the investigative and prosecutive processes might be coordinated.

Inspector Ludtke has had this matter under investigation for some time and made an initial formal presentation of the facts and evidence to the U.S. Attorney at Des Moines on May 20, 1969. Additional reports have subsequently been furnished, based on further evidence developed during the investigation.

As you suggest, we have no control over the scheduling of Grand Jury hearings or other steps in prosecutive proceedings, this being a prerogative of the U.S. Attorney. However, because of . . . the extensive testimony that may well be required, Grand Jury presentation will prove a formidable and time-consuming task.

These and other factors were discussed in our conference at the Department of Justice and we have been assured that all possible assistance will be rendered Mr. Donelson.

Sincerely,

W. J. COTTER,  
Chief Postal Inspector.

#### AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT AND INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING ACT TO CONVERT CRIMINAL PENALTIES TO CIVIL PENALTIES

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, I have today introduced a bill "to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to convert criminal penalties to civil penalties in certain instances, and for other purposes." For the information of the Members of the House, I insert at this point in the RECORD a statement of purposes and need for this bill as submitted by the Commission Chairman:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES AND NEED FOR THE BILL TO AMEND THE SHIPPING ACT, 1916, AND THE INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING ACT, 1933, TO CHANGE CERTAIN CRIMINAL PENALTIES TO CIVIL PENALTIES, AND AUTHORIZE THE COMMISSION TO ASSESS CIVIL PENALTIES

The bill would change the penalties of section 16 (except for paragraphs First and Third) of the Act from criminal penalties to civil penalties, with the money amounts of the penalties to remain unchanged. It also changes the general penalty provision of section 32 of the Act by making all violations of sections under the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Commission, for which no penalty is specifically provided, civil instead of criminal. Authority would be vested in the Commission to fix the amount of civil penalties for violations of sections subject to its jurisdiction. Penalties assessed by the Commission would be remitted or mitigated by it under appropriate circumstances pursuant to the Federal Claims Collection Act of 1966, 31 U.S.C. 951-953, and regulations promulgated thereunder. Since the bill would authorize the Commission to assess civil penalties, sections 15 and 18(b)(6) would be amended to eliminate the words "to be recovered by the United States in a civil action."

As the Act now stands, civil penalties are imposed for violations of section 15, which requires the filing for approval of agreements restricting competition, and of section 18(b), which requires the filing of tariffs. However, the penalties of section 14, which prohibits deferred rebates and other unfair practices, and section 16, which prohibits false billing and undue preferences, are criminal.

The Commission believes that better administration of the Act will be derived from making certain of the penalties under section 16 and penalties under section 32 civil and empowering the Commission to determine and adjudge such penalties. The Commission determinations under these sections are subject to judicial review in a United States Court of Appeals under the Review Act of 1950 (28 U.S.C. 2341 *et seq.*). This would eliminate the necessity of a *de novo* district court penalty suit as is presently required and would enable the Commission to relate the amount of the penalty directly to the nature and circumstances of the violation. Such a procedure should, in many instances, reduce the total litigation expenses to both the government and private parties while at the same time retaining the safeguards of justice through the reviewability of Commission decisions in U.S. Courts of Appeals.

Section 2 of the bill would give the Commission authority to assess the civil penalties presently provided for violations of the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933.

## TECHNOLOGY AND POPULATION CONTROL

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the problem of insuring that the basic necessities of life—including a healthy environment—will be adequate to meet the needs of the population of the world in the years ahead is one of the central issues of our time. It is particularly crucial that we not be misled by proposed technological panaceas from confronting the environmental challenge while there is still time for an effective response.

The December 1969 issue of *BioScience* carried an exceptionally perceptive article on this subject by Paul R. Ehrlich and John P. Holdren, both scientists at Stanford University. Titled "Population and Panaceas: A Technological Perspective," this study argues convincingly that technological advancements will not be able to provide an adequate supply of food and water for the people of the world in view of current rates of population growth.

The authors conclude that we must place greater emphasis upon programs of population control now, if we are to avoid disastrous shortages in human needs within a few decades.

The article follows:

## POPULATION AND PANACEAS: A TECHNOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

(By Paul R. Ehrlich and John P. Holdren\*)

Today more than one billion human beings are either undernourished or malnourished and the human population is growing at a rate of 2% per year. The existing and impending crises in human nutrition and living conditions are well-documented but not widely understood. In particular, there is a tendency among the public, nurtured on Sunday-supplement conceptions of technology, to believe that science has the situation well in hand—that farming the sea and the tropics, irrigating the deserts, and generating cheap nuclear power in abundance hold the key to swift and certain solution of the problem. To espouse this belief is to misjudge the present severity of the situation, the disparate time scales on which technological progress and population growth operate, and the vast complexity of the problems beyond mere food production posed by population pressures. Unfortunately, scientists and engineers have themselves often added to the confusion by failing to distinguish between that which is merely theoretically feasible, and that which is economically and logistically practical.

As we will show here, man's present technology is inadequate to the task of maintaining the world's burgeoning billions, even under the most optimistic assumptions. Furthermore, technology is likely to remain inadequate until such time as the population growth rate is drastically reduced. This is not to assert that present efforts to "revolutionize" tropical agriculture, increased yields of fisheries, desalt water for irrigation, exploit new power sources, and implement related projects are not worthwhile. They may be. They could also easily produce the ultimate disaster for mankind if they are not applied with careful attention to their effects on the ecological systems necessary for our survival (Woodwell, 1967; Cole, 1968). And even if such projects are initiated with unprecedented levels of staffing and expenditures,

without population control they are doomed to fall far short. No effort to expand the carrying capacity of the Earth can keep pace with unbridled population growth.

To support these contentions, we summarize briefly the present lopsided balance sheet in the population/food accounting. We then examine the logistics, economics, and possible consequences of some technological schemes which have been proposed to help restore the balance, or, more ambitiously, to permit the maintenance of human populations much larger than today's. The most pertinent aspects of the balance are:

(1) The world population reached 3.5 billion in mid-1968, with an annual increment of approximately 70 million people (itself increasing) and a doubling time on the order of 35 years (Population Reference Bureau, 1968).

(2) Of this number of people, at least one-half billion are undernourished (deficient in calories or, more succinctly, slowly starving), and approximately an additional billion are malnourished (deficient in particular nutrients, mostly protein) (Borgstrom, 1965; Sukhatme, 1966). Estimates of the number actually perishing annually from starvation begin at 4 million and go up (Ehrlich, 1968) and depend in part on official definitions of starvation which conceal the true magnitude of hunger's contribution to the death rate (Lelyveld, 1968).

(3) Merely to maintain present inadequate nutrition levels, the food requirements of Asia, Africa, and Latin America will, conservatively, increase by 26% in the 10-year period measured from 1965 to 1975 (Paddock and Paddock, 1967). World food production must double in the period if 1965-2000 to stay even; it must triple if nutrition is to be brought up to minimum requirements.

## FOOD PRODUCTION

That there is insufficient additional, good quality agricultural land available in the world to meet these needs is so well documented (Borgstrom, 1965) that we will not belabor the point here. What hope there is must rest with increasing yields on land presently cultivated, bringing marginal land into production, more efficiently exploiting the sea, and bringing less conventional methods of food production to fruition. In all these areas, science and technology play a dominant role. While space does not permit even a cursory look at all the proposals on these topics which have been advanced in recent years, a few representative examples illustrate our points.

*Conventional Agriculture.* Probably the most widely recommended means of increasing agricultural yields is through the more intensive use of fertilizers. Their production is a straightforward, and a good deal is known about their effective application, although, as with many technologies we consider here, the environmental consequences of heavy fertilizer use are ill understood and potentially dangerous<sup>1</sup> (Wadleigh, 1968). But even ignoring such problems, we find staggering difficulties barring the implementation of fertilizer technology on the scale required. In this regard the accomplishments of countries such as Japan and the Netherlands are often cited as offering hope to the underdeveloped world. Some perspective on this point is afforded by noting that if India were to apply fertilizer at the per capita level employed by the Netherlands, her fertilizer needs would be nearly half the present world output (United Nations, 1968).

On a more realistic plane, we note that although the goal for nitrogen fertilizer production in 1971 under India's fourth 5-year plan is 2.4 million metric tons (Anonymous, 1968a), Raymond Ewell (who has served as fertilizer production adviser to the Indian government for the past 12 years) suggests that less than 1.1 million metric tons is a more probable figure for that date.<sup>2</sup> Ewell cites poor plant maintenance, raw materials

shortages, and power and transportation breakdowns as contributing to continued low production by existing Indian plants. Moreover, even when fertilizer is available, increases in productivity do not necessarily follow. In parts of the underdeveloped world lack of farm credit is limiting fertilizer distribution; elsewhere, internal transportation systems are inadequate to the task. Nor can the problem of educating farmers on the advantages and techniques of fertilizer use be ignored. A recent study (Parikh et al., 1968) of the Intensive Agriculture District Program in the Surat district of Gujarat, India (in which scientific fertilizer use was to have been a major ingredient) notes that "on the whole, the performance of adjoining districts which have similar climate but did not enjoy relative preference of input supply was as good as, if not better than, the programme district. . . . A particularly disheartening feature is that the farm production plans, as yet, do not carry any educative value and have largely failed to convince farmers to use improved practices in their proper combinations."

As a second example of a panacea in the realm of conventional agriculture, mention must be given to the development of new high-yield or high-protein strains of food crops. That such strains have the potential of making a major contribution to the food supply of the world is beyond doubt, but this potential is limited in contrast to the potential for population growth, and will be realized too slowly to have anything but a small impact on the immediate crisis. There are major difficulties impeding the widespread use of new high-yield grain varieties. Typically, the new grains require high fertilizer inputs to realize their full potential, and thus are subject to all the difficulties mentioned above. Some other problems were identified in a recent address by Lester R. Brown, administrator of the International Agricultural Development Service: the limited amount of irrigated land suitable for the new varieties, the fact that a farmer's willingness to innovate fluctuates with the market prices (which may be driven down by high-yield crops), and the possibility of tieups at market facilities inadequate for handling increased yields.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps even more important, the new grain varieties are being rushed into production without adequate field testing, so that we are unsure of how resistant they will be to the attacks of insects and plant diseases. William Paddock has presented a plant pathologist's view of the crash programs to shift to new varieties (Paddock, 1967). He describes India's dramatic program of planting improved Mexican wheat, and continues: "Such a rapid switch to a new variety is clearly understandable in a country that tottered on the brink of famine. Yet with such limited testing, one wonders what unknown pathogens await a climate change which will give the environmental conditions needed for their growth." Introduction of the new varieties creates enlarged monocultures of plants with essentially unknown levels of resistance to disaster. Clearly, one of the prices that is paid for higher yield is a higher risk of widespread catastrophe. And the risks are far from local: since the new varieties require more "input" of pesticides (with all their deleterious ecological side effects), these crops may ultimately contribute to the defeat of other environment-related panaceas, such as extracting larger amounts of food from the sea.

A final problem must be mentioned in connection with these strains of food crops. In general, the hungriest people in the world are also those with the most conservative food habits. Even rather minor changes, such as that from a rice variety in which the cooked grains stick together to one in which the grains fall apart, may make new foods unacceptable. It seems to be an unhappy

Footnotes at end of article.

fact of human existence that people would rather starve than eat a nutritious substance which they do not recognize as food.<sup>4</sup>

Beyond the economic, ecological, and sociological problems already mentioned in connection with high-yield agriculture, there is the overall problem of time. We need time to breed the desired characteristics of yield and hardness into a vast array of new strains (a tedious process indeed), time to convince farmers that it is necessary that they change their time-honored ways of cultivation, and time to convince hungry people to change the staples of their diet. The Paddocks give 20 years as the "rule of thumb" for a new technique or plant variety to progress from conception to substantial impact on farming (Paddock and Paddock, 1967). They write: "It is true that a massive research attack on the problem could bring some striking results in less than 20 years. But I do not find such an attack remotely contemplated in the thinking of those officials capable of initiating it." Promising as high-yield agriculture may be, the funds, the personnel, the ecological expertise, and the necessary years are unfortunately not at our disposal. Fulfillment of the promise will come too late for many of the world's starving millions, if it comes at all.

*Bringing More Land Under Cultivation.* The most frequently mentioned means of bringing new land into agricultural production are farming the tropics and irrigating arid and semiarid regions. The former, although widely discussed in optimistic terms, has been tried for years with incredibly poor results, and even recent experiments have not been encouraging. One essential difficulty is the unsuitability of tropical soils for supporting typical foodstuffs instead of jungles (McNeil, 1964; Paddock and Paddock, 1964). Also, "the tropics" are a biologically more diverse area than the temperate zones, so that farming technology developed for one area will all too often prove useless in others. We shall see that irrigating the deserts, while more promising, has serious limitations in terms of scale, cost, and lead time.

The feasible approaches to irrigation of arid lands appear to be limited to large-scale water projects involving dams and transport in canals, and desalination of ocean and brackish water. Supplies of usable ground water are already badly depleted in most areas where they are accessible, and natural recharge is low enough in most arid regions that such supplies do not offer a long-term solution in any case. Some recent statistics will give perspective to the discussion of water projects and desalting which follows. In 1966, the United States was using about 300 billion gal of water per day, of which 135 billion gal were consumed by agriculture and 165 billion gal by municipal and industrial users (Sporn, 1966). The bulk of the agricultural water cost the farmer from 5 to 10 cents/1000 gal; the highest price paid for agricultural water was 15 cents/1000 gal. For small industrial and municipal supplies, prices as high as 50 to 70 cents/1000 gal were prevalent in the U.S. arid regions, and some communities in the Southwest were paying on the order of \$1.00/1000 gal for "project" water. The extremely high cost of the latter stems largely from transportation costs, which have been estimated at 5 to 15 cents/1000 gal per 100 miles (International Atomic Energy Agency, 1964).

We now examine briefly the implications of such numbers in considering the irrigation of the deserts. The most ambitious water project yet conceived in this country is the North American Water and Power Alliance, which proposes to distribute water from the great rivers of Canada to thirsty locations all over the United States. Formidable political problems aside (some based on the certainty that in the face of expanding popula-

tions, demands for water will eventually arise at the source), this project would involve the expenditure of \$100 billion in construction costs over a 20-year completion period. At the end of this time, the yield to the United States would be 69 million acre feet of water annually (Kelly, 1966), or 63 billion gal per day. If past experience with massive water projects is any guide, these figures are overoptimistic; but if we assume they are not, it is instructive to note that this monumental undertaking would provide for an increase of only 21% in the water consumption of the United States, during a period in which the population is expected to increase by between 25 and 43% (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, 1966). To assess the possible contribution to the world food situation, we assume that all this water could be devoted to agriculture, although extrapolation of present consumption patterns indicates that only about one-half would be. Then using the rather optimistic figure of 500 gal per day to grow the food to feed one person, we find that this project could feed 126 million additional people. Since this is less than 8% of the projected world population growth during the construction period (say 1970 to 1990), it should be clear that even the most massive water projects can make but a token contribution to the solution of the world food problem in the long term. And in the crucial short term—the years preceding 1980—no additional people will be fed by projects still on the drawing board today.

In summary, the cost is staggering, the scale insufficient, and the lead time too long. Nor need we resort to such speculation about the future for proof of the failure of technological "solutions" in the absence of population control. The highly touted and very expensive Aswan Dam project now nearing completion, will ultimately supply food (at the present miserable diet level) for less than Egypt's population growth during the time of construction (Borgstrom, 1965; Cole, 1968). Furthermore, its effect on the fertility of the Nile Delta may be disastrous, and, as with all water projects of this nature, siltling of the reservoir will destroy the gains in the long term (perhaps in 100 years).

Desalting for irrigation suffers somewhat similar limitations. The desalting plants operational in the world today produce water at individual rates of 7.5 million gal/day and less, at a cost of 75 cents/1000 gal and up, the cost increasing as the plant size decreases (Bender, 1969). The most optimistic firm proposal which anyone seems to have made for desalting with present or soon-to-be available technology is a 150 million gal per day nuclear-powered installation studied by the Bechtel Corp. for the Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District. Bechtel's early figures indicated that water from this complex would be available at the site for 27-28 cents/1000 gal (Galstann and Currier, 1967). However, skepticism regarding the economic assumptions leading to these figures (Millman, 1966) has since proven justified—the project was shelved after spiraling construction cost estimates indicated an actual water cost of 40-50 cents/1000 gal. Use of even the original figures, however, bears out our contention that the most optimistic assumptions do not alter the verdict that technology is losing the food/population battle. For 28 cents/1000 gal is still approximately twice the cost which farmers have hitherto been willing or able to pay for irrigation water. If the Bechtel plant had been intended to supply agricultural needs, which it was not, one would have had to add to an already unacceptable price the very substantial cost of transporting the water inland.

Significantly, studies have shown that the economies of scale in the distillation process are essentially exhausted by a 150 million gal per day plant (International Atomic Energy Agency, 1964). Hence, merely increasing desalting capacity further will not substantially lower the cost of the water. On purely eco-

nomic grounds, then, it is unlikely that desalting will play a major role in food production by conventional agriculture in the short term.<sup>5</sup> Technological "break-throughs" will presumably improve this outlook with the passage of time, but world population growth will not wait.

Desalting becomes more promising if the high cost of the water can be offset by increased agricultural yields per gallon and, perhaps, use of a single nuclear installation to provide power for both the desalting and profitable on-site industrial processes. This prospect has been investigated in a thorough and well-documented study headed by E. S. Mason (Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 1968). The result is a set of preliminary figures and recommendations regarding nuclear powered "agro-industrial complexes" for arid and semiarid regions, in which desalted water and fertilizer would be produced for use on an adjacent, highly efficient farm. In underdeveloped countries incapable of using the full excess power output of the reactor, this energy would be consumed in on-site production of industrial materials for sale on the world market. Both near-term (10 years hence) and far-term (20 years hence) technologies are considered, as are various mixes of farm and industrial products. The representative near-term case for which a detailed cost breakdown is given involves a seaside facility with a desalting capacity of 1 billion gal/day, a farm size of 320,000 acres, and an industrial electric power consumption of 1585 Mw. The initial investment for this complex is estimated at \$1.8 billion, and annual operating costs at \$236 million. If both the food and the industrial materials produced were sold (as opposed to giving the food, at least, to those in need who could not pay),<sup>6</sup> estimated profit for such a complex, before subtracting financing costs, would be 14.6%.

The authors of the study are commendably cautious in outlining the assumptions and uncertainties upon which these figures rest. The key assumption is that 200 gal/day of water will grow the 2500 calories required to feed one person. Water/calorie ratios of this order or less have been achieved by the top 20% of farmers specializing in such crops as wheat, potatoes, and tomatoes; but more water is required for needed protein-rich crops such as peanuts and soybeans. The authors identify the uncertainty that crops usually raised separately can be grown together in tight rotation on the same piece of land. Problems of water storage between periods of peak irrigation demand, optimal patterns of crop rotation, and seasonal acreage variations are also mentioned. These "ifs" and assumptions, and those associated with the other technologies involved, are unfortunately often omitted when the results of such painstaking studies are summarized for more popular consumption (Anonymous, 1968b, 1968c). The result is the perpetuation of the public's tendency to confuse feasible and available, to see panaceas where scientists in the field concerned see only potential, realizable with massive infusions of time and money.

It is instructive, nevertheless, to examine the impact on the world food problem which the Oak Ridge complexes might have if construction were to begin today, and if all the assumptions about technology 10 years hence were valid now. At the industrial-agricultural mix pertinent to the sample case described above, the food produced would be adequate for just under 3 million people. This means that 23 such plants per year, at a cost of \$41 billion, would have to be put in operation merely to keep pace with world population growth, to say nothing of improving the substandard diets of between one and two billion members of the present population. (Fertilizer production beyond that required for the on-site farm is of course a contribution in the latter regard, but the substantial additional costs of transporting

Footnotes at end of article.

it to where it is needed must then be accounted for.) Since approximately 5 years from the start of construction would be required to put such a complex into operation, we should commence work on at least 125 units post-haste, and begin at least 25 per year thereafter. If the technology were available now, the investment in construction over the next 5 years, prior to operation of the first plants, would be \$315 billion—about 20 times the total U.S. foreign aid expenditure during the past 5 years. By the time the technology is available the bill will be much higher, if famine has not "solved" the problem for us.

This example again illustrates that scale, time, and cost are all working against technology in the short term. And if population growth is not decelerated, the increasing severity of population-related crises will surely neutralize the technological improvements of the middle and long terms.

**Other Food Panaceas.** "Food from the sea" is the most prevalent "answer" to the world food shortage in the view of the general public. This is not surprising, since estimates of the theoretical fisheries productivity of the sea run up to some 50-100 times current yields (Schmitt, 1965; Christy and Scott, 1965). Many practical and economic difficulties, however, make it clear that such a figure will never be reached, and that it will not even be approached in the foreseeable future. In 1966, the annual fisheries harvest was some 57 million metric tons (United Nations, 1968). A careful analysis (Meseck, 1961) indicates that this might be increased to a world production of 70 million metric tons by 1980. If this gain were realized, it would represent (assuming no violent change in population growth patterns) a small per capita loss in fisheries yield.

Both the short- and long-term outlooks for taking food from the sea are clouded by the problems of overexploitation, pollution (which is generally ignored by those calculating potential yields), and economics. Solving these problems will require more than technological legerdemain; it will also require unprecedented changes in human behavior, especially in the area of international cooperation. The unlikelihood that such cooperation will come about is reflected in the recent news (Anonymous, 1968d) that Norway has dropped out of the whaling industry because overfishing has depleted the stock below the level at which it may economically be harvested. In that industry, international controls were tried—and failed. The sea is, unfortunately, a "commons" (Hardin, 1968), and the resultant management problems exacerbate the biological and technical problems of greatly increasing our "take." One suspects that the return per dollar poured into the sea will be much less than the corresponding return from the land for many years, and the return from the land has already been found wanting.

Synthetic foods, protein culture with petroleum, saline agriculture, and weather modification all may hold promise for the future, but all are at present expensive and available only on an extremely limited scale. The research to improve this situation will also be expensive, and, of course, time-consuming. In the absence of funding, it will not occur at all, a fact which occasionally eludes the public and the Congress.

#### DOMESTIC AND INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLIES

The world has water problems, even exclusive of the situation in agriculture. Although total precipitation should in theory be adequate in quantity for several further doublings of population, serious shortages arising from problems of quality, irregularity, and distribution already plague much of the world. Underdeveloped countries will find the water needs of industrialization staggering: 240,000 gal of water are required to produce a ton of newsprint; 650,000 gal, to produce a ton of steel (International Atomic Energy

Agency, 1964). Since maximum acceptable water costs for domestic and industrial use are higher than for agriculture, those who can afford it are or soon will be using desalination (40-100+cents/1000 gal) and used-water renovation (54-57 cents/1000 gal [Ennis, 1967]). Those who cannot afford it are faced with allocating existing supplies between industry and agriculture, and as we have seen, they must choose the latter. In this circumstance, the standard of living remains pitifully low. Technology's only present answer is massive externally-financed complexes of the sort considered above, and we have already suggested there the improbability that we are prepared to pay the bill rung up by present population growth.

The widespread use of desalted water by those who can afford it brings up another problem only rarely mentioned to date, the disposal of the salts. The product of the distillation processes in present use is a hot brine with salt concentration several times that of seawater. Both the temperature and the salinity of this effluent will prove fatal to local marine life if it is simply exhausted to the ocean. The most optimistic statement we have seen on this problem is that "smaller plants (our emphasis) at seaside locations may return the concentrated brine to the ocean if proper attention is paid to the design of the outfall, and to the effect on the local marine ecology." (McIlhenny, 1966) The same writer identifies the major economic uncertainties connected with extracting the salts for sale (to do so is straightforward, but often not profitable). Nor can one simply evaporate the brine and leave the residue in a pile—the 150 million gal/day plant mentioned above would produce brine bearing 90 million lb. of salts daily (based on figures by Parker, 1966). This amount of salt would cover over 15 acres to a depth of one foot. Thus, every year a plant of the billion gallon per day, agro-industrial complex size would produce a pile of salt over 52 ft deep and covering a square mile. The high winds typical of coastal deserts would seriously aggravate the associated soil contamination problem.

#### ENERGY

Man's problems with energy supply are more subtle than those with food and water: we are not yet running out of energy, but we are being forced to use it faster than is probably healthy. The rapacious depletion of our fossil fuels is already forcing us to consider more expensive mining techniques to gain access to lower-grade deposits, such as the oil shales, and even the status of our high-grade uranium ore reserves is not clear-cut (Anonymous, 1968e).

A widely held misconception in this connection is that nuclear power is "dirt cheap," and as such represents a panacea for developed and underdeveloped nations alike. To the contrary, the largest nuclear-generating stations now in operation are just competitive with or marginally superior to modern coal-fired plants of comparable size (where coal is not scarce); at best, both produce power for on the order of 4-5 mills (tenths of a cent) per kilowatt-hour. Smaller nuclear units remain less economical than their fossil-fueled counterparts. Underdeveloped countries can rarely use the power of the larger plants. Simply speaking, there are not enough industries, appliances, and light bulbs to absorb the output, and the cost of industrialization and modernization exceeds the cost of the power required to sustain it by orders of magnitude, regardless of the source of the power. (For example, one study noted that the capital requirement to consume the output of a 70,000 kilowatt plant—about \$1.2 million worth of electricity per year at 40% utilization and 5 mills/kwh—is \$111 million per year if the power is consumed by metals industries, \$270 million per year for petroleum product industries [E. A. Mason, 1957].) Hence, at least at present,

only those underdeveloped countries which are short of fossil fuels or inexpensive means to transport them are in particular need of nuclear power.

Prospects for major reductions in the cost of nuclear power in the future hinge on the long-awaited breeder reactor and the still further distant thermonuclear reactor. In neither case is the time scale or the ultimate cost of energy a matter of any certainty. The breeder reactor, which converts more non-fissile uranium (<sup>238</sup>U) or thorium to fissionable material than it consumes as fuel for itself, effectively extends our nuclear fuel supply by a factor of approximately 400 (Cloud, 1968). It is not expected to become competitive economically with conventional reactors until the 1980's (Bump, 1967). Reductions in the unit energy cost beyond this date are not guaranteed, due both to the probable continued high capital cost of breeder reactors and to increasing costs for the ore which the breeders will convert to fuel. In the latter regard, we mention that although crushing granite for its few parts per million of uranium and thorium is possible in theory, the problem and cost of doing so are far from resolved. It is too soon to predict the costs associated with a fusion reactor (few who work in the field will predict whether such a device will work at all within the next 15-20 years). One guess puts the unit energy cost at something over half that for a coal or fission power station of comparable size (Mills, 1967), but this is pure speculation. Quite possibly the major benefit of controlled fusion will again be to extend the energy supply rather than to cheapen it.

A second misconception about nuclear power is that it can reduce our dependence on fossil fuels to zero as soon as that becomes necessary or desirable. In fact, nuclear power plants contribute only to the electrical portion of the energy budget; and in 1960 in the United States, for example, electrical energy comprised only 19% of the total energy consumed (Sporn, 1963). The degree to which nuclear fuels can postpone the exhaustion of our coal and oil depends on the extent to which that 19% is enlarged. The task is far from a trivial one, and will involve transitions to electric or fuel-cell powered transportation, electric heating, and electrically powered industries. It will be extremely expensive.

Nuclear energy, then, is a panacea neither for us nor for the underdeveloped world. It relieves, but does not remove, the pressure on fossil fuel supplies; it provides reasonably-priced power where these fuels are not abundant; it has substantial (but expensive) potential in intelligent applications such as that suggested in the Oak Ridge study discussed above; and it shares the propensity of fast-growing technology to unpleasant side effects (Novick, 1969). We mention in the last connection that, while nuclear power stations do not produce conventional air pollutants, their radioactive waste problems may in the long run prove a poor trade. Although the AEC seems to have made a good case for solidification and storage in salt mines of the bulk of the radioactive fission products (Blanko et al., 1967), a number of radioactive isotopes are released to the air, and in some areas such isotopes have already turned up in potentially harmful concentrations (Curtis and Hogan, 1969). Projected order of magnitude increases in nuclear power generation will seriously aggravate this situation. Although it has frequently been stated that the eventual advent of fusion reactors will free us from such difficulties, at least one authority, F. L. Parker, takes a more cautious view. He contends that losses of radioactive tritium from fusion power plants may prove even more hazard-

ous than the analogous problems of fission reactors (Parker, 1968).

A more easily evaluated problem is the tremendous quantity of waste heat generated at nuclear installations (to say nothing of the usable power output, which, as with power from whatever source, must also ultimately be dissipated as heat). Both have potentially disastrous effects on the local and world ecological and climatological balance. There is no simple solution to this problem, for, in general, "cooling" only moves heat; it does not remove it from the environment viewed as a whole. Moreover, the Second Law of Thermodynamics puts a ceiling on the efficiency with which we can do even this much, i.e., concentrate and transport heat. In effect, the Second Law condemns us to aggravate the total problem by generating still more heat in any machinery we devise for local cooling (consider, for example, refrigerators and air conditioners).

The only heat which actually leaves the whole system, the Earth, is that which can be radiated back into space. This amount steadily is being diminished as combustion of hydrocarbon fuels increases the atmospheric percentage of CO<sub>2</sub> which has strong absorption bands in the infrared spectrum of the outbound heat energy. (Hubbert, 1962, puts the increase in the CO<sub>2</sub> content of the atmosphere at 10% since 1900.) There is, of course, a competing effect in the Earth's energy balance, which is the increased reflectivity of the upper atmosphere to incoming sunlight due to other forms of air pollution. It has been estimated, ignoring both these effects, that man risks drastic (and perhaps catastrophic) climatological change if the amount of heat he dissipates in the environment on a global scale reaches 1% of the incident solar energy at the Earth's surface (Rose and Clark, 1961). At the present 5% rate of increase in world energy consumption,<sup>8</sup> this level will be reached in less than a century, and in the immediate future the direct contribution of man's power consumption will create serious local problems. If we may safely rule out circumvention of the Second Law or the divorce of energy requirements from population size, this suggests that, whatever science and the technology may accomplish, population growth must be stopped.

#### TRANSPORTATION

We would be remiss in our offer of a technological perspective on population problems without some mention of the difficulties associated with transporting large quantities of food, material, or people across the face of the Earth. While our grain exports have not begun to satisfy the hunger of the underdeveloped world, they already have taxed our ability to transport food in bulk over large distances. The total amount of goods of all kinds loaded at U.S. ports for external trade was 158 million metric tons in 1965 (United Nations, 1968). This is coincidentally the approximate amount of grain which would have been required to make up the dietary shortages of the underdeveloped world in the same year (Sukhatme, 1966). Thus, if the United States had such an amount of grain to ship, it could be handled only by displacing the entirety of our export trade. In a similar vein, the gross weight of the fertilizer, in excess of present consumption, required in the underdeveloped world to feed the additional population there in 1980 will amount to approximately the same figure—150 million metric tons (Sukhatme, 1966). Assuming that a substantial fraction of this fertilizer, should it be available at all, will have to be shipped about, we had best start building freighters! These problems, and the even more discouraging one of internal transportation in the hungry countries, coupled with the complexities of international finance and marketing

which have hobbled even present aid programs, complete a dismal picture of the prospects for "external" solutions to ballooning food requirements in much of the world.

Those who envision migration as a solution to problems of food, land, and water distribution not only ignore the fact that the world has no promising place to put more people, they simply have not looked at the numbers of the transportation game. Neglecting the fact that migration and relocation costs would probably amount to a minimum of several thousand dollars per person, we find, for example, that the entire long-range jet transport fleet of the United States (about 600 planes [Molloy, 1968] with an average capacity of 150), averaging two round trips per week, could transport only about 9 million people per year from India to the United States. This amounts to about 75% of that country's annual population growth (Population Reference Bureau, 1968). Ocean liners and transports, while larger, are less numerous and much slower, and over long distances could not do as well. Does anyone believe, then, that we are going to compensate for the world's population growth by sending the excess to the planets? If there were a place to go on Earth, financially and logistically we could not send our surplus there.

#### CONCLUSION

We have not attempted to be comprehensive in our treatment of population pressures and the prospects of coping with them technologically; rather, we hope simply to have given enough illustrations to make plausible our contention that technology, without population control, cannot meet the challenge. It may be argued that we have shown only that any one technological scheme taken individually is insufficient to the task at hand, whereas all such schemes applied in parallel might well be enough. We would reply that neither the commitment nor the resources to implement them all exists, and indeed that many may prove mutually exclusive (e.g., harvesting algae may diminish fish production).

Certainly, an optimum combination of efforts exists in theory, but we assert that no organized attempt to find it is being made, and that our examination of its probable eventual constituents permits little hope that even the optimum will suffice. Indeed, after a far more thorough survey of the prospects than we have attempted here, the President's Science Advisory Committee Panel on the world food supply concluded (PSAC, 1967): "The solution of the problem that will exist after about 1985 demands that programs of population control be initiated now." We most emphatically agree, noting that "now" was 2 years ago!

Of the problems arising out of population growth in the short, middle, and long terms, we have emphasized the first group. For mankind must pass the first hurdles—food and water for the next 20 years—to be granted the privilege of confronting such dilemmas as the exhaustion of mineral resources and physical space later.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, we have not conveyed the extent of our concern for the environmental deterioration which has accompanied the population explosion, and for the catastrophic ecological consequences which would attend many of the proposed technological "solutions" to the population/food crisis. Nor have we treated the point that "development" of the rest of the world to the standards of the West probably would be lethal ecologically (Ehrlich and Ehrlich, 1970). For even if such grim prospects are ignored, it is abundantly clear that in terms of cost, lead time, and implementation on the scale required, technology without population control will be too little and too late.

What hope there is lies not, of course, in abandoning attempts at technological solutions; on the contrary, they must be pursued

at unprecedented levels, with unprecedented judgment, and above all with unprecedented attention to their ecological consequences. We need dramatic programs now to find ways of ameliorating the food crisis—to buy time for humanity until the inevitable delay accompanying population control efforts has passed. But it cannot be emphasized enough that if the population control measures are not initiated immediately and effectively, all the technology man can bring to bear will not fend off the misery to come.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, confronted as we are with limited resources of time and money, we must consider carefully what fraction of our effort should be applied to the cure of the disease itself instead of to the temporary relief of the symptoms. We should ask, for example, how many vasectomies could be performed by a program funded with the 1.8 billion dollars required to build a single nuclear agro-industrial complex, and what the relative impact on the problem would be in both the short and long terms.

The decision for population control will be opposed by growth-minded economists and businessmen, by nationalistic statesmen, by zealous religious leaders, and by the myopic and well-fed of every description. It is therefore incumbent on all who sense the limitations of technology and the fragility of the environmental balance to make themselves heard above the hollow, optimistic chorus—to convince society and its leaders that there is no alternative but the cessation of our irresponsible, all-demanding, and all-consuming population growth.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the following individuals for reading and commenting on the manuscript: J. H. Brownell (Stanford University); P. A. Cantor (Aerojet General Corp.); P. E. Cloud (University of California, Santa Barbara); D. J. Eckstrom (Stanford University); R. Ewell (State University of New York at Buffalo); J. L. Fisher (Resources for the Future, Inc.); J. A. Hendrickson, Jr. (Stanford University); J. H. Hessel (Stanford University); R. W. Holm (Stanford University); S. C. McIntosh, Jr. (Stanford University); K. E. F. Watt (University of California, Davis). This work was supported in part by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

#### REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 1968a. India aims to remedy fertilizer shortage. *Chem. Eng. News*, 46 (November 25): 29.
- . 1968b. Scientists Studying Nuclear-Powered Agro-Industrial Complexes to Give Food and Jobs to Millions. *New York Times*, March 10, p. 74.
- . 1968c. Food from the atom. *Technol. Rev.*, January, p. 55.
- . 1968d. Norway—The end of the big blubber. *Time*, November 29, p. 98.
- . 1968c. Nuclear fuel cycle. *Nucl. News* January, p. 30.
- Bender, R. J. 1969. Why water desalting will expand. *Power*, 113 (August): 171.
- Blanko, R. E., J. O. Blomeke, and J. T. Roberts. 1967. Solving the waste disposal problem. *Nucleonics*, 25: 58.
- Borgstrom, Georg. 1965. *The Hungry Planet*. Collier-Macmillan, New York.
- Bump, T. R. 1967. A third generation of breeder reactors. *Sci. Amer.*, May, p. 25.
- Christy, F. C., Jr., and A. Scott. 1965. *The Commonwealth in Ocean Fisheries*. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.
- Clawson, M., H. L. Landsberg, and L. T. Alexander. 1969. Desalted seawater for agriculture: Is it economic? *Science*, 164: 1141.
- Cloud, P. R. 1968. Realities of mineral distribution. *Texas Quart.*, Summer, p. 103.
- Cole, LaMont C. 1968. Can the world be saved? *BioScience*, 18: 679.
- Curtis, R., and E. Hogan. 1969. *Perils of the Peaceful Atom*. Doubleday, New York, p. 135, 150-152.
- Ennis, C. E. 1967. Desalted water as a com-

Footnotes at end of article.

petitive commodity. *Chem. Eng. Progr.*, 63: (1): 64.

Ehrlich, P. R. 1968. *The Population Bomb*. Sierra Club/Ballantine, New York.

Ehrlich, P. R., and Anne H. Ehrlich. 1970. *Population, Resources, and Environment*. W. H. Freeman, San Francisco (In press). Galstann, L. S., and E. L. Currier. 1967. The Metropolitan Water District desalting project. *Chem. Eng. Progr.*, 63, (1): 64.

Guéron, J., J. A. Lane, I. R. Maxwell, and J. R. Menke. 1957. *The Economics of Nuclear Power. Progress in Nuclear Energy*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. Series VIII. p. 23.

Hardin, G. 1968. The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162: 1243.

Hubbert, M. K. 1962. Energy resources. A report to the Committee on Natural Resources. National Research Council Report 1000-D, National Academy of Sciences.

International Atomic Energy Agency, 1964. Desalination of water using conventional and nuclear energy. Technical Report 24, Vienna.

Kelly, R. P. 1966. North American water and power alliance. In: *Water Production Using Nuclear Energy*, R. G. Post and R. L. Seale (eds.). University of Arizona Press, Tucson, p. 29.

Lelyveld, D. 1968. Can India survive Calcutta? *New York Times Magazine*, October 13, p. 58.

Mason, E. A. 1957. Economic growth and energy consumption. In: *The Economics of Nuclear Power. Progress in Nuclear Energy*, Series VIII, J. Guéron et al. (eds.). McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, p. 56.

McIlhenny, W. F. 1966. Problems and potentials of concentrated brines. In: *Water Production Using Nuclear Energy*, R. G. Post and R. L. Seale (eds.). University of Arizona Press, Tucson, p. 187.

McKenzie, John. 1968. Nutrition and the soft sell. *New Sci.*, 40: 423.

McNeil, Mary. 1964. Lateritic soils. *Sci. Amer.*, November, p. 99.

Meseck, G. 1961. Importance of fish production and utilization in the food economy. Paper R113 presented at FAO Conference on Fish in Nutrition, Rome.

Milliman, J. W. 1966. Economics of water production using nuclear energy. In: *Water Production Using Nuclear Energy*, R. G. Post and R. L. Seale (eds.). University of Arizona Press, Tucson, p. 49.

Mills, R. G. 1967. Some engineering problems of thermonuclear fusion. *Nucl. Fusion*, 7:223.

Molloy, J. F., Jr. 1968. The \$12-billion financing problem of U.S. airlines *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, October, p. 76.

Novick, S. 1969. *The Careless Atom*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory. 1968. Nuclear energy centers, industrial and agro-industrial complexes, Summary Report. ORNL-4291, July.

Paddock, William. 1967. Phytopathology and a hungry world. *Ann. Rev. Phytopathol.*, 5: 375.

Paddock, William, and Paul Paddock. 1964. *Hungry Nations*. Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

— 1967. *Famine 1975!* Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

Parikh, G., S. Saxena, and M. Maharaja. 1968. Agricultural extension and IADP, a study of Surat. *Econ. Polit. Weekly*, August 24, p. 1307.

Parker, F. L. 1968. Radioactive wastes from fusion reactors. *Science*, 159: 83.

Parker, H. M. 1966. Environmental factors relating to large water plants. In: *Water Production Using Nuclear Energy*, R. G. Post and R. L. Seale (eds.). University of Arizona Press, Tucson, p. 209.

Population Reference Bureau, 1968. Population Reference Bureau Data Sheet. Pop. Ref. Bureau, Washington, D.C.

PSAC. 1967. *The World Food Problem*. Report of the President's Science Advisory

Committee. Vols. 1-3. U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Rose, D. J., and M. Clark, Jr. 1961. *Plasma and Controlled Fusion*. M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., p. 3.

Schmitt, W. R. 1965. The planetary food potential. *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.*, 118: 645.

Sporn, Phillip, 1963. *Energy for Man*. Macmillan, New York.

— 1966. *Fresh Water From Saline Waters*. Pergamon Press, New York.

Sukhatme, P. V. 1966. The world's food supplies. *Roy. Stat. Soc. J.*, 129A: 222.

United Nations. 1968. *United Nations Statistical Yearbook for 1967*. Statistical Office of the U.N., New York.

U.S. Dept. of Commerce. 1966. *Statistical Abstract of the U.S.* U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Wadleigh, C. H. 1968. Wastes in relation to agriculture and industry. USDA Miscellaneous Publication No. 1065, March.

Woodwell, George M. 1967. Toxic substances and ecological cycles. *Sci. Amer.*, March, p. 24.

#### FOOTNOTES

\*The co-authors are affiliated, respectively, with the department of biological sciences, and with the Institute for Plasma Research and department of aeronautics and astronautics, Stanford University.

<sup>1</sup>Barry Commoner, address to 135th Meeting of the AAAS, Dallas, Texas (28 December 1968).

<sup>2</sup>Raymond Ewell, private communication (1 December 1968).

<sup>3</sup>Lester R. Brown, address to the Second International Conference on the War on Hunger, Washington, D.C. (February 1968).

<sup>4</sup>For a more detailed discussion of the psychological problems in persuading people to change their dietary habits, see McKenzie, 1968.

<sup>5</sup>An identical conclusion was reached in a recent study (Clawson et al., 1969) in which the foregoing points and numerous other aspects of desalting were treated in far more detail than was possible here.

<sup>6</sup>Confusing statements often are made about the possibility that food supply will outrun food demand in the future. In these statements, "demand" is used in the economic sense, and in this context many millions of starving people may generate no demand whatsoever. Indeed, one concern of those engaged in increasing food production is to find ways of increasing demand.

<sup>7</sup>A general discussion of extracting metals from common rock is given by Cloud, 1968.

<sup>8</sup>The rate of growth of world energy consumption fluctuates strongly about some mean on a time scale of only a few years, and the figures are not known with great accuracy in any case. A discussion of predicting the mean and a defense of the figure of 5% are given in Guéron et al., 1957.

<sup>9</sup>Since the first draft of this article was written, the authors have seen the manuscript of a timely and pertinent forthcoming book, *Resources and Man*, written under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences and edited by Preston E. Cloud. The book reinforces many of our own conclusions in such areas as agriculture and fisheries and, in addition, treats both short- and long-term prospects in such areas as mineral resources and fossil fuels in great detail.

<sup>10</sup>This conclusion has also been reached within the specific context of aid to underdeveloped countries in a Ph.D. thesis by Douglas Daetz: "Energy Utilization and Aid Effectiveness in Nonmechanized Agriculture: A Computer Simulation of a Socioeconomic System" (University of California, Berkeley, May 1968).

#### JUDGE CARSWELL

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

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, much is being said about the unimportance of a speech that Judge Carswell made when he was 28 years old. It is said that the speech, in which he declared his eternal commitment to racism, was made in the heat of political battle, and therefore is to be ignored. As one who makes a lot of speeches in the heat of political battle and serves in a body where many speeches are made in the heat of political battle, I deeply resent the notion that some special set of morals or mores govern this kind of speechmaking. To defend Judge Carswell by giving politics or political speeches a bad name, is a pretty poor defense indeed.

Or it is said that the speech should be condoned because he was only 28 years old when he made it. What an ingenious way to exacerbate the generation gap to assume that everyone under 30 makes foolish statements and therefore should not be taken seriously. And what a marvelous way to make sure that more people under 30 make foolish statements since the new standard of morality will wipe the slate clean on any speeches that are made before 30. Or is the age 35 or 40 or 45? Maybe everyone in public life ought to be given a period of absolution in which they can wipe the slate clean of all the things about which they wish they had not bared their soul.

There is more merit to the argument that a man in public life should not be judged on the basis of one speech or one public utterance. One speech can be a very small part of a man who, active in public life and in the affairs of his community and nation, can sketch his philosophy and character in the other things he says and does. And here is the real tragedy of the proposed Supreme Court appointee. If he is not a bigot and a racist, as the speech so clearly suggests, then there must be other actions, opinions, and speeches which sketch the real Judge Carswell.

As a member of the judiciary for over 11 years, as a candidate for the State legislature in his home State of Georgia, as a man of affairs and of prominence in his community, surely this man by action, deed, and word can give the lie to the charge that he is a bigot or racist. Other southerners have, other southern conservatives have, other southern conservative Republicans have, other strict constructionist, southern conservative Republicans have. Alas, the record is bare.

And so, as a former law clerk to one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and as a member of the Supreme Court bar who recalls that such distinguished jurists as Oliver Wendell Holmes and Louis B. Brandeis held the seat which Judge Carswell proposes to fill, I can only sadly conclude that if the proposed nominee is not guilty of racism, it can only be shown by proving that he is guilty of cipherism.

#### CONCERNING THE NOMINATION OF JUDGE HARROLD CARSWELL

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

1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Judiciary Committee begins hearings on the nomination of Judge Harrold Carswell of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to the Supreme Court of the United States. President Nixon has submitted his name to the U.S. Senate for confirmation.

As one of three coequal bodies of our Government under our Constitution, the Supreme Court is the highest judicial body in our land. It is the Supreme Court that is called upon to be the final arbiter of our laws. It is as much to the Court that a citizen can turn for redress as to his elected representative. The Supreme Court is the bastion of our concept of a government of laws. Therefore, the membership of the Court is of the greatest consequence to the people of our country.

Unlike the Presidency or the Congress, we do not elect the members of the Supreme Court. Each President nominates candidates for vacancies that occur on the Court, subject to confirmation by the U.S. Senate. Although appointees are not subject to popular vote, their qualifications are subject to the scrutiny of the U.S. Senate. With some exceptions, appointments to the Court have been considered in a bipartisan manner. The Senate has generally not rejected an appointee because his views are those of the opposition party. The central question is whether the appointee is qualified for the position. It is to this question that I would like to speak today.

What are the qualifications required of appointees to the Court today. There are the obvious qualifications of honesty and integrity. One can also expect that the nominee will have shown more than ordinary competence as a lawyer or judge. But even more important is the depth of understanding of the problems that face our society today. We need only to look at the names of the great Justices who have sat on the Court to recognize that they have seen beyond the immediate, beyond the obvious and have helped lead in the emergence of a fair society. Our great Justices have been men of vision, men more able than others to take the unpopular stand when everyone else believes differently under the pressures of the moment. In one sense it is impossible to know how any man will measure up when put to the task. But it seems to me that we must ask just this question when we consider an appointee to the Supreme Court.

There is no more important question facing our society today than that of race. Report after report has confirmed that the division between black and white threatens the very fabric of our Nation. All the legislation and all the court cases have failed in the task of insuring equality of opportunity to all our citizens. The Negro still faces a much higher probability of unemployment, a lower standard of health and fewer opportunities for advancement. Even more disturbing has been the trend in recent years that has seen more rather than less conflict between the races. If we are to realize the promise of American life

for every citizen we must cope more effectively with the problem of relations between the races than we have done so far. Central to this process is the role of the Supreme Court. It is to the Court that the citizen turns for redress. It is to the Court that the responsible citizen looks for guidance rather than to those who advocate violence as the solution to our ills.

When I turn to measure Judge Carswell against this most pressing crisis, I do not find a record of one who has shown insight and distinction in dealing with the problems of racial relations in the past. We learn that as late as 1948 he made the statement:

I believe that segregation of the races is proper and the only practical and correct way of life in our states. I have always so believed, and I shall always so act. I shall be the last to submit to any attempt on the part of anyone to break down and to weaken this firmly established policy of our people.

Judge Carswell has said this week that he repudiates that statement, that he had made that statement as a young man, and that he no longer believes in the philosophy expressed.

But today we learn that in 1956, while serving as a U.S. attorney, Judge Carswell joined others in Tallahassee, Fla., in incorporating a public golf course as a private club so that blacks could be excluded. Once again Judge Carswell demonstrated what can only be termed an insensitivity to the most pressing problem of our day.

What is even more surprising about the appointment of Judge Carswell is the standard against which he is measured. President Nixon has said that he holds Justices Brandeis, Cardozo, and Holmes as the ideal against which Court appointments should be made. Yet we learn today that Prof. William Van Alstyne of Duke University Law School, who had previously supported Judge Haynesworth, does not believe that Judge Carswell is qualified to be appointed to the Court. In the opinion of many, Judge Carswell is not a distinguished jurist.

As the Representative of the 39th District in the State of New York I believe that it is my duty to speak out on the appointment of Judge Carswell. Only this last November the people of the city of Buffalo soundly defeated a candidate for the office of mayor who had a reputation as a racist. Buffalo has long been a city of many different ethnic, religious, and racial backgrounds. Although we have suffered many of the problems of modern American society we have prided ourselves on the basically good relations between blacks and whites, between Catholic and Protestant.

In this spirit, the people of my district look to the Court for the maturity of judgment, the insight so necessary to the evolution of a just American society. I do not believe that we will find that judgment in Judge Carswell.

An appointment of a racist and a judge of undistinguished background to the Supreme Court in this day and age is unconscionable. President Nixon has the responsibility to every citizen to withdraw this nomination and to submit

the name of a candidate more in keeping with the national goals to which we aspire.

I was surprised to learn that Senator GOODELL, as a representative of the citizens of New York State, can accept Judge Carswell's denial of racial bias in light of his public record. Senator GOODELL has been quoted as saying:

As one individual in public life who has been accused of having changed himself, it would be inconsistent not to allow for the possibility of change in another.

Yet Judge Carswell's statements and actions indicate that he lacks the depth of intellect and character to hold a seat on the Court.

I have written to Senators JAVITS and GOODELL, New York State's Senators to urge them to vote against the confirmation of Judge Carswell.

#### RENO, NEV., VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

(Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.)

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly alarmed about the quality of medical care which Nevada veterans are receiving from the Reno Veterans' Administration hospital.

From preliminary information which I have been able to obtain, I understand that the Reno hospital is about \$110,000 short of funds for fiscal year 1970 and that they may be forced to close down an entire 38-bed physical medicine and rehabilitation ward sometime this year if they do not receive additional funds immediately.

It has been reported to me, Mr. Speaker, that according to the standards established by the Veterans' Administration the Reno hospital nursing service is understaffed by 24 positions—yet this hospital apparently is not receiving sufficient funds from its central office to support the minimum standards which they set, even though there are applicants available for the positions. It also appears that the intensive care unit is not fully operational because the hospital needs 10 additional positions to staff it which would cost about \$83,000 annually for proper operation. The alcoholic rehabilitation program needs over \$35,000 annually for proper operation. I have also been advised that almost \$57,000 may have to be diverted from much needed equipment and maintenance and repair funds to support salaries and medical supplies and services to keep the hospital in operation even at a substandard level.

There may be a number of other deficiencies at this hospital which I have not yet uncovered, but I want to assure Nevada's veterans that I will continue with my efforts to determine where other problem areas may be.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the second-rate conditions which our ex-servicemen are having to accept in order to receive the treatment which is due them, and as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Hospitals I fully support the decision of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the

gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, to fully investigate the operations of all VA hospitals to determine if they are being permitted to serve our veterans promptly and in the manner intended by Congress.

#### ATTACK ON POLLUTION

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the attack on pollution is being supported by the public as well as its elected officials, but the effort and funds expended may be unnecessarily wasted. There is no doubt that pollution abatement is needed. The natural wealth and beauty of this great land has been squandered by past generations, and the burgeoning growth of our cities and industrial plants have forced us to finally direct our attention to the need to control our wastes.

Many articles have been written about the needed "war on pollution." The broadcast media have given time to the subject, pointing out the need, and calling for action. Congress and the public are primed for action. But what direction shall we take? We all know the end result we want: Clean air, clean water, clean landscape, control of our wastes, and a substantial reduction of all pollutants. But where is the machinery to direct the attack? Who will head the army in the war? Will the agencies responsible for pollution control be scattered across the Government departments?

In this time of inflation, high taxes and tight spending, every dollar must accomplish the absolute maximum. This calls for leadership, planning, and coordination. But more than just an eye on expenditures is needed. The need is for a central controlling agency to oversee the development of the attack and to maintain efficiency in the field operations.

I propose combining all the existing pollution control bureaus, agencies, and departments under one independent Government agency. Such a National Environment Control Agency is contained in the Pollution Abatement Act I am introducing.

The Agency is to have full powers to fund research in the form of grants, loans, and pilot projects, to approve and inspect pollution abatement equipment, and to establish standards. It will be given full enforcement powers to coordinate and promulgate all actions involved in the attack on pollution, and incorporate all future programs dealing with pollution. The Agency will have a board of seven Commissioners, one of which shall be Chairman.

A full attack on pollution, such as that called for by the President and demanded by the people, can be effective only when such a National Environment Control Agency is established with full power to act, unencumbered by political influences. How far would we have come in the development of orderly commerce if a central agency, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, had not provided a channel for growth? The Nation's re-

sources of radio and television frequencies would have remained a hopeless mess without an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission to approve and inspect the equipment involved and supervise its use.

For these reasons I have requested the Legislative Counsel Office in the House of Representatives to draw up the final papers in order that I may introduce my bill, the Pollution Abatement Act, at the earliest opportunity.

#### CREATING SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 19, I had some remarks to make in the well of this House with respect to the longstanding feud between the NCAA and the AAU and more particularly the completely inconsistent position taken by the NCAA in enforcing their rules, regulations, and the degree of sanctions and punishment doled out to the athletes and universities participating in intercollegiate sports today.

Now, there is no question in my mind that we need an organization to prescribe rules, regulations, scheduling of tournaments, and general policing of intercollegiate sports, but there is so little known about the inner workings of the NCAA and so many complaints raised over the past few years that I think the Congress itself has a legitimate right of inquiry into this organization. I am therefore this day introducing with our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO) a resolution calling for just such a broad, sweeping investigation. A number of other Members have already expressed an interest in co-sponsoring the resolution and we will be circulating the membership later today for their affirmative responses.

I would also like to renew our appeal to the college and university presidents and administrators around the country to take a more active interest in their relationship with the NCAA and to favor us with information that might be helpful in assisting us.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of our resolution to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

#### H. RES. 802

Resolution Creating a Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the National Collegiate Athletic Association

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, including a study of its sources of financial support and the authority under which it operates.

For the purpose of carrying out this regulation the committee, or any subcommittee

thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any other person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

#### FORTHRIGHT RESPONSE OF PRESIDENT TO THE ISSUE OF AMERICAN MIDDLE EAST RELATIONS

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to call the attention of this House to the forthright response by President Nixon to the issue of American Middle East relations that is the subject of a resolution jointly offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), and myself. I am today able to report that 85 Members have now indicated support for this resolution which addresses itself to the need for direct, fact-to-face negotiations between Israel and the Arab States if a real peace is to be achieved.

President Nixon, in a message to a national emergency conference on the Middle East held here this week by citizens from throughout the Nation, has done much to clarify American policy. Rejecting any notion of the Soviet Union or the Arabs that a so-called settlement can be imposed upon Israel by the superpowers, the United States included, the President voiced the spirit and essence of our resolution. He said this country believes "that peace can be based only on agreement between the parties and that agreement can be achieved only through negotiations between them."

The President added:

We do not see any substitute for such negotiations if peace and security arrangements acceptable to the parties are to be worked out.

The President has voiced a new guideline that will reassure our friends and serve notice upon our foes. The response of the Israel Government, expressed by Prime Minister Golda Meir, is gratifying. I feel that the President's statement gives new thrust and meaning to our resolution and that a consensus is emerging on this vital policy matter.

The text of the President's message follows:

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT NIXON TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONFERENCE ON PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am aware of your deep concern that Israel may become increasingly isolated. This is not true as far as the United States is concerned.

The United States stands by its friends. Israel is one of its friends.

The United States is deeply engaged in trying to help the people of the Middle East find peace. In this effort, we are consulting fully with all those most concerned.

The United States believes that peace can be based only on agreement between the parties and that agreement can be achieved only through negotiations between them. We do not see any substitute for such negotiations if peace and security arrangements acceptable to the parties are to be worked out.

The United States does not intend to negotiate the terms of peace. It will not impose the terms of peace. We believe a durable peace agreement is one that is not one-sided and is one that all sides have a vested interest in maintaining. The United Nations resolution of November 1967, described the principles of such a peace.

We are convinced that the prospects for peace are enhanced as the governments in the area are confident that their borders and their people are secure.

The United States is prepared to supply military equipment necessary to support the efforts of friendly governments, like Israel's, to defend the safety of their people. We would prefer restraint in the shipment of arms to this area. But we are maintaining a careful watch on the relative strength of the forces there, and we will not hesitate to provide arms to friendly states as the need arises.

The United States has as its objective helping the people of the Middle East build a peaceful and productive future. I believe that all Americans can unite for that goal.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the 1968 campaign there was much talk about the need to set national priorities and to stick to them once they were established. President Nixon's action in vetoing the inflationary 1970 Labor and HEW appropriations bill clearly demonstrated his commitment to stick to the No. 1 national priority: Stop inflation.

The inflationary picture has not improved in the past year, but signs are beginning to indicate that we may stop the upward spiral in prices soon. But if this is to come about we must put the brakes on all unnecessary spending where ever possible. This appropriations measure at this time is downright inflationary and must be stopped.

There is no question that everyone wants to see better schools for our children and better health services for our aged and infirmed, but that is not the issue here. The sick and the young will not be helped if the extra benefits received now are quickly eaten up by ever increasing inflation. In the end they will suffer, and all others will suffer, a marked decline in just what their dollar will purchase.

In taking up the question of reversing the presidential veto in this body, we must weigh heavily the problem of in-

flation. There is no other real consideration at hand at this point. The fiscal picture has deteriorated greatly since last September when a \$5.8 billion surplus was predicted for this current fiscal year. Now it appears we will just be able to break even. I cannot vote for any measure that is likely to contribute to a Federal budget deficit as I believe the passage of this appropriations bill will do. Nor can I vote for an increase in taxes to finance such a deficit. The taxpayer has taken it in the neck too long.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will not let false issues cloud the issue. It is time for this body to go on record as being against any inflationary measures. I will vote to sustain the veto.

#### BLACK PILOTS TRAINING ACADEMY

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, last month it was my privilege and pleasure to attend a briefing and reception sponsored by the Black Pilots Training Academy Foundation of Marshfield, Mass. It was an evening that gave me new insight into the problems that continually plague minority groups in our country.

In March 1961 President John F. Kennedy signed an Executive order banning discrimination in the air transportation industry. Since that time, however, only a few black pilots have been signed on by the airlines.

Recently, F. Lee Bailey, the well known trial lawyer, decided to do something about the lack of qualified black pilots. He initiated the Black Pilots Training Academy and began to develop and implement a comprehensive plan to train a new and virtually untapped supply of commercial aviators.

Those of us in the Congress who serve on the Commerce Committees should be particularly interested in the progress of this new flight school. It should be encouraging to us that there is private initiative and capital being utilized not only to insure the addition of new pilots but to help break through another barrier of minority exclusion.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I place in the RECORD a news release and information sheet describing the new Black Pilots Training Academy in Marshfield, Mass.:

#### NEWS RELEASE

Young black men who dream of jet-age careers are for the first time being sought across the U.S. for commercial and air transport training.

The concept of a black pilot training academy has been initiated by F. Lee Bailey, prominent trial attorney and private pilot.

Minority candidates who complete the flying program would be immediately available—through a pool of pilots—for commercial aviation and airline jobs.

This opportunity to train for pilot careers is the first ever established in the nation according to Bailey. He is president of Marshfield Aviation, Inc., near Boston, Massachusetts, where the black flying school will be located.

"The contributions of the very few black pilots currently flying hundreds, thousands, and millions of air miles are tremendous. The potential, however, of more trained black

pilots, adding to this country's greatness—and writing a dramatic new chapter in American Negro history—is overwhelming," declared Bailey.

"I'm positive," he explained, "that there are literally hundreds and hundreds of qualified, young black men who can substantially contribute to their country if afforded the opportunity.

"The general aviation industry needs to keep pace with the progress being made by the black man in other endeavors. This program, I genuinely feel, is a direct means of providing the Negro with a chance to prove himself and simultaneously, provide himself with a place in the swiftly-growing industry," Bailey stated.

A study completed by Bailey's company reveals that relatively few of the pilots flying America's jetliners and commercial aircraft are Negroes.

Although exact statistics are unavailable, approximately 50 Negroes are serving as pilots with first-level certificated air carriers.

Under Bailey's plan, young blacks who are U.S. citizens, at least 21 years of age, with a keen interest in aviation as their lifetime goal, will be accepted for the proposed black pilot training program.

It covers an intensive six-to-nine-month period with successful trainees receiving commercial, instrument and multi-engine ratings. Each also would log at least 200 hours of actual flight time.

The training curriculum would include: 140 hours in Cessna 150 Trainer; 20 hours in GAT-1 simulators; 20 hours in Cessna 182 or larger instrumental single-engine aircraft, and 20 hours in multi-engine aircraft.

In addition, each trainee pilot would complete a comprehensive ground school.

S. David Bailey (no relation to Attorney Bailey), chief pilot for Marshfield Aviation, Inc., directs the program which is attracting a great deal of attention in aviation channels. He is assisted by Edward A. Gibbs, a former fixed base operator from Wilmington, North Carolina, and currently president of the Black Airmen's Association.

Negroes interested in applying to the flight training school are invited to write for further information to the following address: Mr. S. David Bailey, Director of Training, Marshfield Aviation, Inc., Marshfield, Massachusetts.

Bailey reported most major airlines have offered a great deal of encouragement for his concept of a black pilots training school. Some offer technical assistance with a training curriculum and aid in inspection and monitoring of the project. A large share also expressed a willingness to interview graduates of the black pilot training school with an eye toward employment.

The flight school, Bailey reported, would accept trainees under the Veterans' Administration flight training school provisions through government-financed student loans and other scholarships made available to the school.

#### BLACK PILOTS TRAINING ACADEMY FOUNDATION, MARSHFIELD AVIATION, INC., MARSHFIELD, MASS.

#### INFORMATION SHEET

The European air battles were still ugly, vivid memories for the all-Negro Fighter Squadron and 332nd Fighter group pilots when the guns of World War II were silenced.

For the all-black 477th Bombardment Squadron, busy flying tough daily schedules in the States prior to combat assignment, the Axis surrender was a permanent reprieve from the chances of high-altitude death and the contrasts of torture and boredom of prisoner-of-war camps.

The war was over.

These highly-trained combat pilots, plus their competent ground crews, were disbanded along with millions of other soldiers and sailors, and returned to the civilian world.

Jobs in the post-war airline industry, expanding without wartime restrictions, were just not available to the daring pilots and mechanics whose skins were black.

Instead, they accepted jobs as sky caps, postmen, day laborers and other tasks totally unrelated to the ABC's of flying and maintenance of aircraft . . . and trained at a high investment of tax dollars.

Their skills were deemed worthless in an America filled with disinterest and prejudice.

They were, literally, forgotten men.

In March 1961, President John F. Kennedy signed an Executive Order, banning such discrimination. There were no black men among the 20,000 pilots and perhaps 20,000 stewardesses then serving with America's air carriers. There probably were not more than a mere handful of topflight Negro mechanics holding jobs with airlines. There were relatively few black ticket reservation agents or counter personnel.

In late 1962, intermittent pressure on the industry led to tokenism. It replaced exclusion. The first black pilot sat in the "front office" and the first charming black stewardess walked the aisles to help passengers aboard the domestic-routed airliners.

Since that time, not too much more has really happened. There are more black pilots, yes, and stewardesses and mechanics and counter people. But there are a lot more sky caps, cleaners and ramp service workers who are black.

Today, those brave men of the 99th Fighter Squadron, the 332nd Fighter Group and the 477th Bombardment Squadron are overage and have lost their skills. Their talents obviously are lost to the industry.

The military is reluctant to reveal how few black pilots they now have on duty status and in training, and that's the source of half of all pilots. So, black pilots are rare, indeed.

In slow fashion, that sad plight of the black man . . . with his heart set on a career in today's sophisticated aircraft . . . is changing.

F. Lee Bailey, brilliant lawyer and private pilot, is helping to accomplish this move. He has shaped a new training program to speed up the supply of pilots for today's commercial and airline transport industry. This plan would provide comprehensive flight training to qualified young, black men who seek a career in the sky.

A Black Pilots Training Academy—based in Marshfield, Massachusetts, and commencing January 1, 1970, is a program carefully planned by Bailey and top figures in U.S. aviation.

For flight students returning from military service, V.A. training will be available, helping to eliminate financial burdens. Others will be assisted through a loan program, guaranteed by a trust committee, with repayment based on future income, similar to loans established for college students.

#### THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of each year the annual observance of Ukraine's Independence becomes increasingly more significant and relevant. The reason for this is to be found in the highly important developments that are taking place in captive Ukraine and among the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. On this memorable occasion of the 52d Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence, I need only

point to three of these dominant developments.

One is the persistent and invincible drive on the part of 47 million Ukrainians for greater liberty and freedom as provided for in the U.S.S.R. Constitution. Although Ukraine has a long and impressive record of national struggle for regained independence, it has been in the past 5 years that this ferment for constitutional rights has emerged and expanded to this very date, with arrests of intellectuals and leaders mounting by the month.

The second important development is the prospective admission by Russian Moscow that over half of the 240 million population in the U.S.S.R. is non-Russian. With Ukraine being the largest non-Russian nation not only in the U.S.S.R. but also in Eastern Europe, this "new" fact on the non-Russian majority in the Soviet Union places Ukraine in a new light of growing importance throughout this whole region. It is a fact that calls for some imaginative and skillful thinking on the part of our Government.

And, third, as indicated a moment ago, Moscow has taken again to repressive actions and slave labor camps to meet these and other developments. If we had a Special Committee on the Captive Nations today, it would productively be focusing attention today on this ominous reality. Let me just cite a few instances:

First. A group of young Ukrainians from Dnipropetrovsk has written an open letter to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukr. S.S.R., V. Shcherbytskyi, the candidate to the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, F. Ovcharenko and the Secretary of Writers' Union of Ukraine D. Pavlyshko.

The letter provides tens of examples of acts of repression against Dnipropetrovsk residents because they bravely opposed the reprisals against Sobor, a novel by Oles Honchar, which in the spring and summer of 1968 were inspired by the KGB organs. Those who protested against this campaign were being fired from work, thrown out of the party, accused of "nationalistic" propaganda and so forth.

Second. In spite of terror and persecution, the young people in Ukraine are continuing their struggle against the Russian occupation. This is proved by the fact that as far back as 1967 the KGB organs conducted numerous arrests among students and cultural leaders of Western Ukraine, accusing them of the fact that in 1964 they organized a political group "Ukrainian National Front," which had as its aim to fight for the independence of Ukraine. This underground organization published a magazine entitled "Fatherland and Freedom," of which a score or two appeared.

Third. The West German Catholic news agency, reports that Archbishop Vasyl Velychkovskiy of the underground Ukrainian Catholic Church was arrested in Lviv on January 27, 1969, on his way to hear the confession of a sick man. The MGB men followed the archbishop to his house, arrested him and searched his

apartment thoroughly. Arresting Archbishop Vasyl they told those present:

You will never see him again.

Fourth. On November 5, 1968, Vasyl Makukh burned himself in Kyiv while crowds watched. Setting fire to himself he cried out: "Long live free Ukraine!" Makukh who spent long years in Russian concentration camps, left two children.

Fifth. The New York Times of February 20, 1969, carried an article by Peter Grose entitled: Archive Fires in Ukraine Stirring Suspicions of a Plot. The author writes:

There was an explosion, and then a fire. Historic collections of Ukrainian and Jewish archives were destroyed as the blaze swept through a 17th century monastery library in Kyiv, the capital of Ukraine. An obscure paragraph in a local Kyiv newspaper "Kyivaska Pravda," reported the destruction last November of the Church of St. George in the Vydubetskiy Monastery, along with its priceless Slavic and Hebraic manuscripts. Strange coincidences attach to this event, which otherwise could have been only a tragic but routine incident. The same night, Nov. 26, 1968, another mysterious fire was reported to have destroyed the Great Synagogue in the Ukrainian port of Odessa, destroying a library of Jewish documents.

Sixth. An organ of the British Communist Party recently published an extensive article which starts as follows:

Hundreds of families are going East this spring, through Siberia for settlement in fertile regions around Lake Khanka, located 150 miles north of Vladivostok.

It is evident from the article that among those "hundreds of families" there are also Ukrainians. This is also confirmed by news from Ukraine about the fact that the Russians are continuing to deport the Ukrainian population to the far-eastern regions of Asia.

Seventh. In the spring the people of Lviv have demonstrated their opposition to the Russian occupation of Ukraine by mass demonstrations at the grave site of General Tarnavskiy, former commander-in-chief of UHA—Ukrainian Army of Halychyna. The Russian occupation of C.S.S.R. has given rise to a number of protests in Ukraine. Among other things, a protest letter in connection with C.S.S.R. was signed by the rector of Kyiv University for which he was removed from his post.

Eighth. In Kyiv a trial of A. Nazarenko, a worker at the Kyiv Hydro-electric Station, was held. He and two other defendants, Kondryukov and Karpenko, were tried for conducting antistate propaganda and agitation. The indictment stated that they sent through the mail illegal leaflets, which condemned Ukraine's Russification by the Russian invaders. Nazarenko was sentenced to 5 years, Kondryukov to 3 years, and Karpenko to 13 months of imprisonment under harsh conditions.

Ninth. On May 28, 1969, the Russians tried Mykola Boryslavskiy of Berdyansk, Zaporizhe oblast, for "antistate action." The trial was held behind closed doors. At the beginning of this year—February 10—Boryslavskiy, 45, a teacher and father of three children, and a former inmate of the Russian concentration camps, has put up placards in the vicinity

of the university, condemning the Russification policies of the Russian occupation regime in Ukraine. Thereafter he attempted to commit suicide. But passers-by and the militia prevented this and he was arrested. As the result of this "trial" which the public was not permitted to attend, the Russians sentenced the defendant to 2½ years of hard labor in a concentration camp.

Mr. Speaker, in further elaboration of some of my points on this notable observance, I wish to append to my remarks the thought-provoking presidential address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, to the 10th Triennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Ancestry, two items on Ukrainian political prisoners which appeared in the December 1969 issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, and a copy of my bill, House Resolution 102, cosponsored by Members from both sides of the aisle, to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Aforementioned material follows:

#### UCCA FACES THE 70'S

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

Mr. Chairman, Delegates, Observers and Guests, on this memorable "10th" in our triennial succession of conventions it is again my pleasure and privilege to keynote the deliberations of our Congress and to define the course of our progress for the future. The progress achieved these past three years is a phasal continuation of the program most of us determined and set upon on the eve of this decade in our Congress in Washington, back in 1959. And as we convene again on the eve of another decade, our combined accomplishments of the 60's have placed us in a position where it can be truthfully maintained that with solid unity, fixed and principled conviction, and with hopeful outlook and challenge, UCCA faces the 70's.

#### A DEDICATED CONGRESS

This Congress, as I proposed several months ago, is fervently dedicated in tribute to the name and works of the late Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki. The noble cause of a free Ukraine—indeed, the cause of freedom generally—lost a powerful advocate and intrepid son in the untimely death of Professor Smal-Stocki. We in UCCA have suffered deeply by this vicissitude, and only in time will the bountiful measure of his contributions and wisdom be fully appreciated by all. It is but a token of this heartfelt appreciation that we perform this unusual dedication on our "10th," and proceed with our work and obligations in the spirit that he would have deemed respectful and necessary—the spirit of free Americans bespeaking the hearts and minds of unfree Ukrainians and all captive nations as now, without our venerable colleague, UCCA faces the 70's.

#### A GENERATION OF SERVICE

My friends, for me this 10th Congress also bears special personal significance. It symbolizes the completion of a generation of service in behalf of the ideals you and I mutually share. It was in the fall of 1949, at our Congress in Washington, that I was elected to the presidency of UCCA, significantly on the eve of another decade; and as I sometimes look back over these twenty years, I cannot but feel humble and enriched by the diverse experiences, associations, and challenges that this responsibility made possible. This seemingly long period was not devoid of numerous stormy episodes, both internal and external, but in the end it has provided an experimental basis for reflections and advice, for a necessary reassertion of fundamental guidelines and a flexible course of action as, today, UCCA faces the 70's.

#### SEVERAL "FIRSTS" IN PAST ADMINISTRATION

It is clearly unnecessary to recount the record and highlights of this past Administration which, I repeat, is another successive phase in the cumulative evolution of our policy and progress over the past twenty years. A large part of this record on our national and international planes has been methodically set forth in the UCCA Washington News which is regularly published by a couple of our papers. A week doesn't go by without several UCCA involvements, whether in the form of continuing projects, representations, meetings, testimonies, speeches, lectures, various types of writing, and planning. As our scope of operations has expanded year by year, increasing pressures of time and economy have demanded a more selective allocation of resources among these various forms of activity, without in the least losing sight of our main thrust and goals.

However, in this respect allow me to mention several new "firsts" of this past UCCA Administration. For the first time we've laid the groundwork for a firm commitment of UCCA in Asian affairs by bringing it closer in an organizational link with the World Anti-Communist League. Needless to say, Asia is fraught with immense possibilities for our cause. Also for the first time we waged a continuous battle and successfully managed to obtain open Senate Foreign Relations hearings on the Consular Convention at the beginning of 1967. Though powerful political forces prevented us from realizing our ultimate goal, our position is inscribed in the national record and history alone will attest to its merits.

A third "first" brought largely through the efforts of UCCA colleagues was the formation of the impressive World Ukrainian Congress at the end of 1967. The fruits of this achievement will unquestionably ripen with time. Fourthly, for the first time we were compelled to openly oppose a Presidential nomination before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee toward the close of 1968. The record of the nominee, who as former editor of The Washington Post waged a scurrilous attack against the Shevchenko project, was not to be left unstained. And lastly, another "first" for us was consummated just this past month, specifically on September 24, when the U.S. House of Representatives passed H. Res. 368, providing for the publication of an anthology of Captive Nations Week. Though it consumed six months to obtain this legislation—the third in a decade—the book will be available soon and will become a part of our official national heritage. Added to those of each previous Administration, these "firsts" we can indeed be proud of, and there is every reason for us to look forward to more incisive "firsts" as UCCA faces the 70's.

#### THE ISSUES AHEAD

My friends, as you well know, our policy has never been to rest on past laurels and accomplishments but rather to look ahead and build on both the past and the opportunities that the unfolding future provides. Sometimes these opportunities are long in coming, now and then reversals set in and a retreat is called for, but so long as we know where we're going and motivate ourselves with fixed purpose and enthusiasm, only balanced progress and fulfillment can result. At our last Congress, I spelled out the real meaning of UCCA by keynoting the theme "Unite, Conserve, Construct, and Advance." In spirit, in activity, in reality that theme existed for us many years before it was so uttered, and it runs through our veins today as UCCA faces the 70's.

We have always been, are, and will continue to be concerned essentially with issues and not petty bickerings, group strife, and personal frustrations that don themselves with the euphemistic cover of some loyal opposition. And the issues ahead are numerous

and demanding in terms of rational objectivity, resources and talent. Let me recite just a few of them as you and I together face the 70's: (1) the realization of a more realistic U.S. foreign policy toward the USSR, which one internationally renowned reviewer of my book on The Vulnerable Russians called a truly Copernican course in U.S. foreign policy; (2) the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, which one legislator recently told me requires only a bold and courageous stroke by the present Administration; (3) a more propaganda-oriented Voice of America and Radio Liberty, which, it is expertly observed, should be interesting in light of Brezhnev's promise to launch a skillful, propaganda barrage against the U.S. in the 70's; (4) the issue of a Freedom Academy, which we have long sought and now is being discussed as guerrilla warfare emerges even in our country; (5) the ratification of the Genocide Convention, which we pioneered for twenty years ago and is beginning now to see the light of day again.

To stop here would be enough, to say the least, for the next Administration of UCCA. But as far as we can look ahead, barring both the normal unexpected and contingent factors, reality poses further issues and projects, such as: (6) the creation of a Ukrainian Catholic Patriarchate, which UCCA formally resolved as far back as the spring of 1963; (7) the growing understanding on the part of our people and the expansion of the Captive Nations Week movement, which is crucial to the cause of the captive non-Russian nations, and particularly Ukraine, in the USSR; (8) early planning for a mammoth 10th anniversary of the Shevchenko statue unveiling in 1974, which can serve as the first concrete step in our participation in the American Revolution Bicentennial in 1976; (9) positive counteraction next year to Moscow's Lenin Centennial, which in reality will be a forced birthday party to the purveyor of Red Russian Machiavellianism that has wrought the destruction of national states and over 80 million human lives; and (10) serious thought and planned action concerning the Sino-Russian conflict, which, if it ever explodes, will have convulsive effects in Asia, Eastern Europe and here. There are other important issues, such as the Shevchenko freedom stamp, but this being the 10th Congress, I'll cease at the number 10. These ten issues spell out in part what you and I are concretely concerned with as UCCA faces the 70's.

#### ONLY A RESOLUTE COURSE

With all this said, now what is the course for us to follow? As in the past decade, so in the coming decade, the only course for us is a resolute one, a course girded to fundamental principles, prudently flexible enough to accommodate significant changes, and intelligible and realistic enough to attract supporters, particularly our youth. In the short-run of passing fancies and even illusions held by our fellow citizens, there is always a price to pay for this course of action; in the long-run, nurtured by patience, alertness and unrelenting educational effort, it reaps the richest and maximum dividends in results and accomplishments. For in this balanced dimension there can be no doubt that time works with us in attaining our goals for a secure and strengthened America, the defeat of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, an independent and free Ukraine, and the liberation and freedom of all the captive nations.

To delineate all the essential aspects of this winning course, I could keep you here all this morning and into the afternoon. Yet the description can be capsuled in the fashion of projecting certain guidelines for our successful pursuit of this winning course:

First, despite scathing criticisms in The Washington Post and other media and at

the risk of standing firmly alone, we should never let up in our enunciation of the basic truth that the issues which faced the Free World on the eve of the 60's and on the eve of the 50's, are very much the same issues facing it on this eve of the 70's. Succinctly, the captive nations in Central Europe, the USSR, and Asia still are very much captive; the chief and prime enemy of the Free World, namely Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, still is very much at work; the Russian goal of world domination still is very much real; Soviet Russian totalitarianism still is very much active in a new wave of tyranny, repressions and slave labor concentration; and dominant Moscow techniques of deceptive "peaceful coexistence," subversion by proxy, and support of spurious "wars of national liberation" still are very much in practical exercise on all continents. For those who were misguided by the many illusions of the 60's and refused to face these unshakeable truths, the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia sobered them up somewhat, and the Brezhnev doctrine should sober them up more as we transit into the 70's;

Second, for many obvious and effective reasons, it is imperative for each of us to understand and transmit among our fellow citizens the structure of thought which emphasizes the unique, strategic importance of Ukraine not only in the USSR, not only in Europe, but in the world and particularly for the security of our United States. The ramifications of this are both logical and incisive. I hoped that my new book *Russia, USSR and U.S.*, which UCCA is sponsoring, would be made available to you at this Congress. Unfortunately, this was not possible. I believe in it you will find a structure of thought that enables us to speak with facility and meaning about Ukraine in any significant environment, and most important in our Nation which, since World War II, still is the last formidable bastion of freedom and peace in the world;

Third, equipped in these ways, we must continue to resist the wave of psychological inwardness and neo-isolationism that has emerged here in the 60's and work steadfastly for the necessary transition "From the Inward 60's to the Outward 70's," which unpredictable events themselves will guarantee. Anyone with insight into world developments cannot but arrive at the clear conclusion that any semi-triumph of impulsive, neo-isolationism in this country will inevitably lead to a hot World War III. Instead, the indomitable forces of nationalism in the Red Empire, and in the Soviet Union in particular, will magnetize American interest and involvement as we ourselves prepare to venerate the principles and truths of the American Revolution on its 200th anniversary. Despite the current aberrations in this country, the vast majority of our fellow citizens would never tolerate any grave dishonor upon the traditions and principles that have made this Nation the greatest spiritual and material power in the world. They will be found most receptive and supporting as UCCA, with courage and conviction, faces the 70's;

All of which, finally, leads to some practical notes for this course of action. Make no mistake about it, the program we advocate is very well known at the very top of our Government. One high official quipped to me recently, "Lev, when they become disenchanted with Russian word-juggling, they'll then turn to your alternative." Actually, the two courses are not exclusive, and could be pursued concurrently. Whatever the time element, it behooves us (1) to carry our programs among our fellow citizens, for as you and I know it is an unprofitable activity for us just to talk among ourselves (2) to advance further our publications in local libraries, newspapers, TV and radio media, as some of our branches will do (3) to promote discussion groups in different citizens' associations and to encourage political involve-

ment in the major parties (4) to provide UCCA with an increased, funded budget so it can extend its international as well as national projects (5) to complete our building program so that a more facilitative headquarters be established here in New York and (6) and most important, to enlist the energies of our youth for the concretization of our program; it is no doubt appealing to the millions of captive youth in the Red Empire and should be of prime appeal to our youth, i.e. if we capably explain to them what our course is in the fundamental and harmonious interests of a secure America and a free Ukraine, as well as the freedom of all the captive nations.

If we fail in this, then don't blame our youth who have more than enough distractions to cope with. Yet the opportunity is there for them to share with the captive youth of the Red Empire in the pursuit of the noblest ideals—national and personal freedoms—and to challenge the energies of all other American youth on the scale of highest values and standards.

Millions, who have never really understood the Cold War, have deluded themselves with the thought that the Cold War between Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and free civilization is on the wane or, for some, even over. This is a plus for Moscow's strategy of "peaceful coexistence." From this you would not know about Moscow's role in Vietnam, behind North Korea, in the Middle East, in Cuba and even here in the United States. By experience and knowledge, we know all too well that the present quiescent stage is only another phase of the Cold War, to be followed by some degree of freezing toward U.S. Paper treaties of sub-marginal worth cannot obfuscate the reality of the captive nations in toto or of the long-run designs of imperialist Moscow. With certitud<sup>e</sup>, knowledge, conviction, unwavering principle, and a patient and courageous course of resolute action, you and I cannot but look forward with the greatest hope and enthusiasm to the next decade as UCCA faces the 70's.

#### UKRAINIAN CONGRESS SUPPORTS PETITIONS OF UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, representing over 2 million American citizens of Ukrainian origin, voiced its unstinted support to the petitions, submitted recently to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights by a group of Ukrainian and Russian political prisoners, held in slave labor camps in the USSR.

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University who is President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, dispatched a letter to U.N. Secretary U Thant, urging him to put the petitions on the agenda of the U.N. Human Rights Commissions.

"These petitions stress the crass violations of human rights, denial of personal and national liberty, suppression of religious freedom and curtailment of other rights inherent to every citizen and individual regardless of race, religion and national origins," Dr. Dobriansky stated.

"As you know, the Soviet Union is a signatory to the U.N. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and makes much of this fact in its massive propaganda drives outside the USSR. But within its own jurisdiction the Soviet government has been ruthless in eradicating the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church; it harasses and persecutes the Protestant denominations as well as the Judaic and Moslem religions—all in violation of Art. 18 of the Declaration, Dr. Dobriansky continued.

"We cannot believe that the United Nations can remain indifferent to the persecution and oppression of whole segments of the citizenry not only in Ukraine, but in other republics of the USSR," he concluded.

#### TEXT OF LETTER TO SECRETARY GENERAL U THANT

**YOUR EXCELLENCY:** On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which represents over 2 million American citizens of Ukrainian descent and origin, I have the honor of writing you this letter in support of the petitions which were reportedly submitted to you recently by groups of Ukrainian and Russian nationals in the USSR. These petitions stress the crass violations of human rights, denial of personal and national liberty, suppression of religious freedom and curtailment of other rights inherent to every citizen and individual regardless of race, religion or national origins.

We particularly call your attention, Your Excellency, to the petition of three Ukrainian political prisoners—Mykhailo Horyn, Ivan Kandyba and Lev Lukyanenko, who are incarcerated in the notorious labor camp in the Mordovian ASSR, which petition was submitted on their behalf by Amnesty International. In the petition they charge that the Soviet police and camp administration has been injecting poison into their food, thus harming them physically and mentally. These Ukrainian political prisoners are guilty of no crimes; whatever they were accused of was consistent with the Soviet constitution and the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. Specifically, they demanded improvement in working conditions, and defended the rights relating to the Ukrainian language, education and culture.

It is to be recalled that the petitioners are only a handful of the hundreds of Ukrainian political prisoners who have been arrested in the last five years and sentenced under articles of the Soviet criminal code, calling for severe punishment for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation."

Equally, we fully support another petition, signed by 46 Russian citizens who reportedly sent a petition to you, Your Excellency, asking that "violation of human rights" in the Soviet Union be discussed in the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The group, including such known persons as Gen. Peter Grigorenko and his wife, Zanaida, Peter Yakir, son of Gen. Ion E. Yakir who was executed by Stalin in 1937 during the Red Army "purges," and several other persons, are part of the Initiative Group for the Defense of Civil Rights in the USSR.

We recall also that in January, 1969 the Soviet security police arrested in the Ukrainian city of Lviv a high-ranking Ukrainian Catholic prelate, namely, the late Archbishop Vasyl Welychkovsky and a number of Ukrainian Catholic priests, all of whom were charged with practicing secretly their religion. (The Archbishop was reported to have died in a Soviet jail subsequent to his arrest.)

As you know, the Soviet Union is a signatory to the U.N. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and makes much of this fact in its massive propaganda drives outside the USSR. But within its own jurisdiction the Soviet government has been ruthless in eradicating the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church; it harasses and persecutes the Protestant denominations as well as the Judaic and Moslem religions—all in violation of Art. 18 of the Declaration, which states:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

In conclusion, Sir, we cannot believe that the United Nations can remain indifferent to the persecution and oppression of whole segments of the citizenry not only in Ukraine, but in other republics of the USSR.

We, therefore, respectfully suggest that these petitions of Ukrainian and Russian political prisoners be given full consideration at special discussions at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS PETITION  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Amnesty International disclosed here yesterday that it had forwarded to the U.N. a petition from three jailed Ukrainians that charged that the "food of political prisoners is poisoned."

A U.N. spokesman confirmed here that a petition had been received here on behalf of three Ukrainian political prisoners.

The spokesman said that the petition had been delivered by a special messenger for Amnesty International, and was left with the guard stationed at the office of Secretary General U Thant. He added that this morning U Thant had found the petition on his desk.

Copies of the appeal were circulated among the news media at the U.N.

Officials of this London-based, non-profit organization explained that they were not at this time involved in transmitting a petition by 46 Soviet intellectuals asking U Thant to place their human rights complaint on the agenda of the Human Rights Commission.

The names of the three Ukrainian petitioners were listed as *Mykhailo Horyn, Ivan Kandyba* and *Lev Lukyanenko*. They claimed to have been arrested for demanding improvements in the conditions of Ukrainian workers, and for defending rights relating to Ukrainian language, education and culture.

They further alleged that prisoners in Vladimir Prison were receiving food with toxic additives eventually leading to "unbearable headaches."

TEXT OF UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS'  
PETITION TO U.N.

"We, the Ukrainian Political Prisoners, address ourselves to you, the highest organ for protection of human rights.

"We were arrested for demanding improvements in the conditions of Ukrainian workers, and for defending the rights of the Ukrainian language, education and culture. Insofar as such demands are permitted by the Soviet constitution, we continue to uphold them. Having failed to break us morally, the KGB organs (secret police) are trying to transform us biologically from intellectuals into primitives.

"Last year Lukyanenko was taken to Vladimir Prison on March 3, and kept there until September. (In this prison) poisonous substances were added to his food. He was given to know that prolonged injection of these toxic substances causes the human organism to deteriorate.

"Poison is also added to the food in the camp. We have made a number of tests and have proved this to be true. The symptoms of poisoning are as follow: Slight pressure in the temples is felt 10-15 minutes after eating; this eventually develops into an unbearable headache. Concentration becomes difficult, even for something like writing a letter home. When reading, one forgets what was written at the beginning of a paragraph by the time one reaches the end. In order to return to a normal state, it is necessary to fast 24 hours. Therefore, we alternate days of fasting with days of the poisoned food.

"Food packages from home are even more heavily poisoned, so that we have been forced to throw them away altogether, although we are allowed to receive them only twice a year. Nutrition in the camp consists of 2,000 calories per day.

"Last year (the situation was) the same as this year. The symptoms of poisoning were somewhat different; 10-15 minutes after eating one experienced a mild intoxication, followed by severe pain in the center of the head, trembling of the hands, inability to concentrate. Headaches lasted for days.

"When we complained to the camp authorities that we were being poisoned, we were transferred to separate cells with windows covered with frost and which, in addition to having bars, have screens and blinds which shut out all daylight; we live under

electric lights all day with the exception of one hour each day when we walk outside. This is the manner in which Russian officials of the KGB treat Ukrainian patriots and honest citizens.

"Honored Commission! If you consider that such methods of reeducating human beings are incompatible with the laws of humanity, we ask that you raise your voice in protest.

Signed: Mykhailo Horyn, Ivan Kandyba, Lev Lukyanenko, June, 1969."

BACKGROUND

In 1961, seven Ukrainians, ranging in age from 32 to 44, were arrested and tried *in camera* in Lviv for allegedly conspiring to form an underground organization intended to effect the secession of Ukraine from the Soviet Union. Four were members of the Communist Party, one was a graduate of the Party higher school, one was a militia member, and three were lawyers. They called their small group the "Ukrainian Workers and Peasants Union," under the leadership of Lev Lukyanenko, and drafted a preliminary program. The aims of the group were to solicit additional members, to work for changes in the official Soviet policy concerning nationalities and particularly the policy concerning Ukraine. Also, they intended to study the feasibility of Ukrainian secession under Art. 17 of the Soviet Constitution, which provided the right of secession for Soviet republics. The KGB learned of their proposed activities and the group was arrested before they could hold a second meeting. Lukyanenko received a death sentence, later commuted to 15 years at hard labor; other members were sentenced from ten to fifteen years at hard labor.

Three members of the group Lukyanenko, Ivan O. Kandyba and Stepan Virun, have written appeals from camp to the First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party in which they quote at length the text of their verdicts, provide detailed information of the personalities in the case, present their own version of the group's proposed program, aims, and activities, and describe conditions in the labor camps where they are held. These appeals found their way out of the Soviet Union and were published in Ukrainian in a book, *Ukrainian Lawyers on Trial*, by Suchasnist Publishers, Munich, 1968.

H. RES. 102

Whereas on the all-important issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the nine anniversaries of Captive Nations Week have clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-

called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historic evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the eight Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That there is hereby established a nonpermanent committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct

an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Sec. 6. The committee shall enjoy a non-standing status, performing its duties in the course of the Ninety-first Congress and subject to renewal only as determined by needs in the completion of its work and further purposes of the House of Representatives.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in commemorating today the 52d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

For over 300 years, the people of the Ukraine suffered as a divided nation under the rule of Russian czars. When the czarist regime crumbled during 1917, the long-awaited opportunity for independence came. A group of Ukrainian patriots declared their intention to seek independence in December 1917, and declared it achieved on January 22, 1918. The newly independent Ukraine was a war-torn country, surrounded by aggressive and feuding neighbors. The preservation of independence was to prove impossible. The Red army invaded the Ukraine in the spring of 1920. In 1923, the Ukraine was made a constituent republic of the Soviet Union, making the Ukrainians among the first victims of a new imperialism.

The Ukraine experienced no respite during World War II. The country again became a battlefield for the contending forces of East and West. The Soviets withdrew only to be replaced by other cruel masters—the Nazis. Following World War II Soviet authority was reasserted, and tightened. Cruellest of ironies, the Ukrainians, on Soviet insistence, were given a delegation to the United Nations. But this delegation is a sham. The facade of independence cannot disguise the ugly fact of subservience.

With a population of more than 45 million, the Ukraine has a territory which exceeds in area that of several

Western European nations combined. The Ukraine is rich in human and material resources, its history and culture are more than a thousand years old. In an era which has seen the rise of many new nations, some of them throwing off colonial bonds after long periods of subjugation, is it not a singular injustice that the Ukrainians, along with their neighbors in Eastern Europe, continue to be subject to exploitation by the worst colonial system of modern times?

Today, as we fight in Southeast Asia on behalf of a small, brave people striving to maintain its freedom and independence, let us not forget that there are many areas of the world where the cause of liberty has yet to prevail, and that we must not relax our vigilance or abandon our struggle until that cause has prevailed.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 52d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I would like to conclude my remarks with a comprehensive article which was recently written in tribute to the life and works of the late Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki. As many Members know, Dr. Smal-Stocki was a well-known authority on Ukraine, the U.S.S.R., and world communism. As an American patriot, he was also a strong advocate of the independence of Ukraine and all the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. This is a most appropriate occasion to include the article on "A Man and Patriot," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and published in the autumn 1969, issue of the internationally authoritative journal of East European and Asian Affairs, the Ukrainian quarterly.

The article follows:

#### A MAN AND PATRIOT (By Lev E. Dobriansky)

"For Ukrainians in particular, but for all free men in general, the death of Dr. Smal-Stocki is a grave loss to the ceaseless cause of freedom. It is truly the grave loss of a patriot, Christian and scholar."<sup>1</sup> These words in my eulogy of the man and patriot, as published in the *Congressional Record*, project no exaggeration of the man and his works, which is oftentimes the case in moments of bereavement. I have no doubt that relatively few, even in the Ukrainian communities of America, really understand the loss sustained by this untimely death. Equally, I have no doubt that in time they will. For as in everything else, whether freedom, genuine friendship or love, it is rarely appreciated enough until we're deprived of it.

Within the span of an article, it is not easy to do adequate justice to the character and stature of Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki in his dimensions as a man and patriot. A personality such as his was too delicately interwoven, rich in quality and characteristics, deep in wisdom and thought, suffused with devotion and love and compassion, to be sufficiently portrayed in an article or an issue or in a volume. In every respect, his was a unique personality, and as I have already observed and think it quite fitting to repeat here, the man, selflessly and with unparalleled devotion, dedicated his entire and long adult life to the cause of a free and independent Ukraine and later, through it, to the preservation of the freedom and security of his America. This pronounced dedication is crucial to an understanding of Smal-Stocki as a man and as a patriot; indeed, it

is the very basis of the man and of the patriot. As I pointed out before, "personal glory, money, even the advantages of a marital existence were alien considerations to his unique and priceless dedication."

It is thus in this and no other way that one can properly and objectively understand this former scholar and leader as both a man and patriot. My close association with him for over two decades probably exceeds that of any other in terms of scholarly exchange, political confidence, and frequency of contact. In view of this long association and respectful friendship, his death was a profound, personal loss to me. I came to know and esteem the man through numerous mutual activities. To reflect accurately and objectively the man and the patriot, perhaps the best approach is to recount some of my outstanding experiences with Smal-Stocki in an organized pattern of successive activities, covering the political, the religious, communications, the scholarly, and public representations. In these five spheres of activity and their experimental highlights the full measure of the man and the patriot can be appreciatively understood.

#### THE PATRIOT IN POLITICAL EDUCATION

Roman Smal-Stocki was a scholar, an educator, a professor and a writer; yet all these dimensions of his being, taken individually or collectively, cannot convey and characterize his total being. In his dynamic self he was far more than any or all of these vocational designations suggest. To describe his full being, one would have to intermix a bit of Aristotelianism and ingredients of Augustinianism, a truly political man, viewing himself as a necessary cognitive member of society, and consistently possessed with an activism to translate ideas into action. Smal-Stocki was contemplative, but he was also the inveterate doer; he was a profound thinker, but he was also a witty, engaging and humorous conversationalist; he was by heritage a Ukrainian, but he was also an American patriot who valued and advanced the revolutionary traditions of the United States. He was a dynamic American patriot of Ukrainian ancestry and yet, without contradiction in any respect, he was a free, cosmopolitan man of the world which he sought to become increasingly free in an ordered and responsible existence.

On countless occasions it was my enduring and memorable privilege to discuss and argue about the world situation with him. Sometimes his reflections appeared somewhat askewed to me, and no doubt mine to him, but always in these instances respectful disagreement and considerate passion prevailed. The man had not only a probing and penetrating brain, but also a warm and genuinely live heart. I shall never forget one of the latest episodes of our thriving relationship. It occurred in the late fall of 1968, when I was invited to attend the Second Conference of the World Anti-Communist League in Saigon, South Vietnam. In seemingly endless telephonic conversations, in open forum, and in social setting Roman endeavored desperately to dissuade me from participating in this conference. He sincerely felt the risks were too great and inordinate, that this anti-communist conference would be a prime target for the Viet Cong and the Hanoi aggressors. It is difficult to put into words the depth of feeling and moving passion with which he argued his case. But here was a consuming part of the man that few could perceive without the benefit of a rich and close association.

Actually, thanks to the direct security provided by the free Vietnamese government and indirectly that of our American forces, the risks proved to be minimal. Two delegates were assassinated, but this was because they had gone somewhat astray of the set ground rules for our stay in this war-torn area. I clearly understood Smal-Stocki's heartfelt motivations, but there was also

Footnotes at end of article.

reflected in his logical argumentation an understandable bias toward Eastern Europe as against Asia. In one framework of reference his position was irrefutable; in another, as typified by Leninist thought on the strategic importance of the less developed areas, it was hardly valid *in toto*. Nevertheless, the episode showed the man in total behavior, both mind and heart at work in what he believed was right and good.

Regarding Smal-Stocki's patriotic devotion to his America, not the slightest indication ever existed as to what might be called a devotional schizophrenia based on a divided background. The greater part of the scholar's life was spent in Europe, particularly the eastern half, and his dedication was directed solely toward the freedom and independence of his beloved Ukraine. Upon his arrival here at the end of the 40's, he quickly recognized that in the present world context this objective could not be realized without a strong and leading America. But he also leaped beyond pragmatic considerations to grasp and value the uniqueness of America in the world community of nations. This vital cultural recognition enabled him to easily reconcile his steadfast devotion to a free Ukraine and his new patriotic dedication to a country he volitionally adopted and loved to the last breath of his life. In fact, his formula of spontaneous adjustment was simple and yet powerfully true: the more he loved and worked for America and its revolutionary tradition, the more he felt he was contributing to the freedom of Ukraine and of all the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR. In short, his devotion as a patriot was unitary and yet allowed for the widest and most flexible efforts aimed at the liberation of all the captive nations in the Red Empire; and this, without contradiction, conflict or insular resistance to harmonizing adjustment.

The consistent and normal behavioral orientation all this led to was his complete and uncompromising dedication of personal resources and talents to America's growing knowledge of the enemy seeking in time to destroy this country. This in essence was Smal-Stocki's life for the past two decades, that of a self-made patriot deeply engaged in political education concerning the basic issues of mythological communism, the real enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the strategic position of Ukraine, and the reality and significance of the captive nations in the aggregate. All as concerns primarily the national security of his America and through it the freedom of his ancestral Ukraine and that of all the captive nations. The expressions and manifestations of this driving bent were too numerous to recount here, but throughout this piece select examples of this all-important point will be given.

One, for instance, was the valuable contribution the good Doctor made in the trial of International Communism at the beginning of 1968. The trial was held at Georgetown University with the aim of offsetting in part the spurious propaganda spewed by Moscow in its celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution and also the thoroughly nonsensical accommodation of this propaganda by our communications media. The method was simply by presenting objectively and honestly the facts of Soviet Russian colonialist exploitation, genocide, and aggression. As reported in the summary of this unique trial, "Dr. Smal-Stocki told the Court that as late as 1966 the Communist Congress of the Soviets was still urging a merger of the cultures and languages and that 'the Soviets are using murder as a system both inside and outside the Soviet Union' in order to suppress and totally liquidate non-Russian cultures."<sup>2</sup> The trial received world-wide coverage and, of course, a scathing retort from Moscow and its dependent associates.

As in all of these cases, Roman and I exchanged notes on how best to maximize the effects of our presentations, one supplementing the other, both avoiding useless duplication and repetition. In the above case, I preceded Roman and covered the whole sweep of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. The following day, January 21, 1968, he followed with a superb and more specialized testimony on Russian linguicide, genocide, and anti-Semitism. It was always a joy to cooperate with him and, as will be seen, this close and harmonious cooperation extended back to the early 50's. As in all human relationships, the basic reason for this harmony was a mutual objectivity, a give-and-take sublimated by a higher goal than the individual and oft-times selfish interests of either person could possibly achieve. There never was any petty nonsense, foolish political play or personal jealousy and envy. The dominating passion was always how to advance best and most efficiently the cause both he and I represent. And with it there was also, too, a relaxing amount of humor and healthy outlook. Roman's varied and hard experiences in life taught him long ago that our mundane existence is never all black or all white. Nor is the pursuit of a noble cause such as ours.

These qualities were totally blazing again when we plunged into the battle against the ratification of the Consular Convention with the USSR. You will recall that after the treaty was signed in 1964, it had to be ratified by the United States Senate. Senator W. J. Fulbright, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, sought to railroad this treaty through the Senate. He had a second thought about this in June of that year when both the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the National Captive Nations Committee indicated they would throw their opposition against the treaty into the Presidential campaign of that year, and at that on a clearly bipartisan basis since numerous Democrats as well as Republicans were opposed to ratification. This Fulbright decision to delay helped us enormously in view of our complete absorption with plans and preparations for the unveiling of the Shevchenko Monument in Washington at that time. I recall how overjoyed Roman was with this turn of events because he felt his energy was not adequate for two major undertakings at one period of time.

As it developed, nearly three years of maneuver and counter-maneuver transpired before Senator Fulbright abandoned his scheme to railroad the treaty without open public hearings. We won out on this, though we eventually lost on the ratification itself, largely because of a political deal beyond our control. Smal-Stocki and I had already worked out our approach to the hearings. On February 17, 1967, I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to testify against the treaty's ratification. I was on the stand for two hours. Smal-Stocki supplemented my testimony with a written one that he submitted to the committee. His statement ably covered ground and provided perspectives which my testimony could not incorporate.<sup>3</sup> Armed with a wealth of facts and insights, he presented a statement which supporters praised highly and opponents could hardly refute. This was consistently the case with Smal-Stocki who was always prepared and ready to educate on political issues of basic import to Free World security.

Before we conclude this phrase, it should be pointed out that the Consular Convention subject is not a closed chapter. To gain his vote and several others for ratification, the Johnson Administration agreed to a condition set forth by Senator Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois. The agreement was that when the time arrived for it the Department of State would consult with Congress and local com-

munities before any Russian consulate is established in any of our cities. I recall how Roman reacted to this when I informed him of it. "We must continue to fight on this basis," he shouted. Well, we have within the format of the Captive Nations Week. Mayor Daley of Chicago has already announced that his city is opposed to having a Russian consulate; so has the Mayor of Buffalo. The reason why this action hasn't been pressed forward at this time is because the Department of State hasn't as yet responded to the preliminary Russian request for consulates in New York and San Francisco.

Of course, this was not the first time that Smal-Stocki lent his heavy support in a high-level Congressional hearing. I've testified practically every year since 1950 on some particular issue in the U.S. Congress, and over the years he offered both solicited and unsolicited advice and recommendations. Whether accepted or not, his advice was always graciously and willingly given in order that the best possible results could be obtained for all concerned. This was completely in line with the superlative character of the man. Objectivity, factual accuracy, and courage of thought and conviction were his consistent standards.

In the late 40's and early 50's we disagreed by 180 degrees on the issue of the Genocide Convention and its ratification by the U.S. Senate. In an informative article on the subject the Professor argued against ratification, fearing that the Russians would also ratify the convention and thus make mockery of the whole subject.<sup>4</sup> At the time I was working closely with the originator of the term "genocide" and prime sponsor of the convention, Dr. Raphael Lemkin. A brilliant international lawyer, Dr. Lemkin taught me all the subtle points of this treaty which, significantly, to this very day resides in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and still has to be acted upon, as indeed it will be. It was our considered thought that with U.S. Senate ratification our Government would be placed in the best possible position to show to the world the evidence of unsurpassed Soviet Russian genocide, far exceeding that of the Nazi Germans, and to easily demonstrate the pure hypocrisy of Moscow's ratification.

As it turned out, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America was committed to the position of ratification. I testified in behalf of this position, and with Dr. Lemkin we reaped considerable mileage on the subject. The towering stature of Smal-Stocki, who was teaching then at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, revealed itself in full proportion. Despite his disagreement on policy, he threw in his lot wholeheartedly, furnishing all the data on Russian genocide that he had in his possession and, within the established policy framework, offering every bit of advice he could. Selfless, cooperative and all-giving, the man felt that it was his dutiful obligation to render every measure of service and assistance in an effort which he later conceded would conduce to the strengthened position of the United States. This was the predominant mark of both the man and the patriot.

Several years later the witty professor participated directly in another Congressional hearing that, on hindsight, seemed to be twenty years before its time. This hearing in 1953, before a special subcommittee in the House of Representatives, dealt with the issue of direct U.S. diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia in the USSR. Thanks to his excellent testimony and to several others, a committee that originally was noncommittal and even opposed to the measure, unanimously voted for it in the end.<sup>5</sup> Similar to other cases, when we had the opportunity to present our position logically and rationally, the outcome was inevitably one of active or passive agreement. Adventitious factors, such as sudden political deals, a time-delaying plea by the De-

Footnotes at end of article.

partment of State to study an issue, or deaths, as in the case of Senator Brian McMahon of Connecticut who was converted into supporting the Genocide Convention, have somehow intervened to obstruct our advance. In the case of this issue, it was the untimely death of Congressman Lawrence H. Smith of Wisconsin that sidetracked the measure in the following Congress.

Congressman Smith and Smal-Stocki were close friends. Their friendship grew from Roman's expanding reputation in the Midwest and Smith's admiration for the professor's views and authority. Obviously reflective of his qualities both as a man and patriot, Smal-Stocki's persistent bent was the non-Ukrainian American forum. Though the Ukrainian American community is basic and essential, he rightly viewed this as the source, not the objective, of our efforts. Plainly, as he often observed, "It does no good to talk simply to ourselves." Not to mention countless others, the former Wisconsin Congressman Charles J. Kersten also became a long and loyal friend of the Doctor. And the role played by the Doctor in the Kersten hearings on Communist aggression in 1953-54 was monumental. As stated earlier, activism, firm conviction, and an informed bearing are the hallmarks of the Stocki legacy.

Finally, of these few select experiences in the area of political education on our American terrain is the truly remarkable one leading to the erection of the Shevchenko statue in the Nation's capital. This is a long story that could fill more than one book. An outline of it appears in my own current work.<sup>6</sup> Here it is sufficient to point out that from the very beginning of the project and to its very end Smal-Stocki played a major role, which meant a free endowment of his intellectual resources, his valuable time and judgments, and his cultured buoyance that brought relief and encouragement in tight situations; and there were many of these over a five-year period. Again, in the nature of the man and patriot, no personal or political pettiness, no shrinking from loyal obligation, no difficulty in the pursuit of constructive work. We had more than our share of these "negatives" from other quarters.

In the long process of this monumental project, Roman joined in the House hearings on the statue. Entirely true to form, his testimony was authoritative, impressive, and convincing. It contributed heavily to the successful launching of H.J. Res. 311 into Public Law 86-749 in September, 1960. On points of comparison between the aspirations of the Ukrainian people as so eloquently expressed by Shevchenko and the revolutionary tradition of America, the Professor was incomparable. His piece on "Shevchenko and the Jews," which proved to be so valuable later against the vicious attacks of *The Washington Post*, formed a scholarly part of the House biographical document on Shevchenko.<sup>7</sup>

When, at the end of August in 1960, I received word at the Georgetown University Hospital of the Congressional passage of the Shevchenko resolution, my first request of the UCCA Executive Board was to form a special Shevchenko Memorial Committee with Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki as President. This request was honored without any objection. At the time I knew of no finer tribute we all could pay to the man and patriot, and for his lifetime works than this. He performed as expected, with refined dignity, moderate leadership, and deep humanism. His strength showed in the fall of 1963 when we ran into unexpected trouble with *The Washington Post*. Following the groundbreaking ceremonies in September, this powerful organ unleashed an editorial campaign against the erection of the statue

that continued almost weekly into the next year. This factually packed story has been recorded in a *Congressional Record* reprint. In it you'll find the lengthy letters written by Smal-Stocki as President of both the Memorial Committee and of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.<sup>8</sup> Again, true to form, they are factual, incisive, and logically invulnerable. Needless to say, the Washington organ displayed its total weakness by refusing to publish these excellent letters. What was disconcerting at the time was the dearth of similar letters from the so-called Ukrainian literati, many of which seemed to hope that the project would fail. The power, sagacity, and drive of one Smal-Stocki were, thankfully, equivalent to hundreds that they could possibly provide in any such venture. In brief, it was all as God seemed to warrant.

#### FOR GOD, COUNTRY AND PEOPLE

The above rich experiences hardly exhaust the wealth of relationship I was privileged to enjoy with Dr. Smal-Stocki. As the remainder of this article will show, our relationship extended beyond the field of political education as covered in part above. It was also projected into the area of religious affairs, TV and radio, scholarly forums, and public representations exclusive of Congressional and general governmental undertakings. But the Stocki spirit was always the same regardless of the sphere of activity. With unparalleled maturity, generosity, kindness, warmth, considerate objectivity and his other sterling qualities consistently shone through. One need only read his article, written in Ukrainian, in the official book of the Shevchenko statue unveiling.<sup>9</sup> You will find an interpretation of Shevchenko in relation to Washington filled with wholesome emotion of political spirit based on religious fervor and faith in ultimate goodness, truth, and moral rectitude. For the man and patriot the moral order of principle and ethical good formed the order framework of his political thought. It is because of this that he was able with ease and intellectual agility to incorporate into numerous of his themes the names of Shevchenko, Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln, Wilson and others, all whose political thought and behavior were founded on determining religious ideas and motivations.

For God, country, and people was the Stocki standard. He had an enormous respect for tradition and the cumulative wisdom and experience of mankind. He was a deeply religious man, not necessarily in terms of institutional ritual and prescription but in fundamental terms of a profound faith in God and His Christocentric immanence in the world. This fixed and unwavering faith was the source of his indefatigable power, his unyielding convictions, and his eternal hope. The goodness of our Creator he saw in the rightness of our cause. The ideals of a developing, more democratic, more just and preserved America, of expanding freedom in the world at large, of a free and independent Ukraine, and of the end of all empires constitute the rightness which cannot but be rationally in accord with divine goodness. To view the strength of the man and the patriot even in weakened, terminal physical circumstances, one would have had to be at his side during those last moments in April 1969 when the spiritual and intellectual lights dimmed and were finally extinguished by physical demise.

In numerous concrete ways the Doctor displayed his keen religious interest and bearing. I shall never forget his inspiring eulogy at the grave of our dear friend John Duzansky in Chicago, in the spring of 1963. His words brought spiritual refreshment and relief to all the bereaved. As a devout Catholic, Roman was constantly immersed in religious affairs. He was chosen as one of the principal speakers at the 25th Anniversary Observance of Metropolitan Senyshyn's consecration in Philadelphia, in December 1967. Later, both

in July and August of 1968, he played an important role in two outstanding events surrounding the presence of His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Slipy in our country. Respectively, in Philadelphia he met with the Cardinal and was one of the most warmly received at the reception and banquet. In Washington, the Doctor was one of the leading lights in the reception given to the Cardinal at the Catholic University where Stocki taught. Roman's many lectures and articles on Russian genocide of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches, the Russian Orthodox Church as a tool of the Kremlin, and the persecution of the Moslems, Jews and other religious bodies in the USSR give more than adequate evidence of the interlocking religious and political factors in his total thinking. In short, the man and the patriot couldn't possibly have been detached from God.

#### ABOUT THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

Many who can write, teach and lecture to a given group, have for some reason a paralyzing incapacity when it comes to a TV camera or a radio mike. This was not so with our man and patriot. On the contrary, he seemed to be at his zenith best. With his arsenal of knowledge and argumentative points, as well as a natural liking of people, Smal-Stocki always exuded a complete air of self-confidence and personal certitude. In fact, over these media he proved to be a delightful and perfectly sincere showman, being quite serious when the moment demanded it, interjecting appropriate humor and jokes when called for, and an overall basis lending productive worth to the given program. I point this out because it also indicates the full and buoyant personality that made up the man and the patriot.

Regardless of a slight but advantageous accent, Roman was always able to hold his own in any public situation. He became a star in his own right in the Midwest area, appearing frequently on TV and radio programs dealing with the Soviet Union and the communist question. My experiences with him covered so many of these programs that I can't recall the number, all the subjects, and the places. Quite often we appeared together on the award-winning Georgetown University TV and Radio Forum. For example, on July 14, 1968 along with Dr. Herminio Portell-Villa, a former University of Havana professor who flunked Fidel Castro in history, we discussed the intriguing subject "Are Captive Nations Still Captive?" Smal-Stocki not only convincingly answered this in the affirmative but also went on to show the new potential captive nations that exist in the world, such as South Vietnam, Egypt, and Brazil. Earlier, on April 17 we were on a three-hour program over TV station WFAN in Washington, D.C., discussing "US-USSR Relations." On this program, called *Controversy*, he not only delivered a remarkable analysis of the Czecho-Slovak crisis in relation to the topic but also predicted Russian intervention, which followed in August. His many years in Prague between the two World Wars equipped him with insights that sheer logic cannot provide.

Constructive criticism also was a standard part of his armor. For instance, at the end of November, 1967 Smal-Stocki appeared with me and Raymond McHugh, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Copley News Service, to discuss my work on *The Vulnerable Russians* over the Georgetown University Forum.<sup>10</sup> Although his attitude toward the work was generally favorable, he nevertheless felt that in the light of prudence I was too specific in naming names and events at this stage of development. As he remarked then, "Truth can be described in many and various ways." By no means did he suggest that the truth be tarnished or concealed. Rather, he was so concerned about both my prospects and safety that he sincerely thought a more generalized account concern-

Footnotes at end of article.

ing the captive nations episode and the "Shevchenko affair" would have been in order. He expressed himself as he saw fit; the air of intellectual freedom was always about him. But a freedom with a thriving sense of responsibility and rational restraint.

In another Georgetown program, staged on May 24, 1964 and devoted to the subject "Shevchenko: Freedom's Symbol," Smal-Stocki found his opportunity to let loose on *The Washington Post*, which months before suppressed his informative letters-to-the-editor. Congressman Edward J. Derwinski and I were the other panelists. Those who knew the man and patriot, always admired his gentility and fairness. He displayed these dominant qualities on this occasion. Without rancor and insult he logically refuted the *Post's* mythical arguments about Shevchenko's alleged anti-Semitism, the opposition of other American groups of East European stock, and Moscow's interest in the statue. It was done superbly, humbly, and graciously.

One can go on and on recounting similar experiences of this nature. In 1958, I was privileged to join Dr. Smal-Stocki in an important "Hammer and Sickle" TV series, sponsored jointly by WXIX in Milwaukee, which is part of the CBS network, and Marquette University. The program covered the plight of the non-Russian nations in the past Russian Czarist Empire and in the present USSR. Smal-Stocki's detailed knowledge of this plight was such that the series truly vibrated with factual and interpretative pungency, and the viewing audience grew by the week in the area. Earlier that year he participated with me in a similar series on "The Captive Non-Russian Nations in the USSR" over the Georgetown University Forum. The five programs were transcribed and published as a Congressional reprint. Thousands of copies were distributed in high quarters throughout the Middle East and South Asia. His solid contribution was acknowledged by all, and largely because it was characteristically couched in specific facts and data that he consistently had on his finger tips. This came natural to him when one considers his extensive scholarship.

#### SOME SCHOLARLY NOTES

The intellectual forte of the man and patriot was indubitably his extensive scholarship. Most leaders possess intellectual competence in varying degrees but few, because of time, background and cognate reasons, have the scholarly foundations that formed the solid basis of Stocki's activism. His uninterrupted scholarly activity actually provided the fuel and food of thought for his other interrelated activities, all in the consummate direction pointed out earlier. This structured the man's fruitful life and made him the highly principled and challenging patriot that in the right and moderate sense of the word he was.

Far be it from me to describe here the scope and depth of Stocki's scholarly activity. This is a subject in and of itself; its relevancy here pertains to its subordinate and serving role for the total man and patriot. The exactitude, precision and balance of thought that the Doctor sought and applied in his philological and historical studies were aptly transferred to his political activity in the Aristotelian sense. I recall, for example, the tremendous impact of his lecture on "Russian Imperialism and the Middle East" at Fort Meade, Maryland.<sup>11</sup> I directed that seminar in July of 1966, with 250 high officers attending and lecturers drawn from government, the diplomatic colony, and our universities. With typical thoroughness, Smal-Stocki portrayed the evolution of Russian imperialist interest in the Middle East and equipped the officers with a pattern of analysis that no one else was able to do. His presentation moved the audience so, that the question-and-answer period was extended a full hour beyond regulation time.

No matter where, the performance and effects were invariably of the highest order. His origination and management of the Slavic Institute at Marquette University, his literary output for the Institute of Ethnic Studies at Georgetown University, his lectures at the 1967 Captive Nations Conference in Washington, and his guidance over the Institute of Ukrainian Studies at St. Josaphat's Seminary, Catholic University—all showed brilliantly the marks of excellence and superlative competence. On three occasions, in the successive years of 1966-1968, it was my pleasure to lecture at St. Josaphat's on a variety of subjects dealing with Ukraine, and each time I left with a profound sense of satisfaction and accomplishment, mainly because of the orderly and masterly manner they were conducted by the director, our venerable Smal-Stocki. Here was culture personified in all its beauty and charm.

In the two general spheres of his composite activity, namely the Shevchenko Scientific Society and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Stocki's scholarly bent led him to virtually specialize in a rigorous surveillance of the proceedings and undertakings of UNESCO. It was this surveillance that enabled us to keep a close tab on the output of UNESCO, such as the scandalous Russian-written book back in 1962 on races, nations, and peoples in the USSR. Under the inspiration of Smal-Stocki, UCCA strongly attacked the fallaciously contrived contents of this fraudulent work. Published in Europe, copies of the book were inaccessible in this country and, strangely enough, we managed to obtain one long before our Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevenson, acquired one.

As indicated, the writings of Smal-Stocki are numerous and varied. I always considered it a privileged honor to have been chosen by him to write the forewords to two of his most successful works. In an early one of his scholarly works I emphasized, "It is with this balancing orientation that the distinguished and scholarly author of this work advances the content and results of his investigation of certain paramount issues pertaining to Soviet thought and practice."<sup>12</sup> This treatise caused quite a stir of reexamination of views in many governmental and academic circles. In a later work on the captive nations I wrote with all sincerity and deep feeling, "Professor Smal-Stocki's life has been dedicated to the defense of the right of self-determination by all the non-Russian nations and peoples in the Soviet Union."<sup>13</sup> And indeed it was. Both he and I fully understood that these nations not only had this right but also had exercised it for independence and national freedom.

On the matter of public representations over and beyond the areas noted here, the good Doctor was about the most congenial, witty and social being you could find anywhere. Reflecting his total personality as man and patriot, his constant behavior may be verily characterized as that of a roving ambassador representing the noblest of causes. Whether in the public forum, at a diplomatic cocktail reception, at a group dinner and similar functions, he invariably was the center of social delight, a source of endless witticism which guaranteed the success and pleasantness of any function. This was only natural. His remarkable character as shown by all the qualities depicted here could have led to nothing else. The man was truly a civilized man of the highest standing and status.

#### IN ETERNAL TRIBUTE

As I conclude, my true feeling is one of inadequacy and imperfection. The words written here I know do not adequately describe the man and the patriot. I doubt that any eloquent combination of words can. However, no matter how imperfect and insufficient they are, they flow from the heart of one who enjoyed the privilege and pleasure in life to know a person with extraordinary

qualities and culture. A friendship such as this is redemption enough for one's faith in civilized man.

Words and acts are the best means to pay eternal tribute to a man and patriot of the stature of Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki. Happily, the Tenth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent in New York, in October 1969, has been dedicated to the everlasting memory of the man and patriot. Also, my forthcoming book on *Russia, USSR and U.S.* is likewise dedicated to him. Doubtless, as time passes and his real and profound value is perceived and understood by more of our citizens, even greater tributes will be recorded. But having known the man and patriot, who was perpetually given to genuine simplicity and the basic, real and enduring values of life, the highest and lasting tribute he would want is to carry on the good fight as portrayed in these pages—the good fight for national independence, freedom, democracy and decency of which he was an integral part and which his works served to perpetuate, intensify and strengthen to the benefit of all of us.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> "Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki: Dedicated American Patriot of Ukrainian Ancestry." *Congressional Record*, June 26, 1969, p. 17596.

<sup>2</sup> "Highlights of International Communism On Trial," Washington, D.C., February 19-21, 1968, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Consular Convention With The Soviet Union*, Hearings, United States Senate, U.S. GPO, 1967, pp. 264-267.

<sup>4</sup> Roman Smal-Stocki, "The Genocide Convention," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Spring, 1949, pp. 144-163.

<sup>5</sup> *Favoring Extension of Diplomatic Relations With The Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia*, Hearing, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, U.S. GPO, 1953, pp. 10-17.

<sup>6</sup> *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1967, pp. 343-374.

<sup>7</sup> *Europe's Freedom Fighter*, House of Representatives, Document No. 445, U.S. GPO, Washington, 1960, pp. 30-32.

<sup>8</sup> E. g. in *Shevchenko, A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom and Independence of All Captive Nations*, U.S. GPO, Washington, 1964, pp. 49-54.

<sup>9</sup> Roman Smal-Stocki, "The Road of Shevchenko to Washington, Capital of America," *Taras Shevchenko Memorial Book*, Washington, DC., 1964, pp. 9-12.

<sup>10</sup> "The Vulnerable Russians—Subject of Roundtable Discussion on Georgetown University TV Forum," *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, November 1-15, 1967, p. 94.

<sup>11</sup> "U.S. Army Seminar On Middle East," *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, October-November 1966, p. 110.

<sup>12</sup> Roman Smal-Stocki, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism*, Milwaukee, 1952, p. vii.

<sup>13</sup> Roman Smal-Stocki, *The Captive Nations*, New York 1960, p. 11.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, each year we mark the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence by recounting the unfortunate history of that brave people under Soviet domination.

Rather than to recall the past, it might be more appropriate on this 52d anniversary for all Americans to reflect on their own good fortune and to imagine for a few moments what it would be like, for example, to trade places with a Ukrainian, a Czech, or an East German.

Of course, all three have certain things in common. They are denied freedom of speech and political expression; their travel to other nations is restricted, there is censorship of what they can see, hear, read, or publish; their frontiers are

patrolled, barbed wire is erected or a wall is constructed to keep them in; and most importantly the Soviet presence to protect them from fellow citizens who seek greater political and cultural freedom.

Such a thought should remind us all of what a privilege it is to be an American. While we can all hope that the Soviet Union will someday become more democratic, we had best be more pragmatic about the aims of Soviet policy.

In recent years the Soviet Union has attempted to convey a more humane and rational approach in its dealings with the West. We all welcome this. However, it is well to remember that rhetoric costs little, while actions more clearly reflect the true character of a nation.

The brutal Soviet repression of Czechoslovakia is a grim reminder of what can be expected when the vital interests of the Soviet Union are at stake.

The world is very different now than it was when Hungary was brought to its knees by Soviet armor. I believe the Soviet Union will live to regret the course it followed in Czechoslovakia.

The resentment that followed, not only from the Czech people, but from world public opinion, has severely damaged the image and credibility of the Soviet Union.

While we seek ways to lessen tensions and to negotiate our differences, we should always stand ready to speak out when the Soviet Union disregards the rights of the individual for the omnipotence of the state.

Mr. Speaker, our goal must be to achieve a more open society within the Soviet bloc. For if they truly believe that their system is superior, they should not fear the exposure of their citizens to ours. If we are successful, the ultimate result would undoubtedly be greater freedom for the people of the Ukraine and of Eastern Europe.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 52d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. In doing so, I wish to highly commend the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for bringing to the attention of the American people the repressions suffered by the 47 million captive people in Ukraine and exposing to public view the total disregard for human freedoms within the U.S.S.R. On October 25 of last year it was my great privilege to attend and address the 10th Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent in New York. The outstanding work of this organization in the cause of human freedom is certainly due in large part to the leadership of such persons as Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, and Dr. Walter Dushnyck, editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Freedom-loving people everywhere are indebted to the devoted work of these brilliant and highly informed authorities on communism and the peoples of the captive nations, including those within the Soviet Union.

As the world daily becomes smaller through the rapid advancements of communication, transportation, and technology; and as the tremendous power held by both the United States and the So-

viet Union necessitates increased communication between these two nations; it seems particularly appropriate that we increase and express our awareness of and personal indignation for the repressive treatment of citizens in the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. It makes little sense to me to commit our Nation's most precious resource, the lives of its young people, to the cause of freedom and self-determination in Southeast Asia and to be unaware or unconcerned about these human rights elsewhere in the world. In commemorating the historic struggle of the freedom-loving people of Ukraine for their independence, we reiterate our deep concern for the millions who live in captivity under the tyranny of Communist rule.

Fifty-two years ago, on January 23, 1918, Ukraine declared its full independence and obtained recognition as the Ukrainian National Republic from a number of European states, including Soviet Russia. Immediately thereafter, however, this independent state met with the armed intervention of the Soviet Government and after more than 3 years of courageous resistance its government was destroyed by the Bolsheviks. Ukraine was made an unwilling member of the Soviet Union in 1923.

As we join today in observing the Ukrainians' valiant fight for freedom, the inspirational words on this subject of the late Gen. Dwight Eisenhower are called to mind. In the 1964 dedication of a monument to the Ukrainian poet-patriot, Taras Shevchenko, General Eisenhower called for a "new world movement" to work for "the independence and freedom of all captive nations" under Communist control. It is through such a commitment that the hopes of freedom-loving people everywhere can remain alive. It is particularly significant, furthermore, that that monument to the patriot, Taras Shevchenko, who remains as a symbol of the persistent determination of his people to fight for freedom, stands in the capital of the greatest free nation of the world. As an eloquent spokesman for Ukrainian independence from Russian colonial rule, Shevchenko endangered his own liberty and was banished into exile for speaking out against substantially the same conditions which exist in his beloved nation today. Just as the spirit of Shevchenko lives on in the hearts of his countrymen today, so does his statue here in Washington, D.C., serve as a constant reminder to us that the freedom for which he fought is still denied to millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to commemorate the 52d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence. Celebrations will be forthcoming all across this Nation, yet in the Ukraine itself there will be no joy. As a captive nation held by the authoritarian power of the Soviet Union, the Ukraine can remember this day only in the innermost hearts of her people. It is therefore fitting, Mr. Speaker, that our words here today ring out twice as loud and twice as strong as ever before.

The Ukrainians are a proud and wonderful people. Proud certainly of a his-

tory which dates back to the days when Kiev was the center of Russian activity. Proud of their resources which could allow them to be self-sufficient. Proud of their ranking as the fifth largest European member of the United Nations. These very facts, however, cause the chain of captivity to be held all the more tightly around the 47 million inhabitants of the Ukraine.

The Soviet Union is now embarking on its first census in many years. Experts tell us that this census will result in one glaring fact—the minority groups in Russia will outnumber the Russians. The time is certainly coming when the Soviet Union must listen to the pleas of its minority groups. Now as these groups come into their own, they need the support of the nations of the free world all the more. We must show them that their plight is a matter of great concern to us, that their pleas do not fall on deaf ears.

The Ukrainian people have known the taste of freedom, the responsibility of leadership, the joy of peace, and their right to justice. Let me urge my colleagues to speak out that we may in our lifetime see the Ukrainian people enjoy the celebrations of independence in their homeland once again.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, acknowledging the busy schedule which faces this body, nevertheless I ask my colleagues to pause for a brief moment today to note Ukrainian Independence Day.

Throughout the free world, Ukrainians and those of Ukrainian descent marked the 52d anniversary on January 23 of the independent Ukrainian Republic. Needless to say, there were no open celebrations within Ukraine itself; where the gallant Ukrainian people live under the yoke of the Soviet Union.

Actually, an independent Ukrainian state dates back to the ninth century, and although the culture, the language, the literature, and the ethos of Ukrainian people have been constant, there have been only short periods when they have been able to live as a national state on their fertile and productive land.

It has been this very fertility which has been the Ukrainian blessing and curse at the same time. This fine soil, tilled productively and diligently by the Ukrainian people, has been coveted by powerful neighbors since the dawn of recorded history. Time after time, these people have been brutally conquered.

But their soul and spirit were never subdued. To this day, they look for and work for a free, independent, and democratic nation.

I feel it is unfortunate that our school history texts concentrate so thoroughly on world powers to the exclusion of historical references to other peoples and nations.

Historically, Ukraine became a political entity in the ninth century. A subsequent ruler was St. Vladimir, who accepted Christianity from Byzantium in 933. This state, with Kiev as its capital, prospered until destruction by the Tatar invasion of 1237-41.

Subsequently, the Ukraine became victim to the rapidly expanding Poland and

Lithuania. The Ukrainian people never lost their fighting spirit and desire for independence. Rebellions were numerous.

An insurrection led by Bogdan Khmelnytsky—Chmielnicki—defeated the Poles in 1648 and again the following year. However, a military defeat in 1651 led to call for aid to Czar Aleksey Mikhailovich.

On October 11, 1653, Moscow declared war on Poland. Two Russo-Polish wars followed, ending on January 31, 1667, with the Treaty of Andruszow, partitioning between Poland and Russia.

In December 1668, Sultan Mohammed IV took the Ukraine under his protection, and 1672, a Turkish army marched against Poland imposing the peace of Buczacz, which gave the Ottoman Empire control of "Polish Ukraine." Turkish control continued until 1684 when John III Sobieski drove out the Turks.

In "Russian Ukraine," an alliance was concluded with King Charles XII of Sweden to re-create an independent Ukraine, but Czar Peter I's victory over the Swedes at Poltava on June 27, 1709, ended this dream.

With the second partition of Poland in 1793, the Ukraine was once again a reunited entity—but under Russian control. Its political autonomy, and even its name, disappeared.

Ukrainian nationalism was reborn in 1846 by the formation of the secret Brotherhood of St. Cyril and St. Methodius in Kiev by about 30 Ukrainian patriots.

With the discovery of the society the following year, the members were either arrested or deported by the Russians, but the spirit of nationalism lived on.

In 1876, the Czarist government forbade the use of Ukrainian in schools and in books and journals.

With the revolution in Russia during World War I, Ukrainian patriots again saw a chance for independence. A National Ukrainian Congress was held in Kiev in April 1917, and elected a rada—a central council.

On June 23 the rada proclaimed an autonomous Ukrainian republic. On July 16 a government was formed. On Nov. 20 the rada announced the convocation of a freely elected constituent assembly, and on Jan. 22, 1918, proclaimed a "free and sovereign" Ukrainian Republic.

German and Austrian armies occupied the Ukraine and found the rada too democratic for their standards. They executed a coup d'etat and established a puppet regime.

With the defeat of the Central Powers, Simon Petlyura, who had been war minister in the rada-sponsored government, assumed power in Kiev as commander-in-chief.

Ukrainian forces were subsequently defeated by the Red army and by the end of 1919, the free republic of Ukraine ceased to exist.

During World War II, the Ukraine was occupied by the German army, which exploited its resources for the benefit of the Germans.

Ukraine has suffered much through the centuries and under the heel of the Communists; but never in its long history have its people ever forgotten their short-

lived freedom; and never have they ceased yearning for independence and democracy.

At this time, let us take a moment to recognize their plight and patriotism; and pray that some day this dream will be realized.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, January 22, marked the 52d anniversary of the Ukraine's independence.

On that historic day in 1918, a national council at Kiev declared the Ukraine a free and independent republic. In their Act of Union, these patriots set forth an inspiring and immortal credo of freedom, a portion of which follows:

From today on there shall be only one independent Ukrainian National Republic. From today on the Ukrainian people, freed by the mighty upsurge of their own strength, have the opportunity to unite all endeavors of their sons for the creation of an indivisible, independent Ukrainian State for the good and the welfare of the working people.

Although this vision was soon obscured by the relentless tide of Russian imperialism, neither military force nor political repression nor religious persecution have succeeded in destroying the Ukrainian dream of self-government. Many Ukrainians fled their homeland to start anew, but each carried with him a fervent nationalism and a passion for freedom. Despite a half century of Soviet domination, the idea of Ukrainian self-determination has survived and flourished.

Today I am privileged to join my colleagues, my fellow Americans and freedom-loving people throughout the world, in commemorating this anniversary of Ukrainian independence. As we Americans prepare to celebrate our bicentennial, let us never forget the sacrifices these brave men have made for the cause of freedom. And let us always remember that so long as some men are enslaved none of us is truly free.

Mr. Speaker, to document the vitality of Ukrainian nationalism today, I comment to my colleagues an article entitled "The Not-So-Silent Majority," which appeared in the January 12 issue of *Newsweek* magazine, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

#### SOVIET UNION: NOT-SO-SILENT MAJORITY

Next week, one of the world's most ambitious door-to-door canvasses will get under way when the Soviet Union embarks on its first national census in more than a decade. During its initial stage, 550,000 census-takers will go into every home in that vast country to register an estimated 240 million citizens. The raw data they gather will then be spot-checked by 100,000 controllers and fed into a central computer bank in Moscow to emerge as columns of statistics for the use of Soviet planners. But in all that jumble of information, one fact is likely to stand out dramatically: for the first time since the formation of the Soviet Union, Great Russians will find themselves a minority in their own country.

The political implications of this demographic fact are worrisome indeed to Soviet leaders. For there are unmistakable signs that the national consciousness of the Soviet Union's non-Russian majority is increasing at least as fast as its numbers. In the past few years, Crimean Tartars and Ukrainians have openly protested against the denial of their ethnic rights. And it is estimated that half the political prisoners detained in Soviet labor camps fall under the category of

"bourgeois nationalists." Moreover, many observers of the Soviet scene think the intensification of ethnic conflict will be the Soviet Union's most pressing domestic problem in the remaining years of this century. "It is not inconceivable," writes Columbia University's Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, "that in the next several decades the nationality problem will become politically more important in the Soviet Union than the racial issue has become in the United States."

#### FAULT

If Brzezinski's forecast is borne out, the fault will not lie entirely with Soviet leaders—past or present. For when they carried out their revolution, the Bolsheviks inherited from Czarist Russia an unwieldy hodgepodge of 130 separate racial, ethnic and national groups, many with their own language, culture and degree of economic development. But it is also true that during their 52 years in power, Soviet leaders have only managed to make a bad situation worse through a confused series of nationality policies, which have ranged from Lenin's relative tolerance toward separate ethnic development to Stalin's ruthless practice of Russification. Even today, the Kremlin permits non-Russians little direct political expression. Those few members of the eleven-man Soviet Politburo who are non-Russian tend to be Uncle Toms. And in most of the country's fifteen republics, Great Russians wield the real power.

In theory, the Soviet Union was founded on the concept of national pluralism. Soviet propaganda continually portrays a colorful pageant of almond-eyed Tartars, fair-haired Estonians, olive-skinned Azerbaijanis and ruddy-faced Russians all walking arm in arm toward the Communist millennium. In practice, of course, the various nationality groups are proceeding at vastly different paces. During the first half of 1969, only seven of the fifteen Soviet republics matched the national increase in gross industrial production. And only four of them recorded a per capita income higher than the nationwide mean of 1,070 rubles (\$1,188). Moreover, there is frequently a direct correlation between economic performance and the grievances of ethnic minorities. One reason why industries east of the Urals fulfilled only 65 per cent of their quotas last year seems to be the resentment of local workers toward "imported" managers and technicians.

The Great Russians, for their part, make no effort to hide their scorn for the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. From *khokhol* (topknot) for a Ukrainian to *chernozadyi* (black bottom) for an Azerbaijani and *yoldashy* (yellow men) for Central Asians, they have a pejorative nickname for each group. Then, too, most Russians are convinced that the national minorities either live better or work less than they do. Georgian farmers are resented for flying their tomatoes and peaches to Russian markets to take advantage of higher prices; Central Asians are reputed to be getting the lion's share of new investment projects; Ukrainians are charged with grabbing too much political power in Moscow. To find out how the national minorities, in turn, view their Russian compatriots, *NEWSWEEK's* Moscow bureau chief John Dornberg recently took an extensive tour of the Soviet Union. Dornberg's report:

Last week Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov arrived back in Peking to continue the Sino-Soviet border talks after a three-week interruption. One of the principal sources of contention at the talks is Peking's claim that vast areas of Soviet Asia are now under Moscow's control because of "unequal treaties" imposed on China by the Russian czars in the nineteenth century. But the Soviets are not about to give up any of the disputed territory—if only because

they have poured billions of rubles into Soviet Asia in order to make it a showplace for the accomplishments of Communism. Indeed, Kazakhstan now ranks third in industrial production among all Soviet republics, and Uzbekistan annually produces almost a million tons of steel.

Feudal nomads only 50 years ago, the Moslem peoples of Central Asia are now almost completely literate and the younger ones, at least, are often better versed in Russian culture than in their own. Among the older generation, however, I frequently encountered bitter resentment at the decline of ancient ways and the contempt which resident Russians display for the local populace. "When you are in the bazaar," said an Uzbek farmer who rushed to my defense as soon as an inebriated Russian tried to prevent me from taking photos, "you are our guests."

If Russians visit Central Asia for a whiff of the Orient, they travel to the three Baltic republics for a breath of the West. Independent from 1918 to 1940, the Baltic republics are still among the least Russified areas in the Soviet Union. In the Estonian capital of Tallin, "Finnish antennas" provide a TV peephole to the West, while in Riga, the capital of Latvia, art galleries display paintings far beyond the limits of socialist realism. Economically, too, the Baltic republics are advanced and specialize in the production of sophisticated industrial machinery as well as such consumer items as cars, radios, TV sets and washing machines. But even though Soviet statistics claim that industrial output has increased twentyfold since "the socialist revolution of 1940," nationalists in the Baltic republics believe they would be even better off free from Moscow's control. "We could still be socialist," one young man in Tallin told me, "but if we were not part of the Soviet Union, we'd be as rich as the Swedes."

#### SIZE

Despite the attachment of the Baltic republics to the West, if a confrontation ever develops between the Great Russians and a resurgent nationalist minority group, it may be most likely in the Ukraine. In part, this is due to the sheer size and population of the Ukraine. With 47 million inhabitants and a territory of 232,000 square miles. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic ranks as the fifth largest European member of the United Nations, where it has held a separate seat since the world organization was founded. But the Ukrainians' intense nationalism is also firmly rooted in cultural and economic achievements. Kiev was the center of medieval Russian civilization and Ukrainians are also the heirs to a highly refined literary culture developed in the nineteenth century. Economically, moreover, the Ukraine is self-sufficient. Besides being one of Europe's principal granaries, it is rich to the point of abundance in iron, coal, oil, manganese and titanium.

Though on paper all fifteen of the Soviet Union's republics enjoy the constitutional right of secession, the Ukraine would doubtless be the most capable of standing on its own feet as an independent nation. Perhaps it is the consciousness of this fact which makes Ukrainian nationalists so intransigent—and the Soviet authorities so quick to stymie their activities. Basically, Ukrainian nationalists object to the official distortion of the Ukraine's history and the de-emphasis of its language in urban schools—as well as the economic directives from Moscow which force the republic to concentrate on heavy industries to the neglect of the more profitable production of consumer goods. But they are not so much in favor of complete independence for their republic as a relaxation of centralized control. "We do not want separatism," one Ukrainian nationalist told

me recently. "What we are looking for is greater autonomy within the union."

That, however, is something which the present crop of Soviet leaders is unlikely to grant. For in an age in which demands for separate nationalist expression are heard around the world, the Kremlin has steadfastly kept a tight lid on its own minority groups. The Soviet leaders are painfully aware, of course, that by opening avenues for legitimate ethnic expression they would court the risk of undermining the very authoritarian system on which their nation is run. Yet, by failing to heed the demands of their increasingly restive nationality groups, the men in the Kremlin are courting the equally grave risk of an eventual political explosion.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues and with the free people of the Ukraine and their descendants in the United States and other nations, in marking the 52d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic and the 51st anniversary of the act of union under which all Ukrainian lands were united into one independent and sovereign nation. The independence and the act of union were proclaimed in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, on January 22, 1918 and 1919, respectively.

It is now more than 75 years since the first Ukrainians came to the State of North Dakota and they were followed in later years by refugees from Soviet oppression. These industrious, gallant, and patriotic people have, through the many years, made a great contribution to our State and Nation. We have no finer group of citizens.

Dr. Anthonis Zukowsky of Steele, N. Dak., president of the State branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., has long been a leader in the fight for Ukrainian independence. I am indebted to him for the following comments on the history of the Ukrainian fight for freedom:

JANUARY 12, 1970.

HON. TOM KLEPPE,  
U.S. Congressman,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEPPE: January 22nd will mark the 52nd Anniversary of Proclamation of Independence of Ukrainian National Republic and 51st anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one independent and sovereign Nation. The Independence and the Act of Union were proclaimed in Kiev, Capital of Ukraine on January 22, 1918 and 1919, respectively.

The Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by a number of foreign governments including that of Soviet Russia. The latter, however, almost simultaneously with recognition declared war and began invasion of Ukraine. For almost 3½ years Ukrainian people waged a gallant struggle in defense of their country, alone and unaided. The free Ukraine was subdued to a puppet regime of Soviet-Socialistic Republic.

The freedom loving people of Ukraine have not accepted Soviet-Russian domination and regardless of harsh persecutions, artificial famine and genocide Russian policy have been fighting for reestablishment of their Independence by all means accessible to them for the last 50 years. During World War II the Ukrainian people organized a powerful underground Ukrainian Partisan Army (U.P.A.), which fought against Nazi regime and against the Soviets as well.

Stalin and Khrushchev unleashed bloody

persecutions and reprisals against the Ukrainian people in late 1940's.

Relentless and severe persecutions of Ukrainians continued after the death of Stalin and after the ouster of Khrushchev from the top leadership in the Kremlin. Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership is bent on keeping the Soviet-Russian empire intact by persecutions and deportations of Ukrainian youth, students, scientists and Ukrainian intellectuals.

Recently the international press has been providing a vast amount of documentation of the suppression of Ukrainian culture.

Briefly, the Kremlin rule in Ukraine can be described as follows: Exploitation of Ukraine's economic resources for the benefit of Moscow and its imperialistic ventures in Asia, Middle-East, Africa, and Latin America. Genocide and systematic deportation of Ukrainians to central Asia. Arrest and trials of Ukrainian patriots including Ukrainian Communists defending freedom of their country.

Persecutions of all religions in Ukraine and enforced Russification aiming at the cultural and linguistic genocide of the Ukrainian people.

All the available evidence of the western observers shows that the ever-increasing tempo of repression has failed to intimidate the Ukrainian people; therefore, the Russian leadership in Kremlin took brutal measure against liberal movement in Czechoslovakia. Since Kremlin leaders were convinced the liberal ideas of Czechoslovakia would help Ukrainian liberals and other captive Nations.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States have expressed their concern over captive non-Russian nations in the USSR by enacting the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" in July 1959.

The American-Ukrainian community in our State and in the Whole United States will observe the forthcoming 52nd Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence and 51st anniversary of the Act of Union in fitting celebration.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago, on January 23, 1918, a land became free, and a magnificent people rejoiced that dreams harbored for hundreds of years had been realized. That land was the beautiful Ukraine, beloved homeland of more than 40 million people. Today we observe the anniversary of a glorious day in their history.

The independence celebrated so proudly on that January day proved fleeting, for the Ukraine was soon set upon from all directions by those covetous of her abundant natural resources and strategic geographic location. Germany and Austria-Hungary were among the first to invade, installing a puppet ruler to oversee the land. After defeat in the war, Germany and Austria-Hungary withdrew, leaving a power vacuum at once filled by France. Poland invaded in an attempt to annex Ukrainian land west of the Dnieper River. White Russians and Bolsheviks turned the lovely little land into a bloody battlefield. Finally, in November 1922, the Ukrainians witnessed the sad ending to a chapter in their heroic struggle for national independence. Only a few short years after their magnificent triumph, they were forced to bow to Russian tyranny.

Yet, through all the dark years of foreign subjugation, the Ukrainian people have carefully preserved their national heritage. They have never forgotten that wonderful, yet fleeting moment of independence. They have never ceased to

revere the words of the poet laureate of the Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko, who pled for a Ukrainian national leader to arise, who, as the American leader George Washington, would bring his people out of bondage:

When will we receive our Washington, with a new and righteous law? And receive him we will some day!

We then may all take inspiration from the wonderful example of the Ukrainian people, who never flinch in the face of adversity, who triumph over hardship, and who have never lost their undying will to be free. On this, their anniversary of independence, we salute them and join with them in the prayer that they may soon realize their goal of freedom.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for this opportunity to protest against Communist imperialism and the suppression of God-given human rights throughout the Soviet Empire.

During the quarter century that has elapsed since World War II, more than 60 nations secured their independence as the British, French, Dutch, and Belgian empires disintegrated. Unfortunately, the hypocritical Soviet Union which, along with its tools and dupes in our own country, has so much to say about colonialism, has not joined with its European neighbors in releasing subject peoples from the yoke of imperialism.

While hundreds of millions of Africans and Asians have been released from bondage, the nearly 50 million people of Ukraine continue to suffer under the tyranny of communism. This reign of terror, which began under Lenin and continued unabated under Stalin and Khrushchev, is as oppressive as ever under the present Soviet leadership.

Until such time as the Kremlin removes the shackles from the Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Letts, Estonians, and other victims of Soviet aggression, we ought to turn deaf ears to prattle about the melting Communists.

Mr. Speaker, for a nation which fought against German national socialism, Italian fascism, Japanese imperialism to directly cooperate in any way with international communism is the most absurd sort of inconsistency.

Let us hope and pray that the people of Ukraine, along with their fellow colonialists, will soon join the ranks of free and independent peoples.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 52d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. It is appropriate that on this occasion every year we take time to pay tribute to this country which represents freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Ukraine's experience as a free, self-determining country from 1918 to 1920 instilled in the Ukrainian people a dedication to the ideals of freedom and a deep desire for independence that has persisted. The spirit of the Ukrainians should be an inspiration to us and a reminder of the struggle that other countries are enduring to achieve the liberty that we have possessed for so long.

On the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, we wish to convey to the

Ukrainian people our concern for their welfare and our respect for their many years of patient efforts to restore their independence.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians are one of the oldest and largest of the Slavic peoples. They are known also as one of the most industrious and peace-loving peoples in Eastern Europe, even though they have not been allowed to live in peace. The reason for this misfortune is that, except for the happy but very brief period of independence in 1918-20, they have been suffering under the alien and oppressive Russian yoke for more than three centuries.

Up to the middle of the 17th century the Ukrainians were able to maintain their freedom and independence against the onslaughts of invading Asiatic hordes. Then in the year 1654 the Ukrainian leaders signed a treaty with the czar of Russia by which they meant to unite the two countries. Soon these leaders found out that they had been tricked by the Russian czar; the wily autocrat succeeded in nullifying the terms of the compact and put an end to the Ukraine's independence. Nearly all of Ukraine's subsequent misfortunes seem to have stemmed from the twisted terms of that compact.

Under the czars the Ukrainians were expected to abandon their traditional beliefs and national aspirations and to lose their identity in a merger with the more numerous Russian people. The czarist government set out to Russianize, by compulsion if necessary, all Ukrainians. Imperial decrees banned the use of Ukrainian as an official language; in schools the teaching of that language was not permitted; and the whole country was treated as a colonial adjunct of imperial Russia.

During more than two centuries, however, Russians could not eradicate Ukrainian nationalist feelings. The more oppressive the hand of the Government, the more the Ukrainians resented and rebelled against their overlords. As a result, Ukrainian nationalism was kept alive and became a powerful force in the country. The idea of freedom was carefully nurtured in the people's hearts. Finally, some 250 years later when the Ukrainians had the chance to regain their freedom, they seized upon it and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. That day has become a momentous landmark in modern Ukrainian history, and since then it has been celebrated as a Ukrainian national holiday.

The republic which the Ukrainian leaders founded 52 years ago was a frail and fragile one and beyond the reach of aid from sympathetic friends and well-wishers. It was surrounded by powerful and dangerous foes, all anxious to pounce upon the new state and put an end to its existence. The inevitable took place in 1920; the country was invaded and overrun by the Red Army, and its independence once again shattered. Thereupon the Ukraine became a de facto part of the Soviet Union, and so it remains to this day.

Communist totalitarianism has turned Ukraine into a vast prison camp in

which more than 45,000,000 freedom-loving and hard-working Ukrainians are being held by the Kremlin. There being no real freedom, the people are not even allowed to observe their independence day. But the irrepressible spirit of the Ukrainian people refused to be chained and muffled; the people retain their national ideals and their aspirations to regain national independence.

On the 52d anniversary observance of their independence day, I wish the gallant people of the Ukraine peace, but also fortitude and hope.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 22d of this month marked the 52d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. That day is particularly meaningful to those Americans of Ukrainian descent who aspire to see freedom and national independence returned to the land of their origin. It is fitting, therefore, that we in the Congress join in tribute to the 47 million people now living in the Ukraine.

The Ukrainian people have enjoyed only brief periods of independence while enduring centuries of struggle against Russian tyranny, both czarist and Communist. The period 1917-18, which we commemorate today, marked a break in the Russian stranglehold and the rebirth of the Ukraine. The Ukraine, as well as other non-Russian territories, established independent governments following the fall of the czarist empire. The Bolsheviks, however, moved quickly to seize control of those areas and the Ukraine, along with the others, fell under Communist domination. The Ukraine withstood military pressure from the Red Army for 3½ years, but could not stand alone. On the heels of the victorious Red Army followed an indiscriminate reign of terror.

The agony of the Ukrainian people under Soviet rule reached its zenith during the period of Stalin's forced collectivization. When it became evident that the Ukrainian peasants could not be induced to abandon their farms and enter the collectives by means of persuasion, Stalin resorted to mass starvation. In 1932, the entire year's grain reserve of the Ukraine was removed from the country by Red convoys. It is estimated that 6 million Ukrainians died in the famine that resulted. Political terror accompanied the famine and 80 percent of all the Ukrainian intellectuals were liquidated under Stalin's purge.

Even today Ukrainians are denied free choice of their institutions and governing bodies. The people of all non-Russian territories are permitted little political expression, even though they constitute the majority of the population.

National consciousness, however, is increasing in these territories and is particularly evident in the Ukraine. Ukrainians know that their territory is economically self-sufficient. They are intensely aware of their distinguished cultural heritage. They object to Russification and economic edicts from Moscow. The result is a resurgence of a nationalism that has always burned beneath the surface of Ukrainian life.

I join with all Ukrainians in this hope that their country will once again regain its rightful place among the family of nations.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with my distinguished and esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, in commemorating the 52d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Unfortunately, as my colleagues know, this independence was short lived. Shortly after Ukraine's declaration of sovereignty the Soviet Union crushed the free Ukrainian nation and reduced it to a constituent State of the U.S.S.R.

This denial of the right to self-determination, exemplifying as it did the Soviet policy of imperial-colonialism, shocked the world. It is a deed which still causes burning indignation in the hearts of all freedom-loving peoples, particularly the loyal sons of the Ukraine.

There have been other instances of Soviet imperialism in the years since the fall of the Ukraine, most recently the invasion of Czechoslovakia. We have all commiserated with the people of Czechoslovakia as the reforms which they won under the enlightened regime of Alexander Dubcek were undermined and eliminated. Seeing what has happened in this instance has demonstrated to us once again what the people of the Ukraine have suffered for 52 years.

Yet, we can take heart in reports from the Ukraine of people speaking out against the Soviet totalitarian regime. The desire for freedom remains strong and vibrant. The refusal to be silent puppets is a constant threat to the Soviet "masters."

Thus, though it is discouraging for the loyal sons of the Ukraine to see the Soviet Union continue its totalitarian control, they do not give up hope. They hold firm to their vision of a homeland free and independent.

At the same time, we must not be blinded by the actions of the Soviet Union. We must not fail to see that the people of the Ukraine and the other captive nations hopefully benefit most from a continued thaw in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Continued belligerence will beget nothing more than continued belligerence.

It was this belief which stimulated the Johnson administration to begin its policy of "building bridges" to the people of Eastern Europe. The same belief, I am sure, has led the new administration to continue and even enlarge upon this policy.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that our Government and its principle of individual dignity represents an attractive and revolutionary idea to the oppressed peoples of the world. We can and must communicate this idea to peoples everywhere.

To accomplish this, it is essential that we nurture the channels of dialog which we have already opened and continue to develop new ones, such as the strategic arms limitation talks now underway.

Individual freedom is such that once it has been tasted, a craving for it develops and spreads—a truth which the people of Czechoslovakia are demonstrating to their Soviet-dominated leaders.

The fact that 52 years has not erased the memory of and the thirst for independence in the people of the Ukraine

bears further witness to the potency of these freedoms.

Thus, I submit that we must not place limits on the avenues of approach to the peoples of Eastern Europe. We must consistently apply our creative energies to developing and expanding our points of contact with those forced to live under communism.

The ultimate result will eventually be a greater freedom for the people of the Ukraine and the other national groups of Eastern Europe. This is the goal to which we must earnestly dedicate ourselves upon this anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in marking the 52d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Ukraine. The years of independence were much too brief and have been followed by too many years of oppression and captivity.

Americans of Ukrainian descent and those Ukrainians still held captive continue to nourish the will for an independent Ukraine. The dream of 1918 is still alive, both here and in the homeland, but our support in this House can help that dream to flourish and grow until the day when the dream becomes reality. This is the occasion when those of us who have spoken and acted in the past for a free Ukraine can renew our resolve, and those who are new to the struggle may join the forces of liberty.

We have seen ample evidence in the last few years that those who believe communism is mellowing and that the system, of its own volition, would slowly relax the bonds on the captive nations are misled. It has become abundantly clear that communism and the basic human freedoms cannot co-exist in the half of the world dominated and controlled by the Communist masters, simply because exercise of these freedoms destroys the control necessary for the continued existence of a Communist government. The rechainning of Czechoslovakia stifled the hopes that Communist Russia would voluntarily permit a gradual resurgence of free speech and dissenting opinion.

But hope of another sort is still alive in the captive nations—the hope that the spark of freedom from within fed by the support of this country and the other free nations will light the way to true independence from the Communist masters.

This support is our charge and one which we in the House should meet.

Last October I was deeply honored to receive the Shevchenko Freedom Award from the 10th annual Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent in recognition of my efforts in the cause of Ukraine's freedom. I was proud and grateful that I had been selected to receive this honor, for my past efforts, but as we observe the 52d anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Ukraine, I would like to look forward to the time when my efforts and those of the other Members of the House will have helped restore freedom to the people of the Ukraine.

When human rights are restored to the Ukraine, when the people are once

again free to determine their own government, and when all the captive nations of Europe and Asia are once again unfettered, then we can all take greatest pride that free men, having continued to struggle against oppression, have prevailed. Then honors, with their finest flavor, honors for successful striving will go to all who fought for freedom.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians are one of the oldest, most numerous and most gifted national groups in Eastern Europe. They have been among the bravest who have fought for their individual and national freedom. For centuries they have suffered hardships under alien regimes, yet they have never abandoned their aspirations to be free and independent. Under the ruthless, callous, and almost inhuman Austrian and Russian autocracies, they managed to maintain their spirit of independence and many of their cherished national and cultural traits. They never gave up the struggle to free themselves from the grip of foreign regimes.

For centuries their sole national goal had been to attain national political independence. And in 1918 they had the chance. When the Russian autocracy was overthrown and the Austrian monarchy was about to share a similar fate, the Ukrainians felt free to declare their independence. This they did on January 22, 1918, and established the Ukrainian Republic. But valiant as they were, they were not fortunate and powerful enough to preserve it. Before they had a chance to enjoy the fruits of freedom, they found themselves fighting on several fronts—against the Poles and Czechs, and of course against the deadly Russian Communists. At last overwhelmed, they surrendered their independence and their country to the Red army in November 1920. That was the untimely end of the Ukrainian Republic.

Since then some 45,000,000 Ukrainians have been living under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Their beloved homeland has become a vast prison camp where they have not much more freedom than people in prison. But these sturdy and stout-hearted people have not given up their hope for freedom and independence, and on this observance of their independence day, let us all hope that they attain their goal in their homeland.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in saluting the courageous people of the Ukraine whose 52d anniversary of independence occurred on January 22, 1970.

The State of Illinois is particularly fortunate to have among her citizens a sizable number of Ukrainian-Americans who have contributed so much to the advancement of our democratic ideals and our American way of life.

I am proud to say that many of the outstanding Ukrainian-American organizations which we have in the Chicago area are headquartered in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent. These include:

Ukrainian-American Civic Center, Inc., 845 North Western Avenue;  
Ukrainian-American Club, 2234 West Chicago Avenue;

Ukrainian-American Publishing & Printing Co., 2315 West Chicago Avenue.

Ukrainian-American Social Club of UNA, 2345 West Chicago Avenue;

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 841 North Western Avenue;

Ukrainian National Association—Lions, 2353 West Chicago Avenue;

Ukrainian Youth Camping Organization, Inc., 2116 West Chicago Avenue;

Ukrainian Book Store, 2315 West Chicago Avenue; and

Ukrainian National Museum, 2453 West Chicago Avenue.

Over the years I have had the opportunity to observe firsthand the various activities conducted under the auspices of these organizations and I am tremendously impressed with their significant contributions to the civic, social, educational, and cultural life of our community. I know that in the years ahead they shall continue to make meaningful contributions to the well-being of all of the people in our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting, therefore, that we observe here in the Congress the 52d anniversary of that eventful day in 1918 when the brave Ukrainians declared their independence from their oppressors. In the face of the dark cloud of communism and overwhelming military opposition by the Red Army, the valiant Ukrainians fought for their country and their culture. Through their unrelenting and tireless efforts and their devotion to the sacred cause of liberty, the Ukrainian independence endured for more than 3 years. However, deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic assistance on the part of the Western powers, the Ukrainian people unfortunately succumbed to the numerically superior forces of Soviet Russia.

Today, communistic totalitarianism reigns in the Ukraine but the dauntless Ukrainian people still cling to their national ideals, confident that one day they will attain their goal of freedom, self-determination, and national independence.

On this important occasion I want to congratulate the Ukrainians for their steadfast efforts to regain their freedom. I also want to join my colleagues in reaffirming our belief in America's historic commitment to the principles of freedom and self-determination and in expressing our hope for the eventual peaceful liberation of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the 52d anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic was commemorated. At the same time, the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of the Act of Union was marked, wherein Western Ukraine united with the Ukrainian National Republic into one independent republic of the Ukrainian people.

These anniversaries are important as symbols of individualism and independence to all people suffering under repressive governments. Here is an ethnic group, the largest in Russia, who have borne much suffering and oppression for the last half century. Nonetheless, they remain a singular people, noted for their literary, cultural, and individualistic

traditions. Although they have undergone Russification and centralization, they yet retain their distinctive character.

The freedom and liberty we sometimes take for granted is most hard won elsewhere. As we experience it, freedom is not mere liberation from slavery or imprisonment. It is quite more, and is characterized by a feeling of freedom from restraint.

The Ukrainian people have not enjoyed a similar privilege. It is therefore incumbent on us to appreciate the unusual benefits we enjoy, when we understand that others just as worthy are less favored. Only by appreciating and utilizing our privileges can we continue to possess them. Like the Ukrainians, we must take stock of our heritage in order to retain it. This is the lesson we can learn from a proud people who will not yield up their individuality, even in the face of overwhelming odds. Their example is inspiring, and behooves us to wish them eventual success in their striving for the dignity and liberation they so richly deserve.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 52d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. It should be inspiring to all freedom-loving people to see the unswerving faith and hope of the Ukrainian people. Even though they are today bound by the shackles of godless oppressors, the Ukrainians bravely commemorate the day they finally realized their dream of independence in 1918. Today, they dream and pray that they shall again, some day, know the joy of freedom. I join with my colleagues in commending all Ukrainians for their undying desire for freedom to live and worship in their own way.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the tragic history of the Ukraine's short-lived independence. It was torn and divided by Austrian, Polish, and Russian interests through much of the 19th century, the collapse of Europe's old order at the conclusion of the First World War gave the Ukrainians a chance to seize their liberty.

But these aspirations were quickly crushed. As the Ukrainians moved to form a government, the Bolsheviks' Red Army occupied Kiev. The Rada had proclaimed "a free and sovereign" Ukrainian Republic on January 22, 1918. Two years later this dream had been shattered.

So today as the House of Representatives pauses to mark the 52d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, we can be certain no similar ceremony is being observed by the Soviet Parliament. This ancient people which traces its history as a nation back to the ninth century does not itself have the privilege of marking its glorious history.

The Russians would have us believe that all is well with their captive nations. These Soviet masters would say that the freedom-loving Ukrainians thrive and grow strong under their domination. Well I have just returned from behind the Iron Curtain and a brief visit to the Ukraine and I can say with authority this is not so.

The Ukrainian people are not content under the jackboot of their Russian

master and the Russians know this, suspect and watch everyone.

I spent 2 days in the Ukraine in late November as part of a longer week's visit to Russia. I went behind the Iron Curtain to prepare myself for the 31st meeting of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at Geneva, where I was the majority representative of a House Judiciary Committee delegation.

Suffice it to say that the pressure to leave Eastern Europe remains high. People are eager to migrate to the West and all one needs see to confirm this for himself are the emigrant camps and lodges around Vienna, which I also visited. Peoples happy with their lot and their governments do not flee their homelands. It is now nearly two decades since the great post World War European migrations and people continue to flock to the West whenever they can.

In Russia, there was little official enthusiasm for my visit to the Ukraine. After getting the grudging consent of the bureaucrats and after spending most of Thanksgiving Day in the Moscow Airport, I finally enplaned for Kiev. In Kiev, the marshmallow wall went up again. My intourist guide and most officials were not eager for me to talk with the people of the Ukraine. They prefer Western visitors to spend their time in museums and staring at monuments. Human contact was discouraged. Clear efforts were made to keep me from seeing living institutions and how people lived.

In Kiev, I managed to visit two typical apartments. Both were small and their floor plans were identical. One apartment was occupied by four persons. Finally, I also was able to convince my Russian hosts to permit me a day's outing to Uman, some 132 miles south of Kiev. At first I was told that the roads were impassable.

The roads, of course, were not impassable. The highway is a fine concrete ribbon, which passes through some of the most primitive hamlets an industrialized society could produce. The hamlets are without electricity, rudimentary plumbing, paved streets, and the like.

The point is simply that the Russians have not allowed the Ukrainians full parity in the economic life of the U.S.S.R. and that was obviously what the apparatchiks were eager to conceal.

A State Department officer tells of being approached in Kiev by a Ukrainian interested only finally in a brief conversation about the officer's camera. When the Ukrainian left he was followed by two men, almost certainly from the Russian Secret Service. The most innocent conversation on a public street is suspect. The Russians obviously do not trust the Ukrainians—and probably for good reason.

The lessons of Hungary and Czechoslovakia are clear. The Russian world is not monolithic. The Soviets cannot dominate foreign peoples with their own national traditions and cultures indefinitely.

Each man must be his own master. It is 52 years since the Ukrainians declared their independence and some 50 years since it was stolen from them. This is a mere trace in the history of man. The Russians know and fear this and the

Ukrainians wait and watch for their chance to seize their independence once again.

#### ADDITIONAL RESPONSES TO EDUCATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in each of the four preceding legislative days, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD responses from local school officials to a questionnaire on title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These statements and responses appear on the following pages of the RECORD: beginning on page 284, January 20; page 644, January 21; page 761, January 22; and page 1033, January 26.

I wish at this time to extend my deep appreciation to all the school superintendents and administrators at the local level for their cooperation in this survey. The rate of return has been far beyond what was expected, and what is usually the case with surveys such as this. The number of responses, and the speed with which they were returned, indicate emphatically the urgency with which local school officials regard the subject of the survey—that is, their evaluation, substantiated with hard fact and statistics, of the effectiveness of title I of ESEA, and their plea for more adequate and timely funding.

Today I will include in the RECORD additional responses received between noon yesterday and today. As I have mentioned in the past, this information, which is being received on a daily basis, is the most current information on title I programs upon which an evaluation can be made.

As we near the vote on the veto action by the President, perhaps it would be helpful to review the results and findings of the questionnaire. When one rereads the hundreds of responses we have received, it becomes abundantly clear that title I funds are effectively and dramatically being employed to make significant improvements in the achievement of educationally disadvantaged children.

The response which I will include from the school superintendent of the Long Beach, Calif., Unified School District, exemplifies a sentiment being expressed almost universally:

We regard our present Title I programs as very effective. Each year, as we have gained additional know-how in education, our programs have become more effective and our evaluation results clearly show this.

Last week, some concern was expressed that the returning questionnaires did not contain statistical data to document the favorable evaluations by local school officials of title I activities. It is my considered judgment that these evaluations have now been fully documented and justified by the statements and information received from State departments of education within the last day or two, information containing hard statistical evidence of improvement in basic skills, such as reading and math.

A telegram received from the Minnesota State Department of Education was not received in time to be included in yesterday's insert. The telegram contained data from a random sampling of the 350 Minnesota school districts serving title I children in reading projects. The results, which are still tentative, show that out of the 12,237 students tested, 1.7 percent, or 207 students, gained 2 years or more in reading; 22.9 percent, that is close to 3,000 students, showed gains from 1 to 2 years; and 5,885, or 48.1 percent, students fell into the category of gaining between 6 and 9 months.

Or let us review information just brought to my attention regarding the effectiveness of title I in the District of Columbia Schools. A survey was made of title I schools with both fourth and sixth grades. There were 12 such schools involved in the study. A study of the fourth grade reading scores in the school year 1966-67 showed that one school was above the national norm, four were near or at the national norm, and seven were below the national norm. A survey 2 years later, in the academic year 1968-69, of the same students when they were in the sixth grade, shows a significant shift upward. While in 1966-67, seven schools registered below the national norm, in 1968-69, only two schools fell into this category. Ten in 1968-69, as compared to four in 1966-67, were near or at the national norm level.

A summary of instructional activity in Kentucky under title I was just received this morning, and I should like to share with my colleagues certain of the results reported.

In one program, out of 243 students tested in grades 1-6, 57 pupils gained an average of 1.6 years in reading achievement, 31 average 2.2 years. Average daily attendance increase by 4 percent for target groups.

In another program, 424 students in grades 3-12 showed an average gain of 1.1 years in reading activity; teacher-parent-pupil surveys indicate positive attitudes.

Out of 164 students in grades 3-7 in still another program, 94 scored above the average expected gain.

Out of 895 students in grades 1-12, part of another activity, 456 students gained an average of .1 year above expectations; 220 gained .2 year more than was expected; 150 gained an average of .3 years above expectations. The group attendance increased by 2.6 percent.

In another school, the report states that 339 of 505 students tested achieved above average expectations. The number of pupils in target groups behind 1 year in reading was reduced by 31, and the number 2 years behind reduced by 78.

With these reports, it is clear that, in conjunction with the statements of 89 percent or more of all the respondents to the questionnaire, title I is effective in meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged students.

My inquiries disclose almost without exception that the only serious problem related to program effectiveness is that of funding. There is widespread and deep

concern registered over the timing and level of financing. Such statements as: "inadequate funding is the cost of limited effectiveness in this district," "inadequate funding is the greatest obstacle in reaching more disadvantaged students and reaching them more emphatically," "any limited effectiveness is due to insufficient funding," "inadequate funding is the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged," "adequate funding is essential to provide comprehensive and quality programs," "inadequate funding has been a real problem because we lose key people in any cutback," are the types of statements which appear on virtually every questionnaire.

Today and tomorrow, as we give final consideration to our action regarding the Presidential veto, we must recognize that H.R. 13111 will not permit any great forward movement in title I but it will simply restore programs to their operating levels of 1968.

I sincerely wish we were going to have an opportunity tomorrow to cast a vote on a proposal which calls for investing billions of dollars in education to assist in meeting the still unmet needs in urban and rural education. Clearly this is not the case, Mr. Speaker. Positive action tomorrow, regrettably will not result in the investment in education which is obviously needed. Positive action tomorrow does mean, however, that Yakima, Wash., may be able to carry out their planned summer program for migrant and other disadvantaged children which they say in their questionnaire is now pigeonholed, because of a lack of funds; or it may mean the restoration of two title I programs which the Corning, N.Y., school system reports they had to terminate in fiscal year 1960; one an elementary home school counselor program and the second, a program of special help in math and reading at the elementary school level.

RESPONSE OF WILLARD A. CANODE, YUMA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, YUMA, ARIZ.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 620.

What is the ADA in your school district grades 9-12?

Answer: 3049.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 27,031, 1969 25,934, 1970 22,727.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$6000, 1971 \$6000.

In your judgement, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Programs can be developed which perhaps determine whether these students remain in school or not.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra

funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment:

YUMA HIGH SCHOOL,  
Yuma, Ariz., January 21, 1970.

Mr. CARL D. PERKINS,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: Attempting to establish program requirements which are intended to regulate the funding of Title I projects cannot be done on a nation wide basis. Providing for the needs, the problems, or the desires of the Negro or Mexican child, in New York City cannot be handled in the same manner as for the Negro or Mexican student in Yuma, Arizona. I have worked for the past four years as director of summer school for the Yuma Union High School District; eighty to eighty-five per cent of the costs have been met by our Title I allocation. There has been no construction or capital outlay from these funds; money has been used for salaries, supplies, and transportation. If the Yuma Union High School District were to receive added funds, these funds would be used to increase the course offering and to hold down the class load in hopes that more might be accomplished. Our opportunity to enroll the disadvantaged student and to work on his attitude toward school and himself is much greater than it would be in a large community. Placing the same restriction or regulations on both groups would certainly handicap one.

I have read several articles which have been critical of the extravagant use of Title I funds. The men in Congress must have received a great deal of mail challenging what John Q. Public might call Federal waste. Any program as extensive as Title I, will encounter problems from time to time. Not every State agency will have the same kind of problems to solve. If the members of the Committee on Education and Labor had the time to visit in the outlying areas and to observe successful programs in operation, I am sure they would be proud of the accomplishments. One failure doesn't make a catastrophe—one success doesn't make a bonanza. Our project in Yuma, Arizona has grown each year; more of the students that we really need to reach are becoming a part of the program. I am unable to estimate the number of students who have remained in school until graduation as a result of our summer school offering. At the end of each summer school from eight to fifteen students have received their diplomas. I am quite sure that none of these students would have returned to high school for a full semester had this opportunity been unavailable. I can not even estimate the number of students who have been able to graduate with their class as a result of having made up required credits through this summer school program. At Yuma High School we feel the dollar and cents value of the money spent has been redeemed a hundred times over by those who have participated in our summer program.

Sincerely,

WARREN P. CONRAD,  
Assistant Principal.

RESPONSE OF W. ODIE WRIGHT, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 3,118.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 71,591.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$1,363,356, 1969 \$1,087,437, 1970 \$745,275.

What additional funds, if any, could you

effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$298,110, 1971 \$1,254,725.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: See attached letter.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: See attached letter.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path or more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: See attached letter.

LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,

Long Beach, Calif., January 23, 1970.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,  
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your questionnaire concerning Title I ESEA funds. We welcome this opportunity to respond. We have answered the first four questions on the form and will address ourselves to each of the remaining ones in order below.

We emphatically believe that Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children. Such programs are essential if we are to bring these children up to a level where they can compete with their peers who come from more advantaged homes. Compensatory education requires extra materials and personnel to provide the individualized instruction required.

We regard our present Title I programs as very effective. Each year as we have gained additional "know how" in educating disadvantaged pupils, our programs have become more effective, and our evaluation results clearly show this. Our greatest handicap has been the continual annual reductions in funds we have suffered.

There is no doubt that lack of funding is our greatest obstacle to more effective education for disadvantaged pupils. All of the funds in Long Beach Unified School District are going for educational programs for disadvantaged pupils. Minimal amounts of Title I funds are assigned to administrative costs, and substantial district effort is helping to support necessary indirect costs. We believe that there is some misdirection of funds at the state level in terms of formulas used. It seems to us that with our large urban area problems we are being assigned too small an amount to carry on an adequate program. For example, our AFDC count is low as presently figured, but we have many low income and poverty level children not reached by any program. Extra funds passed now in the HEW Appropriations Bill can be effectively used for summer programs and the employment of additional teacher aides for more individualized instruction. Of course, we would have to say that the earlier we get funds the more effective our programs can be.

Again, many thanks for this opportunity to express our thoughts. We are appreciative of the continued interest and effort that you have devoted to public education. If we can be of further help, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,

W. ODIE WRIGHT,  
Superintendent of Schools.

RESPONSE OF LARRY J. SISUNG, DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL PROJECTS, JEFFERSON PARISH, GRETNA, LA.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 2,502.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 63,210.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$810,447.62; 1969, \$732,817.64; 1970, \$584,006.00.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$1 million; 1971, \$2 million.

I feel that you should be aware of the following discrepancy in Title I funding: Title I funds are allocated on the number of disadvantaged students residing in a school district during the year 1960.

Jefferson Parish which is a part of the Greater New Orleans Metropolitan Area is experiencing a tremendous population growth. From 1960 to 1968 our population has increased from 208,769 to 314,900; a gain of 50.8% and this growth is continuing.

The following data indicates our school growth since 1960:

	1960	1969	Increase
White.....	24,525	50,010	25,485
Negro.....	7,120	13,200	6,080
Total.....	31,645	63,210	31,565

<sup>1</sup> These students are enrolled in 51 of the 70 schools.

<sup>2</sup> These students are enrolled in 70 schools.

In addition to the above data, there are approximately thirty thousand students in our private and parochial schools and approximately ten thousand educables not enrolled in any school. Thus our total school district student population is approximately one hundred and five thousand.

The Jefferson Parish School System is completely desegregated. As a matter of fact, we have gone beyond the court's ruling in order to maintain stability.

Since 1965 when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was approved by Congress, our Title I allocation has continuously decreased while our student population has continuously increased. The low-income people who lived in the rural counties or parishes in the late fifties, have since moved to the Metropolitan areas. Yet, the rural areas continue to receive the monies for students they no longer have. For your personal edification, there are some parishes in Louisiana whose total school population is less than the enrollment of our minority group; yet, they continue to receive more Title I funds than we do. I consider this to be a gross inequity.

Each year we are advised by H.E.W. officials to concentrate our efforts and provide services to fewer children. This means that many of our (public) deprived students even though their needs are the same never receive services. I feel that this is not a fair and democratic procedure to follow, especially when we are required to provide services to the parochial and private school students regardless of their family income.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Title I programs are definitely needed to meet the special needs of the educationally disadvantaged students. Since our school system, as well as many others in the nation, is suffering from financial difficulties, we cannot afford the special programs required to meet the needs of the educationally disadvantaged. Our system has recognized the special needs of these stu-

dents and have supported all programs in Title I which seek to meet these needs; however, we would be unable to fund these projects without the additional monies provided by ESEA Title I.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Emphatically yes—with the small appropriations which we now receive, we can prove that our programs have been effective in enhancing the educational opportunity of deprived children. This proof is evident in our Title I evaluation. However, you must realize that we are dealing with children who are not only educationally disadvantaged but also culturally disadvantaged. Thus, there are both tangible and intangible, easily measured and not so easily measured, factors which must be considered and reconciled. This reconciliation requires time and patience; therefore, judgments cannot be made in brief time spans.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: We agree with the disclosure that inadequate funding is the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. As we have pointed out, our Title I allocations have decreased yearly while our student population has increased yearly. Therefore, we cannot reach all disadvantaged children as long as this inequitable policy continues.

As for the contention that some funds are being misdirected, I would suggest that you request from the individuals complaining that they point out the school districts which are misusing the funds and that these individuals be advised that unless they comply, their funds will be discontinued. I do not feel that it is just to penalize all school districts because possibly one or two school systems are not complying with the guidelines as set down by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This follows the pedagogical theory that you do not punish the entire class because one student misbehaves. I feel that this theory is apropos.

RESPONSE OF ROBERT R. WHEELER, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, SCHOOL DISTRICT OF KANSAS CITY, MO., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 9,955.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 63,728.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$1,927,025, 1969 \$1,750,566, 1970 \$1,577,988.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 none, 1971 none. If the present trend is continued, there will probably be a lower level of funding.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, although the level of present support is too small to support programs which will meet major needs with the degree of intensity required.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special educa-

tion needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Only partially, because the funding is too small to effectively treat all needs.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: There may be some instances of the misdirection of funds. By and large, however, the money does reach the children for whom it is intended. It may be beneficial, though, to put heavier emphasis on direct instructional measures.

RESPONSE OF W. J. DEFELICE, SUPERINTENDENT, LAFOUCHE PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, THIBODAUX, LA., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 660 children. (Only 3.14% of 21,024 ADM in the district.)

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: ADA 20,078 (17,829 public; and 2,249 parochial.) ADA 95.5% of 21,024 ADM.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$430,734, 1969 \$388,072, 1970 \$315,232.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$185,000 (limited because half the fiscal year passed), 1971 \$385,000 (if we could know and plan in advance).

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. The disadvantaged need more individualized instruction in smaller groups, and this is too expensive for local educational agencies alone.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, for the 660 children now benefitting from our Title I program. With more funds, we could help many more disadvantaged children who need special help.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Eighty per cent (80%) of our 1970 ESEA Title I grant is being used to employ 35 additional teachers who provide remedial instruction for 660 educationally deprived children in 14 target area public schools and in 3 parochial schools. This only helps about half of the disadvantaged who need special educational programs. If our grant was increased to \$700,000, we could use the additional funds effectively in instructional programs for a larger number of disadvantaged children.

RESPONSE OF MELVIN O'CONNELL, SUPERVISING PRINCIPAL, ASHLEY-SUGAR NOTCH SCHOOLS, ASHLEY-SUGAR NOTCH, HIGH SCHOOL BUILDING, ASHLEY, PA., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 325.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 694.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$30,000, 1969, \$26,000, 1970 \$22,000.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$10,000, 1971, \$10,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Limited effectiveness. Need more money.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Inadequate funding is the cause of the limited effectiveness in this district.

RESPONSE OF LAMAR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, RE 2, LAMAR, COLO., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 345.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 2228.8.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$65,930, 1969, \$62,729, 1970 \$51,508.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$10,500, 1971 \$20,500.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, because guidelines are set forth for the use of Title I grants and the money cannot be absorbed in general fund expenditures of the school district but must be used for the purpose intended.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Our Title I programs are quite effective in meeting the special educational needs. As our grants are reduced so do the number of students who can be helped, also the number of special classes and materials in which we can help the educationally disadvantaged children.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Inadequate funding is the greatest obstacle in reaching more disadvantaged students and reaching them more effectively.

RESPONSE OF V. WERTSCHNIG, DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, MILWAUKEE, WIS., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 15,000.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 129,300.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$2,816,000, 1969 \$2,796,000, 1970 allocation unknown; operating on 90% of 1969 allocation.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$3,600,000, 1971 \$4,000,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes! Their categorical nature has highlighted the needs of the disadvantaged.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes! But more funds are needed. Title I funds thus far have only aided the "top of the iceberg"—we need to help the 4/5 below the surface.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Every Title I dollar is being spent on educational programs for the disadvantaged. Any limited effectiveness is due to insufficient funds and a limited experience in the field. Full-funding and more time are crucial.

RESPONSE OF ROBERT J. NEARINE, HARTFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION, HARTFORD, CONN., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 4,300.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4,416,334—aggregate days attendance.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$1,412,505, 1969 \$1,389,585, 1970 \$1,263,414.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$1,368,635—JADC, 1971 \$1,300,000—approximately.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Several of our programs have been selected as exemplary in this regard. We recognize, however, that city youngsters are in a large measure disadvantaged. Hence more freedom to apply programs to needs is indicated.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reach-

ings the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Again, the population of a city requires more categorical aid to fully serve the disadvantaged. Mobility, immigrants, and our population of over 28,000 youngsters mandate that we get away from the target school concept if service is to be rendered. Neither does the target school concept add to our concept of quality of integrated education; operationally, the two concepts are somewhat incompatible.

RESPONSE OF LEROY J. CASAGRANDA, FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS DIRECTOR, ONE, BUTTE, MONT., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 534.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$511.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$208,812; 1969, \$175,668, 1970 (total has not been determined).

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$30,000; 1971, \$—.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Title I has been very beneficial to needy students in Butte. The span of programs include remedial work, kindergarten, programs for school dropouts, summer session and guidance counseling programs.

RESPONSE OF DR. CLYDE MUSE, SUPERINTENDENT, HINDS COUNTY, JACKSON, MISS., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 2,800.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 12,796.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$952,083, 1969 \$880,181, 1970 \$621,139.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$0. Too late in the school year to efficiently plan for effective use of any additional funds. 1971 \$400,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. We are constantly upgrading procedures of teaching as we become more aware of effective ways to meet the special needs of the disadvantaged.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Nearly all the complaints we receive pertain to the lack of welfare programs for the poor financed by Title I. Very rarely have educational programs been mentioned. None of the people who have contended that monies were being misdirected have offered any proof that the entire total of our grants were being spent in a manner which was not in keeping with existing regulations. All funds are directed toward helping the educationally disadvantaged in the most critical areas.

RESPONSE OF GEORGE BELBUSTI, BOARD OF EDUCATION, WEST HAVEN, CONN., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 300.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 10,800.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$115,847; 1969, \$97,395; 1970, \$99,165.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$25,000; 1971, \$45,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Present Title I ESEA programs can be more effective with additional funds, we are recognizing "crisis" areas in the education of disadvantaged youth, e.g., pre-school, but cannot reach out from our basic thrust. The misdirection of funds reflects a lack of pupil identification, a lack of need identification, and inadequate planning. More money is needed.

RESPONSE OF MR. A. J. HENRIQUEZ, SUPERINTENDENT, MONROE, KEY WEST, FLA., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I ESEA?

Answer: 530.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?



Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Inadequate funding has been a real problem, because we lose key personnel in every cutback. Timing has been poor because many of our best people are already committed to other positions. It is true that other pupils benefit from Title I funds because we do not separate the so-called disadvantaged pupils from their classmates, except in tutoring situations.

RESPONSE OF GEORGE J. MCINTOSH, SUPERINTENDENT, NEWPORT NEWS PUBLIC SCHOOLS, NEWPORT NEWS, VA., JANUARY 27, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 3,654.

What is the ADA in your school district grades 1-12?

Answer: 28,592.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$552,151.35, 1969 \$529,418.12, 1970 \$460,726.31. (This amount reflects funding to date, does not include summer programs.)

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 Funding at 1969 level plus at least a 10% increase to take care of summer programs, increase in salaries, cost of living, etc. 1971 funding at the level specified for 1970 plus an additional 10% for reasons previously stated.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. Educationally disadvantaged children are behind in many respects. Local school budgets cannot stretch to cover needed compensatory programs.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, Within the existing funding limitations.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Evidence of misdirected funds should not penalize the majority of school divisions whose programs reflect the spirit and intent of Title I.

RESPONSE OF WILLIAM BRANDON BELL, COORDINATOR OF TITLE I, QUITMAN CONSOLIDATED, QUITMAN, MISS.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 630.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 2,857.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$263,820.00; 1969, \$247,314.00; 1970, \$173,014.00.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$70,000; 1971, \$50,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes—These children need special individual attention.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes—We need more qualified teachers who understand the problems of disadvantaged children.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Some funds may have been misdirected at the beginning of the Title I Programs due to the short time allowed for the obligation of these funds. Since we now have time to develop long range plans, the money should be used wisely.

The parents and guardians of the disadvantaged need some kind of compulsory education program. The extra funds could be effectively and wisely used to train parents to help meet the needs of these children.

RESPONSE OF ARTHUR W. MEEK, FEDERAL COORDINATOR, INKSTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS, INKSTER, MISS.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 250.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4,800.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$108,823; 1969, \$118,377; 1970, \$124,974.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$75,000; 1971, \$100,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: We have endeavored to make the best use of our funds. We have not created any new administrative positions. We perform the extra duties in addition to our regular duties. The continuance of Title I funds is imperative in a disadvantaged area like ours. In addition, our district is a

financially depressed area with no major industry.

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

RESPONSE OF A. W. ALLEN, SUPERINTENDENT, INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 105, YAKIMA, WASH.

JANUARY 23, 1970.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: Your questionnaire has been referred to me for comment.

Intermediate School District No. 105 is a service organization serving 22 school districts in a two and one half county area. Members of our staff are continuously in the classroom and administrative offices of these 22 districts. There are approximately 37,500 students enrolled in these school districts. There is a high percentage of disadvantaged youngsters from all ethnic groups attending these schools.

The amount of Title I ESEA funds that have been received by these districts are as follows:

Fiscal 1968:	
Title I.....	\$1,322,131
Title I migrant.....	358,994
Total .....	1,681,125

Fiscal 1969:	
Title I.....	1,226,772
Title I migrant.....	412,468
Total .....	1,639,240

Fiscal 1970:	
Title I.....	1,099,582
Title I migrant.....	436,772
Total .....	1,536,354

Many of the districts have already planned a summer program for migrant and other disadvantaged youngsters, however, at present these programs have been pigeon-holed because of no funds available for the summer program. We can not give an accurate dollar figure needed for these programs as we only collect the statistics after programs have been funded.

In my judgment, ESEA funds are definitely needed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children in Intermediate School District No. 105. Many fine educational programs have been started as a result of ESEA funds. These programs have been designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and occasionally errors in judgment have been made, which has resulted in an ineffective program. However, in my opinion this is to be expected when experimenting with new methods of instruction.

Delayed funding and decreased funds in my opinion are two of the greatest handicaps that our school district experiences in attempting to serve the needs of the disadvantaged children. People (Teachers and Aides) are probably the most important single factor in serving the educational needs of disadvantaged children. When funds are delayed, people can not be contracted in time to insure the high quality of people which are needed to make a program a success. Secondly without knowledge of funds it is very difficult to get people very enthusiastic about planning. Therefore, advance funding and knowledge of the amount available is extremely important in the development of an educational program to help the disadvantaged children of the Intermediate School District No. 105 in the State of Washington.

Sincerely,

CARL ULRICH,  
Federal Programs Coordinator.

RESPONSE OF WILLIAM J. BARRETT, COORDINATOR OF SPECIAL PROJECTS, CORNING CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CORNING, N.Y.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 350 educationally disadvantaged children.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: No answer.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$123,472; 1969, \$92,747; 1970, \$106,569.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 none; 1971, none. We have no local funds. Last year we were forced to cut driver ed, dental hygiene, and summer school. We would restore 2 programs that were cut in FY 1969—one an elementary home-school counselor and a program of special help in math and reading at the elementary levels if we had more Federal funds.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. Educationally disadvantaged children presently receive the services of 2 home school counselors, a school psychologist and 3 special librarians.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. We have performed several local evaluations that seem to indicate the value of these programs. We will send evaluation on request.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Our funds go 100% to personnel wages and fringe. These people work directly with educationally disadvantaged children and there is no slippage of funds. No equipment or supplies are furnished with federal money—only service.

RESPONSE OF KARL R. KALP, ASSOCIATION SUPERINTENDENT, INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS, EDUCATION CENTER, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 11,500.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 97,097.8.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$1,591,285; 1969, \$1,499,822; 1970, \$1,350,080.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$300,000; 1971, \$450,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. With the school education budget being sorely tested to meet the conventional needs the Title I funds allows the supplemental and auxiliary funds needed to operate innovative and dynamic programs for disadvantaged children.

Do you regard your present Title I pro-

grams as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Both objective and subjective evaluations have shown that the children in this program have been affected in a positive way by Title I projects.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: In order to really make an impact on the education of disadvantaged children, this agency established a priority involving half of the disadvantaged children. To reach all disadvantaged children would require double our present funding.

RESPONSE OF ROCHESTER PUBLIC SCHOOL, INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 535, ROCHESTER, MINN.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 375.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 15,038.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$103,850; 1969, \$107,075; 1970, \$110,084.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$35,000 to \$50,000 additional funds are needed this year; 1971 \$225,000. (We could install a more effective program if our amount were doubled.)

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, definitely. We believe that more elementary age children would become contributing members of society if we had adequate financing of education.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, we are being effective when we teach them in small groups or on an individual basis. (This depends upon amount of remediation needed.)

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: We can speak only for our own situation but we have been very insistent that the most severely disadvantaged are our top priority.

RESPONSE OF R. S. HEIN, WANHESHA, WIS.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 385.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 1968-1969—10,626.4.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$17,000; 1969, \$52,000; 1970, \$49,000.

What additional funds, if any, could you

effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$10,000; 1971, \$12,000.

In your judgement, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer:

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

RESPONSE OF TOM O. MATLOCK, CADDO PARISH, SHREVEPORT, LA.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education program funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 6,110.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 51,052.9 (does not include kindergarten).

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$1,965,552.40; 1969, \$1,526,607.50; 1970, \$1,396,212.

What additional funds if any, could you effectively apply to your title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: Unknown.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Additional funds which could be advantageously used in the Title I program for 1971 could not be determined at this time because of shifting school population brought about by court order.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I simply wanted to query him as to whether or not he was going to have further responses of those whom he has queried printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today or not and, if so, if perhaps, since the vote is coming tomorrow, this will be the last day that we print this rather voluminous number of responses?

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) that the questionnaires do

take up numerous pages in the RECORD and that it is expensive.

Recognizing the expense, I have never made it a practice to place in the RECORD irrelevant or untimely materials. In this case, however, I felt that the data contained in the questionnaires was so current and so related to the vote scheduled for tomorrow that it was important to share it with my colleagues. In addition it was necessary to share information on the effectiveness of title I because of the recent allegations that funds have been misdirected. I will state to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that this will be the last day I will place returns of the questionnaire in the RECORD.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am most delighted to have that information. I do not rise to question the gentleman's opinion as to the value of these questionnaires. But I simply want to point out the fact that we are sorely missing one of our former Members who was on the House Committee on Printing but who is no longer with us, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Jones, but who through his own volition used to ride herd on these matters of printing. According to my recollection he pointed out the fact that it cost about \$136 a page to print any page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have made a rough compilation of the last 4 days and at the rate of \$1,600 a day for the insertions made by our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, this gets to be right costly. So I am delighted with the gentleman's decision to cease and desist after today and, certainly, after the vote tomorrow.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly do not question the figures to which my distinguished colleague from Missouri makes reference. And I am in accord with his viewpoint that there is a certain time for everything. That is precisely why I felt it imperative to share with my colleagues the information local school officials provided, because of its relevance to the decision we must make tomorrow. I agree with my colleague that after tomorrow, there will be no necessity for placing any additional questionnaires in the RECORD.

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

**PRESIDENT AND MRS. NIXON WILL SERVE AS HONORARY COCHAIRMEN OF THE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN LIBRARY FUND DINNER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASHLEY). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to announce that on Friday, February 27, President and Mrs. Nixon will serve as honorary cochairmen of the Everett McKinley Dirksen Library Fund Dinner which will be held at the Washington Hilton Hotel.

This fund-raising dinner will help make possible the Everett McKinley Dirksen Congressional Leadership Re-

search Center. The center will be a part of the Pekin City Library and will hold the Senator's papers as well as microfilm copies of other congressional leaders' papers.

Hopefully, according to K. T. Karabatsos, who is general chairman of the Washington dinner, sufficient funds will be raised to make possible grants to outstanding students and professors who are concerned that the legislative arm of our Government maintain the balance that our Founding Fathers sought to have.

It was my pleasure and privilege to call Senator Dirksen my constituent. He loved the Congress in which he served—first as a Representative of the district I now represent from 1932 through 1948, and after a 2-year absence, the Senate—1950 until his death.

The library and research center is a most appropriate tribute to this man. He loved history and cherished education with a passion. The Halls of Congress were his true home and outside his family, his love was for the legislative arena.

All Members will soon receive an invitation to the February 27 event, and it is my earnest hope that a large delegation from the Congress will attend as an expression of support for this most worthwhile project.

The national chairman of the fund is Mr. James S. Kemper, Jr., of Chicago, New York cochairmen are Mr. and Mrs. Ben Regan, Washington co-chairmen—Mr. and Mrs. Kim T. Karabatsos.

Directors of the endowment fund are: the Honorable William Waldmeier, mayor of Pekin; William D. McNaughton, publisher of the Pekin Times; Arthur W. Ehrlicher, Herget National Bank; John E. Velde, Jr., the president of the Pekin Library Board; Walter V. McAdoo, retired, of Peoria; Samuel Rothberg, director of American Distilling Co.; William L. Nauman, executive vice president of Caterpillar Tractor Co.; and Harold E. Rainville, formerly special assistant to Senator Dirksen.

The organizing committee includes Benjamin Gingiss, Sam Dean, E. Stanley Enlund, Ronald J. Chinnock, Newton C. Farr, and Joseph Rogenstein.

**THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I heartily commend President Nixon on his recent state of the Union message. In my view, his remarks constituted a clear and comprehensive survey of the state of the Union as we enter the 1970's.

Forming the cornerstone of the message were three dominant themes: austerity, prosperity, and peace. By making austerity budget cuts designed to bring our runaway economy back into line, the President squarely faced the problem of mounting inflation and announced his intention to meet it head on. The President also announced his intention to attack inflation by making a balanced

Federal budget a high-priority goal. In this connection, he observed:

In the decade of the 60s, the Federal Government spent \$57 billion more than it took in in taxes. In that same decade, the American people paid the bill for that deficit in price increases which raised the cost of living for the average family of four by \$200 per month.

In his remarks, the President indicated, and I agree with him, that difficult and sometimes politically unpopular decisions must be made regarding Federal spending patterns. If this responsibility is not fully met, and complex budget decisions are made on a shotgun basis or determined by special interest groups, the fiscal results compound rather than reduce the inflationary forces at work in the economy.

In my view, the goals of the administration's austerity programs are simple. They are designed to eliminate short-run inflation and encourage long-run prosperity. On this subject the President predicted that we will see an amount of growth in the next 10 years larger than experienced by our country from the years 1790 to 1950. This predicted growth will be a monument to American genius and ingenuity operating in our free enterprise system. In this regard, the President raised the basic question of how this growth would take place. He asked the Congress and the American people to begin to make the basic decisions that would, in large measure, determine the quality as well as the quantity of our national growth in the 1970's.

The President already has made one of the key decisions which will effect the nature of the American experience in the coming decade. He has set as a first priority, the achievement of peace for America and the world. In an effort to make this possibility a reality for our generation, he has set in motion new forces and new policies based on an evaluation of the world as it exists today. These policies are designed to create an environment in which the cause of peace can be materially advanced throughout the troubled portions of the world. Evidences of these new initiatives may presently be seen in Vietnam, Europe, the Mideast, and our latest policy expressions in the Orient and Southeast Asia.

I believe the President put the philosophy of his foreign policy in apt perspective when he declared:

Today the great industrial nations of Europe, as well as Japan, have regained their economic strength, and the nations of Latin America—and many of the nations that acquired their freedom from colonialism after World War II in Asia and Africa—have a new sense of pride and dignity, and a determination to assume the responsibility for their own defense . . . Neither the defense nor the development of other nations can be exclusively or primarily an American undertaking . . . We shall be faithful to our treaty commitments, but we shall reduce our involvement and our presence in other nations affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call the attention of my colleagues to another central portion of the President's remarks, the environment. Obviously, all of our actions as a nation and as people

will be of no avail if we render our environment uninhabitable through our negligence and our misaction. With this thought in mind, President Nixon framed what he termed "the great question of the 1970's" when he asked:

Shall we surrender our surroundings, or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land and our water.

He challenged the Congress, the far-flung reaches of the Federal Government, the target authority of State and local governments, the enlightened concern of the business community, and the self-interest of Americans everywhere, by raising the problem of environmental pollution to a prime level of national priority, and calling for a collective solution.

When the President declared that each individual has a fundamental right to the enjoyment of his surroundings in their natural state, he defined the problem of pollution in the same clear and basic terms as did the Founding Fathers when they focused upon the issues of free speech and free press. In so doing, he set the stage for a full-scale attack on this growing menace to the very existence of mankind.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on still another vital aspect of the President's first state of the Union message; namely, crime control. I believe that the President rightfully and realistically focused the primary responsibility for solving most crimes and enforcing most laws with State and local governments rather than with the Federal Government. The Federal Government has no police force as such. Neither, in my view, should one be created; for, I believe the problem of law enforcement should be handled for individuals by their State and local governments. There is, however, one area of crime which by its very nature requires Federal involvement and Federal solutions; and that is the area of organized crime, narcotics, and pornography. Last year the new administration sent 13 different legislative proposals dealing with these three issues to the Congress. To date, not one of these proposals has been passed, and not one measure to attack organized crime, narcotics, or pornography has been laid before the President for signature.

I urge my colleagues to promptly and responsibly act on the President's proposals in this area, as these are target measures designed to remedy specific social ills. In a larger perspective, I urge my colleagues to read and reread the President's state of the Union message and take his words to heart. For in this message lies the seeds of even greater glories and successes for our country.

#### HALPERN URGES INCREASED FEDERAL AID TO RELIEVE MASS TRANSIT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, after decades of neglect, the Nation's urban

mass transit system—aged, overcrowded, and in debt—has reached a point of crisis which demands congressional action on H.R. 7006, the proposal creating an urban mass transportation trust fund to funnel desperately needed money into inner city subway and suburban commuter train lines.

Only about \$132 million annually in Federal aid has gone to mass transit in the last 6 years, which is less than New York alone spends, suggesting how massive are the Nation's transit money problems. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I am appealing to the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative WILLIAM A. BARRETT, to start hearings immediately on the transit proposal I cosponsored last spring, which provides \$10 billion in trust fund aid for 5 years, funded through use of present automobile excise taxes.

Embittered subway riders and suburban commuters in New York and other cities are fed up paying higher fares for poorer service. Trains are breaking down every day, or they are canceled, overcrowded, or filthy or dangerous, but nobody has enough money to solve the crisis.

An administration proposal with a different funding scheme was recently compromised in the Senate, providing that \$3.1 billion be obligated initially in a 5-year program that permits long-range planning. Commendable as this is, I still think we should be spending a billion dollars a year on trains, buses, and commuter lines.

I think trust fund revenue provides year-to-year dependability, assuring a large, continuous flow of funds. This would be similar to the highway trust fund, which by 1974 yielded \$60 billion for roads.

The bill I cosponsored along with the gentleman from New York, Representative Ed KOCH, also removes the present 12½-percent restriction which limits the amount which may be spent in any one State on mass transit. This allows the needs of larger urban regions to be given special attention.

For instance, the Federal money available to New York in 1970 is barely sufficient to buy 100 city subway cars—half the number that is replaced each year, and does not help with any other improvements.

The cities and States cannot foot the cost themselves, New York's latest 50-percent fare increase to 30 cents is the fourth since 1948 when it was only a nickel.

Fares alone, though, do not even cover operating expenses. The New York metropolitan area needs \$2.1 billion in the next few years to provide decent service on commuter and train lines. The New York City Transit Authority alone has a \$488 million annual operating budget, which is now being supplemented by the city's share of a \$2.5 billion transportation bond issue approved by State voters in 1967.

But other cities also have massive needs—that is, Chicago needs \$1.5 bil-

lion in the next decade and Washington, D.C., \$2.5 billion—that will not be met unless the Federal Government commits itself to a huge investment.

With so many domestic needs crying for money priority, tapping the auto excise tax for funding a transit trust program is appropriate, because today mass transit and auto transportation complement each other as part of a properly balanced system.

The flight to the suburbs demands more highways, but suburbanites also expect efficient commuter service—which they are not getting. There has not been a major commuter innovation since 1929, yet this year the Federal Government will spend \$5.1 billion for highway construction, almost 30 times the amount appropriated for mass transportation.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in 1967 U.S. exports were valued at \$31,243,000,000, about half again as much as the second ranking country.

#### HEW-LABOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I was terribly disappointed to learn last evening of the President's decision to veto the HEW-Labor appropriations bill. The President's failure to sign this major piece of legislation means no more to me than his failure to face squarely the need for reordering our national priorities.

No one is more concerned about inflation than myself. My record speaks for that. But at the same time I can no longer ignore the education crisis in this country today. I am convinced that the only cure, the only hope to rid society of poverty, disease, deprivation, prejudice, and hate is through education. We must provide all of our children with the very best in education and educational resources.

We have been through these arguments many times before. It is now some 6 months since we began consideration of this matter. It is already well into the 1969-70 school year and the Office of Education is still waiting for its money. Who is to pay for this gesture of thrift on the part of the administration? Our children? And the future direction of our society?

When the President announced his budget last March, we warned the Congress about the effect of the more than \$174 billion of uncontrollable items in a Federal budget of \$192.9 billion. His budget insured having to cut in the so-called controllable areas. This simply does not make sense and we protested it at that time and we protest it now. If cuts are to be made let them be in those areas such as defense manpower, military con-

struction, exotic weapon systems, and stretched out technological programs. Let us not take it out of the school districts of America, who in turn must tax the property owners of their communities who are already overburdened.

Moreover, the committees of Congress, after long and thorough hearings have made it abundantly clear that education and other urgent needs of our cities are to be given the highest priority.

Since the President claims to be concerned about inflation, one wonders why he has abandoned any references to controlling prices, profits, and credit through

tools that he readily has available to him and which were put at his disposal by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to continue to support full funding for education. Tomorrow, I will ask all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle to reflect carefully on the urgent needs of our city schools. A vote to override the President's veto is simply a vote to let the Executive and the world know our commitment to improvement of public education is the very highest domestic priority.

Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the legislative action tomorrow, I am including

the figures for impact aid in all congressional districts. I know that impact aid has been made the "whipping boy" for this veto, but I want each Member to realize what the impact of sustaining the Presidential veto will mean in their own district. Each Member must realize that the revenues for impact aid, if the veto is sustained, will have to come from State and local taxes. I submit if any Member feels that there are "inadequacies" in the impact aid program they should look to a legislative solution and not cut off those funds. Enclosed is a table which shows the allocation by congressional district.

SAFA, fiscal year 1969				SAFA, fiscal year 1969				
State	Congressional District	Net entitlement, 100 percent	Prorated entitlement, 91 percent	State	Congressional District	Net entitlement, 100 percent	Prorated entitlement, 91 percent	
Alabama	1	760,373	691,939.43	Connecticut	1	183,372	166,868.52	
Do	2	1,163,537	1,058,818.67	Do	2	2,170,577	1,975,226.07	
Do	3	1,698,011	1,545,190.01	Do	3	598,861	544,963.51	
Do	4	1,178,574	1,072,502.34	Do	4	183,308	166,810.28	
Do	5	133,451	121,440.41	Do	5	237,981	216,562.71	
Do	7	269,454	245,203.64	Do	6	191,535	174,296.85	
Do	8	3,431,129	3,122,324.39	State total		3,565,634	3,244,726.94	
Do	97	188,215	171,276.65	Delaware		99	801,610	729,466.10
State total		8,822,744	8,028,696.04	District of Columbia		99	5,933,208	5,399,219.28
Alaska	99	16,083,952	14,636,396.32	Florida	1	5,109,230	4,649,399.30	
Arizona	1	914,969	832,622.79	Do	2	717,388	652,823.08	
Do	2	4,357,075	3,964,930.26	Do	3	2,088,736	1,900,740.76	
Do	3	3,805,618	3,463,112.98	Do	4	513,674	467,443.34	
Do	78	954,801	868,868.91	Do	5	6,185,634	5,628,926.94	
State total		10,032,463	9,129,541.83	Do	6	1,069,895	973,604.45	
Arkansas	1	395,660	360,059.89	Do	8	562,004	511,423.64	
Do	2	1,495,565	1,360,964.45	Do	9	39,367	35,823.97	
Do	3	520,591	473,737.81	Do	10	80,127	72,915.57	
Do	4	581,150	528,846.60	Do	12	934,401	850,304.91	
State total		2,992,966	2,723,599.06	Do	82	1,352,149	1,230,455.59	
California	1	2,273,077	2,068,500.07	State total		18,652,605	16,973,870.55	
Do	2	2,522,334	2,295,369.44	Georgia	1	963,678	876,946.98	
Do	3	6,020,220	5,478,400.20	Do	2	863,326	785,626.66	
Do	4	5,078,161	4,621,126.51	Do	3	3,653,852	3,325,005.32	
Do	7	270,240	245,918.40	Do	4	557,273	507,113.43	
Do	8	1,346,033	1,224,890.03	Do	6	1,270,628	1,156,270.48	
Do	9	1,245,486	1,133,392.26	Do	7	2,251,768	2,049,108.88	
Do	10	1,636,745	1,489,437.95	Do	8	699,008	636,097.28	
Do	11	713,624	649,397.84	Do	9	184,736	168,100.76	
Do	12	4,217,125	3,837,588.75	Do	10	1,677,644	1,526,674.24	
Do	13	7,138,139	6,495,706.49	Do	75	1,304,990	1,187,540.90	
Do	14	2,005,260	1,824,786.60	State total		13,426,923	12,218,499.93	
Do	15	1,378,655	1,254,576.05	Hawaii	99	10,396,414	9,460,736.74	
Do	16	897,809	817,006.19	Idaho	1	1,692,082	1,539,794.62	
Do	17	37,611	34,226.01	Do	2	1,264,981	1,151,132.71	
Do	18	2,783,420	2,532,912.20	State total		2,957,063	2,690,927.33	
Do	19	322,144	293,151.04	Illinois	4	95,149	86,585.59	
Do	20	76,927	69,430.87	Do	10	193,521	176,104.11	
Do	23	675,259	614,485.69	Do	12	2,690,034	2,447,830.94	
Do	24	473,527	430,900.57	Do	13	3,623,607	3,297,482.37	
Do	25	319,140	290,417.40	Do	14	601,694	547,541.54	
Do	27	1,311,992	1,193,912.72	Do	15	151,088	137,490.08	
Do	28	374,103	340,433.73	Do	16	139,039	126,525.49	
Do	31	80,403	73,166.73	Do	17	829,485	754,831.35	
Do	32	1,766,985	1,617,056.35	Do	18	6,054	5,509.14	
Do	33	4,993,025	4,543,652.75	Do	20	58,920	53,617.20	
Do	34	1,666,988	1,516,959.08	Do	21	250,745	228,177.95	
Do	35	6,398,488	5,822,624.08	Do	22	1,800,085	1,638,077.35	
Do	36	1,001,814	911,650.74	Do	23	190,656	173,496.96	
Do	37	3,102,518	2,823,291.38	Do	24	2,264,227	2,060,446.57	
Do	38	2,453,191	2,232,403.81	Do	58	611,446	556,415.86	
Do	48	323,965	294,808.15	State total		14,055,967	12,790,929.27	
Do	60	29,227	26,596.57	Indiana	5	930,751	846,983.41	
Do	62	4,333,900	3,943,849.00	Do	6	977,507	893,313.37	
Do	64	397,403	361,636.73	Do	7	400,354	364,322.14	
Do	71	252,836	230,080.76	Do	8	322,034	293,050.94	
Do	81	1,840,380	1,674,745.80	Do	9	1,489,093	1,355,074.63	
Do	83	19,242	17,510.22	Do	11	1,092,319	994,010.29	
Do	84	6,558,636	5,968,358.76	State total		4,542,058	4,133,272.78	
Do	85	383,302	348,804.82	Iowa	1	1,159,298	1,054,961.18	
Do	87	108,650	98,871.50	Do	2	21,472	19,539.52	
Do	90	42,276	38,471.16	Do	3	33,774	30,734.34	
Do	92	36,007	32,760.37	Do	4	753,557	685,736.87	
Do	94	298,615	271,739.65	Do	5	419,215	381,485.65	
Do	95	1,301,207	1,184,098.37	Do	6	257,001	233,870.91	
Do	96	1,330,100	1,210,391.00	Do	7	200,188	182,171.08	
State total		81,845,609	74,479,504.19	State total		2,844,505	2,588,499.55	
Colorado	2	4,308,820	3,921,026.20					
Do	3	8,176,344	7,440,473.04					
Do	4	1,628,333	1,481,783.03					
State total		14,113,497	12,843,282.27					

SAFA, fiscal year 1969			
State	Congressional district	Net entitlement, 100 percent	Prorated entitlement, 91 percent
Kansas	1	68,212	62,072.92
Do	2	4,399,032	4,003,119.12
Do	3	1,144,231	1,041,250.21
Do	4	1,626,992	1,480,562.72
Do	5	2,207,117	2,008,476.47
State total		9,445,584	8,595,431.44
Kentucky	1	804,428	732,029.48
Do	2	886,694	806,891.64
Do	3	1,757,098	1,598,959.18
Do	4	53,277	48,432.07
Do	5	176,156	160,301.96
Do	6	630,580	573,827.80
Do	7	5,981	5,442.21
State total		4,314,214	3,925,934.34
Louisiana	1	82,492	75,067.72
Do	2	268,343	244,192.13
Do	4	1,424,068	1,295,901.88
Do	6	272,794	248,242.54
Do	8	1,032,056	939,170.96
Do	9	536,964	488,637.24
State total		3,616,717	3,291,212.47
Maine	1	1,291,931	1,175,657.21
Do	2	1,541,245	1,402,532.95
State total		2,833,176	2,578,190.16
Maryland	1	1,451,725	1,321,069.75
Do	2	1,649,924	1,501,430.84
Do	5	11,511,797	10,475,735.27
Do	6	1,237,580	1,126,197.80
Do	8	6,636,130	6,038,878.80
Do	76	465,589	423,685.99
Do	77	2,575,392	2,343,612.18
Do	78	2,719,805	2,475,022.55
State total		28,247,948	25,705,632.68
Massachusetts	1	951,170	865,564.70
Do	2	2,093,368	1,904,964.88
Do	3	2,017,714	1,836,119.74
Do	4	683,739	622,202.46
Do	5	1,719,196	1,564,468.39
Do	6	784,277	713,692.07
Do	7	973,946	886,290.86
Do	8	253,448	230,637.68
Do	10	389,069	354,052.79
Do	11	919,848	837,051.68
Do	12	2,612,580	2,377,447.80
Do	46	56,410	51,333.10
Do	61	643,820	585,876.20
Do	73	4,776	4,346.16
Do	75	31,061	28,265.51
Do	79	4,755	4,327.05
State total		14,139,177	12,866,651.07
Michigan	2	21,160	19,258.60
Do	3	529,306	481,668.46
Do	8	37,483	34,100.53
Do	9	69,676	63,405.16
Do	10	766,080	697,132.80
Do	11	1,790,928	1,629,744.48
Do	12	986,116	897,365.56
Do	16	20,189	18,371.99
Do	52	748,042	680,718.22
State total		4,968,980	4,521,771.80
Minnesota	1	112,682	102,540.62
Do	2	10,372	9,438.52
Do	3	808,021	735,299.11
Do	4	856,675	779,574.25
Do	5	433,603	394,578.73
Do	6	179,317	163,178.47
Do	7	542,038	493,254.58
Do	8	746,659	679,459.69
State total		3,689,367	3,357,323.97
Mississippi	1	438,499	399,034.09
Do	3	109,896	100,005.36
Do	4	208,108	189,378.28
Do	5	2,075,505	1,888,709.55
State total		2,832,008	2,577,127.28
Missouri	1	111,509	101,478.49
Do	2	945,614	860,501.74
Do	4	4,115,072	3,744,715.52
Do	5	402,749	366,501.69
Do	6	415,201	377,832.91
Do	7	360,670	328,209.70
Do	8	1,506,760	1,371,151.60
Do	9	230,012	209,310.92
Do	10	63,276	57,581.16
Do	45	146,356	133,183.96
Do	78	874,089	795,420.99
State total		9,171,308	8,345,890.28

SAFA, fiscal year 1969			
State	Congressional district	Net entitlement, 100 percent	Prorated entitlement, 91 percent
Montana	1	1,970,903	1,793,521.73
Do	2	2,620,530	2,384,682.30
State total		4,591,433	4,178,204.03
Nebraska	1	512,150	466,056.50
Do	2	3,725,773	3,390,453.43
Do	3	812,038	738,954.58
State total		5,049,961	4,595,454.51
Nebraska	99	3,881,318	3,531,999.38
New Hampshire	1	2,000,317	1,820,288.47
Do	2	255,505	232,509.55
State total		2,255,822	2,052,798.02
New Jersey	1	1,073,481	976,867.71
Do	2	527,228	479,777.48
Do	3	2,965,978	2,699,039.98
Do	4	591,965	538,688.15
Do	5	695,512	632,915.92
Do	6	5,088,639	4,630,661.49
Do	13	107,331	97,671.21
Do	43	29,414	26,766.74
Do	48	54,114	49,243.74
Do	51	130,757	118,988.87
State total		11,264,419	10,250,621.29
New Mexico	1	4,500,061	4,095,055.51
Do	2	5,820,213	5,296,393.83
Do	99	839,527	763,969.57
State total		11,159,801	10,155,418.91
New York	1	2,241,619	2,039,873.29
Do	2	466,233	424,272.03
Do	4	355,354	323,372.14
Do	5	72,329	65,819.39
Do	25	50,877	46,298.07
Do	27	1,336,279	1,216,013.89
Do	28	57,197	52,049.27
Do	29	1,148,331	1,044,981.21
Do	30	535,316	487,137.56
Do	31	1,259,058	1,145,742.78
Do	32	1,829,462	1,664,810.42
Do	33	472,321	429,812.11
Do	34	269,732	245,436.12
Do	35	370,323	336,993.93
Do	38	120,360	109,527.60
Do	40	331,257	301,443.87
Do	42	153,732	139,896.12
Do	49	28,524	25,956.84
Do	54	155,102	141,142.82
Do	69	5,210,737	4,741,770.67
Do	79	734,738	668,611.58
State total		17,198,881	15,650,981.71
North Carolina	1	1,270,068	1,155,761.88
Do	3	2,318,682	2,110,000.62
Do	5	85,830	78,105.30
Do	7	2,892,511	2,632,185.01
Do	8	198,526	180,658.66
Do	11	298,275	271,430.25
State total		7,063,892	6,428,141.72
North Dakota	1	1,581,948	1,439,572.68
Do	2	1,322,689	1,203,646.99
State total		2,904,637	2,643,219.67
Ohio	1	13,365	12,162.15
Do	2	59,278	53,942.98
Do	3	2,773,517	2,523,900.47
Do	4	42,577	38,745.07
Do	5	25,474	23,181.34
Do	6	469,479	427,225.89
Do	7	1,863,105	1,695,425.55
Do	8	62,013	56,431.83
Do	10	327,869	298,360.79
Do	11	124,027	112,864.57
Do	12	504,733	459,307.03
Do	13	116,415	106,937.65
Do	14	255,108	232,148.28
Do	15	258,054	234,829.14
Do	17	503,723	458,387.93
Do	19	24,647	22,423.77
Do	23	739,497	672,942.27
Do	24	795,700	724,087.00
Do	59	292,793	266,441.63
Do	68	2,332,125	2,122,233.75
Do	79	123,215	112,125.65
State total		11,706,714	10,653,109.74
Oklahoma	1	1,636,444	1,489,164.04
Do	2	1,384,193	1,259,615.63
Do	3	937,205	852,856.55
Do	4	4,323,995	3,934,835.45
Do	5	2,496,561	2,271,870.51
Do	6	1,084,605	986,990.55
Do	75	1,895,741	1,725,124.31
State total		13,758,744	12,520,457.04

State	SAFA, fiscal year 1969		
	Congressional district	Net entitlement, 100 percent	Prorated entitlement, 91 percent
Oregon	1	438,211	398,772.01
Do	2	1,752,522	1,594,795.02
Do	3	560,386	509,951.26
Do	4	803,081	730,803.51
State total		3,554,200	3,234,322.00
Pennsylvania	6	52,632	47,895.12
Do	7	387,573	352,691.43
Do	8	810,292	737,365.72
Do	9	180,151	163,937.41
Do	10	310,826	282,851.06
Do	11	228,230	207,689.30
Do	12	748,792	681,400.72
Do	13	229,091	208,472.81
Do	15	150,968	137,380.88
Do	16	420,705	382,841.55
Do	17	364,591	331,777.81
Do	18	29,698	27,025.18
Do	19	874,082	795,414.62
Do	23	30,126	27,414.66
Do	26	22,238	20,236.58
Do	27	222,649	202,610.59
Do	57	676,027	615,184.57
Do	63	69,740	63,463.40
Do	66	3,747,282	3,410,026.62
Do	67	39,750	36,172.50
State total		9,595,443	8,731,853.13
Rhode Island	1	1,739,990	1,583,390.90
Do	2	1,816,806	1,653,293.46
Do	79	214,703	195,370.73
State total		3,771,499	3,432,064.99
South Carolina	1	4,572,543	4,161,014.13
Do	2	1,931,397	1,757,571.27
Do	3	91,340	83,119.40
Do	4	80,266	73,042.06
Do	5	542,111	493,321.01
Do	6	159,837	145,451.67
State total		7,377,494	6,713,519.54
South Dakota	1	510,791	464,819.81
Do	2	3,217,324	2,927,764.84
State total		3,728,115	3,392,584.65
Tennessee	1	582,729	530,281.39
Do	2	1,090,479	992,335.89
Do	3	429,568	390,908.88
Do	4	1,504,187	1,368,810.57
Do	5	363,972	333,944.52
Do	6	1,092,206	993,906.55
Do	7	258,621	235,345.11
Do	8	445,425	405,336.75
Do	9	775,955	706,119.05
Do	6	839,389	763,843.99
State total		7,385,530	6,720,832.80
Texas	1	1,658,263	1,509,019.33
Do	2	72,349	65,837.69
Do	3	543,223	494,332.93
Do	4	530,891	483,110.81
Do	5	90,976	82,788.16
Do	6	277,167	252,221.97
Do	7	2,754	2,581.14

State	SAFA, fiscal year 1969		
	Congressional district	Net entitlement, 100 percent	Prorated entitlement, 91 percent
Texas—(continued)	8	20,170	18,354.70
Do	9	789,307	718,269.37
Do	10	1,020,505	928,659.55
Do	11	2,911,885	2,649,815.35
Do	12	3,999,921	3,639,837.11
Do	13	1,454,793	1,323,861.63
Do	14	1,160,452	1,056,011.32
Do	15	228,145	207,611.95
Do	16	3,616,378	3,290,903.98
Do	17	1,618,956	1,473,249.96
Do	18	523,276	476,181.16
Do	19	324,542	295,333.22
Do	20	1,201,770	1,093,610.70
Do	21	883,823	804,271.93
Do	22	544,058	495,092.78
Do	23	1,134,432	1,032,333.12
Do	53	493,005	448,634.55
Do	56	444,178	404,201.98
Do	86	7,442,354	6,772,542.14
State total		32,987,473	30,018,600.43
Utah	1	5,639,088	5,131,570.08
Do	2	2,080,663	1,893,403.33
State total		7,719,751	7,024,973.41
Vermont	99	148,581	135,208.71
Virginia	1	7,421,079	6,753,181.89
Do	2	5,259,805	4,786,422.55
Do	3	882,435	803,015.85
Do	4	2,138,811	1,946,318.01
Do	5	65,520	59,623.20
Do	6	632,584	575,651.44
Do	7	67,884	61,774.44
Do	8	2,383,830	2,169,285.30
Do	9	451,827	411,162.57
Do	10	16,539,525	15,050,967.75
State total		35,843,300	32,617,403.00
Washington	1	910,736	828,769.76
Do	2	1,759,223	1,600,892.93
Do	3	857,593	780,409.63
Do	4	1,977,639	1,799,654.49
Do	5	1,539,277	1,409,842.07
Do	6	5,767,644	5,248,556.04
Do	7	606,229	551,668.39
State total		13,428,341	12,219,790.31
West Virginia	2	338,171	307,735.61
Do	3	75,258	68,484.78
Do	4	155,107	141,147.37
State total		568,536	517,367.76
Wisconsin	2	574,067	522,400.97
Do	3	820,931	747,047.21
Do	7	120,864	109,986.24
Do	8	115,550	105,150.50
Do	10	243,191	221,303.81
Do	55	414,217	376,937.47
State total		2,288,820	2,082,826.20
Wyoming	99	1,852,602	1,685,867.82
Gum	99	2,194,727	1,997,201.57
Puerto Rico	99	329,912	300,219.92
Virgin Islands	99	26,675	24,274.25
Grand total		517,962,318	471,345,709.38

**REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY OF PENNSYLVANIA TO VOTE TO OVERRIDE PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stated several weeks ago that if President Nixon vetoed the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, I would vote to override that veto. I certainly intend to do so.

The measure the President has selected as the target for an anti-inflation

campaign happens to represent the financial support for many of the most important domestic programs our Nation has undertaken.

The Congress already has reduced administration budget proposals by \$6 billion in areas I believe were fair targets for such reductions.

However, public health and public education are not fair game in the budget-cutting process. When we at the national level reduce support for health programs, and for education, we are not fighting inflation—we are feeding it. Withdrawal of Federal support does not erase the need in our States and local communities. It merely shifts the tax burden to maintain such programs from the Federal Government to local governments where the burden already is too great.

When supersonic transports and unsafe Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile systems take precedence over schools and medical research, as examples, there is something radically wrong with this administration's domestic priorities.

And if Vice President AGNEW feels the "silent majority" wants health and education to be shortchanged, I am afraid he is due for a rude awakening.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to include in the RECORD a letter I have just received from one of my constituents, who currently serves as president of the Pennsylvania State Education Association. He represents teachers—the individuals who devote their lifetimes to the education of America's young people. His comments are pertinent and most appropriate.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE  
EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

Harrisburg, Pa., January 23, 1970.

HON. FRED B. ROONEY,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: I realize that this letter isn't really necessary to urge your continued support of the federal appropriations for education as passed by the Congress, in the event that the President carries through with his threatened veto of the total measure in which it was included. But this will demonstrate support for your position and perhaps give you needed ammunition in persuading enough of your colleagues, if necessary.

We share the President's concern over inflation but are also aware that the Congress has cut a net total of some \$6 billion from his original budget proposal. If he did not regard that as inflationary, surely a final product reduced by such an amount is even less so. And nothing is more inflationary, if this is really the standard being applied, than military expenditures, where money is poured into the economy without a corresponding increase in the production of goods and services for which that money can be spent.

We remember, even if the President has forgotten, his statements on the campaign trail in 1968. "We call on every citizen to join with us in an action program for education", he said. Or, "Education is the area in which we must keep doing everything that is necessary to help achieve the American dream." And, most relevant of all, "When we talk about cutting the expenses of government—either Federal, State, or Local—the one area we can't shortchange is education."

All we ask is that promises be kept.  
Sincerely,

DAVID W. KIRKPATRICK,  
President, PSEA.

HIGH INTEREST RATES MAKE  
HIGHER HEW APPROPRIATION  
MANDATORY

(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, President Nixon's use of the veto power is highly selective.

It applies to schoolchildren; not the banks.

In June I asked President Nixon to veto the big banks' increase in the prime lending rate—an action many times more inflationary than providing education for children.

President Nixon refused to even utter the most mild of complaints against the banks' interest rate increase which raised the price of everything in the economy. When it comes to vetoing health, education, and welfare, the President is not so timid.

Where was Mr. Nixon's "veto courage" last June?

The additional appropriations voted by the Congress for HEW will not begin to repair the damage that the Nixon high interest rates have done to America's school system. All over the country, high interest rates are blocking badly needed schoolroom construction and threatening the very existence of some school systems.

School districts simply cannot market bond issues at the high interest rates prevailing under the Nixon administration. Bond elections are being canceled

and other districts cannot raise sufficient taxes to meet the interest payments under the present monetary conditions.

Much of the HEW appropriation might not be necessary if local school districts could sell their bonds and raise their own funds. But the high interest rates have blocked this avenue and they have to turn to the Federal Government or face a serious cutback in educational programs.

Earlier this month, the Daily Bond Buyer reported that high interest rates had stalled new school construction in California. The publication said that more than 100,000 elementary and high school students in California will be without adequate classroom space this year because of rising interest rates. This same situation exists in other districts across the Nation.

The Nixon administration should do something about this deplorable situation rather than spending its time and energy with vetoes for the educational needs of the Nation.

A rollback of interest rates would disturb the banker friends of this administration. President Nixon finds it easier to threaten the welfare of millions of schoolchildren than to disturb the comfort of his banker friends, both inside, and outside of the administration.

The President has plenty of power to control inflation; he does not have to use the schoolchildren of this Nation.

URGENT NEED EXISTS FOR IM-  
MEDIATE PASSAGE OF ANNUNZIO  
INNER-CITY INSURANCE BILL

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called to the attention of my colleagues the urgent need for insurance for property owners and small businessmen in the inner cities of America and emphasized the responsibility of our government to make this insurance available at reasonable rates.

Today, I am inserting an article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the January 26 issue of the U.S. News & World Report which gives a realistic appraisal of the problems presently confronting the inner cities of Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, Gary, New York, and in fact, all of the major cities of the North and South.

There are literally hundreds and thousands of buildings in the inner cities of America that are being abandoned by their owners because they are not able to keep up with necessary repairs and they are not able to purchase insurance. Consequently, thousands of small businessmen are being forced out of business and hundreds of thousands of inner city residents are being forced to look elsewhere for adequate housing.

Today, interest rates are higher than ever before and housing starts are less than ever before in the history of our country. Now is the appropriate time for the House Banking and Currency Committee and especially the Housing Sub-

committee, working in conjunction with the officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to hold hearings on my bill, H.R. 13666, which was cosponsored by over 100 Members of this House.

I know of the deep interest and concern of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable WILLIAM BARRETT, who is chairman of the Housing Subcommittee. He has extended to me all of the resources of his subcommittee and we have already held hearings in Chicago on the insurance problem. As a result of these hearings, we have established both the need for action and the responsibility of the Congress to provide a solution to this crucial problem facing the inner city small businessmen and property owners of America.

The article follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 26, 1970]

IN THE INNER CITIES: ACRES OF ABANDONED  
BUILDINGS

At a time when the U.S. is suffering a housing shortage that gets worse by the month, officials in many cities face this puzzling fact—

Houses and apartments in the inner cities by the hundreds are being abandoned by their owners, deserted and boarded up, left to the ravages of vandals and criminals. The number is growing rapidly.

If the pace continues, entire sections of major cities could become ghost towns in the next five years, says James C. Downs, Jr., chairman of the Real Estate Research Corporation, Chicago. Other experts say some cities already have reached this point.

In New York City, in three years enough homes were abandoned to house more than a quarter of a million people.

The good go with the bad. "It is no longer just the poor buildings that are going," says Dr. George Sternlieb, director of the Urban Studies Center of Rutgers University. "In New York, when bad buildings are abandoned, good houses nearby are abandoned, too."

Dr. Sternlieb says most of an estimated 5,000 buildings now vacant in New York City are in Brooklyn's Brownsville-East New York section, or in Williamsburg and Bedford-Stuyvesant. There are a growing number in Harlem, too.

"Many of the blocks are littered with the wreckage of broken and abandoned buildings," he says. "Some streets look as if they had been bombed by B-52s."

Buildings are being abandoned in Detroit at the rate of 10 a week. Officials estimate there are about 2,500 vacant buildings in the central city area.

In Cleveland, officials say 800 houses and apartment buildings are abandoned each year. This is enough housing for 2,400 families.

Philadelphia reports about 25,000 houses, mostly two-story and three-story brick row houses, now stand empty.

The Chicago buildings department figures that nearly 150 structures are abandoned each month, most of them residential and many apartment buildings.

The city of Chicago will spend over 1 million dollars this year just to tear down dangerous and abandoned buildings. In 1960, it had to demolish only 143. Last year, the figure had risen to 2,160 residential buildings.

In Baltimore, an estimated 4,000 to 4,400 houses stand empty; in Boston, more than 1,000. Mayor George G. Selbels, Jr., of Birmingham says 800 vacant buildings have been torn down in his city in recent years, and 2,300 more are scheduled to be demolished.

The housing paradox. Why is housing, some of it in good shape, being abandoned when there is a growing shortage in the nation?

A study of inner-city dwellings in Baltimore was made jointly by the Institute for Environmental Studies of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Urban Studies Institute of Morgan State College. It reports that the inner-city housing market "is in a state of complete and utter collapse." Prices are declining, and a large percentage of the structures are losing money.

"Investors want out because of declining prices, negative cash flows, fear of collecting rents, and vandalism," the study explains. "Not over 10 per cent of the tenants could be described as problems in the sense of abusing property, but these few, plus vandalism of temporarily vacant buildings, are enough to seriously impair cash flows and cause abandonments.

"All of this, as well as the underlying factors, results in housing that is worse than the people actually can afford and in abandonments and boarding up, even of basically good structures. You have a combination of low vacancies and high abandonments."

"Militant" tenants. Says Mr. Downs of Chicago:

"The incidence of abandoned buildings is growing because the structures grow older. Tenants are becoming more militant about demanding repairs which landlords say they cannot afford, and courts more and more often refuse to evict families—especially those on welfare with children—for nonpayment of rent in their disputed cases."

Landlords calculate that operating costs have gone up 30 to 40 per cent in the past five years, while rents have moved up far less. Insurance rates have doubled and tripled in some riot areas. When a city inspector uncovers building-code violations, landlords say it usually is a losing proposition to make repairs.

A vacant building in the inner city most often is stripped quickly of everything of resale value—plumbing fixtures, piping, wiring, ornamental objects, sometimes even the bricks. Officials say this can happen when a house or an apartment is vacant only a few days between occupants. Once this occurs, the cost of putting the building into usable condition skyrockets.

As a result, says Dr. Sternlieb, "You are finding landlords don't press hard for rent any more in some areas, and are very slow to evict unless there is a new tenant ready. They would rather have the house not producing rent, or producing only part of the rent, than have it empty for the scavengers to strip."

The abandoned house is a natural attraction for undesirable activities—everything from rats or street gangs to dope addicts, sex perverts and the like. It is likely to be a hazardous place for children.

"Going downhill." Says Ivan B. Gluckman, Philadelphia's assistant housing director:

"There is no question that a vacant house is part of the crime problem, too. Even if it isn't as bad as the community around the house thinks it is, just the fact that it is vacant makes it harder to keep the rest of the neighborhood stable. Once a house in the block is vacant, it becomes harder for the others to get insurance. The whole block starts going downhill."

Behind it all is one clear factor: Both landlords and tenants, black and white, are moving out of the inner city as fast as they can—the landlord because he no longer sees a profit there, and the tenant because he feels it no longer is a safe place to live.

"Real estate investors take a long-range look at things," explains Dr. Sternlieb. "They have simply lost faith in the future of the inner city. We used to complain about the slumlords, the big businessmen and others who made an unfair profit while providing unfit housing. The real tragedy is that none of them are in there any more. There isn't anybody in there with enough money or influence to keep the whole thing going."

Says Robert Embry, Baltimore's housing commissioner:

"I know Negro families are moving out in droves in some areas. They may have lived all their lives up until now in that neighborhood, but now they are leaving. They are leaving because the situation with regard to crime has changed dramatically. The schools are much worse than they were. They don't feel safe any longer. There has been a massive influx of immigrants from the South in these neighborhoods—of people not ready for city living—that has broken down the fabric of the neighborhoods."

The absent owners. Landlords who are unable to sell often decide to get all the money they can out of a building before abandonment. They stop repairs, stop paying taxes. In most cities, rent can be collected three or four years before the city takes over for unpaid taxes.

Sometimes tenants are left high and dry when the owner walks out. The water, heat and electricity may be turned off with people still living there.

Mr. Downs, who also is president of the Chicago Dwellings Association, a nonprofit group that rehabilitates old buildings, says one big job of the association is providing heat for tenants of abandoned buildings until they can move somewhere else.

Mr. Downs says the association has been offered many abandoned or about-to-be-abandoned apartment buildings free if it will repair them, but most are too far gone for repair.

What can be done with such places?

First effort in most cities when a building has substantial code violations is to try to force the owner to fix it. If this fails, some cities—San Francisco, for one—have authority to rehabilitate the property and send the bill to the owner, or they may take over rents from tenants for this purpose.

A number of cities have laws which permit demolishing the building, with the cost charged to the owner.

One problem with both of these approaches is that, once an owner decides to abandon a building, he often transfers title to someone who obviously can't pay for repairs or demolition, sometimes just a bum on skid row.

Tearing a building down may be a poor solution. Frequently, the lots stand vacant for years, collecting rats and trash. As a result, most cities are now trying rehabilitation. Philadelphia is something of a leader in this effort. At the last count, 73 developers were rehabilitating old houses at a rate of about 2,000 a year in that city. In all, over 5,000 empty houses have been refurbished, mostly for rental to public-housing tenants.

The Philadelphia program began nearly a decade ago when officials took a close look at the abandoned-building problem. The city's assistant housing director, Mr. Gluckman, says:

"We decided these houses could be either a terrible liability or an asset. Finally, we realized this was one way to develop new public housing without having to displace anybody. It was empty already and we could help stabilize neighborhoods. To a large extent we have succeeded in doing this."

How does Philadelphia do this? It guarantees that the city will buy a house at a fixed price, if not sold to a private buyer, once it has been reconditioned to standards set by the Philadelphia Housing Authority.

Originally, developers were permitted to assemble their own groups of houses for rehabilitation. Many developers jumped in and began bidding up the prices of the empty houses. Now, the city assembles the properties. It pays a maximum of \$1,600 per house, takes over many for unpaid taxes, receives some as gifts from owners who take a tax benefit.

Average cost to rehabilitate a three-bedroom house: \$13,200.

The Government's part. Officials are now trying to sell more of the refurbished houses to people in the neighborhood under new federal subsidy programs.

Baltimore is starting a program to rehabilitate 1,400 abandoned houses in an 18-month period under a 20-million-dollar grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The houses will be sold to low-income families with assistance of a federal subsidy.

"We have had this problem of vacant houses for a number of years," says Housing Commissioner Robert Embry. "We didn't have the money to do anything about it. We couldn't force private investors to do it. They would lose money."

The federal program is to be expanded and applied to other cities after it has been tested in Baltimore and, possibly, Philadelphia.

Even in Philadelphia, where large scale rehabilitation already has taken place, abandoned buildings continue to be a major problem. Experts predict it is a problem that will get worse in most cities until some way is found to draw people of all income levels back into the inner city.

#### GROUND RULES FOR AN INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM TITLED "LABOR, GOVERNMENT, THE CARRIER AND THE USER DISCUSS THE CONTAINER"

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on December 2 it was my privilege to host a luncheon in the Rayburn Building out of which came several determinations that could have both lasting and worldwide impact on the shipping industry.

Present at that luncheon were prominent representatives of the Federal Government, of organized labor, of the shipping industry, and the management of major corporations involved in the shipment of goods.

Purpose of the luncheon was to discuss a grand design and the ground rules for an international symposium titled, "Labor, Government, the Carrier and the User Discuss the Container," to be held April 14 to 17 in conjunction with the Fifth International Container Services and Equipment Exposition at the International Amphitheatre in Chicago.

Containerization is that system of handling freight whereby a group of items are packed in a container at the point of origin, the container is sealed and carried as a sealed unit to its destination, regardless of how many different modes of transportation are used.

The objective of the symposium is to open new avenues to more cooperative relations between labor and management away from the pressures of the bargaining table.

On the premise that advance knowledge of needs and problems of all concerned parties is the best way to encourage more responsible labor-management relations, distinguished groups from labor, management, shippers, and Government will at that time come together for the express purpose of fully acquainting each other with their respective needs and problems.

Among those at the planning luncheon who spoke and discussed the significance of the upcoming event were: The Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor; Thomas W. Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's As-

sociation; Gen. Frank Besson, Jr., Joint Logistics Review Board, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Robert J. Blackwell, Deputy Maritime Administrator; Michael R. McEvoy, president, Sea-Land Service, Inc.; Helen Delich Bentley, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission; Robert M. O'Mahoney, Commissioner, Transportation and Communications Service, General Services Administration; Edwin F. Mundy, vice president—traffic, National Biscuit Co.; and Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also present at the luncheon were the catalysts for the exposition and symposium next spring. They are representatives of Mack-Brooks Associates, an international firm of exposition and conference managers. The company was represented by two executives of its Baltimore office, Mrs. LoRee Rommel and Mr. Frank Silloway, who bear the responsibility for putting on the symposium and, simultaneously, the major containerization show that is planned. Through the Mack-Brooks organization, they successfully operated a similar exposition in Baltimore in 1968, although the magnitude of the Chicago show is expected to exceed that.

As many as 15,000 persons are expected to attend in Chicago. The containerization show will be the largest display of products and services related to containerization which ever has been assembled. There will be visitors, exhibitors, and registrants from all over the free world. Trade missions are being organized in several European and Latin American countries for the express purpose of visiting the show and the symposium.

The symposium workshop will be divided into four sessions, each running from 8:30 a.m. to 1 p.m., Tuesday through Friday. On the first day, chaired by Thomas W. Gleason, labor will present its side of the picture. As an integral part of this, all registrants will tour the exhibits for the express purpose of learning the current state of the art of containerization as well as what is in prospect in the near future. Mr. Gleason's speakers will include Charles Byth, secretary general of International Transport Workers' Federation; and Floyd Smith, president of International Association of Machinists; Thomas Flynn of the Teamsters; Jesse Calhoun, M.E.B.A.; Charlie Luna of Railroad Brotherhoods; and Captain O'Calahan of Masters, Mates & Pilots.

On the second day, under the chairmanship of Andrew E. Gibson, the Maritime Administrator, the view and plans of the Government will be presented. Government is vital to the effort not only as a referee, but as both a regulatory and taxing agency, and is the central public body concerned with the promotion of the American economy. Mr. Gibson's speakers will include Helen Delich Bentley, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission; Gen. Frank S. Besson, Chairman, Joint Logistics Review Board, Office of the Secretary of Defense; and similar representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board.

The third day, Thursday, chaired by Edwin F. Mundy, vice president for traffic of the National Biscuit Co., the shippers will have their say. The shippers are the customers who use containers. The other participants handle, transport, regulate, tax, and promote, but the shipper has a vital interest in the economics arising out of the use of containers. Mr. Mundy's speakers will include Commissioner O'Mahoney; Lee Cisneros, director of traffic, Firestone Tire & Rubber; Sheldon R. Lewis, manager, traffic operations, General Electric Co.; Bernard J. Hale, director, physical distribution, Mattel, Inc.

On the final day, the carriers will present their case under the chairmanship of Michael McEvoy. Although industrial strife caused by containerization has so far been primarily limited to ports and the shipping industry, other modes of transportation are involved. For this reason, although there will be heavy emphasis on the sea transport and dockworker's aspect, the problem of other modes of transportation will receive coverage. Speakers on this day will include O. I. M. Porton, president U.S.A., Atlantic Container Line; D. J. Talbot, president, International Terminal Operators; Howard Pack, president, Seatrain Lines; Capt. J. W. Clark, president, Delta Steamship Lines; and Spyros Skouras, president, Prudential Lines.

At the conclusion of the carriers' presentation, each of the four chairmen will summarize the results of the 4 days' discussion from the viewpoint of their respective areas of interest. The wrap-up luncheon Friday afternoon will feature Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz as the principal speaker.

Secretary Shultz set the tone for the symposium at our luncheon last week, and I would ask that his remarks be entered in the RECORD:

A fundamental of our free enterprise system is that maximum progress is made when labor and management work together to avoid unnecessary industrial strife. This is particularly true during periods of rapid technological change such as is occurring in the airline, railroad, shipping and trucking industries. During these periods it is vital to maintain clear lines of communication between employers and representatives of their employees.

The hardware, systems and services to be exhibited at the Fifth International Container Services & Equipment Exposition will provide visible evidence of the developments taking place in the transportation industries. With full knowledge of the technology in use and on the drawing boards, it is hoped that this Symposium/Workshop will provide a forum for an exchange of ideas between labor and management away from the pressures of the collective bargaining table.

Our aim is to help labor and management recognize each other's needs and problems. By participating in the forum we hope to achieve a higher level of understanding and more cooperative labor management relations.

#### THE BANNING OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE: OR ALL IS NOT FAIR IN WAR

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, this country has finally taken a step toward the modification of the age old adage, "All is fair in war."

In 1928, this Nation tried to outlaw war as an instrument of national policy. The United States then went on to fight one World War and two prolonged conflicts in Asia. Does this necessarily point up the follies of our endeavors in 1928?

Perhaps we and the world were over-anxious or unrealistic in our approach. The outlawing of war may be an incremental process. We may have to outlaw the weapons of war until there is no means with which to wage it.

Americans took two important steps in 1969 toward this end. Last year saw the beginnings of the Strategic Arms Limitation—SALT—Talks in Helsinki, and the banning of the development and use of biological weapons.

Americans had finally awakened to the very real danger that chemical and biological warfare posed—generations of deformed individuals, danger to civilians, including women and children. We have come to realize that there are some legitimate and some illegitimate means of defense.

Chemical and biological weapons are not weapons in the traditional sense of the term. For example, there is no limiting the target. The use of such weapons is a menace to everyone concerned—those who initiate and those who are the recipients of the attack. Like Frankenstein, they can turn around and destroy their creator. When weaponry is used, all men become its victims.

With such thoughts in everyone's mind, I am pleased to say that we have taken some action on the matter of chemical and biological warfare. Yet my praise must be tempered by some important qualifications; significant loopholes exist in the present regulations. Biological warfare is dangerous; but chemical warfare is equally dangerous. Can we give reasons for outlawing one without using the same reasons for the outlawing of the other?

Toxins provide a case in point. Toxins are discussed as if they were a scientist's no man's land; they are the organic product of living beings. Warfare using toxins can be as deadly as biological warfare. New strains of toxins can be produced with deadly results. I strongly urge that we act immediately to outlaw these substances.

Further investigation of our use of chemical warfare is a necessity. It is true that the classification of chemical weapons into such categories as lethal and debilitating leave many questions unanswered and many problems unsolved. The effects of some of these chemicals remain largely unknown. The use of tear gas to disperse a large riotous crowd is one thing; the use of such gas to disperse that crowd so that it can be systematically killed or injured is quite another. Two of the defoliants used in Vietnam 2,4,5,-D and 2,4,-D, may be responsible for birth defects and malformations in developing embryos.

I would recommend that further investigation be forthcoming and that guidelines be set up. Such weapons can be a threat to the ultimate well-being of

mankind. To pollute the planet with noxious and lethal weapons is a direct assault on human life. I hope that the United States will not be guilty of such contamination in the years ahead.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY TAX PENALIZES WORKERS OVER AGE 65

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, due to the urgent need for an immediate across-the-board benefit increase before Congress adjourned last year, it was necessary to defer action on many worthwhile social security amendments until this year. One of the areas that deserves careful attention during the committee's current consideration of improvements in the social security program concerns providing greater equity to individuals who continue to work—either full or part time—after they reach retirement age. In order to emphasize the need to act and to provide a basis for the committee's impending consideration of this problem, I am today introducing a bill that provides greater equity under our social security program to individuals who continue to work after they attain age 65.

Under present law, the retirement test prevents many individuals who continue to work after age 65 from drawing any social security benefits and substantially reduces the benefits of an even greater number. It is true that an individual who continues to work might increase the benefits he will ultimately draw by substituting higher earnings in a year after age 65 for lower earnings in an earlier year. But in most cases, earnings capacity declines as an individual becomes older, and post-65 earnings will not increase their benefits.

The typical individual who reaches age 65 and continues to work, not only is either unable to receive benefits or eligible only for substantially reduced benefits, but is required to continue to pay the social security tax. Additionally, the individual who works past age 65 will generally draw less social security benefits, since his life expectancy is somewhat shorter when he fully retires. Although the individual cannot draw benefits and will ultimately receive less in total retirement benefits over his shorter retirement years, he must continue to pay the social security tax.

This is a real inequity. Our working citizens age 65 and over not only are unable to draw the benefits that their fully retired colleagues are receiving, but their earnings are actually taxed to provide these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this is an injustice that must be corrected. My bill takes a long step in this direction. It provides that individuals who work after age 65 will no longer be liable for the OASDHI tax that is imposed on employees. Although the tax would be withheld from their wages by their employer, they would be entitled to credit this amount against any income tax they owed when they filed their income tax return. If they do not owe any income tax, they can claim a refund. An

equivalent exemption is provided for self-employed individuals.

Although individuals 65 and over will not be required to pay the OASDHI tax, their wages in covered employment will be credited for benefit computation purposes. Since there are some individuals whose benefits may be increased by including earnings in years after they attain age 65, and since the employer's share of the social security tax will continue to be paid on their behalf, this is only fair.

Individuals continuing at their regular work after 65 are right in objecting to the present law. By enacting my bill, Congress would be relieving them of the obligation to pay taxes. In effect, we would be providing them with a "paid-up" social security account at age 65.

Removing this inequity would be of substantial benefit to the number of our senior citizens who continue to work past 65. After this year, the combined OASDHI tax rate will be 5.2 percent of a tax base which goes up to \$7,800. For an individual who is being taxed at the maximum wage base—\$7,800—this would amount to \$405.60. For an individual earning \$6,000, this would amount to \$301.20, and for an individual earning \$5,000, this would amount to \$251. With the increasing expenses that often attend old age, as well as the increasing taxes at all levels of Government which make it very difficult for our elderly citizens to maintain their standard of living and remain in their own home, this assistance will be extremely helpful.

I do not feel it is appropriate to introduce a bill without mentioning the costs. The Chief Actuary of Social Security tells me that my proposal would cost approximately .10 percent of payroll and involve first year costs of around \$400 million. In view of the need to provide greater equity to individuals who work after age 65, this is money well spent.

An analysis of the bill follows:

**SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 15537**  
A bill providing for an exemption from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contribution Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65

#### SECTION 1

Adds a new subsection (c) to Section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code. Subsection (c) (1) (A) provides that, in the case of individuals who attained age 65 before the taxable year involved, the self-employment tax for OASDI will be reduced by two-thirds. This reduction is equal to the amount of OASDI tax that an employee—but for the provisions of this bill—would pay in comparable years, and will provide a self-employed individual 65 and over with the same reduction in taxes an employee is provided by a later section of the bill (section two).

Self-employed individuals pay OASDI rates equal to 150 percent of the individual rate, the additional 50 percent being analogous to the employer's contribution. After enactment of this provision, self-employed individuals age 65 and over would pay only the additional 50 percent that is analogous to the employer's contribution.

Subsection (c) (1) (B) provides that the hospital insurance tax applicable to the self-employed age 65 and over before the taxable year involved will be zero. The self-employed pay the same hospital insurance tax rate under present law as employees.

Subsection (c) (2) deals with the problem arising when a self-employed individual reaches age 65 during his taxable year. In this case, the present tax rates will apply to that portion of self-employed income that, under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate, are allowable to the month prior to attaining age 65. The remaining self-employment income for the taxable year will be taxed at the reduced rates provided by this bill.

#### SECTION 2

Section two adds a new subsection (c) to Section 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code. New subsection (c) relieves the employee for any liability for the employee's share of the OASDHI tax for the month in which the employee attains age 65 and all subsequent months. (A refund or credit is provided under subsection 6413(d) as amended by Section three of this bill.) The employer will, in computing the OASDHI excise tax applicable to his covered payroll, continue to include wages paid to individuals 65 and over. Additionally, the employee will, to the extent he works in covered employment, continue to receive wage credits that may be used for benefit computation purposes.

#### SECTION 3

Section 3(a) (1) redesignates Section 6413 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code as subsection (3), and adds a new subsection (d). The new subsection (d) permits an employee who pays the employee payroll tax for months in which he is age 65 to claim a credit or refund for the tax paid. Section 3(b), by an amendment to Section 31(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, enables the employee to credit the amount withheld against any income tax liability that he owes when he files his income tax refund, or if no income tax is owed, to claim a refund.

Section 3(a) (2) amends Section 6413(c) of the Code to insure that the new refund provisions, when combined with refund provisions currently applicable where an employee works for multiple employers, will not result in a duplicate refund of taxes paid.

#### SECTION 4

Section four (a) amends the Social Security Act to provide that where refunds are paid to individuals age 65 and over, the managing trustee of the OASDI and of the HI trust funds will reimburse the Treasury.

#### SECTION 5

Section five prescribes the effective dates of the bill. The reductions in taxes applicable to self-employed individuals age 65 and over is made effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969. The provision relieving employees 65 years of age and over from liability for the OASDHI taxes and providing for refunds is made effective with respect to wages received after December 31, 1969.

#### BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, it is our constitutional obligation to provide for the conducting of the decennial census. We are also obliged to see that the census is conducted in such a way that it will be accurate and complete.

I am greatly disturbed by certain plans of the Bureau of the Census with regard to the 1970 counting of the American people. We need to know the number of people in the United States, not only for purposes of congressional representation, but for social and economic pro-

grams based on numbers and the needs of certain areas of the country. If we do not have an accurate picture of the distribution of our population, the best formulated plans and the most ambitious programs will accomplish little. We will not be reaching the people we want to reach, we will not be helping those people who need help the most and we will not be providing for orderly transition in our society.

In the past there has been vast underenumeration of certain minority groups in the census. Unfortunately, the program for the 1970 census differs so little from that of the past that underenumeration will again occur. The Census Bureau, itself, acknowledges that underenumeration in 1960 was more than 3 percent. Of the total underenumeration 38 percent was nonwhite. A total of 5.7 million Americans were not counted, and for all practical purposes of Government assistance and representation, were invisible. If we realize that those people who are not counted are usually those living in crowded cities and desolate rural areas, in other words, those people who live in the worse conditions in either crowded tenements or lonely and isolated tar-paper shacks, we can see that it is of the utmost importance that they are counted in 1970.

In the decennial counting of our population, those people most likely to be missed are those people whose presence is often not noticed, who live two, three or four families in a small apartment, those people who are suspicious of strangers and will not let a census taker inside the house, those people with poor educations who cannot answer a mailed questionnaire, non-English speaking people who cannot read English and those that have little or no contact with the Federal Government or with strangers of any type.

I have corresponded several times with the Director of the Bureau of the Census. He recognizes the problem of underenumeration and the need to know exactly how many people live in each area of the country, in each portion of our cities, and to know what the needs of our population are. I am impressed with his sincerity in attempting to solve the problem of underenumeration, but I am very much disappointed in the lack of significant procedural changes that would accomplish the most nearly perfect census.

Several of these procedures must be examined carefully:

First. Census taking in densely populated urban areas will rely primarily on mailings. Even with the updated lists described to me by Mr. George H. Brown, Director of the Bureau of the Census, and the prec canvassing slated to begin in February, the basis for the census will still be housing units and not people. The number of living quarters cannot be equated with the number of families, for in poor areas in particular, and where there are high concentrations of minority citizens, there is a great likelihood that individual apartments may be multiple family dwellings without being registered as such or known as such by any authorities. The Census Bureau now has provisions for following through on in-

complete or unanswered questionnaires. However, if no questionnaires are directed to three or four families living in one residence, there will be no follow through and again these people will not be counted.

Second. The census form and instruction sheets are printed only in English. Leaflets, I understand, will be available in both Spanish and Chinese, explaining the questions and procedures for filling out the questionnaire. However, one cannot be sure that the right people will have these leaflets made available to them or that many almost illiterate English-speaking persons will be able to answer the questionnaire. This problem is compounded by the fact that there is no requirement that census takers in bilingual areas be bilingual; although it is certainly desired by the Census Bureau, it is not a requirement.

Third. The poor pay and the piecework basis of payment to enumerators precludes the hiring of more qualified bilingual or trained enumerators. The Census Bureau contends that piece rates are set so that the average enumerator working in a central city area will earn approximately \$2.50 per hour. It seems to me that this is a very optimistic estimate. In many cases, it is quite conceivable that 15 to 20 minutes will be spent trying to gain entrance to talk to the head of a household and that a great deal of time must be spent when the person being questioned is either non-English speaking or is unfamiliar with questionnaires and forms.

Fourth. The consultant staff and community liaison services are extraordinarily weak and incomplete. Mr. Brown has informed me that each of the major regional offices of the Bureau has at least one staff member who has been devoting full time to community education. This is admirable, I am sure, but definitely inadequate.

It seems to me that the deficiencies in procedure that have produced underenumeration in the past are not being corrected in time for the 1970 census. Although Mr. Brown seems extremely well-intentioned and is taking some steps, these steps ignore once again those people who have not been reached in the past. By working through community groups, television, radio, and national organizations, some people may be informed about the census that have previously not been. Others who would have received a questionnaire anyhow will better understand the purpose of the questionnaire and the procedure for filling it out. But those people who are hidden from statistics, the invisible Americans, that have not been reached by previous censuses, are the same people that will not be reached by the usual means of television and radio and the usual community groups.

Therefore, it is of utmost importance that trained enumerators working with community people canvass neighborhoods on a door-to-door basis to ascertain the number of families, not the number of dwellings in their neighborhood. It is imperative that bilingual enumerators canvass neighborhoods where English is not spoken. Community education must be much more extensive and comprehensive

and official assistance and information centers must be readily available to all neighborhoods.

I believe that it is imperative that these changes be made before the 1970 census. It would be beneficial if these changes were made before the prec canvassing of February. If we are not to discount a great number of Americans, we must improve the 1970 census so that it reflects the true complexion and population density of the Nation.

#### THE TEACHER CORPS

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly pleased to be able to vote to fund programs vitally essential to the health and well-being of many millions of our citizens. I would like, however, to mention one program with which I am familiar, which has suffered inordinately in this appropriations measure. I am speaking of the Teacher Corps, which has proven extraordinarily able to help universities and school systems improve the quality of education offered to poor children. This has certainly been so in my district, where the University of Kentucky has been working harmoniously and fruitfully with the Breathitt County schools in the training and service of Teacher Corps interns.

The Teacher Corps, which we had hoped would become a nationwide program, receives in this appropriations bill only \$21.7 million, a sum which provides support for considerably fewer new corps members than last year's appropriation. Therefore, I want to state at this time that I will be among those actively supporting the Teacher Corps' budget request for fiscal year 1971, for these are funds that the Teacher Corps must have if it is to continue to work effectively in the Nation's school districts where the need is greatest.

#### 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. PERKINS, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL, for 5 minutes today, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN, his remarks during consideration of the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act today.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in five instances.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) was granted unanimous consent to allow all Members to have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on his special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of California.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK in four instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. STAFFORD.

Mr. SCHWENGL.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. MIZELL in five instances.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. SNYDER in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. MIKVA in six instances.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. REUSS in six instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in five instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in six instances.

Mr. FALLON in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. DOWNING in two instances.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. PIKE in two instances.

Mr. FARBSTEIN.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. FLOWERS in five instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN in three instances.

Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1653. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on January 26 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13111. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 28, 1970, 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:

1547. A letter from the National Quartermaster-Adjutant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting the proceedings of the national convention held September 27-October 1, 1969 at Milwaukee, Wis., including the proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. for the year ending September 30, 1969 and a report of its receipts and expenditures, pursuant to the provisions of Public Laws 88-105 and 85-830 (H. Doc. No. 91-215); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1548. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665(1)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1549. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department, pursuant to the provisions of section 8031(c), title 10, U.S.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1550. A letter from the Acting Secretary

of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to broaden the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain admiralty claims administratively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1551. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of detailed reports on aliens who conditionally entered the United States pursuant to section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1552. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition and operating results of working capital funds as of June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 405(c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1553. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the final report on school assistance in federally affected areas, pursuant to Public Law 90-557; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 799. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12025, a bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high-timber yield fund, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-798). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14116. A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act, without amendment (Rept. No. 91-799). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 15149 (Rept. No. 91-800). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2214. An act to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14810. A bill to amend section 602(3) and section 608c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1049. A bill to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of October 30, 1965, relating to the conservation and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fishing resources, to encourage certain joint research and development projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture: S. 55. An act for the relief of Leonard N. Rogers, John P. Corcoran, Mrs. Charles W. (Ethel J.) Pensinger, Marion M. Lee, and Arthur N. Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary, S. 495. An act for the relief of Marie-Louise (Mary Louise) Pierce; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 12037. A bill for the relief of All Somay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 6125. A bill for the relief of Anne Reale Pietrandrea; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 1951. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon SP4C. Aaron Tawil; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15537. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 15538. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide veterans' benefits to individuals who served as contract surgeons with the Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 15539. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize appropriations for law enforcement assistance programs for fiscal year 1971 and succeeding fiscal years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15540. A bill to authorize a study to determine the feasibility of developing a small boat channel in the Mill Cove area of Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 15541. A bill to amend section 203(a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to make available annually an additional 10,200 conditional entries for certain refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 15542. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to promote the development of living historical farms in the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 15543. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices, condemned by that act to consumers through civil actions, and to provide for class actions for acts in fraud of consumers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 15544. A bill to end discrimination in the availability of Federal crop insurance and

to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the administration of the Federal crop insurance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15545. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 15546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to excise taxes on small utility vehicles and parts for such vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 15547. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the United States to cooperate in the construction of the Darien Gap Highway to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Pan American Highway System of South America; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 15548. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to convert criminal penalties to civil penalties in certain instances and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ (by request):

H.R. 15549. A bill to further the effectiveness of shipment of goods and supplies in foreign commerce by promoting the welfare of U.S. merchant seamen through cooperation with the United Seamen's Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 15550. A bill to increase the number of nursing home beds operated by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 15551. A bill to authorize outpatient care for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEE (for himself and Mr. SLACK):

H.R. 15552. A bill to authorize a survey of the Gauley River and tributaries in West Virginia, in the interest of flood control, water supply, recreation, and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (for himself, Mr. GRAY, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. YATES, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. SHIPLEY, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 15553. A bill to provide that the Federal Office Building and U.S. Courthouse in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building East" and that the Federal office building to be constructed in Chicago, Ill., shall be named the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Building West" in memory of the late Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois from 1933 to 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 15554. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. DOWDY):

H.R. 15555. A bill to abolish the Commission on Revision of the Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia and to direct the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives to perform the functions of that Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. BRADMAS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 15556. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MINISH, Mr. REES, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 15557. A bill to create a Federal Insurance Guarantee Corporation to protect the American public against certain insurance company insolvencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself and Mr. CAFFERY):

H.R. 15558. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the United States to cooperate in the construction of the Darien Gap Highway to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Pan American Highway System of South America; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15559. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 15560. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, Rodenticide Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 135-135k), to prohibit the importation of certain agricultural commodities to which economic poisons have been applied, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 15561. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15562. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide a criminal penalty for shooting at certain birds, fish, and other animals from an aircraft; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 15563. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 15564. A bill to amend the National Housing Act and the Federal Reserve Act to help meet the national housing goals, including the goals for low- and moderate-income families through the purchase of mortgages with private pension fund and Federal Reserve assets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 15565. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to make regulations that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous material so that they can be readily seen at night; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15566. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States be free of phosphorus; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 15567. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide health insur-

ance benefits for the disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15568. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 15569. A bill to amend section 105(e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain payments in advance of determination of performance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 15570. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 15571. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a national cemetery system within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15572. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to \$150 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15573. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to certain widows, children, and parents of veterans who died after April 30, 1957 and prior to July 1, 1971, with an inservice waiver of insurance premiums in effect, and to discontinue inservice waivers of premiums effective July 1, 1971; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 15574. A bill to amend section 632(e) title 38, United States Code, so as to provide that the Veterans' Memorial Hospital in the Philippine Islands will receive \$100,000 per year for 6 years for medical research and training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15575. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide educational assistance at secondary school level to eligible widows and wives, without charge to any period of entitlement earned pursuant to sections 1710 and 1711 of this chapter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 15576. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code to provide for the mailing of first-class letter mail to Senators and Representatives in Congress at no cost to the sender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 15577. A bill to amend section 108 of the Clean Air Act to authorize the establishment of emission standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. Moss, Mr. REUSS, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 15578. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 15579. A bill to extend for 2 years the programs of Federal assistance to federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15580. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedure for the consideration of applications

for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15581. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15582. A bill to define the application and effective date of court orders effecting desegregation of faculty and students in public school systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 15583. A bill to provide a program of pollution control in selected river basins and waterways of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance to municipalities and regional management associations for the construction of waste treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 15584. A bill to amend the provisions of law providing compensation for work injuries suffered by Federal employees with respect to the entitlement of firefighters in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FOUNTAIN, and Mr. PREYER of North Carolina):

H.R. 15585. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 15586. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a surviving spouse will continue to receive the full income-splitting benefits available to married couples so long as such spouse supports a dependent child in his or her household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, Mr. Dowdy, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 15587. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 by directing the establishment of orderly procedures for the modification of an urban renewal plan and requiring adherence thereto by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, by requiring that provision be made in each redevelopment contract for timely construction of public streets and facilities; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.J. Res. 1065. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.J. Res. 1066. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to powers reserved to the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ (for himself and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H.J. Res. 1067. Joint resolution to require the continuation of payments for the 1970 crop of feed grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 1068. Joint resolution to repeal legislation relating to the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in certain areas outside the United States and to express the sense of the Congress on certain matters relating to the war in Vietnam, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 489. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 490. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK:

H. Con. Res. 491. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of Human Rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 492. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H. Res. 800. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 801. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 189; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. GAIAMO):

H. Res. 802. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the National Collegiate Athletic Association; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H. Res. 803. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG (for himself, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. WYLE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. DENT, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. ROE, and Mr. CASEY):

H. Res. 804. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Investigation of Pornographic Enterprises; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 805. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; 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. CORBETT:

H.R. 15588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tong-guat Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 15589. A bill for the relief of Donald F. Wood and Alton S. Rhodes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15590. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elmira F. Tanner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 15591. A bill for the relief of Con-Elmira F. Tanner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 15592. A bill for the relief of Bitten Stripp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.