

It was also gratifying to hear that he would withdraw another 50,000 troops by the fall, and that he intended fully to keep up the timetable of withdrawal of 150,000 troops between now and April of next year.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we are seeing some light and progress in a war that many people believe was a great mistake. This has been a difficult war for all Americans, especially for those who have lost their loved ones, and for those who will bear the scars of that war for the rest of their lives.

It seems to me that the President's policy provides some light and makes the effort that was made in Vietnam begin to have meaning.

As his aspirations and goals, as stated to the country last night and in previous speeches, are reached, we can indeed, be thankful for a President of such great courage and stature.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### DEATH OF MILBURN D. AKERS, FORMER EDITOR OF CHICAGO SUN-TIMES

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the State of Illinois and the Nation have suffered a

great loss in the death of Milburn D. Akers. Mr. Akers, known as Pete, was the former editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, the president of Shimer College, and a distinguished citizen of my State for many years.

Last week, after staying with his dying sister all night, he drove his car toward Springfield, Ill., after only an hour's sleep, in order to testify on behalf of State aid to private, higher education in Illinois. While en route, he was killed in an automobile accident.

Pete Akers loved life. He loved the State of Illinois. He loved the newspaper business. He particularly loved young people, and spent the final years of his life strengthening higher education in Illinois. He devoted his entire life to trying to find a way to make this a better world for young people.

I think it is a tragic thing that his death occurred when he had so many years of life ahead of him in which to contribute so much to society.

Pete Akers loved to talk, to share ideas late at night with friends and acquaintances on any subject of importance that was current to the day. I have engaged in such conversations with him, and they were immensely enjoyable. I remember telling him after a discussion downstate that he should get more sleep before driving back to Cook County and to Chicago to his job with the newspaper. But I do not know of anyone who knew the highways and the byways of Illinois as well or better than he did, and I always admired his capacity for driving steadily after just a few hours of sleep. I often drove with him myself while downstate.

It is, I suppose, symbolic that Pete Akers should die while giving his atten-

tion to the needs of others—to his dying sister and then to the problems of the young people of his State. Those of us who have been privileged to be his friends through the years, shall miss him a great deal.

Mr. President, I am pleased to have the honor to pay tribute to him on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

He loved this country. He loved the free institutions of the country. As an editor and as a distinguished citizen throughout the course of his lifetime, he did everything possible to strengthen and build America. I know of no person in the State of Illinois or in the Nation who has contributed more as a citizen to the growth of his country and his State. In the role of a private citizen, he played a responsible and valuable role in participatory government.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 5, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 4, 1970

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

William F. Ruhl, president, B. C. Goodpasture Christian School, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we thank Thee for this quiet moment before the pressing needs of a new day come upon us. We are thankful for those who have dedicated their lives to public service, and we pray Thy richest blessings to be upon the Members of Congress today. We ask for Thy overruling providence in a day of world confusions and uncertainty. We pray, our Father, bless our President and leaders of nations around the world. May a spirit of brotherhood, an awareness of Thy equal concern for all men, and a genuine desire to live together in unity guide all their deliberations. We ask this prayer in the name of Him whose truth makes men free. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. NATCHER. 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. 17868) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS) and requests the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) to temporarily assume the chair.

#### 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. 17868, with Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Chairman pro tempore, 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 pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) will be recognized for one-half hour and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER).

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time we submit for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget, it is a distinct honor for me to serve with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), the gentleman

from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). All of these gentlemen are outstanding members of the Committee on Appropriations.

For the seventh consecutive year, the Congress has been presented a budget for the District of Columbia that is out of balance. The budget presented on March 31, 1970, is out of balance \$206,300,000. For operating expenses we have a deficit of \$63,200,000 and there is a loan authorization deficit of \$143,100,000.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five funds: a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary sewage works fund.

We carefully considered budget estimates totaling \$825,158,000 for fiscal year 1971, and we recommend to the House that the sum of \$642,906,000 be approved for the fiscal year 1971.

We recommend to the House that a Federal payment of \$105,000,000 be approved. In our report on page 5, we set forth an updated table showing appropriations to the general fund since the year 1924. The Federal payment in the year 1960 was \$25 million which was 12.51 percent of the total budget for the District of Columbia. The 1965 Congress appropriated \$37,500,000 for the Federal payment and this was 12.57 percent of the total budget for the District of Columbia. The \$105,000,000 recommended is the total authorized Federal payment, and this is 17.59 percent of the total budget for the District of Columbia. In addition to the Federal payment, the District of Columbia will receive Federal grants totaling \$198,729,000. A summary of the Federal grant assistance to the District of Columbia appears on page 4 of our report, and this amount of money is not a part of the budget for fiscal year 1971 which was presented to our committee. The grants set forth, which total the \$198,729,000, represent funds which are used in the different departments of the District government on the same basis of funds used by the 50 States which are carried under the basic legislation authorizing such money.

The amount that we recommend is \$182,252,000 less than the total requested, and \$7,343,600 less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1970.

In reporting this bill at this time we had to make severe reductions to bring the budget into balance. Unfortunately, our committee has had almost no flexibility in its action to balance the budget. A high proportion of the increases requested are to meet mandatory and uncontrollable personnel costs and the staffing of new facilities that will be ready for occupancy during the forthcoming fiscal year. In most instances only these costs have been allowed. Requests for new programs had to be deferred and many capital outlay projects have also been deferred, including those for street maintenance and water pollution control. The operating budget assumed the adoption of revenue measures including a property tax increase, an income tax increase, a Federal payment formula, and a gasoline tax increase. New

revenues from these sources are estimated at \$63.2 million. None of these measures have been enacted. The property tax rate is set by the City Council, and the other measures must be acted upon by the Congress.

The capital outlay budget assumed the enactment of bonding authority to fund \$143.1 million of the \$209,000,000 requested. The construction program is currently funded by loan authority which is expiring. No action has been taken by the Congress to provide the additional financing required.

Mr. Chairman, in order to provide a balanced budget the committee is recommending reductions of \$37,533,000 in the request for operating expenses, plus the elimination of \$25,522,000 in proposed reserves. Capital outlay requests have been reduced \$144.7 million. Approximately \$1,000,000 in loan authority in the general fund will be available for future financing of projects. Loan authority for the highway and sanitary sewage works fund is completely exhausted.

Our committee is still of the opinion that there is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system in our Capital City. In order to meet the tremendous day-by-day growth of traffic, the freeway program must be carried out along with the rapid transit system.

The history of the problems of constructing the Interstate Freeway System in the District of Columbia is a matter of public record and is again documented in part 2 of the printed hearings accompanying this bill, commencing on page 380. Appropriations were first made in 1958 and to date over \$200 million is available for the freeway system. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, section 23, directed the District to proceed with construction of certain segments of the freeway system and to study others and report back to the Congress. Actions were taken to implement this section and this committee recommended the appropriation of \$40,322,000 for the District's share of the 1970 subway construction program. On April 30 of this year, this committee recommended the appropriation of an additional \$1,293,000 for the same purpose. In February 1970, the District government and the Secretary of Transportation submitted reports to the Congress as required by the Highway Act of 1968 which contain certain proposals that are not in compliance with the intent of the law. Another impasse has evolved. Until the current impasse on freeway construction is resolved no funds will be recommended for the District's share of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's fiscal year 1971 construction program. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, we do not recommend at this time the sum of \$34,178,000 for the District's share of the rapid transit construction program costs.

As I have previously stated, Mr. Chairman, during the hearings before our committee, I documented the history of the problems of constructing the Interstate Highway System and the rapid rail transit system. That portion of the hearings pertaining to this matter is as follows:

#### IMPASSE IN FREEWAY SYSTEM

The members of the committee remember full well that in September of 1969 after the impasse was solved in regard to freeways and rapid transit construction, our subcommittee recommended that the rapid transit money be released and we, in turn, in the conference with the Senate agreed to go along with the construction money for rapid transit.

Prior to this time, and, Mr. Davis, you will recall this without any trouble, President Nixon became very much concerned about the situation as it existed here in our Capital city and I want to say for the record that President Nixon has done everything that he said he would do in regard to solving the impasse that has developed and, as I have stated on the floor of the House on more than one occasion, this is the first time that a President of the United States has had nerve enough and courage enough to take a stand in this matter. This impasse existed for over 8 years and our committee after appropriating millions of dollars, a total sum of \$200 million was available, naturally expected the freeway system to proceed in an orderly fashion, saying all the while that there was a place in our Capital city for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system. We believe that in order to meet the tremendous day-by-day growth of traffic the freeway program must be carried out along with the rapid transit system.

Operating on this premise, we approved and recommended that the construction money for rapid rail transit be released. As you will recall, Mr. Davis, I issued a statement which I placed in the Congressional Record reviewing the situation concerning freeways and rapid transit, and unless there is some objection I would like to insert that statement in this hearing record at this point.

#### STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN NATCHER

Our committee is still of the opinion that there is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system in our Capital city. We believe that in order to meet the tremendous day-by-day growth of traffic the freeway program must be carried out along with the rapid transit system.

We started appropriating funds for our freeway system following the 5-year study which was adopted by the District of Columbia in 1958. We now have available over \$200 million which must be used for the freeway system.

In 1962 we started having trouble over the freeway system and this has been the situation up to July 9, 1969, when I recommended to the House that the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill deleting the \$18,737,000 for the start of construction on the rapid transit system be approved. Following our refusal to again approve construction funds for rapid transit construction until the freeway system was started and underway according to the provisions of the Highway Act of 1968, we have had certain actions starting with the District of Columbia City Council vote which approved a resolution requiring the District government to comply with the Highway Act of 1968. This was on August 9, 1969.

On August 11, 1969, the Department of Highways and Traffic received an order from the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner directing the Highway Department to proceed immediately to implement the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

An August 11 the House of Representatives approved the District of Columbia Revenue Act which contained the following provision:

SEC. 903. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year under article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C.

Code, secs. 47-2501a-47-2501b) until the President of the United States has reported to the Congress that (1) the District of Columbia government has begun work on each of the projects listed in section 23(b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 and has committed itself to complete those projects, or (2) the District of Columbia government has not begun work on each of those projects, or made or carried out that commitment, solely because of a court injunction issued in response to a petition filed by a person other than the District of Columbia or an agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States.

On August 12, 1969, I received the following letter from President Nixon:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1969.

DEAR BILL: Your diligent efforts through the years to insure that the District of Columbia will enjoy a balanced transportation system are very much appreciated by all of us who are concerned with the welfare of our Capital City. As you know, I have previously expressed my desire that a fair and effective settlement of the issues involved in the transportation controversy be reached to serve the interests of all those concerned—central city dwellers, suburbanites, shoppers, employees, and visitors. It is my conviction that those steps necessary for a fair and effective settlement have been taken.

The City Council of the District of Columbia has now voted in favor of a resolution to complete the requirements of a Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968. Immediately thereafter, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia directed the Department of Highways to implement immediately the requirements of the Act. The Secretary of Transportation has directed the Federal Highway Administrator to rescind the letter of his predecessor dated January 17, 1969, thus placing these projects back into the Interstate System. Furthermore, the Federal Highway Administrator has been directed to work closely with the Highway Department of the District of Columbia in order to continue work until completion of all projects and the study called for in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968. I trust that these actions will fulfill the criteria which you set forth in your statement of August 11, 1969.

The District of Columbia government is firmly committed to completion of these projects as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 provides. I join the District of Columbia government in that commitment, and I have directed the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to provide assistance to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia to vigorously defend any lawsuits which may be filed to thwart the continuation of the projects called for by this act.

A balanced transportation system is essential for the proper growth and development of the District of Columbia. I hope that this evidence of tangible progress would permit us to assure the citizens of the District of Columbia that your subcommittee will be in a position to approve the \$18,737,000 deleted from the supplemental appropriation bill together with the \$21,586,000 in the regular appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1970.

With cordial regards,

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

On August 13, 1969, F. C. Turner, Federal Highway Administrator, directed a letter to T. F. Airis, Director of the District of Columbia Department of Highway and Traffic, stating that certain adjustments had been made in the Interstate System for the District of Columbia and that such action had reinstated the system to its status as covered in the Interstate System cost estimate re-

ferred to in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

On September 18, 1969, I received the following letter from Mr. Airis, the Director of the Department of Highway and Traffic of the District of Columbia:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF HIGH-  
WAYS AND TRAFFIC,

Washington, D.C., September 18, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM H. NATCHER,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations  
for the District of Columbia, U.S. House  
of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NATCHER: On September 17, 1969, the Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia, received bids for the construction of a new Potomac River crossing—Interstate Route 266—vicinity of the Three Sisters Islands—Contract No. 1—substructure river piers, Federal Aid Project No. District of Columbia-Virginia I-266-2(103)1.

A total of six bids were received, ranging from a low of \$1,152,830 to a high of \$1,528,480. The low bid, submitted by the Head Construction Co., Washington, D.C., is approximately 5 percent above our office estimate. The low bidder is considered competent and qualified to carry out the provisions of this contract and, as a result, the contract was awarded to the Head Construction Co. on this date, with the concurrence of the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal Highway Administration.

We anticipate that all necessary contract documents will be completely executed sometime tomorrow, and efforts will be made to have the contractor commence operations early during the week of September 22, 1969.

The above information is being furnished in order that you and your committee may be kept abreast of the progress being made by the District Government in implementing the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely yours,

T. F. AIRIS,

Director.

On September 18, 1969, I received the following letter from Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESI-  
DENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM H. NATCHER,

Chairman, Subcommittee on the District of  
Columbia, Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to clarify the situation with respect to the District of Columbia appropriation requests for the proposed rapid rail transit system.

I would like to assure you that the appropriation for fiscal year 1970 of the \$18,737,000, earlier deleted from the District of Columbia supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1969, together with the appropriation of the \$21,586,000 in the 1970 fiscal year appropriation request, would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. MAYO,

Director.

On September 22, 1969, I received an excellent statement from Mr. Airis, the Director of the Department of Highways and Traffic, covering all of the highway projects listed under the Highway Act of 1968 and the action the Department of Highways and Traffic is taking at this time to comply with the resolution of the City Council and the Highway Act of 1968. This statement clearly shows that the freeway program is underway.

All of these acts indicate clearly that we are in complete agreement that freeway construction as provided under the highway

Act of 1968 must proceed with rapid rail transit construction.

I will now recommend that the \$18,737,000 deleted from the supplemental appropriations bill together with the \$21,586,000 in the regular appropriations bill for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1970 be appropriated for rapid rail transit construction. I will further recommend that the Federal share for rapid rail transit construction appropriated for fiscal year 1969 totaling \$43,772,000 be released. The provision concerning this amount is contained in the report accompanying the appropriations bill for fiscal year 1969 for the Department of Interior and related agencies and the following part of the report applies:

"DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

"Federal Contribution

Appropriation, 1968.....	-----	
Estimate, 1969.....	-----	\$55,147,000
Recommended, 1969.....	-----	43,772,000

Comparison:

Appropriation, 1968.....	-----	+43,772,000
Estimate, 1969.....	-----	-11,375,000

"Funds available under this appropriation item are to enable the Department of Housing and Urban Development to pay the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, as part of the Federal contribution toward expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, as amended. Funds included in this bill represent two-thirds of the Federal contribution to this project, the remaining one-third to be provided by the District of Columbia.

"The committee directs that this appropriation shall be available only to the extent that an amount equal to one-half the funds provided by this appropriation has been provided by the District of Columbia as required by Public Law 89-173.

"The committee's recommendation is based on a total program of \$68,763,000 consisting of \$8,680,000 for engineering and design; \$5,200,000 for rights-of-way and land acquisition; and \$54,883,000 for construction. Deducting \$3,105,000 representing that portion of the program which will be financed from prior year funds leaves a total of new obligational authority of \$65,658,000. Of this total amount \$43,772,000 is included in this bill and \$21,886,000 would be for provision by the District of Columbia."

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. NATCHER. Since the reports have been made by the District Government and by Secretary Volpe as required by the Highway Act, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives has given this matter attention. On February 27, 1970, Chairman George H. Fallon of the Public Works Committee directed a letter to President Nixon, in which he stated in part that the Congress had received from the District of Columbia and the Department of Transportation their respective reports as required by the Highway Act of 1968.

The letter goes on to state that the reports are, for the most part, in disagreement with each other and are radical departures from the 1968 act.

I have the permission of the chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House to place in the record at this point a copy of this letter. In addition, the chairman of the Public Works Committee, Mr. Fallon, in a statement on the floor of the House made certain observations concerning compliance with the Highway Act of 1968 by the Department of Transportation and by the District Government. The statement and the letter clearly show that the Highway Act of 1968 has not been complied with and that this

fact is known by the Department of Transportation and the District Government.

I will place in the record at this point the copy of the letter to President Nixon, and also the statement of the chairman of the Public Works Committee which he made on the floor of the House concerning the reports that had been received which are not in compliance with the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,  
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1970.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the United States,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In a letter to you of November 12, 1969, particular exception was taken to a crash study program being planned by the District of Columbia government which went far afield of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

The letter also stated clearly the intent of the Congress in that act with respect to what was expected in the way of transportation studies.

The last paragraph of the letter clearly states the overall objective of section 23 of the act:

"The problems associated with the completion of the highway system over the years have been many and the 1968 Highway Act was intended to bring these problems to an end. It is very important that the District of Columbia and the other Federal agencies proceed with dispatch toward that objective."

The Congress has now received from the District of Columbia and the Department of Transportation their respective reports as required by the act. The reports are for the most part in disagreement with each other and are radical departures from the 1968 act.

I am enclosing a copy of my statement in the Congressional Record which expresses my concern in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,  
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE  
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 required under section 23(c) the submission to the Congress of certain reports regarding the Interstate System in the District of Columbia.

The two reports submitted to the Congress this week, one from the District of Columbia government and one from the Secretary of Transportation have presented a confusing set of recommendations.

The intent of the 1968 Highway Act was to clarify the confusion which had reigned for so many years in the District of Columbia regarding the Interstate Highway System. The act directed that certain projects be completed and that others be studied further to enable the District to adjust the projects to whatever changing conditions had occurred during the long period of controversy.

The two reports submitted to the Congress are for the greater part in disagreement with each other, despite stories to the contrary in the press. In addition both contain wide variances from what is contained in the 1968 Highway Act. In other words the two have confused the picture to the same, if not worse, extent as that which existed when the 1968 Highway Act was passed.

While these positions have been developing, the District of Columbia Highway program has again showed signs of bogging down and for the same old reasons.

The East Leg which was to be under construction above Barney Circle has yet to see the award of a contract. The portion of this

project which was directed to be under design between Benning Road and Bladensburg Road has yet to be started.

The Congress cannot sit idly by and allow millions of dollars of taxpayers money to be wasted in an unending series of studies the results of which there seems to be no intention of implementing or in which there is apparently no hope of agreement among the public bodies involved. Nor can they permit projects to proceed which have only had superficial examinations, and little, if any, factual basis.

Even the rapid transit system which required such painstaking effort on the part of so many to get underway is subject to delays by the various recommendations.

As reluctant as we are to inject ourselves into the local picture, it is imperative that the Congress act to insure the Nation's Capital a proper transportation system.

NEED TO RESOLVE IMPASSE

Mr. NATCHER. It is clear from what has transpired since our committee approved the money necessary to begin construction on the rapid transit system and since the time that we recommended to the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations that the money heretofore approved and held in abeyance be released for construction, that the terms of the Highway Act of 1968 have not been complied with, and this is the situation that we are confronted with today.

Under no circumstances can I recommend to this committee that we continue appropriating funds for rapid rail transit construction unless the Highway Act of 1968 is complied with in its entirety. This is the law. It was passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President of the United States in 1968.

Since the reports were received by the Congress from the Transportation Department and from the District officials, and since the letter that was directed to the President by the chairman of the Public Works Committee was received, a meeting has been held with Secretary Volpe by the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the ranking minority member, and other members of the committee. I am reliably informed that as a result of this meeting every effort will now be made to comply with the Highway Act of 1968, and that this will take place before the District budget is approved for fiscal year 1971 by this committee.

If this takes place and the Highway Act of 1968 is complied with in its entirety, then I will be in a position to recommend to this committee that we continue appropriating funds for rapid rail transit construction over and above the 1970 fiscal year funds which we approved believing that the impasse was over and the Highway Act of 1968 would be carried out as promised on Aug. 9 and 11 of 1969. If not, then I do not intend to recommend construction funds for rapid transit for fiscal year 1971.

The committee recommends 41,290 positions for 1971. This is an increase of 308 over the current level. The budget proposed 44,855, an increase of 3,873.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend an appropriation of \$48,406,000 for operating expenses for the various departments and agencies of the District government. This allowance is \$3,940,400 more than has been appropriated to date for 1970 and \$5,882,000 less than requested.

We recommend a total of \$144,641,000 for Public Safety. This is \$20,521,200 more than for 1970 and \$3,751,000 less than requested.

For the Metropolitan Police Department, we recommend a total of \$83,628,100. This is \$15,248,200 above 1970 ap-

propriations and \$697,800 less than the amount requested.

This is the first time the committee has not been able to substantially allow the full request. This is due entirely to the lack of available revenues. The allowance recommended provides support for a uniformed force of 5,100 policemen.

We recommend \$24,848,700 for the Fire Department. This is \$482,200 above current appropriations to date and \$923,800 less than requested. This reduction has been necessary due to the lack of available revenues. For the courts, we recommend a total of \$17,299,400. No provision has been made for court reorganization proposed under pending legislation.

We recommend an appropriation of \$146,353,000 for the operation of the public schools and higher educational institutions of the District of Columbia government.

For public schools, we recommend a total of \$127,204,000 for 1971. This is an increase of \$3,638,300 for 1970 appropriations to date and \$10,407,800 less than requested. For the District of Columbia Teachers College, we recommend an appropriation of \$2,674,000. This is \$160,200 less than requested and \$702,100 more than has been appropriated to date for 1970. For the Federal City College, we recommend an appropriation of \$11,600,000. This is \$5,095,000 below the requested amount and \$726,000 above the 1971 appropriation currently enacted. Only the mandatory increased costs have been allowed. Due to the lack of revenue, it is not possible to provide appropriations for the 123 unfunded positions recently authorized in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill for 1970. For the Washington Technical Institute, we recommend \$4,875,000 for 1971. This is an increase of \$222,000 over current year appropriations but \$1,547,500 less than the amount requested. Funds are not available for the recently authorized 31 unfunded positions.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend an appropriation of \$11,141,000 for the Recreation Department. This is an increase of \$1,961,300 over comparable 1970 appropriations to date and \$2,387,400 less than requested. Funding responsibility for the National Capital region, National Capital parks and, the National Zoological Park has been assumed by the U.S. Government and the 1971 appropriations for those agencies are included in the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1971.

We recommend a total of \$156,677,000 for the six activities now grouped under the newly created Department of Human Resources. For public health we recommend a total of \$87,152,000 for 1971, which is an increase of \$4,460,200 over currently available appropriations and \$710,400 less than requested.

For public welfare we recommend a total of \$67,202,000 for 1971. This amount is \$13,026,000 more than has been appropriated to date for 1970 and \$4,622,900 less than requested. An increase of \$9,128,000 has been allowed for public assistance payments to cover the full-year cost of the increased welfare payments

provided last year and to meet an additional caseload. Mr. Chairman, our committee is concerned over the increasing welfare caseload. At such time as additional resources are available, every consideration will be given to restoring investigator positions to assure that those who are entitled to receive assistance and those who are not are removed from the rolls.

During the hearings the Department of Public Welfare requested \$240,000 for construction services for a new school building to be located at Junior Village, which upon completion would cost \$2,802,000. It developed that there would be 215 pupils to occupy this building and the daily estimated population for Junior Village for the fiscal year 1971 is 445. This, of course, Mr. Chairman, is a right expensive building just to be occupied by 215 pupils. After additional loan authority is approved by the Congress, thereby making all of the capital outlay projects eligible for consideration, the committee believes that this is one project that should be carefully considered before it is resubmitted for approval. We believe on our committee that every time a new building is constructed at Junior Village, to this extent we admit defeat.

Again we want to express our continuing concern for the well-being of homeless dependent children. It seems most unsatisfactory for our Capital City to continue to rely upon area hospitals and Junior Village for the care of infants and children abandoned or displaced from their natural parents. Certainly well babies do not belong in hospitals and growing children have no business in institutions. For many years now it has been known that institutional placement is destructive to the emotional, social, and intellectual development of children. More recent research indicates such institutional placement may have a permanent effect which cannot be overcome by later improvement in care. Our committee, Mr. Chairman, believes that the District authorities should develop, with all possible speed, programs to get displaced children into homes. We believe that every consideration should be given to innovative programs of other large cities which have successfully supplanted institutions with home care. Again we call upon the Welfare Department and the District officials to give every consideration in preparing their new budget to making a major shift in emphasis from institutions to foster homes for homeless dependent children.

We recommend an appropriation of \$771,000 for the new Narcotics Treatment Agency. This new Agency is responsible for the heroin addiction program previously operated by the Department of Public Health. Only uncontrollable increased personnel costs have been allowed. Our committee, Mr. Chairman, is well aware that the appropriations recommended will not provide a comprehensive and effective treatment program adequate to the needs of addicts in the District of Columbia. The lack of funds brings about this action on the part of our committee.

We recommend an appropriation of \$19,759,000 for highways and traffic.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend a total of \$36,069,000 for sanitary engineering. This is \$1,619,100 more than has been provided to date for fiscal year 1970 and is \$1,197,000 less than the amount requested. For the Department of Sanitary Engineering we recommend a total of \$31,713,400. For fiscal year 1970 we appropriated \$30,454,000.

The committee recommends \$15,563,000 for repayment of loans and interest on money borrowed from the Federal Treasury for financing the construction programs of the District of Columbia.

#### CAPITAL OUTLAY

Mr. Chairman, we recommend a total of \$64,294,000 for capital outlay in fiscal year 1971. This is \$56,388,300 less than has been appropriated to date for 1970 and \$144,718,000 less than was requested in the amended budget. Capital outlay is financed by loans. Existing loan authority is not sufficient to finance all of the requested projects under the general and water funds. The projects allowed will be financed during 1971 from previously appropriated but unused loan appropriations. Loan authority for projects financed from the highway and sanitary sewage works funds has been completely utilized.

For public schools, Mr. Chairman, we recommend a total of \$34,647,400 for capital outlay. Twenty-two projects were requested and we are able to recommend 20 for approval. This is \$14,047,500 less than the amount requested for public schools.

For the Police Department our committee recommends the disapproval of construction funds for four new district station houses. The committee is concerned over the high cost of these proposed structures, which are currently estimated to cost from \$3 million to \$4 million. Under present plans, approximately 500 to 600 men would occupy each station house. Mr. Chairman, we recommend that the plans be reexamined and efforts made to design more austere facilities. So far, none of the sites proposed for these station houses have been acquired. We recommend a total of \$1,605,100 for capital outlay items projects for the Police Department. We recommend \$958,000 for capital outlay projects for public welfare. The large item totaling \$4,320,000 for a new receiving home for children was withdrawn by the Department.

For the Department of General Services, we recommend \$2,246,500.

For capital outlay for higher education we recommend a total of \$4,086,700.

As heretofore discussed, Mr. Chairman, we do not recommend at this time the \$34,178,000 for the District's share of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's 1971 capital outlay program. Just as soon as the impasse is resolved, and the Highway Act of 1968 is compiled with, we will recommend, Mr. Chairman, authority for the borrowing of the necessary \$34,178,000 to be used as the District's share for rapid rail transit construction for the fiscal year 1971.

Only two of the 22 projects requested for the Department of Highways and Traffic can be approved, Mr. Chairman. Due to the lack of loan authority to

finance the highway construction program only two projects can be allowed at this time. The \$500,000 recommended for the Three Sisters Bridge will complete the financing for that structure and is available from existing resources. The project "street lighting and communications extensions" for which we recommend \$776,000 will be financed from the general fund. All other projects, including those for street and bridge repair, maintenance, and improvements are financed from the highway fund and cannot be recommended at this time due to the fact that there are no available funds. Mr. Chairman, it is almost unbelievable that a budget would be presented to the Congress by the District officials with no available funds for repairing and maintaining the streets of our Nation's Capital. You will note on page 20 of the report accompanying this bill that street improvements and extensions costs total \$3,495,000 and there are no available funds for this program at this time. We, therefore, can make no recommendation for appropriation of the necessary funds for street improvements and extensions. The table carried on page 20 further shows no available funds or loan authority for the balance of the freeway projects, and the other necessary projects requested by the Department of Highways and Traffic.

For capital outlay for the Department of Sanitary Engineering, we recommend \$7,300,000.

For the Public Library, we recommend \$387,600.

Mr. Chairman, for the Recreation Department, we recommend \$3,316,000.

For the Police Department, we recommend \$1,605,100. For the Fire Department, we recommend \$1,342,500.

For public health, we recommend \$2,934,000. Mr. Chairman, we recommend for the Department of Corrections \$1,281,500.

For the Department of Public Welfare, we recommend \$958,000. For the Department of General Services, we recommend \$2,246,500, and for the Washington Aqueduct, we recommend \$970,000.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield at this time to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) who is interested in all matters pertaining to our Nation's Capital.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I understand the reason that there are no funds at this time in the bill for rapid transit, but I do represent a nearby district, and we are concerned about obtaining rapid transit into the suburban area. We understand this cannot be done until the facility here in the District of Columbia is constructed.

Can the gentleman tell me what the procedure is now? I understand the District of Columbia has not complied with the Highway Act of 1968, and yet, in the interest of my constituents, I wish there were some way we would not arrive at an impasse, and that we could move along.

Is the burden on the officials of the

District of Columbia to comply with the 1968 Highway Act? How can we not have any further delay on rapid transit?

Mr. NATCHER. The burden at this time is on the officials in the District government and the Secretary of Transportation and the members of his agency.

Our committee is still of the opinion that there is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system in our Capital City. In order to meet the tremendous day-by-day growth of traffic, the freeway program must be carried out along with the rapid transit system.

The history of the problems of constructing the Interstate Freeway System in the District of Columbia is a matter of public record and is again documented in part 2 of the printed hearings accompanying this bill, commencing on page 380. Appropriations were first made in 1958 and to date over \$200 million is available for the freeway system. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, section 23, directed the District to proceed with construction of certain segments of the freeway system and to study others and report back to the Congress. Actions were taken to implement this section and this committee recommended the appropriation of \$40,322,000 for the District's share of the 1970 subway construction program. On April 30 of this year this committee recommended the appropriation of an additional \$1,293,000 for the same purpose. In February 1970, the District government and the Secretary of Transportation submitted reports to the Congress as required by the Highway Act of 1968 which contain certain proposals that are not in compliance with the intent of the law. Another impasse has evolved. Until the current impasse on freeway construction is resolved no funds will be recommended for the District's share of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's fiscal year 1971 construction program. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, we do not recommend at this time the sum of \$34,178,000 for the District's share of the rapid transit construction program costs.

If between now and the time the bill passes the Senate, or at any time the District officials and the Department of Transportation comply with the Highway Act of 1968, I will recommend to the members of our subcommittee, to our Committee on Appropriations and to the full House that we appropriate the \$34,178,000 requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

The action of the committee does not stop rapid transit at this time. The work that is underway today will continue. We do not want to stop rapid transit.

But I must say this: As long as there is not compliance with the law passed by this House and the Congress of the United States I will never come to the floor of the House and ask for money to continue construction.

At any time there is compliance—and the appropriate officials know what it takes to comply, I will recommend construction money for rapid transit as was done last year.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is doing and what his subcommittee is doing. I have no thought of any criticism of the subcommittee. I am interested in nothing being done that would hold up the construction of the rapid transit system, and especially to the suburban area.

Perhaps I could contact the Secretary of Transportation and urge him to be in touch with the District of Columbia officials, and perhaps other Members of this House could point out there is an obligation on the part of the District of Columbia to comply with the 1968 act. I am just trying to find a way to see that we do not come to an impasse in the future and that we do not delay the construction of this rapid transit system.

Mr. NATCHER. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

I want the gentleman to know that I hope the day will come when we can come back to the House, and recommend appropriating the \$34,178,000 requested. I hope it will be in the near future.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have listened with great interest to the gentleman's remarks. I should certainly like to commend the gentleman and the members of his subcommittee for their report. I was certainly pleased when the gentleman in the well mentioned that he has recommended that there be a balanced budget for the District of Columbia, with expenditures balanced against revenues. I wanted to be associated with the gentleman in this regard.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend for his remarks.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend from New Jersey, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PATTEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know, so far as the gentleman's work on the Appropriations Committee is concerned, he takes care of it. The District of Columbia is probably equivalent to the 11th State in the United States. As all the States have city problems and social problems, so does the District of Columbia.

I think you and I recognize that as members of the Committee on Appropriations we are very limited in what we can do. I do not feel that we get to the nitty-gritty of District problems. Even though you have the spirit and I have the spirit and the other members of the committee do, to upgrade our schools and do all of the things necessary for our Police Department so as to make the city safe, and make this the greatest city in the country, still all too often a responsibility is put upon our shoulders which is difficult to fulfill. Just serving on the Committee on Appropriations is actually inadequate for running the District of Columbia. The responsibility must be put where it belongs, namely, on the city administration, on the White House,

and whoever else actually does the job. As members of the committee, we are very limited in our efforts. Is that not true?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is exactly correct, and I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and I yield at this time to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, another Member of this House who is interested in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say at this time that the gentleman from Kentucky has worked long and hard and has taken a deep interest in our city. I know the complexity of the problems with which he is faced with regard to the District of Columbia. It is not an easy task.

But, in regard to the question of the Metro system and the expressway system here in the city, I realize that I am one of a very small handful of Congressmen who take exception to a deep-seated feeling in this House that we should not go ahead with funding the transit system unless we have corresponding progress in the expressway system. Let me say that although I stand first in wishing for a balanced transportation system of both transit and freeway, I wish it to be clear that I vigorously support every effort to build these systems which are critically needed by this city and the metropolitan area. The transit system and the freeway system should each be judged on its own merits, and I do not feel that we should hold one program hostage to the other.

But regardless, I would say despite the fact that his constituency is far removed from this area the gentleman from Kentucky has applied himself diligently trying to solve some of the very difficult problems we have in the metropolitan area of Washington. I want to thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend for his statement.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to most emphatically associate myself with the statement made today by that great gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman WILLIAM NATCHER concerning the District of Columbia freeway program.

As he has stated, the Committee on Public Works, chaired by that wonderful gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GEORGE FALLON, and the Subcommittee on Roads of which I am the chairman, felt that the 1968 Highway Act certainly was intended to put an end to the years of unnecessary and ridiculous bickering which had gone on in the District of Columbia concerning interstate highway routes for the Nation's Capital.

We all realize that you must have both a rapid transit system and a freeway system in the large metropolitan areas if those areas are to survive. My own city of Chicago has one of the best transportation systems of any city in the world because it has both an extensive freeway system and an excellent mass transit sys-

tem. Just this week Mayor Daley of that great city testified before our committee concerning the 1970 Federal-Aid Highway Act. He stated in no uncertain terms that an extensive freeway system is an absolute necessity for the economic well-being of our cities if they are to remain great. I certainly agree with him.

Here in the Capital of this great Nation we only need a few more miles to complete the Interstate System. Even then it will be a system of only moderate size. It is just intolerable that the city government continues to obstruct and delay and drag its feet on this vital project.

Where positive action is required all that can be seen is negativeness coupled with a cowering every time a militant voice is raised to object. I read recently that the great Roman statesman and philosopher, Seneca remarked long ago, "that government is ill-conducted, when the mob rules its leader."

As the great gentleman from Texas, (Mr. MAHON), chairman of the Appropriations Committee also stated today, we must have a National Capital of which we are proud. We can hardly be proud of unfinished freeways and intolerable traffic congestion which has resulted from a government of indecision.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of this bill, every portion of it, and in full concurrence with the report which has been prepared. I believe the report is both informational and concise.

I certainly concur with the remarks which the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) just made concerning the dedication and effort that our chairman has exhibited during all the years that I have had the privilege of serving with him in bringing this bill to the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, we did not have the flexibility which we would have liked to have had in working with this bill this year. This is because of the very substantial deficit condition in which we received it. There was a \$206 million difference between the budget that was before us and the funds that were available. Consequently, we could not approve substantial new programs.

There are essentially three sources of additional funds that I suspect need to be and will be made available sometime before the final chapter in this piece of legislation for fiscal year 1971 is written.

One is with respect to the Federal payment. This bill provides the maximum authorized by law. Legislation is pending to change the formula.

A second is through increased taxes. This is a joint responsibility of the Council and of the Congress. The Council does have the authority to adjust real estate taxes without congressional concurrence. The Congress has the authority and responsibility for providing additional sources of revenue.

The third source of funds, concerned primarily with capital outlay, is borrowing authority. This bill provides for the use of all the remaining authorized borrowing authority. If there are to be

additional capital outlay projects and programs it will be necessary for the existing borrowing authority to be increased.

The District government has recommended a change in their borrowing authority this year. Under the present law, as I am sure members who serve on the Legislative Committee are very much aware, they cannot borrow in the traditional manner through the issuance of bonds. Instead they are authorized to borrow direct from the Treasury for capital outlay programs in the District.

The District government has recommended that they be permitted to issue bonds as do other municipalities and States. However, this involves a legislative matter upon which this committee is not in a position to pass judgment. We can only report to you that if additional capital outlay programs are to be approved, it will have to be through an extension of their existing authority or a change authorized by the legislative committee.

We know as we stand here this morning presenting this bill to you that there are some things that we could not fund that need to be funded. But we must await either increased revenue, an increased Federal payment, or increased borrowing authority before any of them can be done.

For example, there is pending legislation to revise and reorganize the courts. This, if and when it is done—and we hope it will be done while this Congress is in session early in the new fiscal year—will mean additional expenditures for both personnel and facilities.

We know there are some projects in the Department of Recreation that need to be provided. We also know that there are facilities for physical education at the institutions of higher learning that need to be provided. We know that certain of the drug and alcoholic control programs need to be implemented, and require additional funding when it can be made available.

In the Department of Highways and Traffic—and I direct your attention to page 20 of the report—you will note that there is simply not money available to do many things that we know must be done.

The same situation exists with the Department of Sanitary Engineering, the sanitary sewage works fund and, as the gentleman from Maryland has pointed out, with the subway. It is the lack of available revenue that has prohibited us from providing any more funds than are contained in this bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I note that the gentleman made reference to the Department of Sanitary Engineering. The President, the Department of the Interior, this Congress, and the American people have made a commitment to clean up the Nation's waters, and we in Congress are moving to fulfill our pledge with the authorizations and funding necessary to provide wholesome water.

Yesterday, members of the Maryland delegation, our two Senators and the Congressman from the Fifth District, Congressman HOGAN, and I, met with the State and local officials in regard to the sanitary sewer problem in the Washington area. We in Maryland are confronted with a State health department order which will prohibit further house construction until the WSSC alleviates certain conditions and overflows. Corollary to this is the question of the sewage load which the Blue Plains plant should ultimately handle. We must resolve both of these questions. We must have a safe sewage system so that new home construction can go forward with a guarantee of adequate sewage service. But we need the appropriations requested by the District to meet the water quality standards for the Potomac.

I believe America's commitment to clean water includes purifying the waters of the river which flows through the Nation's Capital.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for indicating that the Committee on Appropriations did not delete this particular item, because the Members felt that it was a low priority issue, and did not merit funding. Our commitment to cleaning up the water includes appropriating in this session of Congress whatever funds are necessary so that construction will go forward at the Blue Plains plant and meet the timetables and standards necessary to clean up the Potomac.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE). I do not believe that the fact that we could not do some of these things financially indicates a belief on the part of some of the committee members that they are not items of high priority. It simply was a matter of finances. I previously mentioned the sanitary sewage works fund as one of those areas where we recognize the need to do something as soon as there is proper legislation to permit us to proceed.

I think every member of the subcommittee recognizes the significance of the Blue Plains project. However, it does involve a substantial sum of money, and that money is just not available at the present time. I certainly would not want our action to be interpreted as an indication of our thinking that this item is low priority.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield further to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would gather, from the gentleman from Wisconsin, speaking as one of the leaders of the committee, that the Subcommittee on Appropriations would not be adverse to granting additional appropriations provided that the authorization were made available which would make it possible to meet the water quality standards as set forth by the District of Columbia in its request.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I cannot of

course speak for the rest of the members of the subcommittee. I can only say that the chairman is very much aware of the urgency of this subject, and so am I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

This does represent a large commitment requested for the current fiscal year. Consequently it was one of those items that the committee felt it had to leave out at this time. The committee's hope is that there will be legislation by the time of conference with the Members of the Senate on this bill. That would then be an opportunity to review all of these capital outlays and other operational programs in light of the revenues that are available to us at that time.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for having this concern for the purity of the Potomac River as I am sure he does for the beautiful lakes of Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in conclusion that I do recommend the reading of this report to all of the Members. I think it is an informative report and I think a reading of it will provide insight to the committee viewpoint and to the financial problems the committee had to wrestle in bringing this bill to you.

I do regret, as I know the chairman also regrets, the necessity of considering this bill under these circumstances. They make it impossible to give a true picture of the whole program we hope we can provide for the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year. The committee is aware that some activities are not provided for in this bill which are urgently required. It is the committee's hope, of course, that revenue and borrowing authority proposed in the budget will have been considered prior to the consideration of the conference report on this bill. At that time we will have a more complete fiscal picture for the District of Columbia and we will know better what program we can provide for the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I have a very brief table of comparisons between the bill as the committee brings it to the House which I shall incorporate in my remarks. We hope it will be helpful in giving a little more complete perspective of just what we have tried to do in connection with this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following breakdown of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, for the information of the Members:

<i>District of Columbia</i>	
1970 .....	\$650, 249, 600
1971 request.....	825, 158, 000
1971 bill.....	642, 906, 000
Reduction from budget request .....	-182, 252, 000
Reduction from last year.....	-7, 343, 600
Major changes from last year	
Federal funds:	<i>Millions</i>
Loan appropriation to District of Columbia .....	-\$60.3
Federal payment to District of Columbia .....	+ .8
District of Columbia funds:	
Public safety.....	+20.5
Human resources.....	+18.8

Recreation .....	-6.8
Education .....	+5.3
General operating expenses.....	+3.9
Sanitary engineering.....	+1.6
Reimbursement to U.S. loans and interest .....	+4.8
Capital outlay.....	-56.4

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations (Mr. MAHON) such time as he may consume.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, all thoughtful Americans love this great country and are proud of their heritage.

We make no claim of perfection, but we do have a wonderful country. It would not be possible to revere the country without having great respect for the Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C.

A critic might look about the House Chamber and say, in view of the rather small attendance at the moment, that the Members of the House are not interested in the District of Columbia; that the Members of the House are not interested in what goes on in Washington, D.C. But that would be inaccurate and inappropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in my opinion the Members of this House have great concern for the District of Columbia. They want to see the District run well. They want to see Washington, D.C., the pride of the Nation and the pride of the world.

I find, Mr. Chairman, that people from my area, and many of them come to Washington, are utterly surprised and amazed at what they see in the Nation's Capital. Some of them have come here with fear, wondering whether or not a visit to Washington would be safe for them and for their family.

When they come to Washington they are delighted and relieved to find that Washington is a pleasant and interesting city to visit.

Earlier this week a mother and her two daughters and son from the district I represent visited my office. Hardly have I seen people so exuberant and happy and delighted over their visit to the Nation's Capital.

They were utterly surprised to find how courteous the people of the District of Columbia are, how kind everyone is, how people went out of their way to make their visit to the Nation's Capital more delightful.

The people who live in the District of Columbia, as citizens of this area, should not be misled into thinking that the Members of the House of Representatives are unconcerned about their welfare. We regret, the members of the Appropriations Committee and Members generally, that we could not provide more funds in this bill to carry on various programs of the District, but we have to comply with the law, which requires that we have to have the funds for the District before we can appropriate the money.

Of course, we know that before the session is over, certain revenue actions will be taken that will provide additional funds and, of course, the Committee on Appropriations and the House will recommend and pass legislation providing

the additional funds for essential programs.

I want to pay high compliment to Mr. NATCHER, Mr. DAVIS, and to the members of the subcommittee who have labored long and hard to enable the District of Columbia, the city of Washington, to become a lovelier and safer city for the people who live here and for the countless thousands of people from all over the Nation and all over the world who come to visit the capital of the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to express my concern regarding the deletion of the funds for two major projects from this pending appropriation bill. I know there has already been some colloquy about these two projects during prior debate on this bill. I would, however, like to discuss these two points a little further in order to emphasize the seriousness of the problems.

First, the deletion of \$34 million to continue the construction of the mass transit system. We are all aware of the seriousness of traffic congestion and have agreed to the necessity of a subway system. The more we delay doing something about it, the more it will cost to solve the problem.

The other matter of concern is the deletion of funds for the enlargement of the sewage treatment plant at Blue Plains. I think one of the No. 1 domestic problems with which our Nation is confronted, and certainly on which there has been a great deal of public interest, is the problem of the environment and what is happening to it. It is rather disgusting and most embarrassing to have a serious problem of pollution right here in the Nation's Capital, a problem on which we are far behind in doing what must be done to eliminate it. We have been so negligent in the past years that the proper solution will now cost more than \$1 billion. To delay the relatively small appropriation of \$40 million in order to do the minimum that must be done at this time I think is somewhat unforgivable. I make that statement not in criticism of the Committee on Appropriations or the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. On the contrary. I commend them, particularly the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) on doing a splendid job.

Most certainly the increased cost of operating this District government is unconscionable. The idea of asking for 3,800 additional employees at a cost of \$32 million a year should be looked into with a very close scrutiny. The fact that we have three or four times the number of employees per capita in the District of Columbia than there are in any other city of comparable size is something that should require a thorough investigation. So I have no quarrel with the Appropriations Committee in being very careful in what they do in their consideration of the budget requests of the District government.

But I do hope the committee will re-

consider its actions in delaying the appropriation for the mass transit system and the sewage treatment plant. What I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee is this: What do we need to get the District of Columbia to do in order to release these funds?

I might add, before the gentleman responds to my question, that I feel the administration itself, the national administration, has been dragging its feet. I think the Department of Interior has put many stumbling blocks in the path of the transit agency. The Department of Transportation, and the Department of Labor have seriously delayed the movement forward of this construction program because they wanted to develop a set of so-called guidelines for the employment of minorities.

I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky that the District of Columbia government has been dragging its feet.

But, Mr. Chairman, what specifically can we require the District of Columbia government to do at this time in order to release these funds?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is asking about the release of funds for the rapid rail transit?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The subway system.

Mr. NATCHER. All down through the years, the gentleman and I have been of the same opinion that there is a need for both the highway and the rapid transit systems in this city.

The 1968 Highway Act required of the Government of the District of Columbia and the Department of Transportation a positive series of actions.

First of all, as the gentleman knows, the 1968 Highway Act directed that "all routes on the Interstate System within the District of Columbia as set forth in the document entitled '1968 Estimate of the Cost of Completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highway in the District of Columbia'" be constructed as soon as possible under all applicable provisions of title 23 of the United States Code.

The act further presented two steps in which to accomplish this construction, namely:

First. Not later than 30 days after enactment of the law, which was signed on August 23, 1968—almost 2 years ago, work was to be commenced on four specific projects—the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac River Freeway, the center leg of the inner loop, and the east leg of the inner loop.

Second. The remainder of the projects would be studied for a period of 18 months and reported back to the Congress by February 23, 1970.

With regard to the first step of the act the District government proceeded not only to completely ignore the law but within a period of about 4 months proceeded to remove from the plan three of the four required projects as they were designated by the Congress. Most of the remaining study projects were changed completely from what was indicated in the act.

The gentleman distinctly remembers we said to the Members of the House that we are for rapid transit. As soon as this takes place, we will recommend funds be released, and the gentleman remembers that action took place.

In December 1969, Mayor Washington made a public announcement that he had instructed the Department of Highways and Traffic to proceed with the second step and complete the studies for report to Congress by February 23, 1970.

The District of Columbia government and Department of Transportation did report to Congress by February 23, 1970.

Right there is where we are.

They reported on February 23, 1970. The District of Columbia did proceed in August to start on the projects required by the act.

As in the past, however, there was no clarification of the issues involved—simply more confusion.

The report to the Congress by the District of Columbia was merely a warmed over version of the plan which was rejected by the Transportation Planning Board over a year earlier. It further suggested revisions which might take place at some later date which would change the already prescribed project for the east leg of the inner loop.

The report to the Congress by the Department of Transportation proposed a still different plan than either that of the District of Columbia or that proposed in the 1968 act. Not only that but it suggested changes in two of the four projects in the first step of the 1968 act. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Transportation has now agreed to conform to the first step of the act but has retained his original position on the study projects.

We have now reached the point where in the only thing that has been accomplished since the 1968 Highway Act was passed is to let one small contract on the piers of the Three Sisters Bridge and to begin the design of the Potomac River Freeway. Aside from that all is again in confusion.

In the words of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1970—"The intent of the 1968 Highway Act was to clarify the confusion which had reigned for so many years in the District of Columbia regarding the Interstate Highway System." The intent of that act has been thwarted at every turn by the District of Columbia government. Until that situation has changed I see no alternative to the course of action taken by our committee and the action that we report today.

Let me say in conclusion, we want to be in a position tomorrow, next week, next month to be able to come to the House and say that the District and the Department of Transportation are in compliance with the Highway Act of 1968 and that the projects set out in that act, which are now in a state of confusion, are underway and that we recommend the appropriation of the district's share of the funds for subway construction. We want to be able to do that as soon as possible.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Let me

say this in response to the gentleman: I acknowledge that he has assured this House time and time again that he supports the mass transit system and does not desire to do anything to delay its necessary construction. I commend the gentleman on his interest in cooperating with us here in the District of Columbia and the suburbs in trying to solve our area problems. I do not question his sincerity or the necessity to require compliance with the Highway Act of 1968; if we permit the District government to ignore the 1968 law the traffic congestion will become unbearable.

I have some additional comments and questions on this matter I intend to discuss later in debate due to the fact my allotted time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

All time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), the ranking minority member of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky if he has not completed his statement.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my distinguished friend from Minnesota. I believe I have completed my statement.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the discussion on the floor regarding H.R. 17868, the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I take this opportunity to join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), and others in expressing interest in and concern for our Nation's Capital and join in the view that, regardless of whether we come from distant points or whether we live nearby, we should all want to make this a model city.

I believe the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) is to be commended for the work and effort he put in to get this bill to the floor at an early date. Mr. NATCHER properly recognized that \$63.2 million in new revenues were not covered by revenue enactments.

I was pleased with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) regarding the District of Columbia. He pointed out that we should be concerned and we should be doing what needs to be done for our Nation's Capital.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin likewise commented on the fact that there were many things the Appropriations Committee would like to do but could not do because of a lack of authorization to do them. However, if I understood him he did not foreclose something being done in conference if revenue measures are enacted prior to the termination of the conference. So may I say there may be things that we in District Committee may need to examine in the way of revenues. We currently have the crime bill in conference but that should not preclude some

consideration of District fiscal needs, if they need further consideration.

I also want to make a little report, so to speak, on our Federal city relative to the Board of Education in the District of Columbia. Two members of the majority of the school board I know personally, Mrs. Rosenfield and Mrs. Allen. I think those of us who have a concern with the field of education must admit that there is evidence of new and effective leadership on the part of the elected school board in the District of Columbia which is contributing to a better environment in the schools and in the community generally. Those of us who have heard Mrs. Allen testify before our committees are impressed with her determination and resolve to do an effective job in her post as chairman of the school board. I think we can now say that the school board is beginning to do the kind of job we hoped for when we enacted legislation providing for an elected board.

I also wish to mention the fact that in our subcommittee we presently have before us the little Hoover Commission bill which I introduced in the first session. I feel that the city government can benefit greatly from such a study and I am sure we here in Congress would reap benefits from it. There can no doubt be more efficiency and responsiveness in the operation of the local government. It is my hope that our committee will take action on this measure in the near future. If nothing else the debate on the appropriation bill testifies to the need for the Commission.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say this to the Members of the House in regard to the statement just made by my distinguished friend from Minnesota. I appreciate your service on the District of Columbia Committee. I know you have other committee assignments. I know a lot of the matters that are brought up before your committee on the District of Columbia do not pertain to your district or to my district, but the gentleman from Minnesota, who has the floor, has been one of the best friends that the District of Columbia has ever had, and I commend him.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time to me.

Let me commend the committee for the difficult job it has done in allocating limited funds for necessary and desirable projects.

I too am concerned about the lack of funding for the upgrading of the Blue Plains sewage treatment plants and the present polluted condition of the Potomac River. However, at this time I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two with regard to the table which appears on page 19 of the report that has to do with the Department of Corrections. The table refers to funds for the renovation of 22 dormitories as well as a meat processing

plant at the Lorton institutions in Fairfax County, Va.

I notice that a little more than \$1 million is to be appropriated for the Lorton institutions. However, there was considerable fire damage there recently due to rioting by the inmates of the institution. I understand the damage has been estimated at from \$600,000 to \$700,000. Now my question is: Does this measure contain any funds to restore the facilities at Lorton that have been destroyed or damaged by the rioting of the inmates?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished friend from Virginia yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. I say to my distinguished friend from Virginia that there is no money in this bill for that purpose, and none has been requested.

As you will see from the committee report, on page 19, we were not able to fund a great many of the projects requested for the Department of Corrections by virtue of the fact that there is no loan authority remaining to finance capital outlay projects.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. His answer points up the need for efficient administration of the correctional institutions. We just cannot afford to be paying out taxpayers money for riot damage to our prisons by inmates. I hope the conference committee now considering the District of Columbia crime bill will note this lack of funds as an additional reason for agreeing to the House version of the bill which would transfer the administration of the Lorton facilities to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a serious problem involving the District of Columbia and the metropolitan counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges, Md. At a time when the Federal Government is committed to the highest national priority in coping with the serious problem of water pollution, the Congress and the Department of the Interior are neglecting a situation which is at hand.

Recently, the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee knocked out a \$40 million provision for construction of sewage facilities for the District of Columbia. At the same time, the Department of the Interior, through its spokesman, Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research Carl Klein, has stated as a matter of policy that the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant in the District of Columbia can no longer be used by Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties. In doing so, the Department of the Interior has violated the longstanding agreement between the jurisdictions of the metropolitan area dating back to 1916. This agreement has been the basis for the formulation of all plans for the treatment of sewage together with subsequent acts of Congress.

The Department of the Interior has instead stated categorically that Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties should proceed immediately to construct

their own sewage treatment facilities. I submit that this pronouncement is not only not feasible from a technical point of view, particularly in the light of the number of years it would require to develop plans for such facilities and to construct the plants, but also that it would seriously affect the economy of the Metropolitan Washington area.

In a meeting which was held yesterday between officials of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, the State of Maryland, the District of Columbia, the honorable Senators from the State of Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. MATHIAS), my distinguished colleague from Montgomery County (Mr. GUDE), and myself, as well as officials of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, it was unanimously agreed that the proposal by the Department of the Interior constituted a serious economic and health problem for the jurisdictions affected. The specter of unemployment and bankruptcy was also referred to as a result of the action taken by the Department of the Interior, particularly in conjunction with the failure of the House Appropriations Committee to allow the necessary funds for the expansion of the Blue Plains facility.

The problems of simultaneously trying to reverse the trend of the pollution of the Potomac River while maintaining the necessary sewage facilities to assure that the health of the people in this metropolitan area is protected is not helped by the simplistic bureaucratic reasoning of the Department of the Interior. The truth is that there is not a clear-cut choice between cleaning up the Potomac and maintaining adequate sewage facilities but that both must be done. The State of Maryland is willing to do whatever is necessary to see that this is done. The Federal Government can do no less.

Recently, the Health Department of the State of Maryland found it necessary—in view of the pronouncements by the Interior Department with regard to the Blue Plains facility and in view of certain inadequacies in maintaining the system—to declare a moratorium on all sewage connections in certain areas of Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties. Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties and the District of Columbia are now confronted by a major crisis.

One clear example of the crisis is indicated in my own district by the failure of septic tanks in the area known as Westphalia Estates. In this area, the residents are literally living with sewage flowing in the streets creating a serious hazard to their health which could have epidemic proportions. Their problem would have been resolved if the necessary sewage connections could have been made. Because of the existing problem, they can look forward to no relief unless some immediate reversals are made.

In addition, there are numerous homeowners who have invested their savings in new homes but will not be able to move in because of the ban. The result will inevitably be not only hardships but an increased cost to them.

As a result of the meeting held yester-

day on this problem, I have joined with my colleague from Maryland (Mr. GUDE), and Maryland's representatives in the other body, and asked that Secretary of the Interior arrange an immediate meeting of the professional and technical people from all of the local, Federal, and State agencies involved to study the problem and to issue a report identifying the points of agreement and differences so that the necessary scientific and technical information is available for a rational decision.

As Members of Congress, we should not be content to pay lipservice to the problems of solving water pollution at the national level while ignoring such problems at the very footsteps of the Capitol. It is an act of irresponsibility to ignore the urgent need for not only expanded sewage treatment facilities but also to upgrade the treatment of sewage in conformity with the recommendations of the Potomac River Enforcement Conference. If we can make the necessary financial sacrifices to put a man on the moon, if we can develop the technology and the skill necessary to achieve this feat, then, by the same effort, we can solve the water pollution problems of the Metropolitan Washington area and also abate the pollution of the Potomac.

The county is looking to the Congress for leadership. I urge each of my colleagues to study carefully the complexities of these problems and to realize that our choice is not between pollution and sewage treatment but whether or not we are willing to dedicate ourselves to committing the necessary resources and technology to solve both problems. The problem is imminent and we cannot delay. The funds for the District of Columbia must be restored. A saner policy by the Department of the Interior must be pursued.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against any provision of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in further response to the colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), I want to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman to the effect that there has been a lack of cooperation on the part of the District government. I think that is the result of a lack of comprehension on their part as to what this

problem is all about and a lack of concern about the traffic problems here in the Nation's Capital as well as the lack of responsibility on their part with respect thereto.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not we should continue to hold the construction of this mass transit phase as a hostage to the District of Columbia until the District of Columbia complies with the law, a law with which they should be required to comply anyway.

Mr. Chairman, there are others involved. We have an interstate compact. We have other communities contributing funds to the system.

The impact of deleting \$34,178,000 from the \$376,310,000 total fiscal year 1971 estimate has an escalation characteristic. First it has to be matched by \$68,300,000 of Federal funds pursuant to the requirement of the 1969 authorization act. This brings the total to \$102,000,000.

The effect is that we could not sell any of our revenue bonds because of the failure of one of the major participants to pay its share, which would deprive us of another \$106,000,000, bringing to \$208,000,000 out of the \$376,000,000 the total that would be denied.

The remaining money to be made up of suburban government funds and the matching Federal funds would probably not be forthcoming because of the capital grant contribution contract being based upon full participation of all jurisdictions.

This, of course, makes it especially imperative that we also receive the \$83,000,000 of Federal funds now pending before the Senate Deficiency Subcommittee as well as that the Senate restore the District of Columbia \$34,000,000 to the 1971 bill when that is before the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the District government should be required to comply with the act of 1968, whether we construct the subway system or not or whether they are concerned as to whether or not we construct the subway system. For example, we are contributing to the further pollution of the Potomac River by the delay of the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, because we cannot complete the interceptor sewer system until the location of the Three Sisters Bridge has been decided upon.

So I would wonder, and I would ask the gentleman this question: Whether or not he would not feel that a better approach to this problem would be to use the effect of the Broyhill-Adams amendment which we inserted in the revenue bill last year, and which actually made them take action toward compliance with the 1968 Highway Act last year? The thrust of that amendment was that the District government would be denied the Federal payment unless they complied with every detail of the Highway Act of 1968.

Would not that be a much more effective approach, and would that not force compliance by the District government with the law?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, that when we applied the Broyhill-Adams amendment to the revenue bill it was very much in order. I hope that it does not become necessary this year. I hope we do not have to take the kind of action required in that amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I might add further by saying that even if we appropriated the funds, and I know the gentleman will ultimately agree to permit the committee to appropriate the funds for this transit system, the District government should be made to comply with every aspect of any directive on the part of Congress. Not allowing the transit system to proceed really did not get compliance in the District government until they feared, or had cause to fear, that the Committee on Appropriations would deny their entire Federal payment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield further to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Virginia that I concur with every word the gentleman has said concerning the actions of the District of Columbia government. That was the only language the District officials understood.

We have no right to come to this House and ask the House to ignore the Highway Act of 1968. It is the law.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations will refuse consideration of any further supplemental requests on the part of the District of Columbia government until they comply in every detail with the Highway Act of 1968.

I would just like to ask this question, and it has already been partially discussed: that is concerning the Blue Plains Water Treatment Plant, and it is my understanding that the Committee on Appropriations in denying appropriation of those funds did not deny those funds on the basis of whether they thought the funds were warranted or not but, rather, on the basis of not having authority, or borrowing authority, sufficient to make the appropriation of the funds.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. Loan authority, insofar as the Sanitary Sewer Works Fund is concerned, as the gentleman knows, is completely exhausted, and the construction costs of this plant would be financed from that source.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that by and large this subcommittee has done a reasonably good job with these appropriations this year. It is one of the few committees on appropriation to make

a real and, I am sure, a valiant effort to hold the line, and I want to compliment the members of the committee up to that point.

I do have a question or two I would like to ask of the chairman:

In reading the hearings, part II, page 757, it is indicated that teachers in the District of Columbia are no longer required to keep attendance records. Is this true, and if so, why?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentleman and my friend from Iowa that this is the situation here in the District. We asked that this information be furnished to our committee so we could say to the House just what procedure was being used in the operation of the schools. No attendance records are being kept, and, as the gentleman points out, that is a part of the hearings. It is the true situation, and it is a serious mistake.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman that it is a serious mistake.

Mr. NATCHER. It is a serious mistake. If there is any way, through the purse strings, to get to those who operate the school system in the District of Columbia to compel a change in that situation, I hope the committee will use that device.

The hearings also indicate that the District of Columbia spends \$1,087 per pupil, which apparently is considerably higher than Atlanta, Ga.; Baltimore, Md.; Boston, Mass.; Cleveland, Ohio; Milwaukee, Wis.; and a number of other cities and even higher than the richest county in the United States—Montgomery County, Md. Can this be true?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman's statement is absolutely true. The amount expended per pupil in the District of Columbia is \$1,087 and that is the highest amount spent by any city in the United States of America, comparable in size with the District of Columbia.

The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman is as appalled as I am with respect to the school system in the District of Columbia.

I want to compliment the committee for refusing to give the District of Columbia Arts Commission the funds it sought on the specious contention that the Commission could eliminate crime with a handout from the Treasury.

I understand that welfare is a booming business in the District of Columbia. It was testified that new cases in the District are at the alarming rate of 245 per month and that there are over 4,000 employees in the welfare offices in the District of Columbia. Some of these employees, perhaps a substantial number of them it is reported, are actually going out in the streets and recruiting applicants for welfare. Can this be true?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. NATCHER. Here in the District of Columbia we have about 45,000 people on welfare. We have approximately 853,000 living in the Nation's Capital.

So far as the number now on welfare is concerned this is not too bad. I sincerely believe most of those on welfare are entitled to receive welfare payments. We had 79 investigators in the Department of Welfare and through pressure, they had to start taking them off. They have none in that category at the present time. The gates are now down. Unless investigators are used in the District Department of Welfare to see that those who are entitled to be on are eligible and that those who are not entitled are deleted, there is no telling where we are going.

They have too many employees in the Department and they do not have enough in some categories.

Mr. GROSS. May I suggest to the gentleman that unless this situation is rectified within the next year in the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia the committee, instead of giving them all of the funds they seek, pull the purse strings on them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for his interest in this bill. The gentleman has all down through the years shown that he is interested in the operation of our Capital City and believes that it should operate in the proper manner. I certainly agree with him.

There is one other matter that I want to point out to the gentleman from Iowa. We have talked of this problem over the years. I remember on the floor of this House a number of years ago when they were talking of constructing the stadium when the gentleman from Iowa inquired as to what it was going to cost. They informed the gentleman then that it would be \$6 million or \$7 million. But it cost \$20 million.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman permit me to interpose a word on that subject?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. At that time we were told it was not to cost the taxpayers of Kentucky and Iowa 1 red cent.

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct. That was the statement. It would not cost any of the people in any of the States any money. In this bill we carry \$831,600 to pay the interest on the principal. Not one bond has been retired. That is only the interest on the principal. The amount received from revenue from the stadium, the R. F. K. Stadium, this year was \$476,000, which is inadequate to pay the inter-

est, and we are having to borrow \$358,595 to add to the amount received from the stadium to pay the interest on the debt.

Mr. GROSS. To borrow money simply to pay the interest on a debt—money already borrowed.

Mr. NATCHER. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Is that not a sad commentary on that "white elephant" stadium a couple of miles from here?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Apparently other stadiums operated throughout the Nation by private enterprise are making money. Why does not the stadium out here at least break even? Can the gentleman give us a little explanation of that?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to my friend from Florida that in a great many instances stadiums throughout the United States are profitmaking institutions and projects. The gentleman is exactly correct. Here in the District of Columbia, after the stadium was completed, we had to go back and expend over \$225,000 to fill the cracks in the stadium. That situation took place. The concrete was poured in extremely cold weather. As a result of the substance used, the nature and extent of it and the type of pipes behind the concrete the stadium cracked, in many places, and it cost us nearly \$300,000 to fill in the cracks in the stadium.

The teams and those who use the stadium are not paying to the District government an adequate amount for use of the stadium, and that is the answer to the gentleman's question. The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) all down through the years has asked, "Why is this not a moneymaking project? Why do you not get more money?" By virtue of that fact, last year we acquired a little more money, than in the year before, and that was due to the efforts of my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS). The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I might add that the prime contractor who built this stadium also built the veterans' hospital in Boston, which started to fall down before it was fully opened to patients. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his answers to my questions.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I notice in the report that accompanies this bill that there is a reduction of approximately \$40 million in the amount of money necessary for the Blue Plains Sewage Disposal Plant. When I saw the figures in here I became quite concerned because the present administration has said that one of its policies is to clean up the Potomac. So I did a little investigating to find out what is wrong with Blue Plains and what is wrong with the Potomac. I have discovered that the Blue Plains Sewage Disposal Plant was orig-

inally designed to handle 250 million gallons a day. The average daily load that is coming into Blue Plains at the present time is around 300 million gallons a day, with sometimes an excess of twice its rated capacity. Anything in excess of 300 million gallons a day goes untreated into the Potomac River.

I wondered where all this sewage was coming from, and I have a little breakdown. I find that the Washington Suburban Sanitary District contributed approximately \$5½ million to the construction of this plant, which is about 19 percent of its cost.

And for that investment, WSSC is only entitled to treatment of 45 million gallons of raw sewage a day. Very frankly, I was astounded to find that the average daily load from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is not the 45 million gallons, plus the 22 million gallons permitted by Congress in the Dulles interceptors, but it is rather in excess of 113 million gallons. Basically one of the problems is that the people in the surrounding areas are using the District's facilities and not paying for it. This is why the proposition looks bad as it comes here to us today.

I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee and ask whether or not, if proper agreements have been entered into between the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and the District of Columbia, those agreements should be lived up to? And, if so, would it be necessary for the \$40 million to be reinvested or reauthorized for the construction of other facilities at Blue Plains?

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

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is exactly correct in regard to carrying out the terms of previous commitments and agreements. As the gentleman points out, there is nothing in this bill for the water pollution control plant at Blue Plains.

There is no loan authority available to finance the construction of sanitary sewage works fund projects. That is the reason why this particular project is not in the bill.

I appreciate the statement of the gentleman in the well.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his comments, because while the District Committee does a good job and the people on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee do a good job on the appropriations, it seems to me very unfair to criticize the Appropriations Committee and to criticize the District Committee when the fault is not with at least either one of these two committees but is with the governmental authorities of the suburban counties of Maryland.

At the present time, the Blue Plains Sewage Disposal Plant does not adequately treat the affluent for which it was originally designed and no expansion should be allowed at the present site. The Blue Plains Plant must be upgraded and afford complete treatment of affluent that passes through it so that instead of de-

grading the Potomac Estuary it will be upgrading the quality of the water flowing into the Potomac River.

The treatment of the raw sewage above the 67 million gallons per day authorized by agreement with the District of Columbia and by act of Congress must be provided by suburban Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties and not by the District of Columbia at the Blue Plains Plant.

It will accomplish nothing in eliminating pollution to require the Virginia side of the Potomac River to properly treat their sewage and continually permit the people on the Maryland side to degrade the quality of the water in the Potomac.

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

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania's long interest in conservation and in the cleaning of our Nation's waters. The point the gentleman raises is very pertinent. Yesterday, our two Maryland Senators, the Congressman from the fifth district (Mr. HOGAN), and I met with representatives of the State of Maryland and officials of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties until the WSSC alleviates certain conditions and overflows. In taking whatever steps are necessary so that homebuilding will not be impeded, and proper health standards are followed, the degree to which Blue Plains will be utilized, must be precisely ascertained.

But first we must have a tally of just who is responsible for paying what. Everyone should pay his fair share of the cost of the operation of Blue Plains. Whether Blue Plains is expanded, or we develop some other means of adequately handling metropolitan area sewage, we want a system that works, and makes the Potomac and its tributaries clean, and does not deter healthy growth.

But regardless of cost distribution and the design of the future system the facilities at Blue Plains will have to be upgraded. We want to return clean water instead of partly treated sewage to the Nation's waters. I think this is the desire and commitment of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, 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. 17868) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

Mr. LANGEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1059 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1059

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17867) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, all points of order against the provisions contained under the heading "Foreign Military Credit Sales" beginning on page 16, line 3 through line 5, are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1059 provides that during the consideration of H.R. 17867 making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for fiscal year 1971, all points of order are waived against the provisions under the foreign military credit sales, lines 3 through 5, on page 16. The waiver of points of order was granted because of the fact that the foreign military credit sales authorization has not passed the Senate, although it has been passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1059.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) has explained, House Resolution 1059 merely waives points of order on title II of the bill, the Foreign Military Credit Sales Act. This authorizing legislation passed the House last March and is now under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, of course I have always opposed foreign aid and will vote against this measure on final passage, but I have no objection to the rule.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

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

I rise to congratulate the Rules Committee for bringing H.R. 17867 under a rule where the House can work its will. Where provisions in this particular bill constitute legislation in an appropriation bill they will be subject to a point of order.

It is my intention and that of some of our colleagues to raise points of order on every section of the bill that is legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to notify the House that the Committee on Rules has introduced a bill (H.R. 17654) on legislative reorganization, which will be before the House for consideration the latter part of this month. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the fact that we have a printed summary of the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Upon request we shall be happy to furnish copies of the summary to the Members.

Also, I would like to say at this time that we expect the bill to be reported within the next week or 10 days.

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. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 17867) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 17867, with Mr. Boggs 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 unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I recall a question that comes back to my mind very often which was asked by one of the great Members of this House from Pennsylvania time and time again when we were considering money bills, he would ask the question: "Where are you going to get the money?"

That question was never satisfactorily answered.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to pay tribute to one of the great subcommittee members. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) is the ranking minority member on this subcommittee. He is untiring in his efforts to help write a good bill; even though he is on several important committees he tries very hard to attend all of the important sessions of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations on Appropriations.

We have gone over this bill together many, many times. Insofar as I know, we are in accord with the context, especially that dealing with the amount of funds.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly also pay tribute to all of the other members of this subcommittee. We occasionally disagree, but we endeavor to do so without being disagreeable.

I had hoped that this would be the one bill reported out by this subcommittee which would move on to the floor of the House without any controversy, but it would appear that this is not going to be true.

Over the period of many years this committee, recognizing that the great Committee on Foreign Affairs may have overlooked some provisions that we thought were quite appropriate, dealing

with limitations, placed those provisions in the bill. They have held firm, and have been included for many long years. They may be technically subject to a point of order. If the points are made we will try to explain why they are in the bill, and why we believe that the majority of them, if not all of them, are dealing with limitations.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this is one of the best balanced bills this subcommittee has reported out in many long years.

There are several titles to this bill. It seems that the most interest centers around title I and, therefore, most of the explanations will be built around title I. We have brought you a report that is rather comprehensive. I think perhaps this is the finest report this committee has ever brought out because it furnishes a great deal of statistics, important statistics, and some of them we shall go into briefly during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MEEDS). Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

#### [Roll No. 151]

Adams	Frey	O'Neal, Ga.
Addabbo	Fuqua	Ottinger
Andrews, Ala.	Gallagher	Pelly
Ashbrook	Gaydos	Powell
Ashley	Gettys	Price, Ill.
Ayres	Gilbert	Price, Tex.
Baring	Gubser	Qule
Bell, Calif.	Hanna	Rivers
Boland	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Bray	Harvey	Rooney, Pa.
Brock	Hawkins	Roudebush
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Royal
Bush	Hébert	Scheuer
Camp	Holfield	Sisk
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Steed
Clawson, Del.	Kirwan	Stephens
Crane	Kyl	Stratton
Daddario	Lujan	Symington
Davis, Ga.	Lukens	Teague, Calif.
Dawson	McCarthy	Tiernan
Dent	McKneally	Tunney
Dowdy	McMillan	Udall
Downing	Mathias	Whitehurst
Dwyer	May	Wilson,
Esch	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Evins, Tenn.	Mills	Wright
Feighan	Moorhead	Zwach
Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MEEDS, Chairman pro tempore 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. 17867, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 347 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, we were just getting started when the point of order was made that a quorum was not present. I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the best balanced bill that this committee has brought to the floor of the House since the inception

of foreign aid. It is generally known I am not a foreign aid enthusiast. But with privileges go responsibilities and I represent the committee in reporting this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to bring out a bill that would have the support of this House.

We have made substantial reductions. I want to say in all fairness to the President, he recognized that it was necessary to reduce expenditures in certain areas.

President Nixon submitted revised estimates for new budget—obligational—authority for activities authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, title I of this bill, for fiscal year 1970 amounting to \$2,710,020,000. It is interesting to note that the budget estimates submitted for title I for fiscal year 1971 amount to \$2,200,500,000 or some \$509,520,000 below what was submitted to the Congress last year.

In total, the President submitted estimates amounting to \$2,876,539,000 for fiscal year 1971 for all programs considered in this bill, which is \$803,025,000 below the amount submitted in fiscal 1970. Therefore, the committee had much lower estimates to act upon this year as compared to the previous fiscal years.

Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends the appropriation of new budget—obligational—authority of \$2,300,961,000 for the programs contained in titles I, II, and III of the bill, which is \$575,578,000 below the budget estimates of \$2,876,539,000, and which is, incidentally, \$203,299,000 below the fiscal year 1970 appropriation. The committee has approved the total limitations of \$4,082,096,000 proposed by the Budget for the activities of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, I want to commend each member of this subcommittee for the contributions they have made in writing this comprehensive report, referring, of course, to the committee's portion of the report.

On page 4 of the report, there is some information that the committee felt the Members should have available at all times because so often we receive inquiries from our constituents as to the cost of foreign aid.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that through June 30, 1970, it is estimated that the United States will have provided economic and military assistance, of one form or another, amounting to a net total of \$131,530,600,000, of which only \$28,059,500,000 falls into the category of loans. But I think that I should point out that of the \$28,059,500,000 in loans, only \$4 billion will actually be loans that we can expect to be repaid without a subsidy. That represents the portion financed by the Export-Import Bank. The other \$24 billion that we have listed as loans is technically lost, and represents a concessionary type of loan. The development loans provided by AID represent a 46-percent subsidy from the start because of the concessionary interest rates that we provide to the recipients. The balance of the total amount of assistance

provided of \$103,471,100,000 is in the form of grant aid.

Mr. Chairman, since we have had a surplus in the administrative budget only six times since the end of World War II, the committee has estimated and had it verified that an additional cost of \$67,858,067,000 in interest has been incurred to borrow the money we have given to other countries.

There is a detailed list on pages 4 and 5 of the report showing the amount of foreign assistance provided to each country and territory and we then give the grand total cost of foreign aid since its inception.

Incidentally, total net foreign assistance has gone into 123 nations and seven territories of the world for the period from 1946 to 1970 inclusive.

Even though the fiscal 1971 request for economic and military assistance is below the previous year's request and it is one of the lowest requests since the program began, it should be noted that many assistance programs formerly funded under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, have been transferred to other departments and agencies and new programs have been created.

Last year, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation—OPIC—was created to encourage private investment in the less-developed countries. Similar activities, which will now be administered by OPIC, were formerly administered by the Agency for International Development—AID—under the economic assistance item of the bill.

In order to provide a list indicating the total foreign aid programs, the committee has compiled a table showing the President's requests for foreign assistance authorizations and appropriations as contained in the fiscal year 1971 budget document, and this will be found on page 6 of the report.

Now I want to be careful not to have Members misinterpret this part of the report.

On page 6, you will observe there are 27 spigots for foreign assistance requests as contained in the fiscal year 1971 budget.

The total amount is \$12,133,525,000.

The committee wished to make this all inclusive so it did include the Export-Import Bank because under the bank's operations they have their regular operations, they have the long-term credit window, and they also have an operation where they do not have to follow the regular credit criteria.

So the total is \$12,133,525,000.

Again for the benefit of the Members who may not have the opportunity to do the research work to understand the program as well as perhaps some of us who live with it almost 365 days of the year, we have established for the benefit of these Members a pipeline table which also appears on page 6 of the report. There is a pipeline or unexpended balance, of \$18,479,704,000 estimated to be available as of June 30, 1970. This money is obligated for on-going programs and should you deny the new request, it simply means they would phase the program out and finish the contracts. Since

this is money for on-going projects, it is not available to initiate new projects.

Over the years, this committee has had various experiences. Some people wanted to have the budget reduced. Others wanted it increased. I have always been with that group that wanted it reduced. But it is rather amusing to go back and read the record on some of these amendments where Members wanted to increase the budget.

The committee thought that this year it would be good to place in the report a comprehensive report on what has happened in the past.

Over the years, the committee has been criticized for making so-called drastic reductions in the foreign assistance budget program. In the last several years, the requests have been reduced by about 30 percent and in all probability the programs have still been overfunded. This can be evidenced by the fact that large unexpended balances presently exist in this program, as was previously discussed.

The committee is of the opinion that the funds provided by Congress have been adequate and this can be reinforced by the fact that the reductions made by this committee and Congress have generally held because very few requests for supplemental funds have been forthcoming.

There is a table in the report on page 7 showing that during the last 15 years the aggregate requests of the several Presidents amounted to \$57,673,361,250. The committee and the Congress reduced these requests by \$12,082,828,500, which is an aggregate reduction of 20.95 percent for the 15 years. You need no further proof that the program has been adequately financed in the past.

We would like to call the Committee's attention to the fact that soon after the foreign assistance program started in the United States, the U.S. international balance of payments began to experience large deficits. There is a table on page 8 of the report showing that for 20 years our balance-of-payments deficit amounted to \$44,104,000,000. On only two occasions in the 20 years have we had a surplus in our balance-of-payments account. Last year was the largest deficit we have had since the inception of foreign aid.

Because of our worldwide policies to provide funds in the form of foreign assistance to countries, many nations have been able to accumulate excess dollars. With the excess dollars these countries have been able to buy gold from the United States. It might interest you, Mr. Chairman, to know that the U.S. gold holdings have decreased from \$22,879,000,000 as of December 31, 1950, to \$10,367,000,000 as of December 31, 1969, if you exclude the \$1,492,000,000 held in the Exchange Stabilization Fund. However, the recipient countries have increased their gold holdings substantially. In addition, we think we should call to your attention that foreign nations now hold in short-term claims against the United States some \$42,026,000,000 as of December 31, 1969.

Let us look at the detailed program

for fiscal 1971. First, let me say that since the inception of the foreign aid program, the United States has extended assistance to 123 nations and seven territories around the world. In fiscal year 1971 alone, it is anticipated that 103 countries and territories will receive disbursements from prior year programs or present year programs.

The fiscal 1971 proposed program indicates the following: 50 countries will receive military assistance; 77 countries will receive economic assistance; 81 countries will receive Public Law 480 assistance; and 64 countries will receive Peace Corps assistance.

Some of these countries receive only one type of assistance—either economic or military; others may receive both economic and military aid and some may receive assistance from the aid programs contained in titles II, III, and IV of the bill, as well as some of the items not carried in this bill.

The budget requests for funds to finance the activities authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is the lowest since the program began. This year's requests are \$509,520,000 below what was requested for the same activities last year.

However, as has been noted earlier, over the years numerous activities and programs have been splintered off the annual foreign aid bill. The Department of Defense appropriation estimates contain \$2,260,300,000 in military assistance funds and \$117,000,000 in economic assistance funds, which are primarily for countries in Southeast Asia.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,644,950,000 for activities funded under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, a reduction of \$555,550,000 below the budget estimates and \$167,430,000 below the current fiscal 1970 appropriation level.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a substantial reduction this year in the budget requests for the American hospitals and schools abroad. This year's budget calls for only \$8,895,000. Most of these are to complete contracts already underway, as it would apply to the American University at Beirut in the amount of \$5,500,000. Most of this is to complete phase 3 of the medical center at Beirut.

In administrative expenses, some of our Members seem to think we have kept that too high, but I have always insisted, and the majority of the committee agrees, that if you expect these people to administer this type of program well, then you should give them sufficient administrative expenses. Therefore, we are recommending in this bill \$50 million, which is \$1 million below that of last year.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss briefly one of the agencies that recently has been separated out of title I. That is one misgiving I have about this bill, because when we fragmentize programs and start new agencies and provide money, it is no longer considered a part of foreign aid. It seems that some Members and the press believe we are reducing foreign aid, but in most instances we are taking it out of title I and setting up new agencies. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation was previously

carried as part of title I until last fiscal year. Last year in our appropriation bill we recommended \$37,500,000 to start this organization. This is something the committee fought back for many years, but after new evidence, many members of the committee thought we should permit this new agency to start. However, this year, inasmuch as they had not gotten a board of directors, we considered their request of approximately \$37 million to be on the high side and we made a reduction of \$18,750,000.

Mr. Chairman, there is another item in this bill, and that is military assistance. The appropriation for fiscal year 1970 was \$350 million simply because we had an authorization limitation. Again in 1971 the estimate had to be \$350 million on account of the authorization. The committee felt because of the strong evidence presented to our subcommittee by the distinguished Secretary of Defense that we should not try to cut military assistance, because in all probability we are going to have to consider a supplemental in addition to the \$350 million.

I should point out that the military assistance program is appropriated on an illustrative basis. The witnesses presenting the justifications point out they must have flexibility. They do list the countries, they feel at the time they give their justification, where the money will be spent, but conditions change, and it may be necessary for them to reduce one program and increase another program. So this is an illustrative item.

So as far as I am concerned, I am certainly going to support the administration request for \$350 million. I am not going to toy with the security of this country. I am not going to slow down what the President is trying to do, and that is get us out of Vietnam. I think today, more than at any other time, we know our great President has a very definite program to get us out of Vietnam and get us out quickly. I for one am not going to do anything to pull the rug out from under the President. This is very much a part of it.

Mr. Chairman, there is one item in which the Rules Committee recommended a waiver of points of order, and that is the foreign military credit sales program. It is not my obligation to say that it is our policy to make sales to foreign countries, but it is quite obvious unless we agree to make certain sales of military equipment to foreign countries, they are going to buy military equipment from other countries and in some instances these countries have received substantial U.S. aid in the past. And as long as it is our policy to make certain military type sales, then I think this committee should recommend for consideration the full budget request of the President.

Last year the request came down for \$275 million. For some reason or another the legislative committee did not act, so there were no appropriations for military credit sales last year. This year the request is \$272,500,000, and I believe it will interest the committee to learn that as a usual thing, these are short-term sales. The average is about 8 years, I believe, and the rate of interest is 7½ per-

cent. The recipient nation we sell the military equipment to pays the going interest rate, which at this time is 7.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been afraid to state facts as they are.

I am now going to cover the "sacred cow" request at this time, and that is the Peace Corps. If ever there was a misnomer, it is the "Peace Corps." I do not know anything about the operation of this agency which would justify the word "peace."

It is really a juvenile agency, doing certain technical work, going abroad under the protection of a strange type of foreign policy. They go out as free agents. They can go into a country, tear it up, get into trouble, condemn our foreign policy, insult our Secretary of State when he goes abroad; and nothing is done about it.

So far as I am concerned, I ask the membership to look back at the type of people we have had in the Peace Corps and some of the mischief they have gotten into in some of the foreign countries. Members should ask Dr. Morgan about who participated in this trouble in Chicago at the Democratic Convention. Many of them were returned Peace Corpsmen.

If we could ever put this in proper perspective, and call it what is, another technical agency with no restrictions, then we should be able to bring it under control.

It frightens me to know what is going on and to have Members of Congress too busy to look into the facts and then come on this floor and defend them.

Members will recall that a few days ago there was a demonstration in Washington, and returned Peace Corpsmen went down and took over several offices of that building. They displayed publicly the Vietcong flag on the building. They were getting cheers. They were permitted to occupy those offices for 2 days.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of how much anyone may try to distort the record, I promise I shall not go into the record of the Peace Corps, but we should suspend this outfit until we bring them in under the same type of foreign policy other Americans have to observe when they go overseas.

Would it be of any interest to bring to the attention of Members that they have, for various reasons, been withdrawn from 11 countries, from countries where we now have other types of assistance going but not Peace Corps assistance?

I plead with the Members to go over the record, not to listen to the people who cry out for these youngsters. These people are not youngsters. They lack an awful lot of being youngsters. They may be wiser than we are. They may actually know better where they are going and what they are doing than some of us here.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not today or tomorrow apologize for anything I said about yesterday. I knew the direction in which this organization was leading us.

I certainly hope that we will go to the record, and not just listen to what these

people from downtown have to say about the goodness of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said the Peace Corps has been withdrawn from a substantial number of countries. They were not withdrawn. In most cases they were thrown out.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have never known the gentleman to make any statement which could not be substantiated with facts. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, we have another item in this bill carried under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; that is, assistance to refugees, the United States-Cuban refugee program. It is almost impossible to determine the actual need. Whatever it is, we are obligated to pick up the check.

The budget this year requested \$112 million. The committee is recommending the full amount of \$112 million.

May I say, this is one part of foreign aid I am very definitely sympathetic with. Of course, these people are running from tyranny, running from communism. To my way of thinking, so long as they make good Americans and handle themselves as any American should we should receive them with open arms and encourage them.

There are many places in America where these Cubans have settled and are making good citizens. They now have good jobs, and many of them are contributing to the local economy.

Many of them are paying taxes. Down in my own State one of the most remarkable colonies to be found anywhere is one of these colonies of Cubans. So I think we are on absolutely safe grounds in continuing to urge these people to leave Cuba.

As a usual thing, they make good citizens. They work and pay taxes. And we hope the committee will support the entire appropriation.

Now, very briefly, Mr. Chairman, we have in this bill funding for certain international organizations. Again, when witnesses appear before our committee with regard to these matters we begin to interrogate them and they begin to back off, and we find they are reluctant to give us the information that we want. I have never been satisfied with these people testifying with regard to these international institutions. It has been claimed that the amounts have been authorized and the people in the State Department have entered into these agreements and that we have no alternative other than to appropriate the money.

As far as I am concerned, I dread to see the day when we will transfer our bilateral program over to the international organizations. I think I can convince you, whether you support my views or not on foreign aid. This is an interesting exchange with one international organization. May I quote from the report:

During testimony before the Committee, it was determined that the Asian Development Bank would have \$313 million of capital left on hand after honoring all of its

present commitments. Further, the Bank had invested \$96.2 million in United States banks.

That was not the purpose. It was to fund programs elsewhere, but it invested \$96 million in U.S. banks.

Further from the report:

The Committee understands that an additional authorization is being requested to obtain a U.S. contribution to the special fund of the Bank. The Committee does not understand the need for these additional funds in view of the fact that the Bank has such a large amount of funds on hand.

The Committee was astonished by the fact that certain information was withheld by the President of the Bank from the United States Director. The following exchange was recorded in the hearings concerning certain information on loans to staff members of the Bank:

Mr. PASSMAN. Could you furnish for the record the amount of each loan? Make it all inclusive, when you say staff members, you are talking about all nations. We want to know the amount of loans you made to your staff members, the amount, and the rate of interest during calendar year 1969.

Mr. ZAGORIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot give it to you by name, nor the specific loan.

Mr. PASSMAN. Why can't you?

Mr. ZAGORIN. Because the President of the Bank will not disclose that information to me for this purpose.

Further in the hearings, the following exchange was recorded concerning these same loans:

Mr. PASSMAN. You do not know how many loans were made, to how many employees, and in what amount?

This is secret information of the President only, is that correct?

Mr. ZAGORIN. The specifics.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is secret information specifically for the President of the Bank, is that right?

Mr. ZAGORIN. Yes, sir.

Because the Committee felt that more control should be exercised over these financial institutions, the following provisos are included in the General Provisions of the accompanying bill:

SEC. 504. None of the funds herein appropriated for "International Financial Institutions" shall be available to assist in the financing of any project or activity the expenditures for which are not subject to audit by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 505. None of the funds herein appropriated for "International Financial Institutions" shall be available to assist in the financing of any project or activity for which detailed justification is not available to the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

In addition, they are requesting \$160 million for IDA. Under our policy we have no alternative other than to recommend it. But may I say, Mr. Chairman, regardless of who may chair this subcommittee in the future or who the members may be, do you realize what an awkward position you would be in with 4,408 projects and subprojects in 103 nations of the world where you have no way of examination?

Here we could not get the information and even the Director is not told all of the facts. It is a secret for the President.

Mr. Chairman, I say that this legislation should be tightened up either by this proviso or by some other committee whereby this subcommittee or any other subcommittees handling this item may have an opportunity to examine these projects.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose this is an unusual way to present a bill. However, I do not believe in ever withholding facts as they are. I have referred to this bill in this manner because I believe in stating the facts as I understand them to be. We must take into account the fact that we are committed. We have made certain commitments. Your committee certainly took that into account in marking up this bill.

We believe we have made sufficient reductions in this bill that will justify all of you supporting it. Then, if you think this bill should be further curtailed in subsequent years, as I am sure it should be, you should recommend to the authorizing committees that they make the adjustment, and not rely entirely on the Committee on Appropriations to trim this down to what we think is a proper amount.

I trust you will support this bill because it is the very best in my opinion that the committee could submit for your consideration.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I was very interested in the figures set out on pages 4 and 5 of the report detailing foreign aid from the year 1946 to 1970 amounting to a net total of \$131,530,600,000 plus \$67,858,067,000 in interest, for a total of almost \$200 billion to the taxpayers of America. Of course, like many others in this body, I am greatly disheartened when I see so many programs that are going unfinanced in this country because of the lack of funds at the present time. When I think of how this money could have been used to solve some of the problems in the United States it is of great concern to me. Therefore, I would like to ask the gentleman one question: I observe that we have given the country of Kuwait the sum of \$36,800,000 in foreign aid.

Mr. PASSMAN. What figure did the gentleman use?

Mr. ICHORD. The \$36.8 million which appears on page 4.

It is my understanding that this country has one of the—

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman would like to have the correct figures, the total amount was \$131.530 billion before adding the interest.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am speaking now of the amount given to the country of Kuwait, \$36.8 million.

It is my understanding that this country has the highest per capita income of any country in the world. I am wondering whether that \$36 million plus, was given prior to the discovery of oil in that country or after the discovery of oil, which I understand has run the per capita income up to such a great amount.

Mr. PASSMAN. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri has asked a very pertinent question. I must admit that for me to say at what times this money was given to all of these countries, I do not have that information available. I am of the opinion that these contributions or loans were made prior to their coming into their riches. How-

ever, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) for a further response to the question.

Mr. CONTE. I would imagine, Mr. Chairman, that most of this \$36 million was in the form of military equipment taken off the shelves of the Department of Defense.

Mr. ICHORD. Could the gentleman, perhaps, supply that for the RECORD?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, we will provide it for the RECORD.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. This is one of the reasons why we want to tighten up on that defense appropriation bill which they use as a Christmas tree to give military assistance to all of these countries. I will talk about this later in my remarks.

Mr. ICHORD. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts would be in favor of a \$20,000 limitation to countries like Kuwait?

Mr. CONTE. I would be for giving nothing to Kuwait; not \$20,000, but nothing.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me complete the record, if I may. Now, as Members of this body, we have a right to our own opinion about what is good and what is not good. If there should be an amendment to reduce the \$350 million, the only thing that would prevent me from offering an amendment to increase it would be it would be subject to a point of order. The \$350 million is not adequate to meet our commitments. Now, as to whether they should have made the commitments, that is something else, but we are in a state of war, and most of the money, I think the largest part of it, is going to that part of the world.

Now let us keep the record straight. We have not given Kuwait as much as a popgun, we have not given them as much as a toy pistol. The sum mentioned represents a \$36 million hard, high-interest Export-Import Bank loan.

Does that answer the question posed by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. ICHORD. Yes.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is there any money in this bill; is there \$20 million in this bill for expanding the United Nations headquarters in New York?

Mr. PASSMAN. No; that would come under a different appropriation. We provide the money for certain agencies, but not for buildings as such.

Mr. GROSS. So the answer is that the \$20 million that is proposed for that purpose is not in this bill?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding; that is in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. Is this Government still putting money into Cuba through the United Nations?

Mr. PASSMAN. Not intentionally.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is it doing it unintentionally?

Mr. PASSMAN. It could be.

Now, let me give the gentleman a direct answer. The evils that may have

grown up over the years could not be corrected overnight.

First I will answer the gentleman's question. Of course there are certain organizations under the U.N., such as the World Health Organization, the UNDP program, and so forth, and insofar as Cuba is concerned they are a member of the United Nations, and could be eligible to participate in these funds.

But we are always, and have always been assured that there would be no dollars going to Cuba. The gentleman knows that I am not going to try to give him the runaround. We hope that in the corrective legislation that is necessary, which will be forthcoming this year, we can correct this. Certainly the Cubans get certain aid out of certain funds in the U.N., but the witnesses tell us that under no circumstances do they get dollars. But we might as well be realistic. It does not matter very much if they are not getting dollars. All they have to do is to get a paper credit, and they requisition against that credit for their needs, so it is a subterfuge to say that they do not get aid. But I can say it is limited, and I hope our administrators are doing everything they can do to tighten it up.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his answer.

How about the program that UNICEF is reported to be starting in North Vietnam? Is there anything like that—

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not going to quarrel about UNICEF. That is for little children. I do not know where all the little children are, but I know that a child in Louisiana is just as important as a child in Iowa is, and I also think that maybe a little baby is entitled to as much help in one poor country as in another. This is for the little children, the crippled children, and I am very proud that this committee always recommends the full amount. I do not know where all of it may be going.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about UNICEF in North Vietnam, whose principal—

Mr. PASSMAN. I defend babies everywhere.

Mr. GROSS. Whose principal business today—that is, the principal business of the North Vietnamese—is the killing of Americans.

Mr. PASSMAN. Of course, I do not know that the North Vietnamese are getting any money out of this act. You are asking questions, and I will try to get the answer to the gentleman.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question, the answer is "No." UNICEF is in 112 countries.

But first let me say this, the Netherlands have contributed \$105,000; Switzerland, \$95,000—with the specific designation that it is going to be used to help the children of North Vietnam. None of UNICEF's general resources and no U.S. contributions will be used for this project.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. Is that satisfactory to the distin-

gished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS)? If that is acceptable, then I will not go into any further research on it.

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

Mr. Chairman, again I would commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), our chairman, for his diligence, for his hard work and his dedication to the problems of our committee and of the country.

As a matter of fact, every member of our subcommittee on foreign operations of the Committee on Appropriations has spent hours and hours of time in bringing before the House this legislation. They have freely given of their time in dedicated service to what I consider a balanced and a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, on May 19, the President announced that it now looks like we will have a deficit in the fiscal year 1971 Federal budget of \$1.3 billion instead of a surplus as previously anticipated. In reporting this foreign assistance appropriations bill this week, the committee has recommended a figure which will cut this budget deficit nearly in half.

The appropriations requested under titles I, II, and III of this bill total \$2.9 billion. The committee recommends a reduction of \$575.6 million. For title I alone, that is economic and military assistance. The request was \$2.2 billion, and the amount recommended in this bill is \$1,644,950,000. This is a reduction of \$555.5 million. It also represents a reduction of \$167.4 million below the fiscal 1970 appropriation.

In reaching these decisions, the committee was fully aware of the need to determine the relative priorities of our domestic and foreign responsibilities. At a time when we are forced to hold the line at home in the fields of education, health, and capital projects, it is hard to justify increasing expenditures in these fields in other countries. We all know the serious local effects of the cutback of construction projects because of inflation here, yet testimony was presented during our hearings to increase expenditures for similar projects in Indonesia by more than \$36 million, or 72 percent. Our constituents are rightly demanding that we turn our concern toward home.

This bill includes \$375 million for supporting assistance. Eighty percent of this program is for Vietnam, and has a direct connection to the timetable being used to bring our troops home from that country. We have heard a lot about "Vietnamization," and the importance of it on future troop withdrawal decisions of our Commander in Chief. This supporting assistance appropriation provides the all-important monetary means by which this "Vietnamization" can be accomplished.

Thirty-six percent of the Vietnam program is for projects, including continuing assistance for civilian war victims, the new land reform program, and continuing pacification efforts. If the South Vietnamese Government is ever to achieve the trust and loyalty of its citizens, these projects must be supported.

Sixty percent of the Vietnam program is for the commercial import program, which has an even more direct impact on

Vietnamization. As South Vietnam takes over more and more of the military burden of the war, its increased expenditures naturally lead to increasing budgetary deficits and inflation, just as we have seen in our own country. More imports are needed to help soak up the excess currency in the market, but nearly 90 percent of their foreign exchange comes from U.S. activities, either military expenditures or the supporting assistance program.

As our presence in Vietnam diminishes, the military source of this foreign exchange is bound to decline. It is now estimated that South Vietnam's foreign exchange reserves are at a level where they could finance only 3 months of imports. Vietnamization means increasing the ability of the South Vietnamese Government to support a more effective military organization of its own and, at the same time, to provide a stable and responsive society for its own people.

The President's fiscal 1971 budget indicated the possibility of a supplemental authorization and appropriation request for Vietnamization of up to \$100 million. However, in a letter to the committee dated May 16, the Secretary of State assured us that the administration would do its best to meet any additional requirements from within the amount originally requested. Therefore, the committee has recommended a much smaller cutback for supporting assistance than for any of the other major items in this bill.

Since Vietnamization is so important to the prompt return of American military personnel from that country, it is imperative that we appropriate the money necessary to accomplish that goal. I am certain that Congress would not want to be pennywise and pound foolish, when for a little more money these boys might be brought home sooner.

Concerning another matter, the hearings held by our foreign operations subcommittee revealed some very cloudy thinking in the area of bilateral versus multilateral foreign assistance. Dr. John Hannah, the administrator of AID testified that "it is sound to suppose that if we are in fact going to go the multilateral route, one would expect cutbacks in bilateral aid requests." Later, another aid spokesman stated that "a predominantly bilateral U.S. program is no longer politically tenable in our relations with many developing countries, nor is it advisable in view of what other countries are doing in international development." At the same time, it was admitted that an increase in the bilateral program of more than \$300 million over the fiscal 1970 program was being requested, and the President is expected to ask for approximately one-half billion dollars in new funds for multilateral aid programs. The committee has reduced both the bilateral and the multilateral programs, and will continue to do so until more definite priorities are announced.

In the multilateral area, we recommend \$85 million in technical assistance for the various United Nations organizations. This is a reduction of \$20 million below the fiscal 1970 appropriation. And we would expect most or all of that cut to be taken from the United Nations de-

velopment program. In a study of this program by a team of development experts headed by Sir Robert Jackson, it was revealed that 20 percent of its projects are not essential to the recipient country's development. As is pointed out in the report on this bill, the Jackson study also questioned the U.N. development program's administrative capacity to effectively absorb additional funds.

As is evident, the substantial reductions recommended for development loans and Alliance for Progress loans must in the end be taken from individual country programs. Based on evidence introduced during the hearings, several suggestions might be made.

The committee was told that \$267 million is needed to help India continue its "increased reliance on market forces" for its development. Yet the Indian Government recently nationalized 14 of the largest banks in that country for political reasons. That Government also charges individual farmers a 10-percent excise tax on all of the fertilizer furnished under this development loan program. This is very definitely not what the American people had in mind with this program. We were also told that India has spent \$1.5 billion of its scarce resources for military weapons purchased from the Soviet Union during the past 3 years. Our country discontinued weapons sales to India, as we did not believe that their resources should be used in that way. Why should we now increase our assistance to them so that they can use other funds to buy weapons from the Soviet Union?

We have a request of \$81.4 million in development loans for Indonesia. Indonesia is not a poor country, and the justification we heard for this \$35 million increase for capital projects was that all of their foreign exchange was needed to help pay off a \$3 billion debt owed to the Communist world. This is not a very strong justification when we are cutting back on hospital construction here at home.

Under alliance for progress loans, \$155 million is requested for Brazil. During the hearings, I asked if Brazil now has a dictatorial regime. I was told that while it was true that the Government's executive branch had forbidden the legislature to meet, and that "there is a current concern as to the Government's tendency to curtail adverse criticism," it was still not considered a dictatorship by the State Department. Well, it certainly would be considered so in this country.

The bill includes \$18,750,000 for the new overseas private investment corporation, or half of what was requested. While the objectives of this agency are worthy of support, there has been a delay in the actual initiation of operations. Thus, it is felt that this amount will be adequate for fiscal 1971.

The committee has included the full amount requested for the Cuban Refugee Program—\$112 million. However, it should be brought to the attention of the House that this program has tripled during the past 5 years. At the appropriations level, there is no choice but to reimburse the States for their assistance programs for these refugees. At the same time, Congress should be aware that an

increasing percentage of these people cannot take care of themselves and require welfare assistance. Five years ago, 10 percent required these services. That has now gone up to 20 percent.

The full amount of the request for military assistance has been recommended. The \$350 million is the same as the 1970 appropriations and the amount now authorized. There have been substantial cutbacks in this item over the past few years, but much of this money now appears in the defense department budget. For fiscal 1971, \$2.3 billion in military assistance to other countries is included in other appropriation requests.

At the same time, the committee was pleased to note that the "pipeline" of undelivered supplies under the military assistance program has been reduced from \$2.3 billion in fiscal 1966 to only \$542 million this year.

We have been told in the past and will probably be told again today that the United States is not doing its share in the international development business, and that our leadership is necessary to stimulate others to contribute. The record does not bear out these allegations. It has now been shown that as our foreign assistance has been reduced by the actions of Congress during recent years, other countries have increased their efforts so that the total aid going to the developing countries is increasing, not decreasing.

As far as doing our share in this field, the United States now spends approximately 47 percent of our total Federal budget for international activities, including the defense of the free world and economic development efforts. This is far above comparable percentages for all of the other member countries of the development assistance committee with the exception of Portugal, which spends a large portion of its small budget for military purposes in its own colonies.

In conclusion, I support the committee's recommendations as the minimum amount necessary to fund foreign assistance efforts which are considered important to our national interests by the administration. It is clear that a total reevaluation of the potential of foreign assistance in general is needed. I would hope that such a reevaluation will be accomplished by the administration and the appropriate congressional committees before next year's appropriations bill is considered.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I compliment the gentleman on his presentation.

I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions about the development loan programs and the very substantial 50-percent cut that was made by the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman pointed out he was sure Congress would not want to be penny wise and pound foolish. He also pointed out that other countries are spending more to help the less developed countries.

If we spend substantially less in the

development loan field, as recommended by the gentleman's committee, will this not inevitably have an effect on the multilateral arrangements whereby other countries are now contributing for example, to Indonesia or India, or Pakistan or to the other countries we are assisting, along with others?

Mr. SHRIVER. As we discontinue or reduce our bilateral programs and perhaps participate more in the multilateral programs, there would be a decrease in bilateral activities. As we participate—and we are—in many of these international institutions, such as the Asian Bank and the Inter-American Bank and the African Bank and the International Development Association, which is an international organization concerned with development, we are participating and contributing in all these areas, and they are all involved in development loans. It is a sizable amount.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield, he is surely not suggesting that all development loans are on a bilateral basis. He is aware of the fact that many of our DL are made as part of multilateral programs, that international consortia have been established for example, to assist Indonesia with its problems.

The gentleman from Kansas described Indonesia as not a poor country. The fact of the matter is that the natural resources of Indonesia are unequalled by any country in that area. But its wealth is potential rather than available now. Indonesia lacks the technical capacity to make its vast natural resources effective. It is deficient in fertilizer production, in transportation, in power, and in irrigation—to name only the most obvious. Does the gentleman not agree that assistance in programs to overcome these deficiencies is being, and should continue to be, given on a multilateral basis in which other developed countries participate, rather than on a bilateral basis with the United States?

Take the case of Korea where we still maintain a large military presence. That country has made outstanding economic progress. Though a consultative group headed by the World Bank and in which a number of international agencies participate, the United States and other developed countries are contributing to the economic viability of Korea. It is significant, I think, that other donor countries are providing an increasing share of Korea's external capital needs. Certainly this is no time for us to slacken our efforts there.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Going back to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, otherwise known as OPIC, as I understand it, according to the committee hearings, they used none of the \$37.5 million provided last year, yet in this bill the committee proposes to give them \$18.7 million. Why?

Mr. SHRIVER. This year is not over yet. At the time of the hearings they

said they did expect to put some of these funds, appropriated last year, to use.

Mr. GROSS. But up to the date of the hearings, in April, they had not done anything with the \$37.8 million. Why would they be expected to commit all those funds in the 2 months remaining in the fiscal year?

Mr. SHRIVER. They testified they expected to use some of these funds during the remainder of this fiscal year. This year is not over yet.

Mr. GROSS. I have one more question on this subject. Why was the committee unable to obtain, because it was apparently classified as "secret," the amount of the guarantees that have been paid off? Why would this be "secret"? From reading the hearings one would think we were dealing with the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana for an answer to the question.

Mr. PASSMAN. The purpose is that we certainly hope we will be able to collect those accounts that have been charged off. If we make it known publicly that we have charged these accounts off, in all probability we would never collect them.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. In response to the question of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), this so-called development loan, worldwide, is kind of a catchall account. Last year the Congress appropriated \$300 million. This year we are recommending \$280 million.

I believe we should call to the attention of the committee the fact that there is \$1,202,341,000 in this account, unexpended. Many of the programs embodied in the \$1,202 million have been obligated for years. Some of them have been obligated for 5 years, some of them for 6 years, and some of them for 7 years, without the funds being disbursed.

We know that under a good shake-down, under a good audit, in all probability, if the gentleman from New Jersey would help us, we would find perhaps \$250 million of the \$1.2 billion will never be spent.

If the gentleman will yield further, they have so much in this padded account that every year they try to transfer out of this bilateral grouping, into international organizations. The committee, fortunately, up to this particular time has prevented them from doing that very thing.

If the gentleman will assist us in asking them to give us a spread on this \$1.2 billion, when they obligated it and how much of it has been disbursed, I am sure money can be saved.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should simply like to say that I hope the recommendations are not in effect going to destroy needed development assistance

that we should be providing in concert with other nations.

I should add that I am also greatly concerned by the serious reduction in the funds for multilateral programs. The committee recommends a reduction from \$122.6 million to \$85 million—about 32 percent. This program is a creature of the United States. Through our persistent efforts other countries have increased their contributions. In the case of the United Nations development program 48 countries have already increased their pledges by \$26 million over 1969 levels. Estimates are that other governments will contribute over \$150 million in 1971. It may not be too well known that our contribution is on a matching basis of 40 percent, up to a maximum U.S. contribution of \$100 million. Hence any reduction will discourage contributions of other governments.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made earlier by my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and others on the disturbing cutback in assistance to multilateral organizations, particularly the United Nations development program.

The administration's request for these various multilateral organizations was \$122.6 million; the Appropriations Committee has recommended \$85 million, or \$37.6 million less than the administration request. Most of these funds will be taken out of the \$100 million allocation for the U.N. development program, meaning close to a 40-percent cutback in assistance to those programs which fall under UNDP.

Let me point out that in 1969, the United Nations development program was engaged in some 3,000 technical cooperation projects in the developing world, and that this involved an outlay of more than \$200 million in resources voluntarily contributed by participating governments, and a somewhat larger sum in cash or kind from the recipient countries themselves. This rounded out what is known as the first United Nations development decade during which these organizations provided close to \$1.2 billion in technical cooperation assistance. These projects have been aimed at both regional groupings and individual countries, with the latter receiving about 60 percent of the assistance. It is estimated that nearly a half million people in the developing countries have benefited from technical education and training supported by the UNDP. It is further estimated that the annual rate of growth in the developing world over the last decade has been around 4.7 percent, which is close to the 5-percent goal set by the General Assembly at the beginning of the development decade. While growth rates are not necessarily an accurate measure of development, they do give some indication of the overall progress being made in the third world. There is also ample evidence available to indicate that progress has been made in strengthening the underlying conditions necessary for sustained development in these countries. The assistance provided by various multilateral organizations has been an important catalyst in this process.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is with some concern and dismay that I note a waning of support for these efforts as reflected in the 40-percent decrease in this appropriation for multilateral organizations. Last March, the President's Task Force on International Development, under the able leadership of Rudolph Peterson, advised that—

The downward trend in U.S. development assistance appropriations should be reversed.

The task force went on to point out that such assistance serves our long-term national interests—first, because we have “an abiding interest in bringing nations together to serve common needs,” and second, because the developing countries comprise two-thirds of the world's population, and “their future success or failure will influence profoundly the kind of world we live in.”

The task force report went on to discuss the role of international organizations, such as the U.N., and their multilateral assistance programs. Let me quote briefly from that section:

The Task Force believe that more reliance on international organizations should be built into all U.S. policies relating to international development. . . . This is basic to the new approach to foreign assistance we recommend. A predominantly bilateral U.S. program is no longer politically tenable in our relations with many developing countries, nor is it advisable in view of what other countries are doing in international development.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the committee report and am aware of the reasons given for cutting funds for these multilateral assistance organizations. The committee cites the report of Sir Robert Jackson to the effect that the United Nations development program has not been operating in the most effective manner. I am glad the committee has left the door open for a restoration of funds once certain changes are made: Quoting from the committee's report:

Pending any positive action on the part of the U.N. development program concerning this report (The Jackson Report), the committee is of the opinion that a reduced level of funding should be allowed.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that between June 9 and 26, the governing council of UNDP will be meeting to consider the type of reforms that are needed to improve the effectiveness of that organization. I am hopeful that this meeting will take the necessary steps and reforms, and that their efforts will be duly noted during hearings in that other body and later in the conference meetings on this bill. For that reason, I will not attempt to restore funds for these multilateral organizations at this time, but I do want to go on record as supporting continued American assistance to third-world development, both bilaterally and multilaterally, and to register my special concern for the future of our assistance to the United Nations development program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations whatever time he may consume.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS, FISCAL YEAR 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few general remarks about

the appropriations bills for the fiscal year 1971 which begins on July 1.

Today, the Committee on Appropriations reported the Agriculture appropriation bill for the forthcoming fiscal year 1971. That brings to 10 the number of regular annual appropriation bills to be approved by the committee for fiscal 1971. The Agriculture appropriation bill is due to be before the House next Tuesday.

Mr. Chairman, in some of these bills which have been before us this year, we have made some cuts and we have made some rather sharp increases. There may very well be a handful of cuts that are not enduring, that are subject to some possible later adjustment upward, but speaking generally and including the bill reported today, in the House we have reduced the budget requests for appropriations, overall, and in respect to fiscal 1971, by about \$39 million. We went far above the budget in a few items.

The pending bill, however, is cut sharply, and makes the principal contribution thus far to the overall reduction in the 1971 appropriation requests.

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

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I am wondering if, notwithstanding the fact of the nature of this Chamber at present, the distinguished gentleman from Texas would appreciate it if someone made an effort to bring some additional Members to the floor.

Mr. MAHON. I would think that would not be necessary.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the appropriations bills remaining to be considered with respect to fiscal year 1971 at this session, in addition to the Agriculture bill mentioned earlier, are the military construction appropriation bill, which is to be reported next week, and the Labor-HEW bill. Of course, we have already passed the educational part of that bill, and that section is now over in the other body. Then, the public works bill; and then the Defense bill.

We are somewhat concerned about bringing before you the Defense bill because it is a highly controversial measure. The other body has not yet considered the related authorization bill. We do not know what the final version of the authorization will be. So, our reporting schedule on the bills may slip a bit, but we will continue to move forward as expeditiously as we reasonably can and by the end of this month we will have the best record in this regard that has been made in quite a number of years.

THE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL TOUCHES THE LIVES OF ALL AMERICANS

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this statement on the bill scheduled to come up next Tuesday, the Agriculture appropriation bill.

The Committee on Appropriations today released a report which, in my opinion, ought to be read by every Member of the Congress and I hope by many people otherwise. It shows the dramatic implications of the Agriculture appropriation bill for the welfare of all of our people. We call it the Agriculture ap-

propriation bill, and to a very considerable extent for that reason the great majority of our people who live in urban areas think they have no special interest in it, but the truth is that the impact of the agricultural industry and agricultural programs on the welfare of this country and the people is tremendous. Some of the bills we consider have only a more or less indirect relationship to the average citizen. But the Agriculture appropriation bill which comes up next week touches in one way or another the lives of every man, woman, and child in the United States. And the bill has international implications.

The Agriculture appropriation bill deals with public health and safety in a very big way. Public health and safety would be seriously crippled without the Agriculture appropriation bill.

The economy of the country, without the Agriculture appropriation bill, would be very seriously injured.

The antipollution programs would be very greatly crippled without the agriculture appropriation bill.

Nutrition for the average citizen and for all citizens, and especially for the poor, would be very much adversely affected in the absence of many programs in the Agriculture appropriation bill. I refer to the food stamp program which is an important program; to the school lunch program; to the special milk program; to the school breakfast program; and all of these other programs of benefit to all of our people.

Some of our bills more or less relate to only some of our people. The agriculture appropriation bill, with all of its implications, relates to all of the people of the country.

I would hope that all Members can find the time to read the report and the bill before it comes to the floor of the House on next Tuesday.

#### BUDGET "SCOREKEEPING" REPORT

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say further, if I may change the subject, we have what is known as a joint Senate-House Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. I shall place in the RECORD today a statement in regard to the status of congressional actions on the budget generally, prepared by the staff of that committee.

We would hope the statement, while unavoidably a bit complex because the subject of Government finances is complex—we would hope that the statement would be helpful to Members, the press, and others in giving, in summary fashion, a brief picture of congressional actions on the budget in all its essential aspects. We would hope to submit additional status reports for the RECORD from time to time.

I think, in view of the situation confronting us in which we undoubtedly will have a budget deficit this year in Federal funds of at least \$11 billion, and we all have to go home and answer to our constituents, that all of us would want to be as well informed as possible in regard to the fiscal affairs of our Government because, unless we can keep this country fiscally strong, our health programs, our educational programs, and all our programs otherwise will eventually fail.

Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to an amendment to the bill before us which I shall offer when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule.

My amendment is directed to one of the most serious problems facing our own society here in the United States—the problem of narcotics addiction.

Narcotics have become a plague and we are faced with what is truly an epidemic. If this epidemic is to be abated our Government must take steps to reduce the illegal importation from abroad of such drugs as heroin, morphine, cocaine, and all of the opium derivatives.

The amendment which I shall propose provides for the suspension of foreign aid to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to limit the exportation to the United States of narcotic drugs that are entering our shores unlawfully.

Mr. Chairman, such a provision is long overdue. For many years our Government, mostly through our State Department, and through international organizations, has been attempting to persuade foreign governments to curb the illegal growing of opium poppies and the illegal production of heroin, morphine, and cocaine. The little progress that has been made has been more than offset by a rapidly growing increase in the flow of narcotics into the United States. In my judgment, humanitarian appeals for the cooperation of foreign governments simply do not suffice. It has become necessary for us, instead, to impose meaningful economic sanctions on governments that do not cooperate.

One of the most outrageous examples involves the illegal growing of opium poppies in Turkey. About 80 percent of all the heroin smuggled into the United States is made from opium grown in Turkey, where farmers have been cultivating poppy fields for hundreds of years. According to reliable information, the illegal supply of opium is so plentiful in Turkey that the amount necessary to produce a kilo of heroin can be purchased for about \$350. The price to narcotic addicts in the United States purchasing one kilo of heroin is about \$225,000.

The only way in which we will be able to deal effectively with this problem is for the Congress to enact a law which will impose sanctions and which will have teeth. The amendment that I am introducing today will provide such a law on a 1-year basis. I have also introduced a bill (H.R. 17883) which will incorporate the same sanctions permanently in our foreign aid program. By first adding such an amendment to this appropriations bill, it may be that foreign governments will be prodded into immediate action and that permanent provisions of this sort will not be necessary. However, in my view it is essential that we act as soon as possible to take this first step.

Mr. Chairman, the American people cannot be expected to provide aid when, in return for American dollars, foreign narcotics producers reap vast profits by preying on America's youth. I urge all

of my colleagues to give my amendment their support.

The following letter from the Department of State and the various newspaper articles on the subject certainly lend force to the need for such an amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1970.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of January 27, 1970 concerning State Department activities relating to the international control of crime in general and the international control of narcotics in particular.

With respect to the general international control of crime, primary responsibility lies with the Departments of Justice and Treasury, and the State Department's role is comparatively limited. As appropriate in individual cases the State Department, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, handles extradition matters with those countries with which we have appropriate treaty commitments. In the matters of surveillance, interception and arrest of known criminals, particularly those engaged in illicit trafficking of narcotics, this government cooperates closely with the International Criminal Police Organization (ICPO/INTERPOL), a non-governmental organization. The Treasury Department has primary liaison relations with INTERPOL, which has no force of agents in being but provides a world-wide communications network centered in Paris. I am sure that the Treasury Department would be most happy to describe to you their working relations with ICPO/INTERPOL.

In multilateral matters dealing with narcotics, the United States has very specific treaty obligations, dating back to 1909, to monitor and control the international flow of narcotic drugs. There are two United Nations organs, both located in Geneva, which deal with the subject, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) and the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB). The United States is a member of each.

The Department of State is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that for the sessions of these bodies, the unified position of the various United States agencies concerned are correlated and approved and that, where appropriate, guidance and instructions are provided on any political matters which may arise. Further, the State Department is the official channel for all communications between the United States Government agencies and these international bodies. A member of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in Geneva provides close and regular liaison with their Secretariats. However, primary responsibility for dealing with these organizations on technical matters rests with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Department of Justice.

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs is the technical body set up to advise the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on narcotic affairs. The U.S. Representative is John E. Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) of the Department of Justice. The CND, a Functional Commission of the United Nations, provides a forum where government delegates meeting biennially attempt to solve problems and arrive at decisions concerning all phases of the narcotics problem. Although originally created to deal with issues relating to narcotic drugs, such as opium and its derivatives, the Commission has broadened its area of activity to include new synthetic preparations. Specifically, the Commission has just agreed upon a draft "Protocol on Psychotropic Substances" in order that such products as LSD and other

mind-expanding substances may be placed under similar types of international control as other narcotics.

The other major multilateral organization is the International Narcotics Control Board, formerly the Permanent Central Opium Board, dating back to 1925. The INCB is composed of 11 experts in the field of narcotics, elected by the United Nations Economic and Social Council from candidates proposed by governments. These experts serve in a private capacity and in fact cannot have an official position with a national government. The U.S. Member of the INCB is Dr. Leon Steinig. In essence, INCB's purpose is to provide a control system of manufacture and international trade, based on estimates of requirements submitted by governments and examined by the Board. To bring the system into application the Board annually publishes these estimates, thereby enabling governments to satisfy themselves that the amounts manufactured, imported and exported remain within the legitimate limits contemplated by treaty. The annual statement also includes forecasts of legitimate opium production, and is supplemented by quarterly revisions. A second supplement shows licit movements of narcotic drugs from the production of the raw material to the consumption of the finished product. Tables of maximum permissible opium stocks are given, together with a comprehensive review of the trends in the licit movement of narcotics, and a brief statement of seizures in illicit traffic.

If the INCB finds that a dangerous quantity of drugs is accumulating in a given country it may recommend that other States stop shipments of the drug to the country in question. It also has the authority to make this recommendation if, in comparing the estimates and the statistics furnished by governments, it finds that a country has violated its treaty obligations relating to the maximum amount of narcotic drugs which it may manufacture or import. The Board has never taken such action, perhaps because the real power behind multilateral international control activity is the power of public opinion and the weapon of publicity. Both the CND and the INCB reports are reviewed by the UN Economic and Social Council and governments are extremely sensitive to any public accusation that they have failed to cooperate in this humanitarian and social venture.

In addition to multilateral organizations dealing with narcotics, the State Department gives high priority to bilateral representation in those countries where the production, manufacture or smuggling of illicit drugs is a factor. Such representations are of course closely coordinated with the Departments of Justice and Treasury, both through the formal mechanism of President Nixon's Task Force on Narcotics Matters, on which all concerned government agencies are represented. To cite one example, the State Department, through the Agency for International Development, made a loan to the Government of Turkey to permit phase-out of illicit poppy growth. This, of course, would reduce the possibilities for diversion. In another area the State Department, with Treasury and Justice, is working with the authorities of the Government of Mexico on "Operation Cooperation" to reduce the flow of illicit narcotics and other drugs on the southern border.

The Department of State considers the matter of illicit trafficking to be of such importance that in 1969 it created the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Narcotic Matters. Mr. Harry Schwartz is the incumbent (632-3608) and he will be happy to meet with you at your convenience to brief you privately.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. TORBETT, JR.,  
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

[From the Newark Sunday News, May 31, 1970]

#### WORLD DRIVE ON NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING IS TAKING TO THE AIR

LONDON (Reuters).—Spotter aircraft soon will be fanning out over Turkish farmlands to detect secret fields of opium poppies—chief source of illicit heroin shipments to Western Europe and North America.

This is one of many new methods being used by nations around the world to wipe out narcotics trafficking at the source, according to a survey by Reuters.

Another major source of opium can be found in the poppy fields of Indochina's mountainous areas and adjacent regions. The traffickers do a flourishing trade mainly for consumption in the traditional opium dens of Southeast Asia. Little filters through to Western countries.

#### MEDICAL USE

About 900 tons of opium are needed each year for medical purposes. Three countries—the Soviet Union, India and Turkey—provide this amount. There is little leakage into the underground market except from Turkey.

Yet the Soviet Union is not immune to the drug problem. New anti-narcotics legislation provides stern penalties for the illicit sale or use of both hard and soft drugs.

Three different plants are responsible for the drugs:

Opium poppy (hard drug)—Its unripened seed pods make opium. Morphine and heroin are derivatives. It is grown mainly in Asia.

Coca shrub (hard drug)—Its leaves make cocaine, used for medical purposes as well as chewed as a sedative by people in Bolivia and Peru where it originates. Lately some cocaine has been reaching illicit markets in North America.

Cannabis (soft drug)—Its dried leaf makes marijuana, its resin makes hashish. Mexico and North African countries are major producers but the plant grows almost everywhere on the poorest soil.

#### COOPERATION

The United Nations Narcotics Board, the International Police Agency and other world bodies are cooperating with national governments to curb the growth of drug trafficking.

Their guns are also aimed at the illegal use of synthetic drugs such as the chemically-produced barbiturates, amphetamines (pep pills) and hallucinatory drugs like LSD.

At present, heroin is causing the most concern, especially in the United States. The U.S. Bureau of Narcotics says there are 68,000 known addicts in America—some 30,000 of them in New York City. Unofficial estimates claim there are 100,000 heroin addicts in New York City alone.

French officials believe that about 80 per cent of the heroin reaching addicts in America is processed in secret laboratories in the Marseilles area.

#### PRESSURE BY U.S.

The U.S. government has been pressing Turkey to impose a complete ban on opium poppy cultivation. It has granted financial aid specifically earmarked for the purchase of spotter aircraft to fight the problem at the source.

Illicit plots of poppies are hidden in the middle of huge Turkish wheatfields and can only be detected from the air. The Turkish government restricts official poppy cultivation to nine of the 67 provinces. These poppies are considered to produce the highest-quality opium in the world.

Turkey has argued against the U.S. request for a complete ban on poppy cultivation which would affect 80,000 growers of the crop. To recoup his losses each year, a Turkish poppy farmer would have to harvest a non-poppy crop three times in 12 months.

For the Turkish government, the ban would mean a huge loss in much-needed foreign currency.

#### NEW METHODS

At the same time, Turkey is doing all within its power to halt the illicit trade. Police and customs officials have adopted new methods to trap traffickers and the penalties for drug offenses range from two years in prison to death.

Narcotics seized by Turkish border officers last year amounted to 5,566 pounds of raw opium and 106 pounds of morphine base, as well as 935 pounds of marijuana.

Smuggling routes have increased with the growth of tourist travel. The opening of Communist countries to Western tourists has been a boon to traffickers.

Morphine base, much easier to conceal than raw opium, and refined heroin can be hidden in false-bottom suitcases, wine bottles, cans of food, motor cars, ski poles or in clothing.

Drugs move by air, sea and overland routes from Turkey to Western Europe, carried by agents of various underworld groups. The agents may be innocent-looking tourists, airline or ship personnel or hippies.

United Nations experts estimate that some 200 tons of opium grown in Turkey reach addicts in the West each year.

Israeli authorities say that since the June 1967 war, an increasing amount of drugs—mostly hashish grown in occupied Arab areas—has been smuggled out of the country.

Profits from heroin trafficking are enormous. The U.S. Narcotics Bureau says 22 pounds of raw opium grown in Turkey and sold to an underworld broker for \$350 will produce 45,000 packets containing 5 per cent heroin mixed with other substances. Each packet sells for \$5 for a total sale value of \$225,000.

In Paris, a narcotics expert says morphine base costs \$80 a kilo (2.2 pounds) but fetches \$15,000 in America after it has been processed into heroin.

Hashish sells for \$336 per kilo in Turkey but fetches \$8,640 for the same amount in Western Europe.

[From the Washington Post, March 6, 1970]

#### U.S. NARCOTICS UNIT TO PRESS TURKEY TO END OPIUM TRADE

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Alarmed by the rising death toll from heroin in this country, the Bureau of Narcotics said yesterday that it will press Turkey—where most of it originates—to close down all of its opium fields.

"When you have over 900 deaths in one city (New York) in one year, and 224 of them are teenagers, then I think we've got a right to start hollering," Director John E. Ingersoll of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs declared at a news conference.

About 80 per cent of all the heroin smuggled into this country, he said, is made from opium grown in Turkey where farmers have been cultivating poppy fields for hundreds of years.

It makes its way into this country from clandestine processing labs in Europe, especially on the French Riviera.

The Turkish government already has agreed to cut back the number of provinces where opium cultivation is authorized, but now, Ingersoll said "we're pressing for total abolition."

He said French officials also have agreed to assign 300 officers to control narcotics in that country and another 30 to deal with international trafficking.

U.S. officials have been reluctant in the past to speak out on the "delicate" negotiations with Turkey on the opium issue.

"The United States is probably the biggest single victim of illegal narcotics traffic," Ingersoll said. In New York, he said, heroin

addiction has mushroomed to the point where it is the biggest single cause of death for 18- to 35-year-olds.

A Turkish government monopoly buys some 100 tons of opium each year for world medicinal needs, but controls, Ingersoll said, are loose.

Countries such as India, the narcotics chief added, have much tighter restrictions.

The Turkish monopoly pays farmers there \$165 for the opium needed to produce a kilo of heroin, but they can get \$350 for it on the black market. According to narcotics agents, an addict would have to pay about \$225,000 for all of the fixes he could get from a single kilo.

Turkey already is receiving a \$3 million loan from the Agency for International Development to help step up its surveillance work and encourage Turkish farmers to switch over to other crops such as sugar beets, sorghum and sunflowers.

Premier Suleyman Demirel's government has agreed to limit authorized production to nine provinces this year and only four next year.

It was permitted in 21 provinces several years ago, but Ingersoll said the impact of the cutback has been nominal. The most productive provinces are still in business.

While opium production represents less than one per cent of Turkey's gross national product, the narcotics chief said it is a "deeply ingrained tradition" among Turkish farmers.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1966]

#### U.S. SEEKS BAN ON OPIUM POPPIES IN MIDEAST AREA

(By Alfred Friendly)

The United States has recently proposed a strict prohibition of the cultivation of opium poppies in the Middle Eastern area that now supplies three-fourths of America's illegal heroin.

The plan was submitted in May to a meeting of the Central Treaty Organization in Tehran, but was not publicized.

It would apply almost entirely to Turkey. Iran successfully banned the growing of opium poppies in 1957, and the third CENTO power in the area, Pakistan, is a negligible source.

The American proposal, calling for a complete stop to poppy growing, with strict enforcement, spelled out no further details. But the cost of narcotics addiction in this country and the importance to it of diminishing the supply are so great that it would make sense for the United States to offer Turkey a considerable inducement to agree.

Under international treaties, Turkey licenses poppy growing and requires that all opium gum, the raw material for medical morphine and codeine, be sold to a government monopoly. But with nearly 200,000 licensed growers, enforcement is impossible. Smugglers pay the Turkish farmer three to five times the government price and as a result only a minor proportion of the gum is sold through legal channels.

Nevertheless, Turkey's legitimate exports of opium gum bring it a hard currency return of almost \$3 million a year, and the value to the Turkish farmers (who sell the seeds as well, for conversion to vegetable oil) is even higher. The Turks would be hurt by the loss of that revenue.

Federal, state and local narcotics enforcement costs in the United States, however, run to more than \$24 million annually. Heroin addicts, of whom there are nearly 53,000 in this country, spend close to \$200 million in purchases of the drug. Accordingly, it would seem to be much to America's advantage to give Turkey money and technical aid during a transition period as an inducement to its cutting off such a large proportion of the illegal American supply.

Iran moved the whole way to total prohi-

bition of poppy growing under the pressure of its own serious addiction problem. At that time, the United States helped it over the transition period with technical advice to farmers on ways of growing the best substitute cash crops.

Today, Iran also has an interest in stopping the Turkish product, since substantial amounts of opium gum are smuggled over the border to supply Iranian addicts.

Besides the moral considerations for halting production, Turkey faces the economic fact that sooner or later its revenue from lawful exports will be ended. American development of synthetic painkillers, not habit-forming, is proceeding encouragingly, portending an end to the medical use of opium derivatives.

The present illegal traffic flows from Turkey to the Levant and thence to Marseilles, where processing is done. The resulting heroin is then smuggled to the United States.

Of the rest of Americas supply, about two-thirds comes from poppies grown in Mexico and one-third from the Orient.

If the Turkish source were cut off, scarcity and the resulting high prices would make suppression and treatment of addiction much easier, it is believed. It would take several years for the processors and shippers—mainly Italians and Corsicans who switched operations to the Marseilles area after the last war—to set up new facilities and trade channels, presumably in the Far East.

During that time, it is thought, much could be done to relieve the problem here.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1969]  
IRAN, BACK IN POPPY-GROWING BUSINESS,  
PLANS DEATH PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED  
OPIUM TRADERS

(By Lawrence Fellows)

TEHERAN, IRAN.—This is a land of lovely, high, windblown steppes on which the opium poppy grows so well. Perhaps two million people in Iran once liked their opium pipe so well that they felt they would die without it.

Nevertheless, the National Assembly will gather Sunday in the old Qajar Palace in Baharestan Square to debate a bill that would impose the death penalty on anyone in Iran found guilty of unauthorized traffic in opium or its derivatives, morphine and heroin. The Assembly is expected to approve this bill quickly.

A few blocks away from the Assembly the Government's Foreign Trade Company is studying the bids it had invited from pharmaceutical houses in Britain, Germany, France, Switzerland and Japan for 30 tons of opium.

A spokesman, clearly disappointed with the low bids, explained that the opium had come from poppies grown outside the country and had been confiscated, and that the morphine content was not up to the old high standard established in Iran.

And on the green, disused fields of Kerman and Kurdistan teams of government experts are setting out new fields of the pretty but powerful little white flowers. After 14 years of a strict ban imposed at the request of the United Nations, the Government has decided that Iran should get back into the poppy-growing business.

At first glance these scattered bits of activity around the poppy might seem to be contradictory, and in some features unpleasant news to health officers and law enforcement agencies around the world who have been trying to control the traffic in narcotics by stamping it out at the source.

But Iran's argument is essentially a simple one: she was willing to cooperate, but her neighbors were not, and after years of warnings that she would not suffer alone and for nothing, she has decided to go after the trade she has lost to Turkey and Afghanistan.

Since 1955 when Iran imposed the ban on poppy-growing the country has lost the \$40-million it would have earned each year from the 1,200 tons of opium it was accustomed to selling yearly abroad, the Government has reckoned.

The Government has even had to lay out hard currency to import the narcotics it needs for legitimate medicinal purposes. Worse yet, the ban has cost Iran an additional \$10-million yearly in gold and hard currency in illicit traffic—sums paid out by Iran's own addicts for narcotics brought to them in camel caravans over the wild, uncontrollable Afghanistan frontier.

There are fewer addicts in Iran now than there were in 1955 when the ban was imposed. From two million then, the figure dropped to 35,000 in 1962. Clinics were set up around the country to help people kick the habit.

But the number of addicts has risen again to a quarter of a million, in a population of 27 million, partly because of new addicts and partly because some of the old ones quit trying to quit, especially with the increasing ease with which the narcotics could be got from across the borders.

One unpleasant aspect of the increasing addiction in Iran is the gradual shift from smoking opium to taking the much more powerful heroin by needle.

When a man put the charcoal to opium in his pipe and the dark brown, chocolate-like substance began to ooze down into the pipe and smolder, the whole neighborhood could smell it, including the police. Heroin is more dangerous and expensive, but it is also quick and odorless.

There were other burdens for the authorities. There were the rising costs of hospitalizing the addicts, of trying and imprisoning the traders. There was the heavy cost of policing the frontiers, and this should become less burdensome when the poppies are grown locally on government fields or under government supervision.

There will be stiff penalties for those Iranians who think the Government is relaxing things all around. Civil servants who become addicted and fall to lose the habit will lose their jobs. Everyone else who stays addicted will run the risk of losing his social security benefits.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding and I rise to commend the gentleman for his salutary amendment.

In my considered judgment, after some 23 years' service on the police department of the city of New York, and being fairly familiar with the drug problem, this is a direct blow at the heart of the drug industry. I sincerely hope the amendment passes in this bill, or if it does not in this bill, it should receive prime consideration from House of Representatives as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for bringing to the attention of the Committee this amendment. It is a very fine amendment. I do not believe it would be at all appropriate to offer it to this bill, but if it is offered on the legislative bill when that bill is brought out onto the floor I am certainly going to support the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to support the gentleman's proposed amendment. I think we have to realize that, once these drugs arrive upon our shores, it is very difficult to police their distribution, and consequently we have to rely on the cooperation of other countries; certainly a quid pro quo for the aid that we are giving to these countries should be their active cooperation in cutting off this flow of drugs to America.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the distinguished Subcommittee on Foreign Operations for 12 years now. During that time, I have consistently raised my voice in support of effectively planned and efficiently administered foreign assistance programs.

That support for and interest in our foreign aid programs has declined should be clear after looking over H.R. 17867. The committee has cut \$536.8 million—more than half a billion dollars—from the \$1.8 billion requested for economic assistance.

The biggest cuts came in the heart of the nonmilitary program—\$86.8 million from technical assistance; \$112.5 million from Alliance for Progress development loans; and \$290 million from worldwide development loans. In addition, among other cuts, was \$18.8 million from the Peace Corps.

Last year in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 28, page 37957, I said.

To cut off foreign economic assistance would be to turn off the lights of the less developed world. That, however, is precisely what this body will be doing if it accepts all of the committee's recommendations.

The same thing is happening all over again, and I for one have not been hardened by the repetition of such tragic action.

#### PEACE CORPS

The committee has cut \$18.8 million from the Peace Corps and recommended \$80 million. This is \$18.4 million below the 1970 level.

At a time when defense spending exceeds \$70 billion and when the committee made no cut from the \$350 million request for military assistance, it is ironic that we must cut by 20 percent something called the Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps, with its small budget, performs a noble and important function. It serves the cause of global peace, the foreign policy of our Nation, and at a time when our young people are searching for ways to improve the "system," it provides a constructive avenue for them to take.

Moreover, the Peace Corps is now moving in directions which I believe most of my colleagues support. It is broadening its appeal to include Americans of all ages and of greater competence. It now admits families and draws from the professions, farming and labor.

The new recruitment effort is in full

swing. It has already succeeded by doubling the number of applicants over 30 years of age; by doubling the number of farmers available for service; by increasing by 50 percent the number of applicants with craft skills such as mechanics, carpentry, and welding; and by increasing by 40 percent the number of experienced teachers who have applied.

The Peace Corps has also reduced the size of its Washington staff by 22 percent.

The action taken by the committee is very serious indeed. It could result in serious and lasting damage to the Peace Corps.

Since the bulk of the Peace Corps budget is needed for the support of programs already in progress overseas, any sizable reduction in funds creates a corresponding cutback in the only area of any flexibility—the new training input.

The 20-percent cut by the committee would mean a 50-percent cut in new trainees, some 3,400 compared with the requested 7,000. I think this would put the future of the Peace Corps in grave doubt.

For all these reasons, I will, at the appropriate time and if a point of order is not raised because the budget has not been authorized, offer an amendment to restore \$10 million of the cut and a corresponding \$2 million in administrative expenses. This would result in a \$90 million budget for 1971.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

#### MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

The committee has cut \$37.6 million from technical assistance for multilateral organizations. The recommendation of \$85 million is \$20 million less than the figure for 1970.

I strongly object to this cut. To begin with, technical assistance is what might be called the "bread and butter" of economic assistance. This is what one reads about when we help an Indian farmer grow a better grain of wheat or a Malaysian farmer grow some "miracle" rice. It is helping others directly to help themselves.

In addition, both the Pearson Commission report and the Peterson task force report have called for increased emphasis upon multilateral rather than bilateral assistance. I have long maintained that this is the direction in which our aid program should be moving.

Operating through a multilateral framework can also be more economical. Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of the United Nations development program, has noted that each \$100 million appropriated for the UNDP generates some \$450 million—\$150 million from other donors and another \$150 million or more in matching funds.

In spite of all this, what has the committee done? It has cut the money needed to move in a new direction—a direction with great promise for the future of the developing world. It has failed to provide the means with which change could be effected. It has refused to recognize the necessity of international action in the new and developing nations of the world.

I want the record clear on the fact that I do not concur in the \$37.6 million cut made by the committee.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S TESTIMONY

On April 23, 1970, the Secretary of State, William P. Rogers appeared before the foreign operations subcommittee. None of the testimony except the prepared statement by the Secretary, appears in the hearings.

I must express my gravest concern over the classification of the Secretary's entire testimony as well as all the questions asked by the subcommittee members I have done this at length in separate views to the report, House Report No. 91-1134. I was joined in these views by Mr. YATES, Mr. CHAIMO, Mr. OBEY, Mr. AD-DABBO, and Mr. BOLAND.

I would particularly draw my colleagues' attention to the following statement in our separate views:

The classified treatment request was granted by the Chairman of the Subcommittee without consulting the Subcommittee members. A request on May 21 by five of the Subcommittee members to meet to consider this vital question was rejected by the Subcommittee Chairman.

The questions and answers on April 23 ranged far and wide. They were not limited to Cambodia and Vietnam. While Southeast Asia was heavily stressed, the Middle East, Latin America, Europe, Africa, and just about every section of the world was discussed.

I think the American people, under our democratic and open system of government, have the right to know what Secretary Rogers said—to the extent that such information would have no adverse effect upon the national security of the United States. To the extent that it would have an adverse effect upon our national security, and only to that extent, the committee should have approved the classification request.

As we stated in our separate views:

National security, not embarrassment is the standard we have set forth for classifying information in our record.

We are taught at the earliest levels of learning that this is a nation of checks and balances. Congress is supposed to act as a check on the executive branch.

Congress has the right—the constitutional right—to know the answers to questions on matters it has the ultimate responsibility to authorize and to fund. Such questions were raised before the Secretary of State, and they were answered by him. I do not see how it protects the national security to keep all of these questions and answers from the general public and the other Members of this body.

For many decades now Congress has sat silent witness to the continuing erosion of its powers in the field of foreign affairs. To some extent this has represented a necessary change to meet changing times. The events of the past decade, however, have made extremely clear just how dangerously far this shift in powers has gone.

The people of this Nation are rightly demanding today that Congress reassert its power and assume the full share of its awesome responsibilities in foreign affairs and particularly in the critical area of war.

I think some basic constitutional ques-

tions are involved in this series of events. That is why five subcommittee members requested a meeting with the chairman (Mr. PASSMAN). I regret very much that we did not have the opportunity to discuss the Secretary's request with him.

In conclusion, I would point out that the committee and the Congress have very important decisions to make regarding Federal spending for programs of foreign assistance. I hope that in the future, and in cases not specifically involving the national security, these decisions would be made openly before the Members of Congress and before the American public.

#### EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES PROGRAM

I would like to turn now to what has become one of the more controversial parts of the foreign aid program. I refer to the so-called excess defense articles program under which the United States gives away surplus military property of all kinds throughout the free world. A brief outline of my work in this area might be in order at this time.

#### A. JETS FOR TAIWAN IN FISCAL 1970 BILL

When the foreign aid bill for fiscal 1970 was on the floor last year, I spoke at length against the gift of some \$54.5 million for jets to the Republic of China.

I said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 28, page 37957:

I strongly oppose this appropriation because there has been no justification whatsoever for it. \* \* \* Now I ask my colleagues very pointedly—how do we know whether China needs these jets? Floor debate consisted of some five pages in the Record. No supporting material was sent up to Congress. In fact, barely anyone knew anything about these jets until that fateful day in November—the 20th to be exact—when an amendment was offered calling for the expenditure of \$54.5 million of the taxpayers' money.

The battle over those jets, as many of my colleagues will recall, continued into early 1970. However, the earmarking of that money was finally deleted from the bill.

But the fight was not over.

#### B. "CHRISTMAS PACKAGE" FOR TAIWAN

I subsequently found out that the United States had decided to give Taiwan what I have called a "Christmas package" consisting of \$157 million in surplus military property. It included not only jets, but also air transports, tanks, howitzers and rifles.

The story of this disclosure and how it all came about is vividly documented in three New York Times pieces that I would like to include in the RECORD at this time. The first, dated March 29, 1970, is by John Finney. The other two, dated April 5, 1970, consist of an article by Peter Grose and an editorial entitled "Arms Loophole."

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1970]  
TAIWAN SECRETLY GIVEN MILLIONS IN U.S. ARMS IN 1969

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 28.—The United States secretly presented Nationalist China last year with fighter planes, cargo planes, destroyers, anti-aircraft missiles, tanks and rifles reportedly worth \$157 million.

Except for approximately \$1-million paid for four destroyers, the Government of Pres-

ident Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan received the weapons free out of stocks that had been declared surplus by the Defense Department.

Such large-scale use of "surplus" weapons as an indirect form of military assistance is a relatively new development and is raising unresolved policy questions within the State Department and Congress.

With the reduction of the United States military forces and withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam, billions of dollars' worth of weapons are being declared surplus by the military services. A study by the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee suggests that the total may come to \$10-billion, although State Department officials believe this estimate is too high.

The Defense Department never announced, either publicly or to Congress, the transfer of the weapons to Taiwan, and the gift would probably have gone unnoticed if some questions had not been raised in a recent meeting of a House appropriations subcommittee by Representative Silvio O. Conte, Republican of Massachusetts.

At a closed-door hearing, Representative Otto E. Passman, Democrat of Louisiana, the subcommittee chairman, was once again raising the possibility of providing \$54-million so the Government in Taiwan could buy a squadron of F-4 Phantom jet planes. A similar proposed grant in the military-assistance program was approved last year by the House, but blocked by the Senate.

As the debate in the foreign aid subcommittee warmed up, Lieut. Gen. Robert H. Warren, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for military assistance and sales, broke in and was said to have observed: "I want you to know we have given them quite a bit." Then, under questioning by Mr. Conte, the details of the military goods supplied to the Chinese Nationalists were disclosed by General Warren.

During floor debate last week, when the House approved legislation lending three submarines to Taiwan, Mr. Conte listed some of the "military goodies" that were included in what he described as the "beautiful Christmas present" for the Chiang Government. In an interview, he listed additional items that had been included in the package.

These included four 20-year-old destroyers that had been decommissioned by the Navy; equipment for a Nike Hercules missile battery that had been decommissioned by the Navy; 35 F-100 Super Saber jets, which are relatively old supersonic interceptors; more than 20 F-104 Starfighters, which are supersonic fighter planes still in use by the United States Air Force and the North Atlantic allies; more than 30 C-119 flying boxcars, which are 15-year-old troop and cargo transports; some 50 medium tanks, and about 120 Howitzers and thousands of M-14 rifles.

On the basis of the Warren testimony, Mr. Conte placed the total cost of the package at \$157-million.

#### PENTAGON WON'T COMMENT

In response to inquiries, the Defense Department declined to confirm or deny the details of the package described by Mr. Conte. The explanation offered by a department spokesman was that the Pentagon normally does not discuss the transfer of arms to foreign allies and furthermore that the information gets to "the order of battle" of the Chinese Nationalist armed forces.

State Department officials, who were not so reluctant to discuss the transaction, said the transfer had been worked out in negotiations last summer and fall. Confirming the general outlines of the package, these officials said the weapons were needed to modernize Taiwan's air defenses and to replace obsolete ships.

State Department officials described the transaction as part of a general program of using surplus arms to bolster the defenses of such "forward defense" countries as South

Korea, Turkey and Taiwan. In recent months, for example, the Defense Department has transferred 790,000 used rifles, carbines and submachine guns to South Korea for use by its home defense reserve forces.

#### AID PROGRAM REDUCED

Within the last year or so, the Pentagon has embarked on a major program to use surplus weapons to supplement its military assistance program, which has been sharply reduced in recent years.

This was a principal justification offered by State Department officials for the major shipment of surplus arms to Nationalist China.

Since the end of World War II, Nationalist China, known formally as the Republic of China, has received \$2.7-billion in military assistance from the United States, primarily in arms provided as grants. But in recent years, this direct military assistance has been drastically curtailed, falling from \$117-million in fiscal 1968 to about \$25-million in the current fiscal year, which ends June 30.

"One reason we provided the Republic of China with so much in such a short time," a State Department official explained, "is that grant assistance was dropping drastically but at the same time China, as an exposed forward-defense country, had unfulfilled military requirements."

The policy question now being raised by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is what controls, either by the executive branch or by Congress, are being exercised over the Pentagon's use of its growing stockpile of surplus weapons as a form of military assistance.

In other areas of military assistance, Congress and the executive branch have established tight controls over the Pentagon.

Direct military grant assistance, for example, is subject to annual authorizations and appropriations by Congress, which thus sets a limit on how much aid can be provided country by country.

In the area of military sales—an area in which the Pentagon used to have complete latitude with its own "revolving fund" to finance credit sales of arms—Congress in the last three years has imposed tight controls. Under legislation first enacted in 1968 and now up for renewal, the Pentagon must obtain Congressional authorization for credit sales and Congress in turn imposes an annual ceiling on the amount.

But in the disposal of surplus arms abroad—through sale or gift—the Pentagon needs no Congressional authorization and faces no Congressional limitation. The only requirement is that the Defense Department report the surplus arms transportations annually when it appears before Congress for its military-assistance appropriations, but as one Foreign Relations Committee staff member observed: "The reporting usually comes considerably after the fact."

Within the executive branch, the Pentagon in principle has to obtain State Department clearance for the disposal abroad of any major item of surplus equipment. But State Department officials acknowledge that the controls over surplus equipment are not as tight as those that have been worked out for sales of military equipment.

One of the current efforts within the State Department's Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, therefore, is to establish tighter inter-agency controls over the disposal of surplus weapons. A corresponding effort to establish stricter Congressional controls is certain to be made by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as it considers extension of the military sales legislation, already approved by the House.

A foreign relations subcommittee, headed by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, got its first insight into the Pentagon's growing use of surplus weapons as a

form of military assistance when it held still-secret hearings last fall into United States military arrangements with Nationalist China.

One of the operations discovered by the subcommittee was that Maj. Gen. Richard G. Ciccolella, chief of the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group in Taiwan, had sent a special team to South Vietnam with the mission of finding used or damaged equipment that could be turned over to Taiwan.

The subcommittee also determined, according to Congressional sources, that General Ciccolella had arranged for establishment of a military equipment repair facility in Taiwan.

The repair facility, according to these Congressional sources, was proving profitable to the Nationalist Government in two respects. First, it was receiving money to repair equipment under contracts with the Defense Department. Second, it was receiving free equipment by taking over weapons that had been declared irreparable by the United States.

General Ciccolella had been scheduled to testify before the Symington subcommittee last fall, but his appearance was postponed when he was hospitalized with a back ailment. The general has now been reassigned to Fort Meade in Maryland, and the subcommittee plans to have him testify before closing the Taiwan phase of its investigation.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1970]

#### PENTAGON SLIPS ITS "GOODIES" TO ITS FRIENDS

(By Peter Grose)

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon, already battered in a season of Congressional suspicions, was thrown on the defensive once again last week—this time on the issue of free military hardware flowing quietly to friendly foreign governments.

Voices on Capitol Hill asked if something was going on that Congress was not being told about. Both the State and Defense Departments replied firmly in the negative, scarcely concealing their impatience that the sturdy old Military Assistance Program (MAP) should suddenly be cast in a sinister light.

Sinister or not, the episode stirred lingering doubts among those so inclined about the supervision of arms sales and outright gifts, and about the relation between military aid and over-all foreign policy.

The trigger was pulled by Representative Silvio O. Conte, Republican of Massachusetts, who said he stumbled on the fact by accident in an appropriations subcommittee hearing that nearly \$160-million worth of what he called "military goodies" had been slipped quietly—and almost free—to the Nationalist Chinese government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek last year.

#### TAKEN UNAWARES

Officials at the State and Defense Departments were taken unawares, and it took them a few days to sort out their complex statistics and present an intelligible reaction. Yes, they said, the Republic of China was one of the four major recipients of United States military aid. Yes, the figure was not wildly off if one calculated the value of brand new equipment—but what was sent to Taiwan was used, military surplus, and thus had an assigned "utility" value of only one-third or less of what the Congressman had estimated.

But, most vehemently, they said Congress already had the full information on this and all military assistance transactions.

For nearly two decades of so-called MAP aid, precise dollar amounts of aid to each country had been appropriated by Congress; voluminous annual reports have been submitted in both public and more detailed classified versions, officials said. "It's not our

fault if people don't bother to read them," said one harried expert.

Attention quickly focused on the technique of declaring supplies surplus, valued at one-third the new acquisition cost, and thus tripling the amount of military hardware that can be given to friendly governments under the dollar ceiling imposed by Congress.

#### FRANK EXPLANATION

On this point, the fine print in a new Defense Department pamphlet provided a frank explanation. Military aid administrators have become increasingly frustrated at the dwindling authorizations for the program, which include executive training and construction as well as gifts of equipment, from a high point of nearly \$6-billion in 1952 to \$350-million for 1971.

The requested authorization "is not adequate to permit optimum use of military assistance," the Defense Department noted. "Fortunately, therefore, efforts along other lines to augment the amount of material which may be used to increase that support are proving productive. One such source is Department of Defense stocks in long supply and excess."

By week's end, the Executive Branch argument was in line. First, why is so much attention paid to gifts of military equipment when much more is sold on credit or for cash? Only four countries—Greece, Turkey, South Korea and Nationalist China—still receive significant hardware for nothing. Most of the other recipients of outright grant aid in the 1950's are now paying customers of the United States.

And second, in the words of the Defense Department, "The Nixon Doctrine places new and greater emphasis on the contribution of allied and friendly forces to their own national and common defense. However, many of our most willing and potentially helpful friends and allies simply do not have the resources or technical capabilities to assume greater responsibilities."

In other words, the Administration is telling Congress, if this country no longer wishes to let its own forces get deeply involved abroad, it should not at the same time cut back on the training and material support for the force on the spot.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1970]

#### ARMS LOOPHOLE

Congressmen seeking to extend their control over United States military assistance and sales abroad have stumbled onto a loophole big enough to encompass billions of dollars in weapons. That loophole takes the form of Pentagon disposal of surplus arms.

As the lawmakers have curtailed foreign military aid appropriations and introduced new restrictions on credit sales of weapons, the Defense Department has stepped up its overseas gifts of military equipment it has declared to be in excess of United States needs. In fiscal 1969, for example, the United States gave away secondhand weapons valued by the Pentagon at \$117.3 million. The original cost of these weapons to the American taxpayer was about \$470 million, substantially more than the \$350-million military aid appropriation for that year.

One major beneficiary of this give-away program has been Taiwan. Representative Silvio Conte, Republican of Massachusetts, extracted from a Defense Department witness recently an admission that the Administration last year quietly turned over to the Chiang Kai-Shek Government jet war planes, cargo planes, destroyers, tanks, howitzers and rifles valued by the Pentagon at \$40 million. Mr. Conte placed the total cost of the package at \$157 million, based on the original purchase prices.

The Administration says that the surplus disposal program is supervised by a joint control group of State and Defense Department officials. It examines each proposed grant, both in terms of over-all foreign pol-

icy interests and of certification that the equipment has been legitimately designated as surplus. Some members of Congress are not persuaded that this control mechanism is fully effective, and for good reason.

For example, it is difficult to reconcile massive arms shipments to Taiwan with President Nixon's attempts to improve relations with Peking. Some question whether all the arms that are being given away would be considered "excess" if a tighter rein were kept on regular defense spending. And there is a further question of the long-range impact on international peace of any continuing large-scale disposal of the legitimate castoffs of the lavish United States military establishment.

Congress has a duty to look more deeply into these questions and to assert its authority over the disposal of arms that have been bought by the American people. Quite apart from the waste of Government funds urgently needed for unmet domestic priorities, a curb on the international arms race is of vital concern to the United States. Global conflicts can grow out of the profligate distribution of instruments of destruction made in America.

#### C. CONTE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 17867

With that as background, I would like to explain my amendment to H.R. 17867. It is the last proviso under the military assistance section and reads:

*Provided further, That the Excess Defense Articles program for any country shall not be increased beyond twenty per centum of the amount presented to the Congress.*

In a letter to me dated May 11, 1970, Lt. Gen. Robert H. Warren, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Assistance and Sales, described the excess defense articles program this way:

The distribution of excess assets to eligible MAP recipients is controlled by a well-defined system. Requirements are developed, in accordance with DOD guidance, by our Military Assistance Advisory Groups in the foreign countries and are reviewed and approved by the Unified Commands and the Department of Defense. The Military Departments identify available assets under strict formulae. A Defense Control Group, which includes representation from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Department of State and all interested elements of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, supervises the distribution, against approved requirements, of the assets reported by the Military Departments.

The proposed program that emerges after this joint State-Defense review is presented on a country-by-country basis to the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, on which I have sat for 12 years.

As a result of what I discovered in the case of China last year, I became concerned over the accuracy of the estimates that were being presented to the subcommittee. Therefore, I did a little more work on the subject.

On April 6, 1970, I wrote General Warren requesting some more figures on the worldwide and the Taiwan programs.

Two sets of figures are now used in the excess property program. "Utility value" represents approximately 25 percent of new value. "Acquisition value" is the new value or the cost at purchase. For purposes of my remarks, I will be using "acquisition value."

By letter dated April 20, General Warren sent me the figures I had requested. They showed that the proposed 1970 program for Taiwan was \$341,000 and that the midyear program had jumped over 400 times to \$143.9 million. They also showed that the 1970 worldwide program

had increased from \$79.6 million to \$523.3 million, or almost eight times the original estimate.

The worldwide and Taiwan figures for preceding years reflect similar increases, and I would like to include them in the RECORD now so that my colleagues can see these increases:

WORLDWIDE TOTAL—EXCESS STOCKS AT ACQUISITION VALUE			
[In thousands of dollars]			
Year	Proposed program	Program at midyear	Final program
Fiscal year:			
1971.....	\$ 521,177	\$ 521,177	521,177
1970.....	79,603	523,369	523,369
1969.....	106,974	164,262	355,321
1968.....	129,667	139,517	221,677
1967.....	66,275	82,080	112,484
1966.....	65,040	151,992	154,777
1965.....	19,944	57,763	253,062
1964.....	48,704	27,562	122,499
1963.....	48,179	112,535	105,827
1962.....	28,952	121,963	141,112
1961.....	77,219	44,355	54,787
1960.....	84,593	60,207	115,321
1959.....	74,349	330,757	225,138
1950-58.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	2,009,967
total (fiscal year 50-71).....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	4,896,518

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

<sup>2</sup> Not available.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA—EXCESS STOCKS AT ACQUISITION VALUE			
[In thousands of dollars]			
Year	Proposed program	Program at midyear	Final program
Fiscal year:			
1971.....	438	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
1970.....	341	143,985	( <sup>1</sup> )
1969.....	19,127	41,683	76,953
1968.....	27,263	47,459	34,480
1967.....	2,007	3,581	7,128
1966.....	5,226	2,755	10,913
1965.....	270	2	7,701
1964.....	249	6	8,841
1963.....	1,147	78	5,204
1962.....	3,926	2,274	2,271
1961.....	1,930	1,683	1,683
1960.....	25,224	2,149	38,392
1959.....	2,793	168,706	109,763
Cumulative 1950-58.....			237,334

<sup>1</sup> Estimate of final program for this fiscal year available only as a world-wide total. It has not been distributed by country.

The extent and consistency of these overruns troubled me. I wrote General Warren again on April 30 to get figures for all our surplus property recipients. And again, I found many overruns.

For example, the estimated fiscal 1969 program for Greece was \$12.9 million. The final program was \$67.4 million.

The estimated 1969 program for Korea was \$1.5 million. The final program skyrocketed to \$81.2 million.

The estimated fiscal 1968 program for the Philippines was \$634,000 and the final program was \$2.5 million.

Finally, turning to Latin America, the estimated fiscal 1965 program for Brazil was \$228,000. The final program was \$2.2 million.

I would like to include the breakdown on these four countries in the RECORD at this point:

EXCESS STOCKS PROGRAMMED			
[In thousands of dollars]			
Acquisition value			
	Proposed program	Program at midyear	Final program
GREECE			
Fiscal year:			
1969.....	12,928	46,678	67,447
1968.....	17,715	18,607	52,113
1967.....	10,698	25,445	31,427
1966.....	14,483	19,081	19,973
1965.....	597	13,521	28,512
1964.....	298	611	4,069

	Acquisition value		Final program
	Proposed program	Program at midyear	
Cumulative fiscal years 1950-63.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	129,702
<b>KOREA</b>			
Fiscal year:			
1969.....	1,554	1,534	81,288
1968.....	3,218	1,426	49,540
1967.....	4,159	6,998	10,039
1966.....	12,599	22,361	30,782
1965.....	362	3,723	11,618
1964.....	2,788	219	35,775
Cumulative fiscal years 1950-63.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	211,154
<b>PHILIPPINES</b>			
Fiscal year:			
1969.....	1,130	438	971
1968.....	634	915	2,536
1967.....	439	233	6,506
1966.....	10	88	639
1965.....	187	10	836
1964.....	767	802	1,215
Cumulative fiscal year 1950-63.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	55,015
<b>BRAZIL</b>			
Fiscal year:			
1969.....	102	11	217
1968.....	855	1,423	1,523
1967.....	2,498	3,201	5,058
1966.....	228	992	2,252
1965.....	3,667	1,450	1,116
Cumulative fiscal years 1950-63.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	72,513

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable.

The point I am trying to make is that we must exercise greater control over the excess defense articles program and we must require a greater degree of accuracy in the estimates for each country as well as the worldwide total. My amendment to the bill would do just this.

As I indicated earlier, it would require accuracy in the country by country estimates, and therefore in the world total. I might note that there is no escape clause from the prohibition against exceeding estimates by more than 20 percent.

I think approval of my amendment by this body will show the American people that Congress means business and that it will not tolerate abuses in the military aid program.

#### VIETNAM AID PROGRAM

During the subcommittee hearings, I had a very interesting discussion with Mr. Donald G. MacDonald, Director of the U.S. AID mission to Vietnam. I was trying to find out the extent to which the Vietnam AID program depended upon U.S. military assistance.

The following discussion appears on page 733 of part 2 of the foreign aid hearings:

Mr. CONTE. May I ask one question? There is a growing movement in Congress to cut out all the funds for the military in Vietnam. If this prevails, do you feel you are in a position to carry out an AID program in Vietnam without the military?

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, if the military weren't there, if that implies the coming of peace, we could carry out a whole of an AID program, sir.

Mr. CONTE. I am not saying that. . . . My question to you is: You have been out there 4 years. Can you run an AID program with-

out any U.S. military combat troops in Vietnam?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CONTE. You are not going to be bothered by Communists or anybody else? You can go ahead and do it?

Mr. MACDONALD. We can run an AID program.

I consider this an interesting discussion because here we have an AID official who has spent 4 years in Vietnam and is now Director of the mission there saying AID could go on without U.S. combat troops. I am sure my colleagues will find it equally interesting.

#### CONTE-LONG AMENDMENT

I would finally like to turn to a military assistance problem that I have followed closely over the years. I refer to the transfer of military hardware by the United States to the developing nations.

I have long felt that the United States should not become the weapons arsenal for the free world.

It is bad enough when the recipient can afford our new and shiny weapons. It is even worse when the recipient cannot, and that is why I amended the foreign aid bill back in 1967 to prohibit the transfer of sophisticated weapons to less developed countries.

In view of efforts last year and now to water down my amendment, I would like to explain what the committee did with it. In effect, it took the same action that it did on the fiscal 1970 bill.

You will note that in the second proviso under military assistance, we have retained a general prohibition on the use of aid funds to furnish sophisticated weapons to developing nations. There are five exceptions—Greece, Turkey, China, the Philippines, and Korea.

We have also retained section 119, the penalty clause. The President must withhold in economic assistance the amount a less developed country, except the five just mentioned, spends on sophisticated weapons. This is mandatory, unless the President himself determines such purchase is important to our national security and reports such determination to us in 30 days.

The addition of new section 120 to the fiscal 1970 bill, and its inclusion again this year, does not change what I have said.

In other words, the intent of the committee is to retain the Conte-Long amendment as it was. I certainly support this action because, as I have said many times in the past, these countries do not have the money to waste on elaborate weapons systems.

#### CONCLUSION

I conclude these remarks by repeating my opposition to the huge cuts made by the committee in the area of economic assistance. I think foreign aid has a role to play in the 1970's just as it had a role to play in the 1960's, the 1950's, and the late 1940's.

I recognize, however, and I have for some time, that changes must be made in this program. One such change would be a new and increased emphasis upon working through a multilateral framework. I have already discussed the unfortunate action taken by the committee in this regard.

In ending my remarks last year, I said:

Our noble efforts to lift the development burdens of the less-developed nations have been offset by a misguided and unfortunate preoccupation with military adventures—a preoccupation at odds not only with the goals of our economic aid program, but also with the resources necessary to accomplish those goals.

We remain, in my opinion, preoccupied with military adventures, and so long as we do, our economic assistance programs will suffer.

The Pearson report gave a good answer to the question of "Why Aid?" when it appealed not only to morality but also to enlightened and constructive self-interest. It went on to say:

In short, we face an essential need and an unprecedented opportunity. International development is a great challenge of our age. Our response to it will show whether we understand the implications of interdependence or whether we prefer to delude ourselves that the poverty and deprivation of the great majority of mankind can be ignored without tragic consequences for all.

I urge my colleagues to study these words carefully.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. One of the reasons given for classifying this information was that, in the release that was made public, the Secretary of State had been quoted out of context. Would not the best way—if he really wanted to clear up whether he had been quoted out of context—be to release the whole document so the public would see for itself whether he had in fact been quoted out of context?

Mr. CONTE. As I said earlier, I have sat on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for 12 years. During that time, Secretary of State Dulles, Secretary of State Herter, Secretary of State Rusk, and now Secretary of State Rogers have appeared before the subcommittee.

The same is true of the various Secretaries of Defense who have held that position during the past 12 years. I remember when the current Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, was on the committee with me. He used to send documents back to Secretary of Defense McNamara and argue that they should not be classified.

I am sure the distinguished chairman will bear me out on that. It is the way we have worked during my 12 years on the committee.

I have never leaked anything out of the committee that was of a secret or confidential nature.

Now during the hearings on April 23 with Secretary of State William Rogers, I asked questions on a great number of things. I asked about Latin America, especially in light of the Rockefeller report and President Nixon's emphasis on this part of the world. I asked about the French sale of jets to Libya and the effect it would have upon the balance of arms in the Middle East. I asked about the entire Middle East situation, which I am sure my colleagues would agree is one of the most explosive ones facing the

world today. And I asked about many other issues.

These are all important questions that the public should know about. Yet now they are buried in the committee where nobody can read them.

The worst part about it is that my questions were classified. How is the national security adversely affected by what I have to ask? They were just plain frank questions that are being asked each and every day by citizens and constituents coming into our offices.

Mr. Chairman, if I sound disturbed, I am disturbed. I think that we in the Congress—we Members of the legislative branch of the Government—must stand up for our rights. Since the days of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, our power—the power of the legislative branch—has been eroded by the executive branch. Our power has also been eroded by the judicial branch where the Supreme Court has, upon occasion, taken a license to legislate through its decisions.

If you like what you are doing, and you believe in what you are doing, then you must fight for your rights and you must stand up for your rights. That is why I am so disturbed.

Let me repeat, so that it is absolutely clear, that I do not fault Secretary Rogers. He was merely doing his job, and I think he is doing a very good job. I told him so during the subcommittee hearings. The burdens that he must bear are extremely heavy.

The final decision, however, should be with the committee, and it is with the action of the committee that I am upset.

As I said earlier, basic constitutional questions are involved in this series of events. That is why five subcommittee members requested a meeting with the subcommittee chairman. I regret very much that we did not have the opportunity to discuss the Secretary's request with him.

The committee and the Congress have very important decisions to make regarding Federal spending for programs of foreign assistance. I want to see the committee and the Congress make them forthrightly, and in cases not specifically involving the national security, openly before all the Members of this body and before the American public.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I would like to say a special word of commendation for our subcommittee's dedicated chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), and our extremely able ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), for the capable leadership they have provided as we have endeavored to evaluate and assess foreign assistance requests for fiscal 1971. In view of the enormity of our Nation's aid commitments throughout the world—to 103 countries and territories in 1971—and the increasing domestic needs at home during a period when it is necessary to curtail Federal expenditures

wherever possible because of continuing inflationary pressures, this annual reappraisal has been a most difficult task, to say the least, and we are fortunate to have the special knowledge and experience these gentlemen contribute to this discussion. I believe the record of the hearings this year as well as the committee report gives all of us a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of our foreign assistance program. I consider it an honor and a privilege to serve on the subcommittee.

The appropriations included in House Resolution 17867 are based on the second of a 2-year authorization program passed by the Congress and enacted into law last year. My subcommittee has reported to the House the lowest foreign aid recommendations in the history of these programs. We have reduced the total bill some \$203 million below the fiscal 1970 level and \$575 million below the budget requests submitted by the President.

Another factor which we considered in marking up the bill—in addition to the present financial situation confronting the United States—is the pending submission of recommendations by the President concerning the future direction of foreign assistance programs which may embrace various recommendations submitted by the Peterson task force in March 1970.

President Nixon has determined that continued foreign aid is in our national interest and I feel that the appropriations recommended by the committee will provide adequate funding for a low-level program pending the major redirections in our aid programs and a redefinition of the aid process itself which must come early next year. The purpose of foreign assistance is to help less-developed countries achieve self-sustaining growth and then to go out of business. AID has achieved this objective and hence phased out its operations in some countries and it is close to its objective in other countries which are expected to attain self-sustaining growth rates during this decade. With the establishment of the new Overseas Private Investment Corporation there will be greater incentive for investors to join in partnership with the Government in providing opportunities for private enterprise in the developing countries and thus reduce the need for assistance.

The Nixon administration has announced its intention to reduce our Armed Forces by a million men as the Vietnamization program proceeds and men are brought home from various other parts of the world. Under the new Nixon doctrine, it has been determined that each nation must do its share and make its fair contribution. However, as part of this doctrine, it has been stated that a continued and revitalized economic and military assistance program is necessary if we are to honor our obligations, support our allies, and reduce the likelihood of having to commit American forces to overseas battle.

Although I have not been an enthusiastic supporter of foreign assistance in past years, I do intend to vote for this bill. In my opinion, my committee has done a capable job in reducing the request to

the bare essentials and I feel the President should be given this latitude to carry forward the program for an additional year until he has had an opportunity to decide what new direction should be taken in the future.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE).

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concern with sections 504 and 505 of the appropriation bill which would provide for the ADB and IDA to be subject to a GAO audit, and for each project these institutions finance, to be brought before the Congress for detailed justification.

These two sections of the bill contradict the whole concept of the multilateral approach—where we have other countries take on a share of development finance. They violate the charter and basic principles on which the Asian Bank and IDA are established. Legally, it seems to me that the charters of the two institutions would prevent them from being able to accept this U.S. payment with such conditions attached—a payment which Congress has earlier authorized the U.S. Government to pledge.

The basic question is: Does the United States favor the use of the multilateral banks—where others share the costs with us—as one technique for financing economic development in the developing nations of the world?

I know many of us feel that the multilateral banks provide distinct advantages. That is why the United States has played such a key role in establishing these banks. That is also why Congress has authorized the United States to join and to provide its appropriate share of the resources needed by these banks.

I stress one of the advantages to the United States of the multilateral banks and that is burden sharing. They provide perhaps our most effective machinery for assuring that all donor countries share the assistance burden—not the United States paying the bill alone. It is no accident that reliance on these banks increased sharply during the 1960's, when the United States was trying to get the industrial countries of Europe and Japan to take on a share of the aid burden which the United States had largely borne before.

The bill before us gives ample evidence of the burden-sharing benefits of the multilateral banks. In the Asian Development Banks, for every \$1 which it is proposed we put up for ordinary capital, other countries will put up \$4. In IDA, for every U.S. contribution of \$1, other countries put up \$1.50.

I think the multilateral banks have time and again proved their usefulness—not only for burden sharing, but for their experience and knowledge in dealing with complicated development problems. There is a political importance too, for we remove the mendicant relationship and the appearance of meddling in other countries' domestic affairs. The multilateral banks also serve a useful role as intermediaries between aid donors and recipients. I do not think it is in the interest of the United States—or the world community—for us to shift away

from the multilateral banks. Quite the contrary. The experience of recent years has been toward greater rather than less emphasis on the multilateral channels for assistance. The Peterson Commission has strongly recommended increased multilateralism, and President Nixon has stated he intends to follow that approach.

But multilateralism means we are one participant in a cooperative effect. We do not have the same degree of control that we have over bilateral, wholly U.S.-financed programs. It would not be appropriate for us or for any one member to have that degree of control. The United States is a minority stockholder in these institutions. We have a major voice and influence in the banks but the views of other members must also be reflected. In the Asian Bank we are one member out of 34. In IDA we are one member out of 104. The banks must operate on the basis of consensus of all members, large or small, donor and recipient. That is the multilateral concept and it is the only way these banks can operate if they are to be genuinely multilateral institutions.

Sections 504 and 505 are alien to this multilateral concept. Section 504 calls for GAO audit of the institutions. The banks are now audited by independent auditing firms of international repute—Haskins and Sells audits ADB and Price Waterhouse audits IDA. The results of these audits are available to all member nations and are carefully examined each year by the U.S. agencies responsible for our participation in the banks. These audits and the loan transactions are reported to the Congress.

A requirement for an additional audit on the part of the United States or any other member, would not be in keeping with the international character of the two banks, their charters, their status and congressionally approved immunities. The U.S. voice in the operations of the banks is appropriately reflected through our membership on the Board of Governors and the Board of Directors. For each of the 34 members of the Asian Bank to have a separate audit of the bank's operations, each filing its reports on how it thinks the bank should operate, and how it should have spent its funds would make a mockery of multilateralism.

Similarly, the proposal in section 504 calling for detailed justification before the Congress for each project or activity would be completely alien to the multilateral concept and would place an improper restraint on the bank's activities. If each donor country were to have its own rigid controls over how the bank's funds were spent, it would mean that we would be running a series of bilateral assistance programs under the guise of a multilateral bank. Not only would this be improper but it would be entirely unacceptable to all other members.

In sum, I think there are major advantages for the United States in following the multilateral approach, and I think that if we are to participate in these banks we must do so honestly, recognizing that we should not try to exercise detailed control over the banks.

We cannot have a baseball team where each player has his own umpire and his own set of rules. We cannot have a corporation where each stockholder controls how his share of the company funds is used. I think this body should consider this issue long and hard, and be extremely careful in deciding to attack the multilateral agencies in the manner here proposed.

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

Mr. MIZE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It want to compliment the gentleman on a very penetrating statement. I agree with him. There is really an apparent distrust of multilateral organizations shown in this bill. This is true of reductions in the development loan requests, and the cutbacks in international organizations, and also in the proposed audit of the international banks.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kansas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the reduction of \$37,620,000 in the funds requested for multilateral organizations. This cutback would allow only \$85 million for these vital programs and would particularly affect the operations of the United Nations development program.

UNDP is now receiving \$100 million a year from the United States. This generates almost twice as many dollars from the developing countries assisted by UNDP. In 1970, UNDP has a total program of \$225 million which generates almost \$450 million. Our investment, therefore, is one that has a significant multiplier effect.

More importantly, it is very much in the American interest to speed the development of developing countries. Beyond the obvious humanitarian reasons, UNDP assistance helps to encourage productivity which in turn increases real income in the recipient nation. These nations then become customers for American exports, and surely there is no argument over the fact that we need foreign importers for American products.

While there has been some concern expressed over the ability of UNDP to handle an increased program, Mr. Paul Hoffman, UNDP Administrator, informs me that he has assured the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) that changes are being made in programming and operation. I have full confidence in Mr. Hoffmann's proven ability to manage a successful program of whatever size and surely there is no justification for a reduction in the ongoing appropriation. The United States has a direct economic interest in the work of the United Nations development program and I would hope that the funds will be restored to their full \$100 million level in the Senate.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the ranking

minority Republican member, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), for the very conscientious work which he has done in the course of developing this bill and, particularly, I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), who has been indefatigable in bringing to the attention of the Congress and the taxpayers the history and the dimensions of our foreign aid. He has shown that foreign aid, far from being a small and insignificant program is, in fact, a growing and proliferating one. He has drawn to the attention of the Members of the House of the fact that efforts to extend loan guarantees and multilateral programs are efforts to hide from Congress and the public the manner in which our aid money is being expended.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend the gentleman from Kansas for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak briefly about the fact that in the committee report I have presented some supplemental views. I have very strong feelings about the subject matter of those supplemental views, and I would recommend them to the Members of the Committee of the Whole for your consideration.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to go further and repeat a comment I made in our subcommittee when Secretary of State Rogers appeared as a witness. I said at the time and I say again today I think he is one of the outstanding men in the Nixon administration and one for whom I have great personal regard. I think Secretary Rogers has done a good job under difficult circumstances. Certainly, I would not want my supplemental views to be construed as an expression of a lack of confidence in the Secretary of State. I have great confidence in him. I think he is an outstanding man and I hope he will continue to serve through the remainder of this administration.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would not want my supplemental views to indicate any lack of feeling or high regard for my subcommittee chairman whom I consider a good friend.

The point I wish to make is this. What we need to recognize is the fact that over a long period of time the Congress has seen its coequal responsibilities as an independent body of the Federal Government whittled away by the executive branch, and in some instances by the judicial branch of the Government. This is a pre-Nixon administration problem and I raise it not as a matter of a new problem with this administration, but a problem of long-term duration.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that when we allow our constitutional prerogatives to be invaded or eroded or whittled away, we do so at great peril to the basic concept of our Government. Under our Constitution we are supposed to operate as co-equal branches and I think this works well in practice. I do not think we have to apologize for the Constitution of the United States and

the government structure which it brought into being. I think to the extent we have difficulties it is often because we do not let that structure work in the manner in which it was intended to work. It's time for the Congress to step up to the full measure of its responsibilities—and resist the steady encroachment of the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying that my supplemental views are presented in that frame of reference. I hope that every Member will read these views, I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

It should be brought to the attention of House Members that Secretary of State Rogers—in an act without precedent on this Subcommittee—asked that his entire cross-examination testimony before our Committee be erased from the public record. It is my belief that all the subcommittee members were willing to agree to reasonable modifications and deletions; but to erase all the testimony—including all the questions of the subcommittee members—sets an unreasonable and potentially dangerous precedent. For reasons that are not clear, my good friend and colleague the Chairman of our Subcommittee agreed to this unusual request.

Although I have grave reservations about this—particularly the classifying of the Members' questions—I will defer to the Secretary and his apparent concern about the national security impact of these questions at this time. However, certain things should be made clear.

Although five Members of this subcommittee asked, in writing, to formally discuss this matter, the press of time and events prevented such a subcommittee meeting.

The testimony in question involved a broad range of issues relating to foreign aid and foreign policy—including a detailed discussion of Cambodia and the possible use of United States troops in that country some seven days before the movement of American troops into Cambodia.

The issue of Mr. Rogers' testimony before the Subcommittee has important significance to the House and to the country. As is well known by now, a portion of his testimony was apparently released by another Subcommittee Member and found its way into public print. These excerpts have been widely quoted from coast-to-coast.

Without repeating the verbatim quotes that have already appeared in public print—the Secretary, as quoted in the press, expressed the gravest reservations about the possible use of American forces in Cambodia. Further, he indicated that the Administration was absolutely pledged to consult in detail with the Congress prior to any introduction of American troops in Cambodia.

Taken as a whole, the Secretary's testimony was exactly contrary to Administration policy as it was revealed just seven days later. For the Secretary to now erase all his testimony from the record is a very dubious step and can only result in damaging the credibility of the Administration. It is one more pointed example of an ever-weakening House of Representatives willingly surrendering its co-equal Constitutional prerogatives to an increasingly all-powerful Executive Branch.

By his testimony, Secretary Rogers was inadvertently telling the Committee that another opposing opinion existed in the Executive Branch that apparently wields immense power and influence but does not report to the Congress.

I refer to the President's special advisors on national security affairs. This exclusive

inner circle of men who are making our national strategic decisions have Congressional immunity. They are isolated from Congressional opinion and interrogation, they are not required to meet the press, and they answer directly to no constituency. The base of power that they maintain in the Executive Office building falls outside our established system of checks and balances. As was demonstrated by the country's recent move into Cambodia, they exert far greater influence over national security affairs than our Congressional leaders—or members of the President's own Cabinet.

The President's reliance on an elite group of men to help him make strategic foreign policy decisions is not unique to the Nixon Administration. President Kennedy entrusted similar responsibilities to McGeorge Bundy and Theodore Sorenson, and former President Johnson's reliance on Mr. Rostow with respect to the Vietnam War is well known. Like Mr. Kissinger, President Nixon's current advisor on national security affairs, these men also worked under the protective umbrella of the Executive office and were thus shielded from public scrutiny and the veto power of the ballot box. It has been correctly observed that the Congress is not always hearing from the men who are making the critical decisions in the Executive Branch. Instead, it is often hearing from official spokesmen or functionaries who may be outside the decision-making process.

Given the potentially divisive nature to foreign policy initiatives like the Cambodian invasion, common sense suggests that these men should be required to appear before the Congress. If Cabinet Secretaries are required to justify their policies and programs to the Congress, it is not too much to ask these other advisors—who deal with the issues of war and peace—to also testify. The Constitution is most specific in placing the war power, the ultimate instrument of foreign policy, in the hands of Congress, and it could never be concluded that this group of advisors inherited this responsibility directly, or indirectly, because of their seat on the National Security Council.

In addition to the accumulated "war power" role of these men, there is the more practical question of how the Congress can make intelligent decisions on Committee Appropriations when some of the best information in the Executive Branch is being withheld from them. Under present circumstances, we are being asked on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee to allocate taxpayers' dollars without access to the total body, and apparent controlling portion, of opinion in the Executive Branch. This can only dilute the effectiveness of this Committee and the Congress, and cause the public to wonder if its money is being intelligently spent. I would hope that in any future hearings before this Committee on military or economic assistance, these advisors would appear in person so that the Congress can better discharge its Constitutional responsibilities. Cambodia has vividly demonstrated that there is too much at stake to do otherwise.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has just spoken in regard to the separate views that have been filed. May I say that I am not in agreement with those separate views. It has been the precedent of the committee for many years to assure the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, or whoever may be testifying on matters concerned with our national security, that they will have the opportunity to review their remarks and to classify those

discussions that may affect the national security.

The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, announced before Mr. Rogers testified that he would have this opportunity. When Mr. Rogers came up he was given this assurance. This testimony was received before the Cambodian decision was made. The precedent of the committee has been to permit deletion of things that may be of importance to the national security. I would hope that no one would understand that this incident establishes any new precedent.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman from Louisiana in the position he has taken in permitting these matters to be taken out of the printed hearings.

The question of taking only answers out of the record is a separate problem. This could cause more trouble than leaving the answers in, because one could infer answer from the questions that could be worse, or even more damaging than the actual replies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur in the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

During the general conversation in the committee, prior to the Secretary testifying, the Secretary said that he would welcome general questions, but with respect to certain questions, if the responses were to be very meaningful the discussion should be off the record.

So we assured the Secretary that he could speak on the record, and then could remove from the record everything that he felt would not be in the best interest of our national security.

Furthermore, it was later indicated in a letter concerning the testimony that "the questions themselves often contain classified material drawn from previous responses. The sensitivity of material throughout the exchange is such that we remain strongly of the opinion, as stated in the Secretary's letter, that the published record should show only the prepared statement, and the rest of the text remain classified."

I support the views of the gentleman from Ohio, and I support the Secretary's views. I think the best interests of our country have been served by the actions of the Secretary, because I must admit that we went into court with dirty hands. Now, the distinguished gentleman who is accused of leaking information was quite forthright, and he did not go behind the curtains. He said, "Yes, I made the remark," and I praise the gentleman for being so forthright. Some other leaks that have occurred on the committee, the individuals have not been so forthright.

The Members may go in the committee room and read every word the Secretary of State said, and they themselves can form their own opinions. But

I support the Secretary's statement, and the views of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) has said. In my opinion it is most unfortunate that this information was actually given out. This is something that had never been done before by the Committee on Appropriations. I hope it will not happen again.

These are days in which we have to be very careful of what we do and say. I submit that a release of this type a few days after the testimony was given is a great mistake.

We have to respect and protect the integrity of the executive and legislative branches of Government. I would hope that this would never happen again.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I would like to say that I heard the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, congratulate the Committee on Rules today for bringing out the rule concerned with this bill. This is fine. I wish I were able to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs today for having brought out all the necessary legislation prior to today so we would not have had to request a rule.

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

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, is talking about an authorization for foreign assistance?

Mr. BOW. Necessary authorization is exactly what I am talking about. In the past the Committee on Appropriations has been accused of not bringing out their bills in due time. This year we announced a schedule but we have still not had the necessary Committee on Foreign Affairs bill upon which to appropriate.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Ohio is absolutely right.

What he meant was the Peace Corps, because they have no foreign assistance authorization this year. They passed a 2-year authorization so they had nothing to do—nothing to do but to pass the Peace Corps authorization bill.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I say the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out the incorrectness of the statement of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio. The Committee on Appropriations has had authorizing legislation for foreign aid since last year. Now how much longer than that do you need a bill upon which to appropriate?

Mr. BOW. I will say this to the gentleman from Indiana. I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin has questions that he wants to raise about this bill, but we have not received all the neces-

sary authorization from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I only wish we could have acted on the necessary authorization bill first, so we would not have had to ask for a rule. I do not like to ask for rules. I would hope we could get all the legislative committees to promptly bring their bills to the floor before we appropriate.

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

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. What the gentleman from Ohio is saying is—yes, we had an authorization bill but we did not have a Peace Corps authorization bill and we did not have the military sales credit authorization bill. There we were—wanting for youth corps—we have been through with all the hearings for months—at least 2 months, and we were waiting until your committee would pass out that small piece of legislation.

Here we are today and they are going to raise a point of order against it as I understand, and that is going to set us back another 2 weeks in the Congress.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, there is probably no Government program which receives more scrutiny and more criticism than our foreign assistance program. At the same time, however, there is probably no program which, for a very limited investment, can make a greater contribution to future world stability and peaceful development.

The foreign aid program has not been perfect. After the astounding successes of the Marshall plan, following World War II, we have been perplexed and frustrated by the slower, far less spectacular, and problematic progress that is involved in helping developing countries. Too often, limited and parochial political perspectives obscure our view of the long range importance, as much to ourselves as to the other peoples of the world, of contributing to the development of other countries.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which is before us today would appropriate \$2.4 billion for all foreign and military assistance. Of that figure, only \$1.3 billion would be allocated to all the programs of economic technical and development assistance, throughout the world. That figure is some \$555 million less than the budget request, and more than \$167 million less than was expended last year.

At a time when literally millions and millions of people around the world are in need of every assistance they can get in order to build up their own capacities as nations, to feed, clothe, and house themselves, the United States, the most powerful and wealthiest country in the world, will not provide the financial and technical assistance of which we are capable.

Mr. Chairman, I point to one example in the present bill. Some \$122 million was requested for multilateral organizations providing technical assistance. This is the program through which the United States contributes her vast technical and professional expertise to the

developing countries in an effort to build their own capability to meet and solve problems. This technical assistance includes U.S. contributions to such programs as the United Nations Children's Fund, which tries to help those young and innocent victims of war, poverty, and disease all over the world, the U.N. world food program, the U.N. population program, the World Health Organization, and other equally obviously meritorious efforts, including the United Nations Development Fund. The UNDP is the major source of multilateral technical and preinvestment aid to poorer countries. It conducts surveys of mineral, land, and power resources and provides training and aid to industry and agriculture, which will then stimulate needed financing from the World Bank, private investment, and other sources. It has been acclaimed for its positive accomplishments.

The committee bill recommends an appropriation of \$85 million for all these programs—multilateral programs to which we are only asked to contribute modest amounts in the promise of far greater returns. And the returns are great.

Of all the studies of our foreign assistance which have been made over the years, none has failed to note the importance of channeling more U.S. assistance through multinational organizations. When the United States is coming under increasing criticism in other countries for the way in which our aid is handled—and when such criticism has often led to severe reaction in the Congress in terms of reducing the amounts of foreign assistance—what could be more obvious than the advantages of making an increased contribution to solving world problems, in concert with other nations. The merits are clear—the assistance can be given where it is needed, but at the same time, the United States does not become the brunt of critical attack.

And the less the United States contributes to multilateral organizations, such as the U.N. development program, the less other moneys that program is able to generate. The fact is, that for every dollar the United States contributes to multilateral organizations, one and a half times that amount is generated from other contributing countries. And, perhaps more important, these contributions have a multiplier effect in the recipient country, generating two and a half times the original contribution in terms of economic development.

The committee report states the rationale for so reducing the U.S. contribution to the U.N. development program—referring to a recent study carried on by the U.N. of its own development program's capacities, the committee argued that the report found the UNDP "has not been operating in the most effective manner."

Mr. Chairman, the report, submitted by a group headed by Sir Robert Jackson of Australia, did indeed note the problems faced by the U.N. development program. These problems result from the tremendous growth in the program's size and the need for a better organization to effectively administer the anticipated

future growth of the program. Certainly this is no reason to reduce our contribution. If the capacity of the UNDP to handle the burgeoning problems of development all around the globe is overextended, the response should not be to reduce our support, but to increase it.

We need to recognize one basic fact. The needs of developing countries will increase in the future—they will certainly not be met by a declining interest in and support of this Government's modest aid programs by those of us in the Congress. Do we not have the foresight to see that if we permit the gap between ourselves and the poorer countries of the world to continue, inexorably, to widen, that in the end it is we ourselves who will be in need of help?

Mr. HALEY, Mr. Chairman, this bill to continue our program for the redistribution of the wealth of the United States to other countries of the world—in this case to 99 countries and six territories—comes before us at a very significant time.

It comes only a day after the House has been forced again—forced by the necessity for keeping up with our obligations—to increase the national debt ceiling. The significance lies in the fact that over the years of the foreign aid program, its expenditures have closely paralleled the increase in the national debt.

I would point out to you, for example, that the national debt in fiscal year 1960 stood at \$286 billion, 330 million. In fiscal 1969 it had risen to \$353 billion, 720 million. And in that period, the total of U.S. foreign aid expenditures was \$54 billion, 190 million. It is a simple exercise in mathematics to see, therefore, that foreign aid outlays accounted for about 82 percent of the increase in the national debt in those years—and they were years of war.

The able chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. PASSMAN, has included in the report on this bill now before us a table which shows that our total outlays for foreign aid since inception of the program have amounted to \$133,444 million. This compares with an increase of \$146,230 million in the public debt in the same period. Thus, foreign aid represents about 90 percent of the debt increase.

But—listen to this: The same table in the report contains an informed estimate that—as it was necessary for us to borrow most of the money poured into this giveaway—the accumulated interest on those borrowings amounted to more than \$66 billion. Thus, the real cost of foreign aid to the taxpayers has been \$199 billion—or 136 percent of the increase in the national debt.

Personally, I need no other evidence to prove that the foreign aid program has gravely damaged the national economy and that its continuance can bring disaster to us. I wholeheartedly commend the gentleman from Louisiana and his subcommittee for achieving a reduction of \$575 million in the budget request for this program. But I cannot support this bill.

Mr. HALPERN, Mr. Chairman, the foreign assistance and related programs

appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971 adds two qualifications to the appropriations for the ADB and IDA. The appropriations involved are the fifth and final installment of \$20 million for our subscription to the paid-in capital of the Asian Development Bank and the third and final installment of the U.S. contribution to the second replenishment of the International Development Association.

In sections 504 and 505 of the bill there are two conditions on the availability of these funds for expenditure. First, there must be a GAO audit of the expenditures. This means that there must be a GAO audit of the ADB and IDA expenditures of these appropriations. Second, there must be a detailed justification to Congress of each project or activity. This provision may imply that each loan of the ADB and IDA as it comes up for board approval would have to be justified.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that these two provisions contained in the bill before us would most seriously impair our ability to participate in the ADB and the IDA. The terms and conditions on which the U.S. contribution and the contributions of all other countries are made available to the Asian Bank and the IDA are laid down in their articles of agreement and in certain resolutions of the Board of Governors of these institutions. It would be legally impossible for these institutions to accept the U.S. contribution with new conditions not contained in these documents without amendment of these documents requiring the consent of the other member nations.

Moreover, there is a broad policy question involved. If the United States can impose conditions on its contribution then any member could equally impose conditions on its own contribution. If this were to happen we would not have multilateral banks that have achieved such great success but a series of individual special funds governed by a complex of conflicting rules and regulations. The effect would be to destroy multilateral banks.

I strongly feel that a GAO audit and detailed advance justifications of particular projects and loans are completely inconsistent with the multilateral character of these highly desirable multilateral financial institutions. It is basic to their character that no individual member can impose its own auditing requirements on the bank as a condition of the use of its funds. It is essential to their multilateral character that no member can refuse to allow its funds to be used for a particular project because that project had not been justified to its internal authorities, including its Congress or Parliament.

The issue of U.S. audits of international institutions has been considered by Congress before and the Congress has rejected such audits. Congress has provided for GAO audits of certain funds under international administration where all the funds were contributed by the United States—the Maillard amendment. Congress has provided for a directive to the U.S. executive director to request the executive board of the IDB

to establish a multilateral audit of that institution—the Seiden amendment to the Inter-American Development Bank Act. Congress has specifically rejected GAO audits of the multilateral institutions because such audits would be inconsistent with their multilateral character.

There is no argument, Mr. Chairman, that audits are an important management tool and should be used to assure effective and efficient operations. But it should be pointed out that IDA and the ADB are now subject to comprehensive audits by independent accountants of international reputation—Haskins and Sells in the case of the ADB and Price Waterhouse for IDA. Of course, more can always be done to improve the internal management systems of all institutions both public and private and every effort will be made in multilateral channels to accomplish this objective.

While the objectives of the amendments are commendable to provide full information to the Congress on the activities of the IDA and ADB, this goal should be accomplished without placing a limitation on the use of U.S. contributions. Full justifications are now provided at the time contributions are authorized and during annual appropriations hearings. In addition, the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury has emphasized the need for closer and continuing communication between the Treasury and the Congress including information on matters of particular interest to the Congress.

Sections 504 and 505 do not belong in this legislation and should be deleted from the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 17867, the foreign aid bill. In reading the report on this bill, I would say that it voices many of the same concerns that have troubled me about our foreign aid program.

I would like to quote from the committee report:

The Committee is also aware of a few cases where aid recipient countries have expropriated or "nationalized" property owned by U.S. investors. While the Committee realizes that nations around the world are sovereign entities and the U.S. should not try to impose its will over these nations, it is highly critical of the practice of providing increased aid programs or continuing present programs of assistance to recipient countries who are often the most flagrant violators of our foreign aid program objectives.

And again, later in the report:

In the last several years, the requests have been reduced by about 30% and in all probability the programs have still been overfunded. This can be evidenced by the fact that large unexpended balances presently exist in this program, as was previously discussed.

I would add that these comments were not part of the separate views, but were in the body of the report.

My contention today, as it has been in the past, is that the State Department has proceeded along a direction but has not checked that course on a systematic basis and thus, we find that no proper evaluation has been made as to our in-

vestments abroad through the foreign aid program. As a result, I feel we are mispending millions of dollars. Giving aid to friends is one thing.

But, for instance, sending \$1.9 million to Jordan after that nation's government condoned riots against the American Embassy in Amman, is something else again. Our Assistant Secretary of State, Joseph J. Sisco, was forced to cancel his official visit to Jordan because of these riots.

Jordanian demonstrators burned four official cars, tore down the American flag, ripped the seal of the United States from the Embassy wall and trampled it.

I hardly think this is sound reason why the United States should continue to help prop up the Government of Jordan, especially in light of the fact that the United States literally paid for the Jordanian budget for several years.

There are other examples. But we should look also at the situation here in the United States. The President has just asked for an \$18 billion increase in the national debt ceiling. This very morning there was evidence that our own budget would run a \$5 to \$8 billion deficit for 1970 when we anticipated, according to the President's statement last year, a surplus. Taxes are high and the cost of living is continuing to climb. Unemployment is rising and building is down.

In general, I think that we should look to the many problems we have here at home and try to solve them before we send almost \$2 billion overseas.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which directs itself to the problem of the illegal traffic in narcotics flowing into this country from foreign sources. Essentially the foreign aid bill is a perfect vehicle to implement what should be the beginning of our efforts internationally to stop the illegal flow of drugs into this country.

By allowing the President to determine whether or not foreign aid recipients are directly or indirectly contributing to our drug problem through neglect or apathy or Government corruption, the threatened loss of foreign aid assistance dollars will be a viable weapon in the war against drugs and crime here in the United States.

Producer-grower nations which are also recipients of U.S. foreign aid, should not be allowed to accept millions of hard earned American tax dollars and ignore, at the same time, our pleas for cooperation and assistance in cracking down on international dope smuggling rings that operate in their countries. By forcing the recipients of foreign aid dollars to consider the consequences of a possible loss of this economic assistance, foreign government leaders will, of necessity, have to look within their own bureaucracy to uncover those that either knowingly aid the underworld through bribes, or apathetically ignore their duties.

Foreign controls of foreign aid dollars in this instance will reap vast economic benefits for the United States. By cutting off the supply of drugs at the source, we lessen the spread of narcotics abuse in America. Ultimately this will reduce our crime rates that result from narcotics addiction. The cost of crime directly

attributable to narcotics addiction runs into the billions annually. I need not say what physical effects narcotics has on its victims, nor need I repeat the horrifying effects of drug abuse at the grade schools level in this Nation.

This amendment parallels, in content and substance, a bill I have introduced today to provide the President with the power to suspend American economic and military assistance to any nation which fails to take appropriate action to prevent narcotics from entering the United States through their supply routes.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this floor amendment today and to consider the value of this legislation when it is applied to other foreign aid programs.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am dismayed that in the bill before us the Appropriations Committee has made such deep cuts in the economic and technical assistance aspects of the foreign assistance program, and I hope that these cuts will be restored in the future progress of this legislation through the Congress.

It is discouraging to hear Members attack this program as if we in the United States had no interest whatsoever in the welfare of our fellow citizens of the world in less fortunate areas. I should have thought that the vision of the earth, as seen from near the moon, would have increased the realization that mankind occupies a relatively small neighborhood, and that we cannot escape our obligations to serve as good neighbors, one to another.

Other nations, following the urging of American representatives, have gradually increased their contributions to the development of the so-called third world. It is tragic that the contribution of the United States, as the richest nation in the world, should be going steadily down.

I particularly deplore the drastic cuts in the multilateral programs, such as the United Nations development program. These programs cost the United States a tiny fraction of what we pay for a single nuclear aircraft carrier. The small investment we and other members of the United Nations make in these programs are multiplied many times by the investments, many of them private, that follow after the initial steps have been funded by the UNDP. If an amendment is proposed to increase the appropriations for these purposes to the original amounts requested, I would gladly support such an amendment, but I am sorry to have to conclude that in the present mood of the House, such a move would serve no purpose.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, in recent years the United States has played an important role in providing financial assistance to the developing countries of the world. Significantly, this assistance has been channeled more and more through international organizations, two singular examples of which are the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank. The emergence of these organizations has encouraged the participation of many of the recipient countries by permitting

them a voice in the allocation of the available funds. I commend the Congress for the foresight and responsibility evidenced by the support this body has offered those institutions.

However, now, in an apparent pique of jealousy over an alleged loss of jurisdiction over the funds appropriated to these institutions, this Congress is considering a move which would arrogate to it the power to control and audit the financial actions of these organizations. For the United States to unilaterally assert this power over a multinational body is, to put it mildly, unthinkable.

The implications, both in international law and in international politics, of such a move cannot be fully comprehended at this point in time. Suffice it to say that such an action by the United States would severely detract from the financial support for and the confidence in these bodies by the other member nations.

Finally, if the Members of this body will take the time to recall, your Banking and Currency Committee, in considering the requests for funds by these institutions, carefully investigated and evaluated the allegations against these banks relative to their "proper" use of funds. The conclusion of your committee was that there was in fact no substance to the allegations.

Thus, if the House would but pause and seriously, and responsibly, consider the reports of its committees and the inevitable international repercussions of such an action, it would realize that this body cannot, in all good conscience, so move.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, a nation just as a person that receives help should also be willing to share at least from the benefits it receives.

Mr. Chairman, as I have pointed out many times, our country has received more foreign aid than any country in history. Foreign aid has come to us in various forms. It came with the 45,000,000 who have immigrated to this country. It came with many needed material things brought here to help build the institutions that serve America. It came with the ideals and ideas that serve the basic freedoms. It came with the millions of dollars that were needed to carry us through crisis periods and it came with the military aid to help us win the military battles to protect and promote the freedoms in critical times in our history.

Let us not shrink from opportunities to serve freedom wherever in the world where the people want help to the institutions that can serve people and the cause of liberty and justice under law.

#### THE COST OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. Chairman, I think a realistic understanding of the cost of foreign aid is needed to counterbalance the notion that the program is bankrupting us or depriving us of needed domestic programs.

Too many people overestimate the proportion of the taxpayer's dollar that goes into foreign aid.

Even some of my colleagues here may be surprised to learn that less than a penny of that dollar goes for foreign assistance in all its forms.

Economic assistance extended on a

concessionary basis, has decreased in recent years to a level of only about one-third of 1 percent of Gross National Product.

This should be viewed in the light of a recent recommendation by the Pearson commission, a distinguished commission headed by former Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson, that all developed countries extend concessionary aid to the extent of seven-tenths of 1 percent of GNP by 1975, if possible.

The figures for 1969 show that we have dropped to ninth place among donors, when ranked by relationship between GNP and our contribution to the developing countries. This year we may drop to tenth.

What does AID cost in terms of the balance-of-payments deficit?

This may surprise some of my colleagues more: in fiscal 1969 we actually had a surplus in our foreign aid account. Nearly all of our aid funds are required by law to be expended in the United States. AID money thus helps provide jobs for American workers and profits for U.S. business firms. Last year, more than \$1.8 billion of AID funds were spent in the United States, and \$143 million were spent overseas.

At the same time, developing countries were paying interest and amortization on past AID loans to the amount of \$385 million, giving us a net balance surplus for 1969 of \$242 million.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of foreign aid is very small indeed. But this comparatively small amount represents a critical margin of help for the poor nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America who are struggling to end centuries of famine, disease, illiteracy and despair.

One thing is certain. There will be much less hope for peace if we isolate ourselves in a world of hungry and frustrated neighbors.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign operations appropriation bill. There are at least two reasons why every Member of the House should support this legislation.

The first is that if the Nixon doctrine is to succeed, the passage of this legislation is essential to that purpose. Mr. Nixon has indicated his intention and desire to substitute economic and military assistance by the United States, plus greater help from our allies and the threatened peoples themselves, for the kind of involvement in which we are now engaged in Southeast Asia, when a nation to which we have commitments or which we deem vital to our security is threatened by aggression.

Of course, we can heed the voices of the neo-isolationists and retreat to our own shores, letting the aggressors do what they will elsewhere.

Such a policy, however, would find us soon faced by a hostile and probably predominantly Communist world in which we might find ourselves engaged in combat on the shores of California.

The only other alternative to adequate economic and military assistance to the countries in question is to continue to spend billions in active military involvement in such places as Vietnam and Korea.

Our only real choice is whether we will send our men or our money, our economic and military support or our sons to defend such nations as the Republic of Vietnam against aggression.

Even more important, the safe and honorable extraction from Southeast Asia of 400,000 Americans presently in Vietnam depends in part upon the funding in this bill. These funds undergird the Government of Vietnam and support its military efforts.

The degree of strength and success of that government and that military force constitutes the key to the success or failure to the whole plan of Vietnamization and phased withdrawal.

It is folly to spend billions through the Department of Defense and refuse to spend the millions required to provide essential economic support to the Nation in which the billions of dollars and so many thousand American lives have been invested.

It is my confidence that the Republic of Vietnam can continue to exist as a viable non-Communist nation and its military can take the entire burden of combat against the Communists.

This is simply not possible at this time, however, without the economic support provided in this legislation.

All those who want to end American military involvement in Southeast Asia and bring American servicemen home should support this legislation.

All those who stand behind the President in his new foreign policy of avoiding involvements like the present one and his phased withdrawal of American troops should support it as an essential part of that proposal.

If we are not willing to provide the President with the essential economic support provided in this bill, we might just as well join the demonstrators and actively oppose his policy.

The second and more positive reason that all Members should support this legislation is because it provides a relatively small investment which can pay rich dividends for the developing countries and for our Nation as well.

In helping them help themselves make economic progress we move from a sick toward a healthy world and one made stronger and safer by progress in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It also opens vast new markets for our economy.

There is, for example, one revolution we should all support and that is the Green Revolution.

We have heard a lot about the Green Revolution in some of the developing countries. It is true that India, Pakistan, Turkey, the Philippines and a few other nations are enjoying significantly bigger harvests of their basic foodgrains, wheat and rice. But it is also true that many other developing countries have not yet reaped the benefits of the new high-yield grains. Furthermore, the Green Revolution itself has posed new problems and underlined old ones.

Our foreign assistance program was instrumental in spreading the Green Revolution across the fields of the needy nations. But the job is nowhere near finished. There is still much hunger in the world.

The initial task of helping to provide the fertilizer, pesticides, seeds, irrigation and know-how must continue. But the Green Revolution is also taking on new directions. High-yield varieties of rice and wheat have helped boost overall food production in the developing countries by 14 percent in just 3 years. As a result, new problems of grain storage and shipment have emerged. The bountiful harvests have tended to benefit large landholders more than the subsistence farmers.

There is an additional problem. When we talk about hunger, we are not talking about starvation alone. Relatively few people are presently starving to death, but one person in every five in the developing countries is malnourished. The result is people physically and mentally below par—unhappy people who are unable to contribute fully to the development of their countries. One of the pillars of our aid program is research into ways to provide the kind of protein-rich food to minimize malnutrition. This program has helped develop the corn, soya, milk blend known as CSM, which eased the suffering of victims of the Nigerian civil war. The program also helped develop WSB, a wheat soy blend of high protein content. U.S. foreign aid is financing research at the University of Nebraska which seeks wheat varieties which will contain more of the amino acids essential to a health diet. Already almost 11,000 wheats have been tested out of an expected total of 17,000. Research is also underway to find strains of corn which will supply similar basic dietary needs.

This research, solutions to the new problems resulting from the very success of the Green Revolution, and the escalation of the revolution itself depend in large measure upon our foreign aid program. It is up to us to see that the program is not emasculated.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House is not entirely adequate to meet the needs and challenges of helping ourselves through help to developing countries, but the funds which it will make available are important toward that end and I urge its passage by the House.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I urge a closer look at this bill which comes before us as a foreign assistance appropriation. I refer specifically to the \$350 million for military assistance and \$272,500,000 for foreign military credit sales in titles I and II of H.R. 17867. An examination of the committee report does not reveal much, but a study of the hearings held earlier this year brings out some alarming evidence of the uses to which these funds will be put.

In testimony on American military activity in Laos, Defense Secretary Laird claimed that our policies have not changed for the past 4 years. He further explained:

I want to make it clear we are not sending combat troops to Laos. We have a total of approximately — military personnel in Laos. They are serving there as military attaches and as military personnel who give military assistance. They are military assistants to the Royal Laotian Forces.

Secretary Laird went on to place the total number of U.S. personnel, military and civilian, in Laos at 1,040.

Mr. Chairman, I recently sent two of my staff members, one of whom was a military adviser to the Royal Lao Army in the early 1960's and the other a regional director of the U.S. AID refugee program, on a 10-day inspection trip to Laos. They reported back to me that at least half of the Air Force's 48,000 men now stationed in Thailand are directly involved in air strikes over Laos, and that an unknown number of U.S. military personnel are assigned to Laos on "temporary duty" from military base in Southeast Asia. Air America carries personnel and arms throughout Laos, American pilots are serving as forward air controllers, and other American pilots fly missions over Laos from carriers in the South China Sea and from other Southeast Asia bases.

Mr. Chairman, these observations confirm that the administration is fully committing American personnel to the war in Laos and keeping the facts carefully concealed from the American people. The subterfuge of reporting a military unit as being assigned to Vietnam when it is actually operational in Laos can only be called a massive deception, one more example of executive usurpation of the congressional prerogative to declare where in the world American fighting men shall be committed. These activities are largely carried on under the auspices of the CIA, and the fact that many of our military "advisers" operate in civilian clothing instead of khaki does not lessen the implications of a massive American involvement in Laos.

Furthermore the estimated American air sorties over Laos are now placed at approximately 900 a day, seven times the level of 2 years ago, at a cost of billions of dollars to the American taxpayers. Since the administration by design refuses to disclose the exact costs of our Laos involvement, as well as the commitment of American troops, it becomes our role in Congress to turn back foreign military spending bills like this one until we have a full and complete disclosure as to where this money is going and why.

Furthermore, Secretary Laird testified before an Appropriations Subcommittee on March 10, 1970, that to the best of his knowledge there had been only one American military assistant killed in Laos to that date. If it is indeed true that this is the only combat death that the Defense Secretary knows about, then we must ask by what authorization and by whom is this clandestine war being waged. We must ask why the facts cannot be revealed to the American people. We must insist on being told what independent warmaking body exists within the executive branch of our Government.

The pertinent information is either deleted from the hearings, or it is not being presented to Congress, and yet we are expected to go on giving blank checks for military ventures without any congressional scrutiny as to the implications for our foreign policy vis-a-vis Southeast Asia. This has been the sorry story ever since our tragic and seemingly

endless intervention in Indochina began, and it is finally time for us in the Congress to stand up and say "The buck stops here." If the American people are to be denied the facts about our foreign policies, then it is indeed a sorry day for representative democracy in this country. This appropriation bill and all others with military funds should be defeated until a full accounting is made to the Congress and to the American people.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the House passed legislation to raise the ceiling on the national debt. I opposed this proposal because I believe what this Nation needs is sound financial management, not just more debt piled upon our existing indebtedness. As of the first quarter of 1970, the national debt totaled approximately \$373 billion, an \$11-billion increase over last year. The annual interest on this amount will cost the taxpayers \$18 billion.

To facilitate economic recovery Congress should cut unnecessary spending rather than raising the public debt. This is the surest route to national financial health.

Today, Congress has the opportunity to facilitate economic stability not by increasing tax liabilities, but by decreasing Federal spending. It can do this by refusing to appropriate additional money for foreign aid this year. This would not be fatal to our foreign aid program; it would, however, help flush out the foreign aid pipelines. Presently, in addition to the requests for authorizations and appropriations, there is approximately \$18.5 billion left from previous years lying unspent in the pipelines. These funds fall in the following general categories:

*Unexpended balances in pipeline from prior years for selected aid programs*

Foreign assistance (mutual security) .....	\$4,450,356,000
Export-Import Bank, uncommitted borrowing authority .....	4,454,200,000
Export-Import Bank, long-term credits .....	3,006,000,000
Export-Import Bank, Regular Operation .....	345,100,000
Export-Import Bank, Expansion Program .....	162,200,000
Inter-American Development Bank .....	2,259,494,000
Military Assistance (in defense budget) .....	1,330,000,000
Public Law 480 (agriculture commodities) .....	851,426,000
Permanent military construction overseas .....	448,000,000
Foreign Military Credit Sales Fund .....	406,215,000
International Development Association .....	350,000,000
Asian Development Bank .....	140,000,000
Overseas Private Investment Corporation .....	135,500,000
Peace Corps .....	27,157,000
Education exchange .....	26,706,000
International military headquarters .....	20,000,000
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands .....	15,849,000
Economic Assistance (in defense budget) .....	15,000,000
Inter-American Highway .....	11,152,000
MAAG's missions and groups .....	9,000,000
Ryukyuu Islands .....	8,162,000
Migrants and refugees .....	4,519,000

*Unexpended balances in pipeline from prior years for selected aid programs—Continued*  
Contributions to international organizations..... \$3,668,000

Total ..... 18,479,704,000

In addition to the unspent \$18.5 billion in the pipelines, over \$2 billion in counterpart funds are located in countries around the world. The respective nations and their balance of counterpart funds according to the most recent U.S. Treasury reports are as follows:

*World sources of U.S. counterpart funds*

	<i>Balance on hand</i>
<i>Excess currency countries:</i>	
Burma .....	\$19,135,279
Ceylon .....	4,582,099
Guinea .....	28,666,833
India .....	897,491,699
Israel .....	19,692,556
Morocco .....	24,726,893
Pakistan .....	209,501,271
Poland .....	438,705,022
Tunisia .....	24,320,176
United Arab Republic .....	259,856,876
Yugoslavia .....	66,796,728
Total .....	1,993,475,438

<i>Near-excess currency countries:</i>	
Bolivia .....	3,290,431
Ghana .....	3,467,076
Indonesia .....	2,032,242
Sudan .....	6,735,378
Total .....	15,525,127

<i>Nonexcess currency countries:</i>	
Afghanistan .....	69,201
Algeria .....	213
Angola .....	213
Argentina .....	213
Australia .....	213
Austria .....	213
Bahamas .....	213
Bahrain .....	213
Barbados .....	213
Belgium .....	5,414
Bermuda .....	213
Brazil .....	3,104,946
British Honduras .....	213
Bulgaria .....	213
Burundi .....	213
Cambodia .....	367,665
Cameroon .....	23,830
Canada .....	213
Chad .....	411
Chile .....	213
China .....	10,956,211
Colombia .....	254,744
Congo .....	350,247
Costa Rica .....	2,585
Cyprus .....	213
Czechoslovakia .....	994,660
Denmark .....	1,798
Dominican Republic .....	84,640
Ecuador .....	910,979
El Salvador .....	213
Ethiopia .....	771,613
Finland .....	68,700
Fiji .....	213
France .....	166,754
Gambia .....	213
Germany .....	3,536
Germany .....	2,584
Greece .....	5,990,345
Guatemala .....	213
Guyana .....	213
Haiti .....	213
Honduras .....	3,536
Hong Kong .....	213
Hungary .....	36,502
Iceland .....	45,470
Iran .....	187,693
Iraq .....	213
Ireland .....	1,766
Italy .....	10,651,695

Country:	Balance on hand
Ivory Coast	\$109
Jamaica	
Japan	22,411,741
Jordan	224,932
Kenya	18,931
Korea	2,119,041
Kuwait	
Laos	3,932,335
Lebanon	
Liberia	
Libya	
Luxembourg	
Malagasy	
Malawi	821
Malaysia	
Mal	410,016
Malta	
Martinique	
Mauritius	
Mexico	
Mozambique	
Nepal	597
Netherlands	497,390
Netherlands Antilles	
New Zealand	2,406
Nicaragua	
Niger	
Nigeria	38,683
Norway	
Panama	
Paraguay	3,050,368
Peru	34,901
Philippines	917,118
Portugal	681
Rumania	
Rwanda	
Saudi Arabia	
Senegal	47,335
Sierre Leone	129
Singapore	
Somali	100,761
South Africa	201
South Arabia	
Southern Rhodesia	
Spain	2,649,098
Surinam	
Sweden	
Switzerland	1,984,358
Syrian Arab Republic	5,043,269
Tanzania	
Thailand	1,399,378
Togo	
Trinidad	
Turkey	11,092,665
Uganda	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	
United Kingdom	2,455,766
Upper Volta	60,697
Uruguay	45,172
Venezuela	
Vietnam	32,683,396
Yemen	
Zambia	-1
Various	
<b>Total</b>	<b>126,280,058</b>
<b>Total all countries</b>	<b>2,135,280,624</b>

This \$2.1 billion in counterpart funds has accrued by operation of Public Law 480, the law under which the United States disposes of surplus agricultural commodities. To utilize the abundant agricultural productivity of this Nation to combat world hunger and malnutrition and to encourage economic growth in the developing countries, we sell agricultural products for foreign currencies based on bilateral agreements with the purchasing country. When the sale is completed, the foreign currency resulting therefrom is deposited in a designated foreign bank.

By law, counterpart funds can only be spent in the particular nation involved;

they cannot be released for expenditure in the United States. Through faulty planning on the part of foreign aid policymakers, these funds have been allowed to lie idle and accumulate in certain countries. Accordingly, rich sources of U.S. foreign assistance expenditures have developed almost by default.

Mr. Chairman, I propose that no more money be allocated to foreign aid programs until earmarked counterpart funds and present pipeline funds are spent. This would allow us to continue foreign assistance efforts while at the same time providing considerable tax relief to the American wage earner. Moreover, while these backlogged surpluses are being diminished, Congress should channel the allocations with the purpose in mind of only funding those aid projects that are strictly designed to promote our national interest. The United States should give foreign assistance only to advance the economic development and well-being of nations that are firm allies or potential allies and who are committed to the doctrine of self-help.

In my judgment, this Nation has far too long engaged in an international welfare program which, like its domestic counterpart, has corrupted both the giver and the receiver. Corrective action must be taken and taken now. The dictates of commonsense and fiscal responsibility call for nothing less.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise once again in opposition to our annual foreign aid program, this year being H.R. 17867, entitled foreign assistance and related programs appropriations bill, 1971.

There were some very interesting tabulations in the report which accompanied the bill but on page 5 of the report there appeared a most revealing figure that the grand total of the cost of foreign assistance from 1946 to 1970 stands at \$199 billion. Then on page 41 of the report the grand total of this appropriation will be \$2,300 million which means that we have now spent over \$201 billion on so-called foreign assistance.

No one can deny that the Marshall plan after World War II was a success. Western Europe had to be put back on its feet and those countries today serve as a bulwark against world war III. But the day has long since passed to continue on and on with these foreign assistance programs.

Yesterday, we were requested to raise the debt ceiling. That was a difficult thing for some of us to have to support. Facts are it did not cost us anything nor did it save us any money. In this regard the Federal Government is sort of like a family. We have gone to the grocery store and bought groceries and now we have to pay for them. The time to avoid debt ceilings is when we appropriate money. Now is the time, today, to stop this appropriation for further Federal assistance to the tune of \$2,300,000,000.

It has been established again and again that you cannot buy friendship in the world community. Again and again it has been demonstrated that the more we spend on foreign aid the fewer friends we have in the world to show for it. For the sake of saving ourselves another in-

crease in the public debt ceiling, we should defeat this appropriation bill today. More importantly, for the sake of our own good among the community of nations we should recognize that each year as we appropriate more and more for foreign aid we have fewer and fewer friends in the world community. Then, in our own self-interest, we should suspend the foreign assistance program because the facts have proven that we are certainly going in the wrong direction.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the economic situation in the country is such that the Congress absolutely must realine the Nation's economic priorities. Every proposed appropriation must be carefully examined and cuts made in low priority spending. And that thinking applies not just to programs which we oppose, but even to measures and programs which we basically favor.

There is no question but that properly conceived foreign aid programs are among the soundest possible investments in the long run best interests of America. We would be in serious error to completely eliminate or even to cut too much our assistance to the rest of the world community. Because of the seriousness of our own economic situation, however, it is obvious that we must make some reductions in what we would otherwise like to appropriate in this area. I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for its careful attention to the need to prune appropriations in H.R. 17867.

Nevertheless, I regret that the committee did not make an even stronger effort to redirect certain expenditures of funds within the bill. I note that in title I, for instance, the only area which has not been cut back in appropriations is that of military assistance. It is unfortunate that we continue to lean so heavily on military strength for a solution of the world's ills, instead of directing more of our efforts toward raising the standard of living in underdeveloped nations. It is my opinion that such a move would be a much wiser investment in the future of the world.

I intend to support this bill on final passage and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I will vote today for the foreign aid appropriations bill. I do so reluctantly, however, because I believe that the funding for economic assistance is inadequate. While I recognize that there are many problems involved in both the administration and effectiveness of our present foreign aid program, I nevertheless deplore the attitude apparently gaining strength with the majority of the Congress and the country which questions the necessity for such economic aid at all.

The question is whether America, as the richest Nation in the world, can expect to assure her own stability while half the world's population remains abjectly poor and peoples become increasingly conscious of the contrast between their lives and those of the developed nations. Such awareness creates a frustration which can lead to violence.

Robert McNamara, in a speech given in 1966, stated:

There is a direct and constant relationship between the incidence of violence and the economic status of the countries affected.

As an example, McNamara cited the fact that of 27 rich nations in the world, only one had suffered major internal violence between 1958 and 1966, while of the 38 very poor nations, 32 suffered significant conflicts within that same time period, McNamara added:

Indeed they have suffered an average of two major out-breaks of violence per country in the eight year period. That is a great deal of conflicts.

This year more than half the world's population lives in independent countries south of the equator. Yet these 1½ billion people have only one-sixth of the total world goods and services.

Obviously, we cannot ignore such a vast segment of the world's population. The potential for violence and instability in these countries cannot help but affect our own security. We would do far more to assure our own security by providing a realistic level of economic aid than we do with continually spiraling investments in the hardware of war. Mr. McNamara made the point well in the same speech when he said:

A nation can reach the point at which it does not buy more security for itself simply by buying more military hardware—we are at that point.

The decisive factor for a powerful nation—already adequately armed—is the character of its relationships with the world.

During the past decade, our relationship with the rest of the world has assumed an aspect of imperialism and militarism. Confidence in our credibility and our honesty has been badly shaken. We have poured \$100 billion into Southeast Asia in military aid in the past 5 years, yet at the same time our small commitment of economic aid to the other underdeveloped nations of the world has decreased. In 1961 we appropriated \$2,381,400,000 for foreign economic aid. In 1965, this figure had dropped to \$2,195,000,000, and in 1970 it is \$1,294,000,000. The most dramatic decreases have come in the past 4 years. By 1968 the United States had dropped to eighth among the 16 principal aid donors of the world.

More recently in September 1969 the Commission on International Development chaired by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, former Prime Minister of Canada, issued a report which warned that:

International development is a great challenge of our age. Our response to it will show whether we understand the implications of interdependence or whether we prefer to delude ourselves that the poverty and deprivation of the great majority of mankind can be ignored without tragic consequences for all.

When we speak of the need for foreign aid, we are really speaking of the miseries of overpopulation, poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and disease.

Many experts say that at least half the people of the world are undernourished which increases their vulnerability to disease and mental retardation.

There have been estimates that 5 million children in India die of malnutrition each year. The population in the

underdeveloped countries is growing three times as fast as the United States. In some cases, such as Kenya, Turkey, and Nigeria the population is doubling about every 25 years.

By the year 2000 7 billion people will inhabit this earth. Of those, 80 percent will live in underdeveloped countries. It is questionable that food production can keep pace with this tremendous growth, and there are predictions that per capita economic gain will be cut in half by increased population growth in these nations. At the present time the average per capita income of an underdeveloped country is less than \$100. It is well over \$2,000 in the United States.

Availability of medical care in underdeveloped countries is wholly inadequate. In the United States, where we are considered to have a doctor shortage, there is one physician for every 700 people. Latest available figures, however, show that in Africa there is one doctor for every 9,200 persons; in East Asia one doctor for every 7,400; and in the Near East one for every 3,300.

Adequate education for people in these countries also is sorely lacking. Of every 100 children entering primary school in developing countries, no more than 30 finish. In most African and Latin American countries, more than half of primary school pupils do not return to school after the second grade. Without adequate education, it is impossible to substantially improve the quality of life in these countries.

America can well afford to contribute more than it is toward alleviating some of this misery.

In 1968, we allocated a little more than one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product to foreign aid programs. During that same year Americans spent nearly five times that amount on cigarettes and nearly eight times the foreign aid allocation on alcohol. The Federal Government for fiscal year 1970 allocated 40 times the amount spent on foreign aid for national defense. With our national security so clearly linked with that of the developing nations, I suggest that an expenditure of \$40 of national defense funds for every \$1 of foreign aid is both myopic and dangerous.

Here is one example of wastefulness in defense spending.

This year the Congress authorized \$544.4 million for the "procurement" of the C-5A, the Air Force's monster airlift aircraft. Of this amount, \$344.4 million will pay for cost overruns and \$200 million will go to Lockheed, the producer, to take care of extra costs which the Air Force maintains are not the Air Force's responsibility.

Over the years we have willingly paid the price which the military has asked and only recently even questioned their rationale. We pay for the mistakes of the military—cost overruns are amounting to billions of dollars in all facets of military hardware—yet we are unwilling to spend even a minimum amount on the essential economic aid which all of the developing countries so desperately need.

Our involvement in Vietnam has made us wary of giving aid to other countries of the world. There is a growing, and I

believe dangerous, trend toward isolationism. Our fate is intrinsically bound with that of the rest of the world. Our security lies in helping other nations to achieve internal stability—a stability which will only come from a decent standard of living for their citizens. Economic—not military—aid is the solution.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have 1 minute remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is correct.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield that 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kansas for yielding, but the part of the bill that I desired to explain has already been explained. I yield back the time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance: For necessary expenses as authorized by law \$310,000,000, distributed as follows:

(1) World-wide, \$154,000,000 (section 212);

(2) Alliance for Progress, \$75,000,000 (section 252(a)); and

(3) Multilateral organizations, \$85,000,000 (section 302(a)), of which not less than \$13,000,000 shall be available only for the United Nations Children's Fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate any project or activity which has not been justified to the Congress, except projects or activities relating to the reduction of population growth: *Provided further*, That the President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United Nations Development Program authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be used for projects for economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If a Member desired to raise a point of order to paragraph (3) on page 2, would he have to wait until the Clerk had read the entire title?

The CHAIRMAN. No, he would have to wait only until the Clerk had read the paragraph carrying the language to which the gentleman wishes to make his point of order.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order to language appearing on page 2. The gentleman from Wisconsin was on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read the section to which the gentleman wishes to make his point of order.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ICHORD. I wish to offer an amendment affecting lines 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 on page 2. Is the amendment in order at this time?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is my understanding that the Clerk has already read that section and has even gone into a reading of the third page of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin was on his feet seeking recognition, and the Chair will protect his rights.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will defer offering his amendment. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin on his point of order.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the entire proviso beginning on line 20 and ending on line 25 of page 2 is legislation in an appropriation. I am for its objectives, but in effect it simply says that the President should try to enforce existing law. The provisions in existing law, section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act are stronger and there is no sense in this useless repetition in an appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. The proviso was added by the Committee on Appropriations in the foreign assistance appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965 in order to insure that no U.S. contribution to the UNDP would be used to give any type of economical or technical assistance to Cuba as long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

I would like to interpret this as a limitation on an appropriation bill and ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The language in question is as follows: Line 20, page 2:

*Provided further, That the President shall seek to assure \* \* \**

And so forth.

That is obviously a directive to the President of the United States, it is not limited in application to the funds appropriated in this bill or any section thereof, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ICHORD

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD: Amend H.R. 17867, title I, page 1, as follows:

At line 10 strike out the figure "\$310,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$155,000,000".

At line 11 strike out the figure "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75,000,000."

At line 12 strike out the figure "\$75,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$37,500,000".

At line 14 strike out the figure "\$85,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$42,500,000".

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a 50-percent cut across the board in technical assistance. As we realize, Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Aid Appropriations Committee—the gentleman from Louisiana and the members of his committee—have cut this foreign aid bill \$203 million below last year's bill, and \$575,578,000 under the budgetary

request. I applaud this action of the committee.

But the bill, I submit, is still too high in view of the many domestic projects we have in this country which will go unfinanced because of our very serious budgetary problems. Yesterday we acted to permanently increase the national debt \$13 billion, and I just simply cannot see the necessity of spending the \$2.3 billion which this bill will cost, money which we just do not have.

Our financial situation, Mr. Chairman, calls for a more drastic cut, I submit, than the committee has made. We hear a great deal today about the reorienting of our priorities. Regardless of how beneficial the technical assistance program may be to the emerging undeveloped nations of the world, I cannot see sufficient priority to justify the further borrowing of money to finance this program.

When I look at the figures on pages 4 and 5 of the report, I am sickened at the way the money has been wasted. It is \$200 billion, almost two-thirds of the national debt. Look at the figures: There is \$36,800,000 to the country of Kuwait, which I understand has the highest per capita income of any country in the world. I realize there is no money in this bill today for that country, but this is just an example of how the money has been wasted. With the exception of the money spent under the Marshall plan, most of the money in the foreign aid bill, I submit, has been wasted. How I wish we had this \$200 billion to attack some of the problems that have been building up in this country, when we have been so obsessed with trying to solve all the ills of all the nations of the world.

I would point out to the members of the committee that the amount contained in this bill is just a small part of the total foreign aid cost to the United States of America.

I would remind the distinguished chairman of the committee of the argument which he made last year when this bill was submitted before the Congress. I believe his argument was that foreign aid had been fragmented into several different bills and that the total foreign aid cost was in excess of \$10 billion, rather than the \$2 billion plus the bill called for last year.

Mr. Chairman, I propose by this amendment to give the members of the committee a choice, to make a real reduction, instead of the \$200 million sum already cut by the committee to cut another \$155 million.

If this amendment carries, I shall have similar cuts to offer to other provisions of the bill.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. How much would the amendment cut the contributions to multilateral organizations?

Mr. ICHORD. It would cut it 50 percent across the board, I would say to the gentleman from Minnesota, by reducing the total technical assistance program to \$155 million, and the worldwide also would have a 50-percent cut, the Alliance for Progress a 50-percent cut, and

multilateral organizations likewise a 50-percent cut.

Mr. FRASER. May I say to the gentleman, as I understand the effect of the amendment, then, it would cut even further our participation in the United Nations development program.

Mr. ICHORD. I would cut the whole assistance program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is a great experience to serve as a Member of this body. Everyday I learn something new from the great Members who serve in this body.

Less than 20 minutes ago one of the very able Members of this body objected to the cuts which the committee had already recommended. Now we see another gentleman, equally as conscientious, who objects to the amount, and he wants to cut it.

As I said in my remarks, we brought to the floor a balanced bill, a good bill, if there is such a thing as a good bill in foreign aid.

I want to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the fact that this is the heart of the foreign aid bill. It is the point 4 program. It is the old Truman Doctrine of technical aid, to send technicians to countries to teach people our techniques. This is the oldest part of the foreign aid program.

The budget requested \$396,870,000, and the committee made a reduction of \$86,870,000.

We believe these three particular spigots of technical aid—worldwide, Alliance for Progress, and multilateral organizations—can live with what we have recommended.

But I should like to call to the attention of the Committee the fact that this is not like some of the other items in the bill, where there have been no commitments made. As to this particular item, about 70 percent of this money goes to ongoing projects which are already underway. Some of them may be 80 percent complete, some of them 60 percent, some of them 40 percent, and some of them 30 percent. So this in all probability is the most important part of the bill, because it is the technical aid portion; that is, this is where we send technicians out to train the people in the foreign countries.

We have brought out a bill every year based upon the justifications. We mark it as scientifically as we can. We believe this is the minimum amount with which we can carry on a satisfactory program.

I certainly hope that the Committee will vote down this amendment and follow the recommendation of the committee. This was brought out, so far as I know, with a unanimous vote.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

As I pointed out earlier, the committee has already made substantial cuts in technical assistance. This is the "bread and butter" of the whole economic assistance program. This is what you read about when we help a poor farmer in some developing nation grow a better wheat or construct an irrigation project.

The emphasis this year in technical

assistance will be on agriculture and on family planning. Overpopulation, which is tied in with agricultural production, is one of the most difficult problems facing the world today. India is a prime example. The increase in population there offsets the increase in agricultural production. That is why AID is emphasizing family planning.

What disturbs me, Mr. Chairman—and I think the RECORD should be clear on this for all the American people to read—is the identity of those who are today trying to kill the foreign aid program with the amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD.

These are the same voices—I repeat, the same voices—that appear right here in the well of this body to ask for billions upon billions of dollars for instruments of war, not instruments for peace. They ask billions for defense but not a cent for family planning. They ask billions for missiles but not a cent for agricultural production. They ask billions for a manned bomber, new aircraft carriers, new tanks, new air transports, and you name it, but not a cent for fertilizer, water, transportation, and a helping hand for those less fortunate than us in the world today.

We have spent more than \$120 billion in Vietnam. The committee is recommending \$1.2 billion for economic assistance for 1971. We are spending for war, but we do not seem to be willing to spend for peace—for peace throughout the world.

The money in the bill would enable needy people in the developing nations of the world get some water and grow some food with which to feed their families.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. Chairman, if I understand correctly this amendment proposes to cut across the board 50 percent. As I have stated, I rise in support of the amendment but, frankly will tell you if the amendment proposed a 100-percent cut, I would support it more enthusiastically.

I remember years ago, many years ago, when the military people came before our Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations with charts showing the countries that would benefit under our foreign aid program, and the Army divisions that they would have and that they would supply to support us if we got into war with the Communists. In other words, this little country on the chart would have two divisions, this little country would have 10, this one would have 15, and the purpose of this program, this foreign aid program, was supposed to do that. It has been with us and will be with us like the poor, forever. If we got in trouble with the Communists, the advocates of the program said they would come in and help us. All right, we are in trouble with the Communists today in Vietnam. We have been in trouble down

there since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. Look at the list of recipient countries in the foreign aid program on pages 4 and 5 of the report. Call the roll in Vietnam. How many of them will answer? Maybe three, and we are paying dearly for their assistance down there. One of them has pulled out and another one is threatening to pull out.

So, if you go into Vietnam looking for our friends which we were supposed to make under this program, you will not find them. Not only are they not helping us, most of them are highly critical of our position in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, it frightens me to read here where this program has cost \$199 billion, plus. I assume that is correct. It is in the committee report. The interest on that figure amounts to \$6 or \$7 billion, plus, and do not forget that every dime we give away in this program is borrowed money.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the easiest thing on this earth to do is to spend the money of someone else. I will venture to say that if you took a hat and passed it around this Chamber, passed it in front of the Members of this House, asking for voluntary contributions out of your pocket, you would not get enough to say grace over. You know it. But this is the taxpayers' money.

Oh, how easy it is to say this lousy small sum of \$2.3 billion. Well, down my way that is not a paltry sum.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word to my liberal friends over on this side of the aisle—and there are some of them over there, too—who have been looking under the bed and everywhere else to get money to carry on some of the programs that they sincerely believe this Nation needs. I want to help you. Here is a wonderful place to get some of that money. You had better send out an SOS to your study group right now and get them to come in here and vote in a bloc like they do on many occasions, vote for this amendment and then vote on final passage "No" against this bill.

I hope that the Members of this House will give the poor downtrodden, overburdened taxpayers of America a break this afternoon. Let him see the end of the tunnel. Let us at least refuse to take \$2.3 billion more out of his pocket.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and then will vote against the bill.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri would reduce technical assistance by 50 percent. I would remind all of the Members that the committee has already reduced technical assistance \$86 million from the amount that was in the budget, \$86 million, and \$43 million less than last year.

Your committee has done an excellent job in connection with reasonably reducing this particular program. It is one of the better parts of the foreign aid program, and I think most everyone will admit that.

In agriculture alone we have been urging other countries to attempt to help themselves. The agricultural programs instituted under the technical assistance aid program have helped other countries help themselves. We have had a green revolution as a result of the agricultural programs in India, Pakistan, and incidentally in South Vietnam. We have assisted in the growing of new kinds of rice and new kinds of wheat, and other products and commodities in these countries, and it has been most beneficial.

Something was mentioned about what help to our country comes from technical assistance. During our hearings in answer to a question by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID), in which she asked, "How many research and educational institutions are receiving grants, or have contracts to do research and carry on technical assistance?"

Dr. Hanna stated: "At the moment there are 125 U.S. colleges and universities which have contracts or grants for research or technical assistance," assisting us in helping other countries help themselves, and that is what technical assistance is.

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

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree with my previous statement that this appropriation is mainly to finance on-going programs; that the technicians are already there in these programs in most instances, and about 70 percent of it goes to finance on-going programs, some of them as much as 70 or 80 percent completed?

Mr. SHRIVER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would the gentleman not agree that the committee wrote a sum of money into the bill, and spent considerable time examining the programs on their merits? Would not the gentleman agree that some of those who want to cut it so much should at least have the burden of explaining why they chose 50 percent instead of some other figure? And does not the amendment smack a bit of swinging the meat-ax blindly?

Mr. SHRIVER. We were more selective about this, and I would emphasize we reduced it \$86 million from the budget figures.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am struck by the fact that the arguments made in support of this amendment are derived from the committee report itself. I think if one looks in the committee report they can make a good argument in favor of reducing this program. Which brings me to the point that I do not believe the committee report adequately describes the nature of the foreign aid over the last 25 years.

Out of that total of \$131 billion that

is identified as the net total foreign aid program of the United States since 1946, the fact of the matter is that only \$65 billion of that represents foreign economic aid to the third world, only \$65 billion. Another \$20 billion is represented in the Marshall plan aid, and the balance of this is military assistance.

I do not find anybody trying to cut military assistance in this program. In fact, it is the one item in the request from the administration which is not cut. I am unable to understand how so many Members are able to follow our Presidents into a war, and defend them in the war, and spend billions of dollars in the war, all solidly lined up behind the President, both Democrat and Republican, and yet be unwilling to follow our President in his request for peaceful works in the world.

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

Mr. FRASER. Let me continue on for a moment, and then I will yield to the gentleman.

Clearly these economic assistance programs are the only positive works for peace that we have. The United States today ranks eighth among the wealthy nations in the world in the proportion of our wealth that we give to try to help other less developed nations. I would think that we would want to present a better face not only to the world, but to our own people, this is a matter of simple decency.

We are clearly so wealthy in relation to the rest of the world that to devote to the positive side of American policy 5 percent of what we spend for the instruments of war hardly seems an excessive expenditure. If one measures foreign aid against educational needs, poverty programs, and so on, I would say we ought to cut it, but if you measure it against the instruments of war for which we spend \$70 or \$80 billion, then it seems to me this economic aid is a minuscule amount that ought to be raised.

Finally, one element that really disturbs me in this appropriation measure is the cut already made by the committee for the United Nations. This is the one multilateral agency which is free of national political constraints. It is the one institution in the world that offers yet some hope for peace and for the future of mankind.

I had considered an amendment to increase the multilateral organizational aid, but I shall forgo that for the moment.

I hope the figures will come up in conference because if we really want to follow the Presidential leadership, why do we not follow it on the positive side of American policy? Why follow it only in terms of war—the body counts and villages destroyed and pacification progress?

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. I would want some clarification of the gentleman's statement, in regard to people being willing to follow the President into a war in South Vietnam and then not following him with regard to the foreign aid program.

As I recall, in the vote on the Tonkin Gulf resolution there was only one vote in this House against the Tonkin Gulf resolution. Was the gentleman the one who cast that vote?

Mr. FRASER. No, I am sorry my name is not on the list of those who voted against it. Very honestly, my feeling is that we were put on by that resolution.

Mr. ICHORD. Judging from the gentleman from Minnesota's language, you have a strange way of interpreting the Tonkin Gulf resolution. I think the Tonkin Gulf resolution was quite clear. There are people who have run away from the language of that resolution. I happen to be one who will not run away from it and it is quite clear so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FRASER. Let me say to the gentleman that I supported the war at that time and I defended the U.S. position. I changed my mind—I changed my mind and perhaps there are not enough of us who have changed their mind.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the technical assistance program is one of the most valuable undertakings in our entire international development effort. It involves the sharing of our skills and our know-how with peoples and countries which are trying to help themselves and which are striving to create a better environment and a better way of life for their people. This is a program which goes back to the early post World War II days—the days of the point IV program—and which has been consistently supported by the American people.

The tremendous growth in the technology of the developed countries, particularly of the United States, has served to widen the gap that exists between the developed and the underdeveloped nations. It has made it much more difficult for those on the bottom of the economic ladder to push themselves up. For this reason, any effort to reduce U.S. technical assistance, which helps to share the fruits of technology with others, ought to be resisted.

I am particularly concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the reduction in the technical assistance for Latin America recommended by the Appropriations Committee. I would have hoped that the committee could have gone along with the full budget request. The committee itself admits that technical assistance is one of our most valuable undertakings and that it has accomplished many desirable objectives. This is particularly so in Latin America where throughout the years of the Alliance for Progress we in the United States and the governments and peoples of our sister republics have made some impressive gains in creating the foundations for future economic and social progress.

For these reasons, I would oppose any further reduction in the appropriations for technical assistance, and I would hope that the full amount proposed by the executive branch for fiscal 1971 could be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I should further like to say that I share the concern of some of my colleagues about the proposed appropriation for U.S. contributions to a number of multilateral organizations and programs.

The Appropriations Committee has reduced the executive request for these purposes by some \$37.6 million—from the \$122.6 million proposed for fiscal 1971 to \$85 million. This is a very substantial reduction when one considers the uses to which this money is going to be put.

When we set aside the \$13 million which is reserved by specific language of the bill for the United Nations Children's Fund, as well as the approximately \$9.6 million which has been programmed for eight other U.N.-related activities, the balance remaining will amount to \$62.4 million.

This balance will in effect constitute the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Development Program—a program which has proved very valuable in promoting international development activities in many parts of the world.

I want to stress that I fully appreciate the reasons which prompted the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the subcommittee headed by my able colleague from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), to recommend these economies.

Surely our own domestic needs are quite pressing, and the performance of the U.N. system engaged in carrying out technical assistance and other developmental tasks is in need of improvement.

I do not quarrel with those conclusions. As a matter of fact, a report which my good colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. WHALLEY) and I submitted to the House earlier this year after our service as U.S. Delegates to the 24th General Assembly of the United Nations, stressed the same points.

Entitled "To Save Succeeding Generations," our report urged that the U.N. system be strengthened and improved along the lines suggested by Sir Robert Jackson so that it would become a more modern, more efficient, and more effective instrument for promoting the development effort in the decade of the 1970's.

I still believe that the implementation of the reforms suggested in the Jackson study and several other reports, is essential if the United States and other developed countries are to place increased reliance on the United Nations mechanism in the technical assistance field.

These reforms, I should add, are presently being reviewed and gradually implemented within the U.N. system. This process cannot be accomplished overnight. It will take some time. Its progress will depend in large measure on the actions of the U.N. Governing Council which will be meeting on this issue in Geneva beginning next week.

The thrust of the point which I would like to make is that this does not seem like an opportune time for the United States to start cutting back, and cutting back very sharply, on our support for the U.N. development program.

For the second year in a row now, the U.S. Government has proposed a \$100 million contribution to the U.N. develop-

ment program. Last year, because of congressional cuts in appropriations, our contribution had to be limited to approximately \$82 million. This year, if the amount recommended in the bill before us is approved, it may go down to \$62 million, or nearly 25 percent below the level in fiscal 1970.

This, in my view, could result in a serious setback for the U.N. development program because a lowering of our contribution has the effect of triggering an even larger reduction in that program.

In this regard, I would like to point out that a \$100 million contribution on the part of the United States can support a U.N. development program of about \$425 to \$450 million during the coming year. It would have, in effect, a 4-to-1 multiplier effect. This is so because each dollar contributed by the United States has to be matched by \$1.50 from other countries and by an additional donation representing local costs assumed by the developing countries themselves.

Consequently, a reduction in the U.S. contribution of the size recommended by the Appropriations Committee could shrink the overall development effort of the U.N. development program by as much as \$150 million.

I do not believe that this is the intent of the Appropriations Committee and I would hope that the cut proposed in this instance would be reconsidered.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the deficiencies of the foreign aid legislation in one South American country.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 years, I have had a friend, a graduate in agriculture, in Guatemala.

He is employed by a company to work with the people of that country to develop their agricultural capabilities. He is in an excellent position to observe the effectiveness of our AID program. He states that in his opinion only 5 to 10 percent of the money allotted to Guatemala filters down to the poor for which it is intended. One specific AID venture involved construction of a water system in a village called El Rancho. On two occasions materials for construction of this water system were hauled to this village and were promptly stolen. On the third occasion the system was built. This shows the lack of regard in which our AID programs are held.

Within a mile from this village an irrigation system was constructed in which large concrete conduits were built. Near the largest conduit is a sign stating:

This system constructed by the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture of Guatemala.

No mention is made of the fact that Uncle Sam—Uncle Sugar—provided the money for such construction.

This year, Guatemala will receive 6,549,000 of our taxpayer's dollars. From experience, we know that only \$654,000 will get down to the poor.

Many of these people have a saying, "Trade—not aid."

I agree that trade between the United States and these countries would be helpful. However, there is one hindrance:

When an ordinary car from the United States enters Guatemala, a tariff of 100 percent is immediately levied. When a car of the same quality from Japan is shipped into Guatemala, a tariff of only 70 percent is levied.

Again, we see that the \$347 million given to Guatemala since 1946 has not improved the commercial relations between our countries. Neither has it appreciably improved the economic condition of the people of Guatemala.

Not only do these Central American countries today demand that AID be given in increasing amounts, but also they would use this aid and have used some of the aid to purchase from countries other than the United States.

The taxpayers of the United States are tired of throwing their money into this giant maw which has consumed so much and shows so little in the way of economic improvement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), a question. How much does the gentleman estimate will be in the foreign handout pipeline on June 30, the end of this fiscal year?

Mr. PASSMAN. As usual, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has asked a question, a question about which his committee has knowledge long before the subject gets to my committee. But I am flattered that he would ask the question of me. If the gentleman will permit me to refer to page 6 of the report, he will find that the amount in the pipeline for title I, all parts of title I, is \$4,450,356,000. But these funds are already obligated. These are not for new starts.

Mr. GROSS. Cannot these funds be deobligated and reobligated? And we do not need any new starts.

Mr. PASSMAN. Some of it will be deobligated, I am sure. That has been the history of this program.

Mr. GROSS. So that as of June 30 there will be \$4½ billion in the pipeline of this program, and according to the gentleman's report, this giveaway program has already cost the taxpayers of this country almost \$200 billion.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, briefly.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have been issuing this report for 15 years. I hope the gentleman has observed the reports in previous years. If so, he will have observed that we have brought in this year an amount \$575 million below the amount requested in the budget.

Mr. GROSS. I am aware that it has been cut below the administration's asking price, but we all know that is like a horse trader who always asks far more for an old, spavined horse than he expects to get. The facts are that the money provided in this bill is only slightly less than was approved last year, and the financial condition of the Government called for a drastic cut this year.

Mr. PASSMAN. The amount is \$200 million below last year and, of course,

we are prepared to follow what the gentleman recommends from his committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa does not recommend any foreign aid from his committee, and the gentleman well knows it.

Mr. Chairman, I well remember how the promoters of this program back in the 1940's, tripped the light fantastic onto the floor of the House saying "It will be over in 5 years—this foreign handout program—and all we will spend is \$5 billion." Now the gentleman from Louisiana says we have already spent almost \$200 billion. A 5-year program that was going to cost the taxpayers of this country only \$5 billion.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), now chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was here when they tripped down the aisle, the original proponents of this legislation, asserting "It will be over in 5 years, and we will have spent only \$5 billion."

It was amusing to hear some of the Members this afternoon talk about this country being the wealthiest and the most prosperous in the world. Only yesterday—and the gentleman from Texas voted for it, which is his prerogative—the House approved an increase of \$18 billion in the debt ceiling, taking the ceiling up to \$395 billion. And yesterday he told us that a year from now the Federal debt will be close to that figure of \$395 billion.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, it should not be necessary to point out to any Member of Congress that this Government has more debt than all the rest of the world put together. Yes, it is less than funny, to hear all this talk about the wealth and prosperity of this Nation when it threatens to come apart at the financial seams.

Yet, through this bill and the Export-Import Bank we are guaranteeing the financing of car wash equipment in Switzerland to the tune of \$200,000—guaranteeing payment in Switzerland, of all places in this world.

And there is \$10,000 in this bill for entertainment purposes by the Overseas Private Investment Corp.

Now why should the Overseas Private Investment Corp. spend \$10,000 or any part of that amount for entertainment? Why should American taxpayers entertain anyone to induce them to invest money in foreign countries?

In this world of make believe, Mr. Chairman, it is fitting that the House of Representatives should raise the debt ceiling \$18 billion and the very next day approve a \$2½ billion handout to foreigners. What a dream world this is especially when every Member of the House knows that the \$2½ billion will have to be borrowed.

This is fiscal irresponsibility at its worst, both on the part of the administration and the House of Representatives.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, as I reviewed the report on the foreign assistance and related programs appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, I came upon some startling statistics.

On page 5, under the section labeled "Extent of U.S. foreign aid and assistance," I discovered that the "total net

disbursements to foreign nations," 1946 through 1970 were \$131,530,600,000. The "total net interest paid" on what we have borrowed to give away during that time has cost our citizens \$67,858,067,000. This interest charge is a sum equal to almost one-half of the total amount we disbursed in foreign aid. Add together the disbursements and interest paid between 1946 and 1970 and the grand total comes to \$199,388,667,000.

In 1946, when this all began, the entire Federal budget outlay was only \$61,738,000,000. The accumulated interest on foreign aid alone is greater than the entire 1946 budget, a year when this Nation was still basically operating on a full wartime economy. The House just voted to raise the national debt ceiling to \$395 billion. The debt limit in 1946 was \$269.9 billion. The difference is \$125 billion or only slightly less than the amount given away in foreign aid during that period.

Is it any wonder that year after year this country must continually resort to deficit financing and continually increase the public debt limit? If this is how we husband the taxpayers dollars, is it any wonder that we are now beset by inflation?

I also ask my colleagues: What have we received for the \$199½ billion we have poured into the bottomless pit of foreign aid? To be sure, there have been a few successes, but will anyone suggest that the American people have received their money's worth?

Mr. Chairman, I cannot in clear conscience support this continual drain on our citizens for the dubious results received. I will vote against H.R. 17867.

At this moment, there is an unexpended balance of \$18,479,704,000 in the foreign aid "pipeline." It is my opinion that we should clean out the "pipeline" before clogging it more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, one of my fans in the House of Representatives is the gentleman from Iowa, who performs many useful functions, and his cooperation is always welcome. At times he is most helpful. The gentleman called my name on a couple of occasions here, once in connection with my vote yesterday to support President Nixon in his request to raise the debt limit.

This legislation did not cost any money, and it did not save any money. The way to save money is not to authorize and not to appropriate for these programs.

Of course, I did not vote against the bill to raise the debt limit, because we have gone to the grocery store, so to speak, and bought the groceries, and we have to pay for them. Honesty is becoming to an individual, but even more so to a nation, and to repudiate the debts of the United States and make it impossible for the United States to pay its bills would not only rock this country, but it would also rock the world—and talk about a stock market slump, and economic chaos, we would have it if we did not raise the debt ceiling. So, of course, in defense of my country and the tax-

payer, I voted, along with many others yesterday, with the majority, to raise the debt limit.

Now, with respect to foreign aid, I did not originate foreign aid, and I did not trip down the aisle and say it would be over in 5 years or 4 years or 6 years. But it is true, I have been in this House since 1935, and I was here following World War II, and I realized then that this country ought to do what it could to help put Western Europe on its feet.

Through foreign aid, we did help put Western Europe on its feet, and we did help Western Europe erect the strongest bulwark against war that has ever been erected in the history of mankind, and the erection of that bulwark has, in my opinion, made a major contribution toward preventing world war III, which would have cost vastly more than \$200 billion plus millions of lives. Such a war would make \$200 billion look like chickenfeed. The foreign aid in the Marshall Plan recommended by both Democrats and Republicans and by the President made a great contribution toward the preservation of humanity on this earth.

So while there have been mistakes made in foreign aid, this great Nation during the so-called foreign aid era has had the most fantastic growth in all the history of mankind. We cannot live in this world alone. Yes, we have helped the other nations help themselves for the benefit of the United States. We have had a selfish purpose, but also this purpose has redounded to the benefit of others.

Of course, mistakes have been made, and we apologize for the mistakes, and further mistakes will be made.

We have drastically reduced President Nixon's foreign aid request. He strongly supports foreign aid as his predecessors have done. He says it is important and necessary in order to promote the economic and military power of the United States. He endorses it as a means to help save the lives of our fighting men and hasten the end of the war. He is trying as our representative and spokesman to do his best to bring about peace and stability in the world.

So I stand here, not in apology, but in pride, that I have been a Member of this Congress during this period of tremendous growth on the part of the United States, and I am tremendously proud of the fact that through all our programs we have been able to prevent world war III and enable mankind to have an opportunity to survive and move forward.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me say I think the gentleman from Texas has most eloquently made the justification for the actions he has taken and the actions I have taken, because on this issue, I believe for the last 21 years we have been almost arm in arm.

The eloquent presentation and argument made by the gentleman from Texas fully sustains what has been done and what the committee is trying to do this year. I am tremendously impressed by

the fact that the committee has reduced the appropriation for the item of technical assistance for the next fiscal year by \$86,870,000 compared to the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

I believe the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman and I too urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ICHORD) there were—ayes 19, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance: For expenses authorized by section 504(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, including administrative expenses and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, \$350,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available for the purchase of new automotive vehicles outside of the United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in that paragraph shall be used to furnish sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, to any underdeveloped country other than Greece, Turkey, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea, unless the President determines that the furnishing of such weapons systems is important to the national security of the United States and reports within thirty days each such determination to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the military assistance program for any country shall not be increased beyond twenty per centum of the amount justified to the Congress, unless the President determines that an increase in such program is essential to the national interest of the United States and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within thirty days after each such determination: *Provided further*, That the Excess Defense Articles program for any country shall not be increased beyond twenty per centum of the amount presented to the Congress.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the proviso contained in lines 1 through 9 on page 6. This is patently legislation in an appropriation bill. It is not a limitation of funds. It does direct the Executive that funds cannot be appropriated for or furnished to support sophisticated weapons, with certain exceptions listed.

Mr. Chairman, similar provisions and restrictions are contained in sections 504 and 620(s) of the Foreign Assistance Act, and also section 35 of the Military Sales Act.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say this is legislation on an appropriation bill and is unnecessary because of similar provisions in the Authorization Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

The committee felt this to be a limitation, because the words "none of the funds appropriated \* \* \* shall be used" appear in this paragraph.

This provision was added by the committee to the foreign assistance appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968 in order to stop underdeveloped countries from buying sophisticated weapons systems with U.S. grant-aid funds. The provision was subsequently modified to encourage countries away from arms races. We believe it is a limitation and we ask for a ruling.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

This is an amendment that I had offered and it has been in the bill for 4 years now. I believe it comes within the Holman rule. It is a retrenchment of Federal expenditures. It is negative in nature. It is germane, and I do not see where it imposes any addition or affirmative duties on anyone. I think the point of order should be ruled against.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

On September 20, 1966, a point of order was sustained against language which was contained in a foreign aid appropriation bill prohibiting aid to any nation that sells or permits ships on its registry to transport cargo to North Vietnam and containing the phrase "unless the President determines." The important language there is "unless the President determines." The language here appears to be identical, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

POINT OF ORDER MADE BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso on page 6, lines 9 through part of 16. This is clearly legislation in an appropriation in that it provides for a Presidential determination on military assistance under certain circumstances.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I feel here again that this is a limitation on funds. This would provide that the Pentagon could not give away more than 20 percent of the amount of military equipment that they come up here to the Congress with in their presentation book. It is clearly a retrenchment and is saving money for the taxpayers. It is a limitation on an appropriation bill, and I do not feel that the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point of order is essentially the same as the one made a moment ago by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the precedent is substantially the same. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

POINT OF ORDER MADE BY MR. ZABLOCKI

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso on lines 16 through 19. This is clearly legislation in an appropriation and is not a proper appropriation limitation. It attempts to provide that excess defense articles programs may be increased up to 20 percent for any country beyond the amounts presented to the Congress.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to go into the substance of the proviso since this language is not in the authorization act. I do want

to point out, however, that this proviso particularly is not in the interest of our national security nor is it in the interest of our economic well-being.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to renew my point of order that this is legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

I support the point of order made against this language. Again this is legislation on an appropriation bill. Beyond that, no funds are contained in this bill for the excess defense articles program other than modest amounts for repair, rehabilitation, packaging, and crating of such equipment. The proviso limits the amount of equipment which can be provided to the various countries. It does not limit the funds in this bill. In other words, it is not a limitation on the use of funds in this bill but, rather, it seeks to limit the amount of excess equipment that can be disposed of pursuant to authority contained in the basic law.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, the proviso interferes with Presidential discretion which is provided for in the basic legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boggs). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has raised a point of order against the language appearing on page 6 of the bill, lines 16 through 19, relating to excess defense articles, on the ground that the proviso is in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of rule XXI, clause 2.

The Chair has examined the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. Section 503 of that act bestows authority for military assistance and gives the President wide discretion in the furnishing and allotment of such assistance, subject of course to the general authorization levels set in section 504. The Chair is of the opinion that the proviso to which the point of order is directed places a limitation upon that Executive discretion as contained in the basic act and is therefore legislation on an appropriation bill that is not in order under the rule.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that this is language which should not be in the bill. The language has been ruled out of order.

Mr. Chairman, I had proposed to strike from the bill by amendment the proviso beginning on line 16, page 6. This has been accomplished by a point of order. However, I wish to discuss the proviso which states, "that the excess defense articles program for any country shall not be increased beyond 20 percent of the amount presented to the Congress." The language would simply create a can of worms without beginning or ending. It would make a complete shambles of the present program which permits excess defense articles to be made available to allied and friendly nations. It would

make attainment of our objectives in helping deserving nations more difficult, and it could very well defeat its own purpose by hampering the efforts of the countries we are urging to assume greater responsibility for their own defense and for the common defense.

It is important to understand what is meant by the excess defense articles. We are speaking of equipment and other materials which become excess to the needs of the Department of Defense. This occurs each year. These materials have been bought and paid for through the defense budget. They have served the purpose for which they were acquired. Practically all of the equipment is old and extremely well used. By our standards it is generally obsolete or obsolescent. Nevertheless, this material is of potentially significant value to foreign countries whose weapons standards are not as high as ours. By rework and rebuild programs, our allies are able to utilize much of this equipment for their own defense requirements. This lessens the burden on their defense budgets and places no significant additional burden on ours.

The alternative, of course, is to scrap the weapons and equipment through the surplus property disposal processes. That means it brings a few cents on the dollar and really serves no useful purpose. It leaves our allies without needed equipment which is usable for their purposes, and it adds to their budget problems.

We are not talking about large amounts in terms of total U.S. budget requirements. The actual value today of the excess articles, which could be used to meet previously validated country requirements, is set forth in justifications presented to the Congress by the executive branch at \$152 million.

If the equipment were bought new, it would cost several times as much. In fact, it will be worth several times as much to our allies, for it represents equipment which can be rebuilt to serve their requirements. We can no longer serve our needs. If it goes to scrap, it will bring only a fractional part of the declared value. We should not tie down and destroy this useful program in its application.

The language to which I object would limit the use of excess to fill established military assistance requirements to 120 percent of the illustrative amounts shown in the justifications on a country-by-country basis for 11 selected countries. Those amounts reflect only major items of equipment which could be foreseen as excess when the program was developed many months ago.

At that time, they totaled slightly over \$13 million; and the bulk of the excess defense articles program—\$139 million—was presented on an undistributed worldwide basis. Since the two amounts were intended to be additive, and the proposed language applies to the illustrative country programs only, the impact of the limitation would be far greater than may be readily apparent.

In other words, the restriction, if enacted into law, would disallow the use of any of the \$139 million estimated excess

presented on a worldwide basis, and the 20 percent allowable increase would apply only to the some \$13 million in individual country programs set forth in the justifications. Thus the total amount of excess materials which could be used in support of valid military assistance objectives, and to meet already established military assistance requirements would be approximately \$16 million—a net reduction of 90 percent in the total program originally proposed.

Such a reduction is, I submit, inconsistent with both our national interest in the maintenance of an adequate defense posture and our efforts to provide for that posture at minimum cost. It would preclude optimum use of excess defense articles as one means of strengthening allied and friendly armed forces while, at the same time, saving money and preventing the waste of potentially valuable equipment. It fails to take into account the fact that, except for a relatively few items, it is unrealistic to expect any precise prediction as to what articles may become excess as much as a year in advance. Legislation which would limit the program to those few items which can be foreseen as excess could only choke off a potentially valuable source of supply and result in the wasteful scrapping of equipment which can and should be put to effective and productive use by the armed forces of nations we are asking to make increasingly greater effort in their own and the common defense.

I urge you to join with me in voting against that legislation and thereby insuring the Department of Defense the opportunity to make optimum use of a valuable asset and continue to realize all possible savings therefrom.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, subsequent to the approval by the subcommittee of this language, and the full committee, it was necessary that I discuss this amendment in detail with General Warren, the Administrator of the military assistance program.

Had I known at the time what was involved in the amendment as it pertains to excess equipment, I would have opposed the amendment at the time of the markup.

Under the law you only have excess military equipment when it is no longer being used by our defense forces. It is excess equipment. It has no actual value other than salvage value.

The law prohibits the sale of this equipment to civilians. So, unless it is disposed of through one of our allies then, of course, this equipment must be demolished or it can only be sold for junk for only a few pennies on the dollar.

In many instances this excess equipment is already in the recipient country. When you give them the excess equipment then, of course, it saves dollars because it takes the place of wornout equipment and reduces transportation costs.

Therefore, I feel it is only proper, if this amendment had not been stricken on a point of order, that it should have gone out on an amendment, because we should place the military in the position where it could take such equipment and

allocate it to other nations. If not, it would have to be junked, and the value would be only a few pennies on the dollar.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should set the record straight on this provision. I offered this amendment in committee, and it was accepted by the committee.

The excess defense articles program has been greatly abused. That is why I offered my amendment to limit overruns to 20 percent of the original presentations.

It is interesting to note that the people opposing my amendment today are the same people who supported giving Taiwan \$54.5 million worth of offensive jets last December. Those jets had not been requested by the administration, the Department of Defense, or anyone else. No hearings were ever held on the request. Nonetheless, these same people—the same ones opposing me today—eagerly supported the jets for Taiwan last December.

And while we were debating whether or not to give \$54.5 million in jets to China, someone treated Taiwan to a nice "Christmas Package." The package consisted of \$157 million in so-called surplus or excess property, and it made the \$54.5 million deal look small by comparison.

The chairman has called this "Christmas Package" junk. Well, I would like to have that junk. I am sure Israel would also like to have that junk with the very serious problems it is facing in the Middle East.

The "Christmas package" to Taiwan contained jet fighters, air transports, tanks, rifles, and even SAM missiles which the general that Mr. PASSMAN is speaking about called "brand new." Would my colleagues call something that is "brand new" junk?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am told—and I have a letter that I will be very happy to make available to the gentleman—that says that, when it is declared excess, there is no further need for it in the United States, and it may be sent to some other nations, but it is given because it has no further use in support of our Nation.

A good part of this is used, some of it is new, but it is excess, and our own defense is not affected by it.

Mr. CONTE. I think it is a fair statement that the gentleman from Louisiana just made. Some of it is new. But you can declare anything excess. They can come over here and tell the committee that all these jet fighters are excess and that we should give them to Taiwan, the Philippines, or Korea. That is the way the program has been run.

There are tanks sitting in a European country, whose name I cannot disclose, ready to go to one of the recipient nations. Any day now we will hear once again in the papers that tanks have been given to this or that country.

I think this program has been abused. I think Congress should assert itself and see to it that the program is no longer abused.

I talked to Gen. Robert H. Warren, head of the military assistance program. He agreed with me. He also indicated that, as a result of new programming, the Defense Department would have no trouble meeting the limits established by my amendment.

The other amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin has deleted was one that I put in this bill several years ago to prevent the United States from giving or selling sophisticated weapons of war to developing nations, except the five specifically mentioned in the provision. I am terribly sorry that the gentleman raised a point of order against this amendment. The Foreign Affairs Committee has not done anything about it in the 12 years I have been here. Yet we are building up a jet club in Latin America. Argentina got jets, and so Bolivia wanted jets, and so the Peruvians wanted jets, and so on. The Peruvians went out and purchased \$25 million worth of French Mirage jets. The Peruvians need jets like I need a hole in my head. They are building up this great jet set in Latin America. That is all I was trying to do by this amendment—stop an arms race throughout the world. I am sorry the gentleman raised a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is this:

Does the proviso on page 5, line 22, remain in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the bill and the Chair will state that we have passed that paragraph and no point of order was raised and it does stay in the bill.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. The Congress hereby reiterates its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China, and it is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations. In the event of the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations, the President is requested to inform the Congress, insofar as is compatible with the requirements of national security, of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States and our foreign relationships, including that created by membership in the United Nations, together with any recommendations which he may have with respect to the matter.

#### POINT OF ORDER BY MR. FRASER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order as to the language on page 7, line 25, and continuing on page 8 to line 16.

I make a point of order against the language set forth on the ground that this is an effort to insert a major foreign policy statement in the middle of an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order without prejudice to the merit or wisdom of the provision, but simply on the ground that it does not belong in this appropriation measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this provision was added by the Senate to the fiscal 1957 bill because the Congress does not want Communist China to sit in the United Nations.

It has been carried in this bill for 14 years.

If it should be technically subject to a point of order, at least it is extremely desirable and I certainly hope this bill will never be enacted into law until either the authorizing committee of this body or the Senate will make this permanent legislation because I think it is very dangerous to be striking this type of language out of the bill after it has been there and has sustained itself very well for 14 years.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The language states among other things, in the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota, on page 8, "it is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of Congress that the Communist regime in China \* \* \*".

Then further down on line 10, page 8, the language reads, "The President is required to inform the Congress \* \* \*".

These are clearly: First, the expression of the sense of Congress and second, a direction to the President of the United States. Both of which clearly violate rule XXI, clause 2.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

POINT OF ORDER BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 106, lines 17 through 25 on page 8 on the ground that it constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add further that the essential wording of this section is already in existing law, and has been so for many years. I refer to section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act. That section reads as follows:

The Congress further declares that any distinction made by foreign nations between American citizens because of race, color or

religion in the granting of, or in the exercise of personal or other rights available to American citizens, is repugnant to our principles.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman; we concede the point of order.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the entire paragraph has been read. I think the Committee of the Whole is entitled to know all the language that is being sought to be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will re-read the full paragraph, section 106, beginning on line 17 and continuing through line 25.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana concedes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, in addition to those items contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any other articles, materials or supplies of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war or of strategic significance to the conduct of war, including petroleum products.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 107(a) on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make his point of order against the entire section?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. When I get the opportunity, I shall certainly make the point of order against section (b) also. If it is in order, I shall be glad to make the point of order against both sections (a) and (b) at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would prefer to rule on the sections separately. The gentleman has made a point of order against section 107(a). The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act contains similar restrictions, but they are much more detailed, specific, and restricted than those contained in the provision which I am seeking to strike from the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana care to be heard?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, your committee felt that the language contained a very definite limitation. The language itself states—

No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba—

That provision has stood up over the years as being a limitation. We feel that it is, and we ask the Chair for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. As the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out, the language is similar but it is not identical with the provisions of section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act as amended. In addition, it relates to provisions other than those contained in this bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting to me to see what has been stricken out of this bill—language that has been in the bill for a number of years. Because of a question of jurisdiction we now say that the part which prevents U.S. funds from being used "to pay pensions, annuities, retirement pay, or adjusted service compensation for any persons heretofore or hereafter serving in the armed forces of any recipient country" is stricken out.

We also say that language opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, and requiring the President to inform the Congress of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States should be stricken out.

For a number of years the bill has also provided that the principle of no discrimination because of race or religion should be applied in all negotiations between the United States and any other nation with respect to economic assistance. This has been stricken.

Another provision has been stricken which has been in the bill for some time. This provides that no economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba or North Vietnam arms, ammunition, or items of economic assistance.

These provisions have all been stricken—but they have been in this bill for a number of years.

Again I point out that the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, announced to this House early in the session a schedule of appropriations. This schedule was provided to give every legislative committee the opportunity to

bring their bills before the House, on the floor, before our committee passed on the related appropriation. If all of these items had been in a legislative bill, then it would not have been necessary for the Appropriations Committee to include them. Because they had not been in the legislative bills—and some are still not—the Appropriations Committee put them in.

Mr. Chairman, I am completely opposed and I am sure my chairman is, to legislation on an appropriation bill. But we are interested in bringing appropriation bills before the Congress, so they may be acted upon.

The legislative committees should bring in bills with this language. This would give us a chance to debate them, and support or defeat them on the floor of the House. If the legislative committee will bring bills with this language in and give the Congress the opportunity to pass upon these questions of legislation, then we will not have to come in here with legislation on appropriation bills, or be forced to seek necessary rules.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was informed earlier there is only one bill relating to this appropriation that has not been passed by the House, at least, and that is the Peace Corps.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman tell me what bill includes these limitations.

And if they are included, then why does the gentleman object to our including them again.

It is only a matter of jurisdictional dispute.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to section 620 of the authorization act. There are five full pages of limitations. Also in the same act there are two pages containing limitations in the statement of policy.

The limitations in the authorization act contain the same wording, and certainly the basic policy and limitations as the provisions in the appropriation bill before this committee. I submit these provisions violate House rules.

May I ask the gentleman from Ohio, if the Foreign Affairs Committee decided to provide for appropriations and funding in the foreign aid bill, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio agree? He will not object?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman knows the answer to that.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman would not agree?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Ohio could not agree. This is a matter of the rules of the House, which the gentleman knows.

Mr. Chairman, I will not yield further at this point, but is the gentleman only complaining because the Appropriations Committee has included these provi-

sions. If the gentleman is really interested in saying all these things that are in the bill, why does he object?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I object for the same reason the gentleman from Ohio would object: It is a violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Ohio should join the gentleman from Wisconsin not to permit legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio as a member of the Appropriations Committee is understandably chagrined that certain language is being stricken out on points of order, but as he pointed out himself, these are being stricken out because they constitute legislation in an appropriation bill.

As I just finished explaining, in my point of order to strike section 107(a) of this appropriation bill, there is comparable language already in the Foreign Assistance Act, and it has been there for many years.

It is far more explicit and detailed and restrictive than the language of the appropriation bill.

In a sense, perhaps, this is a contest between two committees. I feel that the legislative committee should have the responsibility for developing suitable legislative language on these points. In almost every case it has done so, and has done so many years ago.

What we are trying to do is to regularize a situation where language proposed by the Appropriations Committee has been protected in the past by the nature of the rule that has been granted. As members of the Foreign Affairs Committee we have complained against legislation in appropriation bills but we have been unable, because of the rule which has been adopted, to do anything about striking the language.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

There is an incident related in the Old Testament Scripture, in which King David was rebuked by the Prophet Nathan, after he had killed Uriah, having sent him in the front of the ranks and had him killed, in order that he might proceed to commit adultery with his wife, and to marry her—Bathsheba.

And Nathan said to David, that there was a man, a rich man, who had many flocks, and there was another man who had nothing but one little ewe-lamb, yet, he slew the poor man and made off with his one lamb.

The great Appropriations Committee is respected by us all. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has but one little lamb left. Our jurisdiction has been raided by committee after committee. We are down, really, to nothing more than this little foreign assistance legislation, which is all we have left to deal with.

I want to say, you ought to leave us with our one little lamb.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, is

simply this: If there has ever been a time when this country needed a balancing voice in foreign policy, that time is now. If there has ever been a time when the Congress needed a voice to balance foreign policy, that time is now. I would say the dominant voices in the other body do not reflect the views of many Americans and of many Members of this House.

Recently, when our President was asked to meet with members of the Foreign Relations Committee, he insisted that members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee attend the meeting, too, to discuss Cambodia. In this way he indicated his confidence that the House of Representatives ought to have a voice in foreign policy.

If we are going to have a voice, we must do so through our committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee. We must respect that committee and show such respect in the House, if it is to have the respect of the other body of the Congress and of the people of the United States.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I am very interested in what the gentleman had to say. The first few sentences disturbed me a little. I would hope the gentleman is not accusing the Appropriations Committee of having any of those desires portrayed in some of his first statements.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would say to the distinguished gentleman, my committee has been raped more than once on the floor of the House.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Has section 107(b) been read?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language on lines 13 through 17, page 9, section 107(b) constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore should be stricken.

I should like to point out, also, there is comparable language, but stronger language, already in the Foreign Assistance Act. I refer to section 620(a)(3) with respect to the prohibition against trade with Cuba, and section 620(n), the language with respect to North Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee believes now, as we have believed for many years, that this was a limitation on expenditures. It says:

No economic assistance—

Referring first to U.S. dollars—

shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam.

According to the committee's interpretation, this is a limitation, and I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The first two lines read:

No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961—

It is entirely possible that there is a variety of programs under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Therefore, this is clearly a limitation upon the act and not on the bill and comes within the prohibition of rule XXI, clause 2, and the point of order is sustained.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the analogy of the flocks of sheep and the lamb is particularly appropriate here today, because the taxpayers are about to get their annual shearing if this bill is approved.

I ask for a vote on my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 18, noes 70.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 108. Any expenditure made from funds provided in this title for procurement outside the United States of any commodity in bulk and in excess of \$100,000 shall be reported to the Senate and House of Representatives at least twice annually: *Provided*, That each such report shall state the reasons for which the President determined, pursuant to criteria set forth in section 604(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that foreign procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

POINT OF ORDER MADE BY MR. ADAIR

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 108.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAIR. This is legislation in an appropriation bill. It requires a report to the Congress of all procurements of more than \$100,000 made outside of the United States and prescribes the type of justification that the President must give.

Thus, in my opinion, it is clearly legislation.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, to answer a point that has been made earlier by the gentleman from Ohio, this same general subject matter is in existing law in section 604 of the Foreign Assistance Act, where again, in my opinion, it is set forth more fully and effectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, we ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boggs). The Chair is prepared to rule. The language in question, the significant part of it, section 108:

Any expenditure made from funds provided in this title for procurement outside the United States of any commodity in bulk and in excess of \$100,000 shall be reported to the Senate and the House of Representatives at least twice annually:

That, obviously, is an imposition of new duties upon the Executive and it clearly falls within the prohibition of section XXI, clause 2.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when the Clerk reads the next section, I propose to raise a point of order against both clauses (a) and (b), and I rise at this time to inquire if I can make the point of order against both clauses and have it considered at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Minnesota that that can be done only by unanimous consent.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 109. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 109, paragraph (a). This provision duplicates a restriction in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act against any form of assistance to Communist countries. In fact, the wording of the provision in the authorizing legislation is much more specific as to the countries which may be considered "Communist" countries. This provision in the appropriation bill is therefore unnecessary.

I make the point of order that this language constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boggs). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The language in question in section 109(a) is similar but not identical to the language in the authorization legislation and, therefore, does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 214(b)), unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the Congress and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 109, paragraph (b). The provision forbids any economic assistance to Communist countries. As with reference to the previous paragraph, this one is duplicative of section 620(f). In fact, it is far less precise than the provision contained in the authorizing legislation. Therefore, I make the point of order that the language in section 109, paragraph (b) constitutes legislation in an appropriation measure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The language is similar but is not identical to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It imposes new duties upon the President of the United States and as such clearly falls within the prohibition of rule XXI, clause 2.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 111. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this or any predecessor Act for the years subsequent to fiscal year 1962 for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to make payments with respect to any contract for the performance of services outside the United States by United States citizens unless the President shall have promulgated regulations that provide for the investigation of such citizens for loyalty and security to the extent necessary to protect the security and other interests of the United States: *Provided*, That such regulations shall require that any such United States citizen who will have access, in connection with the performance of such services, to information or material classified for security reasons shall be subject to such investigation as may otherwise be provided by law and executive order.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against section 111.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, section 111 constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill. This provision has been carried in legislation since 1963.

I am in sympathy with this provision, and will do my best to include even stronger language in the next authorization bill. The time has come when we should clearly define the responsibilities of our committees and prevent further encroachment, and although I favor this language personally I must insist on my point of order because of the principle involved, that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee felt that this year, as in the previous years, that this was a limitation provision which was added by the committee to the fiscal year 1963 bill in order to require investigation of the U.S. citizens outside the United States who are performing service on U.S.-funded contracts, and for security to protect the U.S. interests. We felt it was a limitation, and that we had carried it for 7 years.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The significant language is found on line 17, where it defines the duties of the President of the United States in saying that "unless the President"—on line 18—"shall have promulgated regulations that provide for the investigation of such citizens," and so on. That again is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and falls within the prohibition, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 116. No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country that sells, furnishes or permits any ships under its registry to carry to North Vietnam any of the items mentioned in subsection 107(a) of this Act.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 116 in that it constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill. I would like to add, furthermore, it is almost word for word part of a prohibition which is already contained in existing law, and that is section 620(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act. The fact is the existing law is stronger and broader in its restrictions than the language in this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The language is similar and almost like the language contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. However, it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 117. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be available for assistance to the United Arab Republic, unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet to make a point of order as to section 117 that was just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has a point of order on section 117?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin on his point of order.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I will gladly defer to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) if I do not lose my opportunity to make my point of order in so doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the point of order takes precedence.

POINT OF ORDER BY MR. ZABLOCKI

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 117 on the ground that it constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill.

It is almost identical with the prohibitions contained in section 620(p) of the existing Foreign Assistance Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The language on page 13, line 19, "unless the President determines," is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and clearly violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the exercise in the House today demonstrates the difficulty we have had through the years with the foreign aid appropriation bills.

In order to make the foreign aid program more effective, if such is possible, the Congress through the years has written into the appropriation bill various restrictions such as prohibitions against aiding Communist countries and many other provisions which it has been felt were in the best interests of the United States.

These various legislative provisions have found their way over a period of years or decades into the bill, and these re-

strictions and prohibitions and modifications have tended to make the appropriation bill more acceptable and capable of passage through the House and the other body.

We realize that we are having a field day here by knocking out certain of these provisions which have established over the years a settled congressional policy. If these were new provisions, it would be different. But here we are dealing with what could be called settled congressional policy.

The gentleman from Alabama talked about King David and Bathsheba. He also talked about going to the White House and he welcomed the opportunity for the Congress to have a voice in foreign policy. That is what we have been doing through the years in this bill, asserting our authority over foreign policy. We have had a very significant voice on foreign policy. But the gentleman from Alabama and others have objected to proposals in the bill designed to strengthen the hand of Congress in foreign policy matters.

What we have done through the years is to build up this appropriation bill with these policy provisions. They are being summarily knocked out today.

We do not complain. We went before the Committee on Rules and asked for a rule with respect to some of the provisions in the bill, and particularly the provision as to the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps is not too palatable—I hold no brief for it—some are for it and some are against it. But we asked for a rule on that. I assume that since the rule was not granted on the appropriation of \$80 million—some \$18 million below the budget for the Peace Corps—that it will be stricken out on a point of order. That can be done. I shall not complain.

The Committee on Appropriations has brought in thus far about 11 appropriation bills and resolutions involving more than \$40 billion. I hope we have worked diligently and with some degree of effectiveness.

When you walk down the corridors of the Capitol, members say, "How are we coming along on appropriations? When do you think we can get them behind us? How are we moving toward the time when we might adjourn insofar as appropriations are concerned?" We say, we are doing the best we can. We announced months in advance that we were going to have bills up at a certain time, generally speaking. For example, with respect to the Peace Corps, the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and it is a great committee and headed by a very able chairman and has very able members—that Committee on Foreign Affairs has known for many months that there would have to be an authorization on the Peace Corps.

I realize that the Peace Corps authorization involving about \$100 million is a serious matter, but it had been thought that these authorizations would be approved and that we would be able to handle appropriations by this late date.

In a sense, we are trying ourselves today. Is our system able to function or

are the critics right, that the Congress is outmoded, incompetent, and unable to do its job? I do not know just how we are going to be rated when we are weighed in the balance on these matters.

More points of order will be made. This bill will be stripped of a series of provisions which I think probably 75 or 80 percent of the Members approve. It will be made less acceptable. But the Committee on Appropriations has done the best it could under the circumstances.

We have labored long and hard in the vineyard trying to help the Members to get the job done so they could go home earlier during this campaign year.

I would hope that while this bill is stripped of many of its helpful provisions, nevertheless, you will understand the plight in which we find ourselves as we approach the end of the fiscal year without the benefit of an authorization bill. Authorization bills must be passed on a timely basis if we are to avoid a chaotic situation.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the members of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs have a good, close look at some of the provisions that have been stricken out today on points of order. These helpful and desirable provisions have been carried in this bill for many years. The test will come later today. But I am of the opinion that any vote on the merits of the provisions would be in the affirmative. I can understand why they are jealous of their prerogatives. They have supported these amendments, some of them, for many years, recognizing that they were good amendments. Now, today, they say they are good, but they constitute legislation on an appropriation bill. They have not said they would adopt these provisions in the Foreign Affairs Committee. They have said they would try.

I am of the opinion that if the House goes along with this bill today with all these provisions stricken, it may afford the Foreign Affairs Committee an opportunity to bring out legislation; and if they fail to do so, there will be no more foreign aid bills.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding, because I want to add my commendations to those who have commended and congratulated the gentleman from Louisiana. The Appropriations Committee has done a splendid job in the amounts reported. I refer particularly to the gentleman from Louisiana. No one can quarrel with his sincerity, his conscientiousness, and his objectiveness. We applaud

you, commend you, and salute you. To the extent that you guard, and jealously guard, the prerogatives of your Appropriations Committee, we want to assure you that we are just as jealous of the prerogatives of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

I want to again to commend the gentleman for bringing into proper perspective the entire ball of wax of our foreign aid program, which is worldwide. The gentleman has done an excellent job.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for those compliments. I am very fond of every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have never known whether they were too busy doing something else, but for some reason or other we are always waiting for authorization. Let us put it on the line. For most of the 16 years we have had to move this bill with some type of provision waiving points of order. For some reason this great committee never gets these bills out. We have been forced to write provisions into this bill to protect the American people from abuses.

Now I hope it is time to take a rest. If they are too busy, then some of you should take the initiative and clean this up, because you are going to get this bill defeated after this year if you do not bring out a measure reestablishing these provisions.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask with respect to the Peace Corps if since the Committee on Appropriations has reported this bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has taken action on the Peace Corps bill? This being the fourth day of June, would it have been possible for this great committee to have taken action in February or March or April or May? Or has the committee had such a rugged schedule on the floor that the committee just could not do it?

This is the thing that has concerned us. We all try to work hard and get our work done. Often we do not get the authorization on the foreign aid until late in the year, at times not until October or later.

Mr. MAHON. We are in a difficult situation, and we want help in connection with this matter.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the record should be set straight here this afternoon. A number of Members have complained, especially members of the Committee on Appropriations, that they have not had the authorizing legislation for foreign assistance for an adequate amount of time. I want to point out, as I said earlier, that this legislation was authorized last year when the aid program was authorized for 2 years. The Committee on Appropriations, contrary to some of the things that have been said on this floor this afternoon, has had that authorization for all of this year. I do

not know how much more time could be required than that.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the committee that for this one time since I have been chairman of this committee the gentleman's committee did get a bill out in time for us to move on it. However, the committee did not get out a legislative bill on the Peace Corps.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask our committee chairman if it is not true the Foreign Affairs Committee has studied the entire Peace Corps program in depth, and that there was considerable controversy on several matters? There was objection to the so-called reverse Peace Corps suggestion. The Committee on Foreign Affairs took great time and used much zeal in looking into details of the Peace Corps operation before deciding when the authorization was ready to report. I am sure the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid of the Committee on Appropriations could have waited 1 more week while the bill was reported.

I am sure that since the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee is here, the gentleman from Indiana will yield to the chairman.

Mr. ADAIR. Before yielding to the chairman, let me add one other point.

Something has been made of the fact that provisions in this appropriation bill have been stricken out on points of order today, and the gentleman from Louisiana expressed concern that these provisions were not in the law. As a matter of fact, almost every provision that has been stricken out is in existing law where it ought to be, in the authorizing legislation. In almost every case, in my opinion it is in better and more explicit language than that which has been proposed here. So I want to give assurance to those who are here that almost without exception these provisions are in existing law.

Now I yield to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say the Foreign Affairs Committee did not have the opportunity this year to even look at a copy of the foreign operations bill until almost just before this committee went before the Rules Committee.

We did not have the courtesy of a notice from the Appropriations Committee that this bill would include legislative matter within our jurisdiction as the authorizing committee.

When I went to several members of the subcommittee, they said the chairman of the subcommittee had a closed, tight security arrangement, that nobody could talk about this bill.

Of course, we did not have an adequate opportunity to examine this bill.

I want to say, so far as the Peace Corps is concerned, we needed a little more time to look at the Peace Corps and to examine its operation. We completed our hearings on the Peace Corps in April, but our consideration was extended and we did not file the report until today, after modifying the bill in several particulars.

Of course, I was alarmed about some of the publicity on the Peace Corps. I was alarmed when some people who are Peace Corps volunteers put an advertisement in a metropolitan paper. I wanted to find out what happened. I was concerned about several other things.

An authorizing committee must have time to authorize its own legislation. After all, when this committee voted out this bill it was only June 3, 1970. No one can blame the Foreign Affairs Committee because the foreign operations appropriation did not become law until February 9, 1970. The Foreign Affairs Committee was not responsible for the delays that held up the final approval of the foreign aid appropriation bill of the last session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I believe we have heard a thorough discussion here on jurisdiction and who is to blame. I hope we can get on with this bill, vote on it, and let us go home.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I believe comment needs to be made also about the matter of the Foreign Military Sales Act. All members of the committee here this afternoon are aware that that legislation was considered, was reported, was passed by this House weeks ago, and is now involved in debate in the other body. Certainly that cannot be charged to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We are not blaming the great Foreign Affairs Committee for the military credit sales portion of this bill.

I do want to say, with compassion and understanding, it is a fact that this bill was passed after a struggle in October, November, and sometimes in December, so if this little exchange is considered a barb by the Foreign Affairs Committee, we have accomplished something. I hope the gentleman agrees.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 119. The President is directed to withhold economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes from any country other than Greece, Turkey, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea, unless the President determines that such purchase or acquisition of weapons systems is important to the national security of the United States and reports within thirty days each such determination to the Congress.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 14, lines 13 to 22, section 119, that this is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

It is a good provision, again, but it has no legitimate place in an appropriation bill, especially when even stronger restrictions are already contained in section 520(s) of the existing Foreign Assistance Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, section 119 was put into this bill to prevent a hideous waste of the taxpayers' money. That surely is the main purpose of the Committee on Appropriations.

This amendment is in the nature of a limitation which would withhold an equivalent amount of aid in cases where underdeveloped countries otherwise recipients of U.S. aid undertake to make purchases of sophisticated weapons systems with their own funds. This limitation applies solely to the appropriation under consideration and does not operate beyond the fiscal year in which the appropriation is made.

Section 119 has saved the taxpayers money. The United States withheld a \$30 million development loan to Peru because of that nation's purchase of Mirage jets in 1968. Section 119 was added to the Foreign Assistance Act for 1968. At that time Argentina purchased U.S. A4-D jet fighters and Chile bought English Hunters and Peru was reportedly negotiating for the purchase of \$20 million of French Mirage jets.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is not talking to the point of order.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am arguing that this section was put in to save money and that it has saved money.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman argue that it is in order?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am arguing it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his argument?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Under the rules and precedents, limitations may be written into appropriations bills. As Chairman Dingley, of Maine, wrote in 1896:

The House in Committee of the Whole has the right to refuse to appropriate for any object, either in whole or in part, even though that object may be authorized by law. That principle of limitation has been sustained so repeatedly that it may be regarded as a part of the parliamentary law of the Committee of the Whole.

Asher C. Hinds, clerk to the Speaker from 1881 until 1891, and editor of the "Rules, Manual and Digest" of the House of Representatives in 1899, and of "Hinds' Precedents" in 1908:

Thus the power of limitation is solely a negative power, capable of setting up a barrier, and not a positive power, capable of creative functions. The appropriation may interfere with Executive discretion only in a negative way. It may decline to appropriate for ships to be built in a navy yard by saying that no part of the appropriation shall be used for that purpose. These negative prohibitions are within the power of the appropriation bill.

In the past, limitations have prohibited such measures as the payment of troops stationed in certain geographical locations, the appropriations for repair of vessels in private shipyards, and appropriations for the return of a Reserve Force to active duty—Cannon's Precedents.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds the precedent cited is not germane. Section 119 as it is now drafted reads as follows:

The President is directed to withhold economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country—

And again on line 19 it says—

unless the President determines that such purchase or acquisition of weapons systems is important to the national security of the United States and reports within 30 days each such determination to the Congress.

It is obviously legislation in an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 120. (a) In order to restrain arms races and proliferation of sophisticated weapons, and to insure that resources intended for economic development are not diverted to military purposes, the President shall take into account before furnishing development loans, Alliance loans, or supporting assistance to any country under this Act, and before making sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended:

(1) the percentage of the recipient or purchasing country's budget which is devoted to military purposes.

(2) the degree to which the recipient or purchasing country is using its foreign exchange resources to acquire military equipment; and

(3) the amount spent by the recipient or purchasing country for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, from any country.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 120. It clearly constitutes detailed legislative provisions in an appropriation. Furthermore, in essence and detail, its language is already in existing law—section 620(s) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman not make a point of order to the entire section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was going to ask the gentleman whether or not the point of order relates to section 120(a) or 120 (a) and (b).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. To the entire section, Mr. Chairman. Page 14, line 23, through line 19 on page 15. The entire section 120, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has only read section 120(a), so the Chair will advise the gentleman to make his point of order on paragraph (a) rather than the whole section.

Does the gentleman from Louisiana care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Again a careful reading will show that the President is directed to take into account various considerations, all of which constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) The President shall report annually to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate his actions in carrying out this provision.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I repeat my point of order that I made earlier against section 120.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Again the President is required to take certain action, and it clearly falls within the prohibition. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT  
PEACE CORPS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, including purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for use outside the United States, \$80,000,000, of which not to exceed \$28,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 16, lines 9 through 14, because this is an effort to appropriate money for an authorization which does not yet exist. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has passed out an authorizing bill but the House has not yet had time to act. I would ask, therefore, that this language be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana rise?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Minnesota meant lines 7 through 14.

Mr. FRASER. Yes; it would be lines 7 through 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers that in the form of an amendment to his point of order, lines 7 through 14?

Mr. FRASER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee concedes a point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND  
WELFARE

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-510), relating to aid to refugees within the United States, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$112,000,000: *Provided*, That funds from this appropriation shall be used to reimburse the Secretary of State to cover the costs incurred by the Department of State in connection with the movement of refugees from Cuba to the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLAY: Page 18, beginning in line 15, strike out "\$112,000,000" and all that follows down through line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$111,200,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to reimburse the Secretary of State to cover the costs incurred by the Department of State in connection with the movement of refugees from Cuba to the United States."

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, it is incumbent upon me to call to the attention of my colleagues that the continuation of the Cuban airlift is an unjustifiable drain on the taxpayers' purse. Such an expenditure is a wasteful and unnecessary spending of the Federal tax dollar, and it perpetuates a program that is not in the best interest of this country.

More than 11 years ago, Fidel Castro forceably captured political control of Cuba. During the intervening years, our Government has established a policy of nonrecognition of the Castro regime. In addition, we agreed to give political asylum to those Cubans who ideologically and politically differed with Castro. Most Americans wholeheartedly agreed with that decision.

In 1965, this Government began what is known as Freedom Airlift in connection with our policy for admitting persons considered refugees fleeing an oppressed state. Most Americans also gave their endorsement to the Freedom Airlift for Cubans.

Today, 11 years after Castro's successful revolution, we are not only continuing to admit Cuban citizens as refugees—but we continue to fly 1,000 Cuban refugees into this country each week. In the last 6 years, we have admitted more than 225,000 Cuban refugees at a cost of \$300 million.

I take sharp issue with this official and costly policy whereby this Nation has opened the doors for unlimited Cuban immigration. No longer can this policy be couched or obscured in refugee terminology. The real refugees of Cuba left in the early 1960's when they had to flee for sanctuary. They were the ones who opposed Castro politically and who faced oppression and mistreatment at the hands of the Castro regime.

What we have now in our Cuban refugee policy is a direct subsidizing of the welfare program of an alien nation. Many of those now coming to this country are the aged, the blind, the invalids, and the unemployables.

Though the United States will not recognize Castro's government, we volunteer to handle his social and economic problems. We spend tax money to solve the social problems of an enemy nation, thereby compounding the overwhelming social and economic problems of our own.

We have set up special programs for Cuban immigrants in order to relocate, educate, train, and to feed them. We pay out school impact aid in the amount of \$17 million in Dade County, Fla., alone to accommodate the schools suffering from the massive influx of Cuban citizens. There are an estimated 50,000 Cuban refugees now on State welfare for which the Federal Government reimburses the States. The Office of Education administers a special Cuban Loan Section in the Division of Student Financial Aid—just to handle and operate our special loan program for Cuban students.

In addition to the madness of the cost and special programs addressed to Cuban citizens, the policy runs counter to all basic immigration thought, law, and practice. It is grossly unfair to impose strict limitations and requirements on the numbers of immigrants we will accept from other nations in the Eastern or Western Hemisphere—and to exclude Cubans from that same criteria.

Once the Cuban refugee becomes an American resident, he is counted in the number of persons we will admit from the Western Hemisphere, thereby greatly reducing the number of immigrants from other Western Hemisphere countries.

The policy toward Cuban refugees was instituted as an emergency measure. That emergency condition no longer exists. The airlift and other measures were never intended to become permanent institutions.

Finally, the operational cost of Freedom Airlift is \$800,000 a year. I recommend that you support my amendment to strike out that section of the foreign assistance appropriation bill relating to the cost of the airlift—this would assure that this program will eventually come to a close when those refugees now living in this country are fully disseminated into our society.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those of us living in Louisiana live in a little bit closer to the situation than some of the other Members of this House.

In a newspaper article entitled "Cuban Exiles Make a New Life," there are some interesting observations. It says that instead of becoming a burden on the U.S. cities to which they have settled, the Cuban refugees are contributing to the economy. In fact, these exiles possess initiative, ambition, pride, energy, various skills, intelligence, and other traits that enabled Americans in pioneer days to overcome great hardships and obstacles.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know about the gentleman's State of Missouri, but I do know in Louisiana there is a lot of jealousy growing up because these Cubans are willing to work, and it embarrasses some of these people who would rather live on a handout.

Here is one program I consider to be an excellent one, and this can be verified.

In the State of Louisiana it says that the success of the Cubans in starting life anew puts to shame lazy native Americans who look to the Government to rescue them from poverty. The Office of Economic Opportunity might do well to get Cubans to take charge of certain antipoverty programs.

Now repeating, if I may, we have found that some of these Cubans have initiative and they have ability and they are willing to accept jobs in keeping with their qualifications. They do not come over here wanting to be bookkeepers or airplane pilots or steamboat captains. They are willing to accept positions in keeping with their qualifications. A great many citizens in my State and others do not subscribe to their policy; they want to be bookkeepers, whether or not they can make 2 and 2 add up to 4. So I have nothing but praise for these Cubans. They are coming out of a Communist country and I think we should embrace them with compassion and welcome them to our shores.

Remember, these people are writing back to their relatives not only in Cuba but in other Communist countries. So we should fund this entire program and encourage these people to come to America where they can make a new life and maybe they can impart some knowledge to some of these citizens who prefer to live on a handout rather than to accept a job in keeping with their qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is voted down.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Missouri for raising this issue. I can thoroughly understand his feelings.

There is certainly some validity to the arguments presented by our colleague from Missouri. Our domestic needs are pressing. This is particularly the case when we consider the condition of some of our educational, housing, social welfare, and other facilities in our larger cities—as well as the plight of the low-income families in rural areas.

However, the vast bulk of the money contained in this bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is designed to assist local communities throughout the United States which have been subjected to special demands as a result of Cuban airlift.

This money is intended for local communities from Florida to Michigan, from New York to the west coast, to help them provide the necessary facilities and services to their residents—primarily those who have arrived in recent years from Cuba.

If this money is cut off, local communities which have felt the impact of this very unique inflow of new residents, will find themselves even more hard pressed to meet the basic needs of their people.

Their problems will increase, instead of diminishing.

Cuban refugees have been resettled in all 50 States and more than 3,000 communities. The 15 States and District of Columbia, other than Florida that have the greatest number are—as of April 30, 1970:

New York	68,995
New Jersey	45,298
California	31,211
Illinois	18,222
Massachusetts	6,941
Louisiana	6,356
Texas	4,748
Pennsylvania	3,452
Connecticut	3,125
Ohio	2,209
Michigan	2,310
District of Columbia	2,164
Georgia	1,993
Virginia	1,915
Maryland	1,512

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add some comments about the whole issue of the Cuban airlift.

This undertaking, conceived in good faith and for plainly humanitarian reasons, has offered an opportunity for a new life in freedom for nearly 200,000 refugees from Cuba. That is precisely what those people were. They could not live, indeed survive, in the totalitarian Communist order imposed on Cuba by the Castro regime. Further, most of them had very close family ties in the United States. And so the airlift, if we look at it from the American side, from the point of view of American citizens of Cuban ancestry, afforded our own fellow citizens an opportunity to become reunited with their immediate families—reunited here in the United States.

The United States, over the long history of our national existence, has extended similar preferential opportunities to other groups of American citizens who wanted to bring their children, parents, and brothers and sisters to this free soil.

In this respect, the Cuban airlift program was not unique in our historical panorama. It was consistent with what our country has done, time and again, for other groups within our own society.

This special treatment, special consideration, has worked to the benefit of our entire society. The Cuban relatives who have come here since 1965 have proved, in the largest part, a great asset to the communities in which they have settled. They have brought new skills, and energy, and talents which they have put to constructive use. They have worked and created and helped our country move ahead. And they have paid taxes. I am informed that the amount of taxes paid by these recent arrivals to our shore greatly exceeds the cost of the entire airlift and resettlement program.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, no program, no matter how good and constructive, can continue indefinitely without periodic review and reexamination. And I am pleased to say that, at least partly at my initiative and urging, the executive branch is in the process of carefully reviewing all aspects of this undertaking, and I hope it can orderly and properly phase this program to a successful conclusion.

Early last year, when it became apparent that the immediate objective of the Cuban airlift—the reunification of the immediate families of Americans of Cuban ancestry, and of Cubans residing in this country—was being achieved. I urged the executive branch to start looking ahead and deciding where we should go.

I was advised by the executive branch at that time that an estimated 100,000 Cuban citizens were still registered for migration to the United States. At the rate of movement of 40,000 to 50,000 persons a year, the airlift should be able to complete that phase of our undertaking by the end of this calendar year, or not long afterward.

The Memorandum of Understanding between our Government and the Castro regime, relating to the Cuban airlift, has, however, some further provisions—provisions which go beyond our primary and immediate objective of reuniting the immediate families which were separated when that understanding was signed.

That memorandum includes a provision which leaves the way open for other Cuban nationals to leave Cuba and try to make new lives for themselves in an environment of freedom.

The task of giving those people such an opportunity is, it seems to me, a matter that should properly concern the entire inter-American community. It is not a matter for the United States alone.

I would hope, therefore, and I have suggested, that the U.S. Government consider raising this issue in an appropriate organ of the Organization of American States in order that our sister republics of this hemisphere could participate jointly in arriving at some practical and acceptable long-term solution to this question.

I sincerely hope that this matter is being given careful thought within the framework of the overall review of the Cuban refugee airlift being conducted by the executive branch.

As all of us are aware, Mr. Chairman, many issues and complex considerations are involved in this. There are humanitarian, political, economic, and international implications to this movement of Cubans to freedom. They have to be weighed carefully, and they should be so weighed by all the free republics of our hemisphere.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is equitable, humanitarian, or moral to abruptly terminate these flights today. Thousands of families have relied on the U.S. commitment. They have lost all they own; subjected themselves to harassment and abuse; in some cases considerable danger; and are now on the waiting list. They must be considered.

But it is time to orderly phase out our

commitment, and urge that the inter-American community cooperate fully for that purpose.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17867 and the provision to continue funding for the aid of refugees from Cuba. I believe we have an international commitment to honor, as well as a commitment to thousands of Cubans who have served notice on Premier Castro that they wish to leave. Moreover, as a result of this Federal commitment, States and local communities must provide services for refugees settling in the United States.

After Premier Castro's government settled into the typical Communist syndrome of repression, thousands of Cubans sought to escape Cuba in small boats. Many hundreds were drowned.

On September 28, 1965, Fidel Castro, concerned with being blamed for the loss of life, said that he would open a port in Cuba to which all Cubans in the United States could come and pick up their relatives who were still in Cuba. He said:

Now it will be known who is at fault if someone drowns trying to reach the American paradise, the Yanqui paradise. That! For the well-prepared imperialists. Let's see what they say or do.

President Johnson responded on October 3, as he signed the new Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 at the Statue of Liberty. He said:

I declare this afternoon to the people of Cuba that those who seek refuge here in America will find it. The dedication of America to our traditions as an asylum for the oppressed is going to be upheld.

In an effort to create a safe and orderly flow of refugees, the United States, through the Swiss Embassy in Havana, negotiated a memorandum of understanding with Cuba. Under this international agreement, the United States agreed to provide air transportation for between 3,000 and 4,000 refugees a month.

The memorandum provided for priority to be given in this movement to the relatives of Cubans in the United States in order to reunite families that had been split as the result of some members having come to the United States and others not having been able to leave Cuba.

Under the memorandum, the Cuban refugee airlift was established December 1, 1965. Two flights a day, 5 days a week, bring refugees from Cuba to the Miami International Airport.

There is no question that this airlift ranks with the Berlin Airlift as one of the greatest humanitarian efforts any nation has ever undertaken to provide refuge from tyranny and oppression.

Since the airlift was established, through May 22, 1970, 192,159 refugees have been airlifted to the United States. Of these 136,594 have been resettled outside Miami.

The characteristics of the refugees who have arrived on the airlift are: professional, semiprofessional, and managerial workers, 6.5 percent; clerical and sales, 11.7 percent; skilled workers, 9.3 percent; unskilled, 3.6 percent; service occupations, 3.1 percent; farming and fishing, 1.8 percent; children, students, and housewives, 64.0 percent. The proportion is the same as one could expect in any general family movement, with three out of four persons in an average family consisting of the mother and children.

With respect to age, 7.3 percent of the airlifted refugees have been over 65 years, and 4.1 percent between 61 and 65.

All of the refugees who have arrived on the airlift are relatives of refugees already in the United States. Practically all are persons who registered in Cuba during the period from November 1965 through May 1966, when Castro permitted persons who wished to leave Cuba to register.

From the day these persons indicated their desire to leave, until the day of their departure they have been subjected to continued harassment, loss of jobs, confiscation of property, and forced labor.

It is my understanding that there are many thousands of Cubans remaining who have indicated a desire to leave. To deny them this opportunity, to cut off their escape after they have acted in reliance of our promise, would serve notice to all peoples that we do not honor our commitments. An amendment to cut off these funds would leave in an untenable position thousands of Cubans who have chosen freedom over repression and have jeopardized their lives in Cuba by doing so.

When the airlift was originally devised, it was believed that the refugees would disperse throughout the country. Like other previous immigrants, however, these people are more comfortable among their own people and, like previous immigrants, it is not likely that their first generation will disperse.

Thus, four States, New York, New Jersey, California, and Illinois, bear the brunt of 82 percent of refugees who resettle in the 15 States which have the greatest number of resettlers.

The experience of my own State of New Jersey and the two communities which receive the greatest number of refugees may indicate the effect of a sudden refugee settlement into a community. The greatest impact is upon the school system. As for welfare expenses, our experience in Hudson County has been that most Cubans who do apply for welfare are only on the rolls for an average of 6 months, and thereafter, probably because of skills developed in Cuba, become self-sufficient and do not reapply. Nevertheless, because of the continual inflow and the long time it takes for their taxes to pay for community services, there is a substantial drain on the local community which the Federal Government has a duty to offset.

Refugees have settled in our communities at an increasing rate. They bring with them more children who must be educated.

In the school systems of the two communities, more than 50 percent of the pupils are of Spanish origin and most of them are Cuban refugees. Some of the children are totally illiterate.

I understand, for example, that in the September 1969 enrollment alone, several hundred Cuban refugees were registered for school. One child, 11 years of age, was illiterate not only in the English language, but the Spanish language as well.

Some classes, which are large—composed of about 35 to 40 students—have children who are mostly of Cuban origin. Moreover, in the past few months the enrollment of children of Cuban refugees has steadily increased rather than leveled off, and projections indicate a continued increase.

In 1965-66, the total population in our public schools was 11,752. In 1969-70, it is already 14,757, and we estimate that there will be almost 16,000 children in the schools of Union City and West New York by the end of the school year. This represents an increase of more than 4,000 for both communities in 5 years.

During this same period 6,363 children of Cuban refugees came to our schools. In the first year they only represented 17.3 percent of the total school population. Now 45.4 percent of the children in our communities are from Cuba.

For every American-born child in the public schools, there is a Cuban refugee child sitting next to him in the classrooms. Overcrowding is the order of the day.

These two communities, as well as others throughout the United States, want to meet their obligations. They understand that so long as these people are here, it is in the public interest that they be educated rather than becoming a possible drain on the community.

It is to the national benefit to provide the resources and the opportunity for the poor and oppressed, whether indigenous Americans, immigrants, or refugees, to live independent lives and maintain a decent standard of living.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that these people make good citizens? They are anxious to accept jobs and they do accept jobs. They go into communities and become taxpayers. We have had very little trouble, if any, with Cuban refugees.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely true. We have in any number of States, at least in the Miami area, where we have a great number of these people, Cubans who are good citizens. Their difficulty with the law is no greater than anybody else's.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused after hearing the statements on this amendment, and I wish to ask a couple of questions of the gentleman from Missouri. Is it correct that your amendment would not affect any

Cuban refugee who is presently in the United States?

Mr. CLAY. That is correct. The amendment calls only for the striking of the \$800,000 which would be provided for the cost of transporting Cubans from Cuba to the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. But it would not affect any who are now here; is that correct?

Mr. CLAY. The amendment would not affect the \$111 million that we are now spending for special Cuban refugee programs, such as health, education, relocating in this country, finding them jobs, finding them homes, and then putting cash dollars into their pockets. It will not affect that part of the program.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri one additional question, and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Florida. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the only people who can come out on the Cuban airlift are people that Castro has approved?

Mr. CLAY. That is correct. Castro has imposed certain restrictions on those who may leave, and no males between the ages of 17 and 29 are now leaving Cuba. Most of the people who are leaving Cuba at this time are invalids, the aged, the blind, and children. The refugees that they are talking about coming to this country and making a significant contribution are Cubans who have escaped Cuba through Mexico and have come to this country at their own expense.

What I am saying is that we ought to stop bringing Cuban rejects to this country when we have so many of our own problems that we ought to be trying to correct.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question with regard to the statement that was made that these people are industrious, and that these people coming here seek work. If that were the case, why are 50,000 Cubans, or 10 percent of the Cuban refugees in this country, now on welfare that the U.S. Government has to pay for?

Mr. O'HARA. Does the gentleman from Florida wish me to yield?

Mr. FASCELL. When the gentleman from Missouri finishes.

Mr. CLAY. One additional question. We talk about the financial contribution that Cuban refugees are making to this country. I would like to point out that in this gentleman's home district the U.S. Government pays \$17 million in impact aid for Cuban refugee children in the school system, but that is only 60 percent of the cost of educating those children, which means that the gentleman's constituents have to pay an additional \$13 million a year for the education of those children. If we continue to bring Cuban refugees into this country at the rate of 1,000 per week, as we have been bringing them in since 1965, the cost of the Cuban program is going to be, not \$112 million, but \$500 million.

I think it is unfair to have unlimited, unrestricted immigration of Cubans and restricted, limited immigration for other people in the Western Hemisphere. Every

time a Cuban refugee comes into this country we reduce the quota that we impose upon all the other Western Hemisphere countries—Mexico, Canada, and Latin America.

We talk about humanitarianism, and we talk about reuniting families. There are Mexicans in the western part of this country who would like to have some of their relatives come in and reunite with them, but every time a Cuban comes into this country, that eliminates the possibility of a Mexican bringing one of his relatives into this country to reunite with him.

There is one other point I would like to make. We talk about the humanitarian principle involved and talk about people escaping oppression. Are we going to be selective about the kinds of oppression we are concerned about? Or are we going to admit the people of Haiti or Brazil who want to escape oppression in their countries on the same basis as we admit the refugees from Cuba?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLAY) there were—ayes 40, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to use the time I have available to pose a question or two to the distinguished chairman of the committee. The first question I have is: Is there any money in this bill which can be used to assist the 30,000 refugees in Peru who have suffered as a result of the earthquakes?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman, the entire bill, that is on the economic side, appropriates on the illustrative basis. If the President should determine that out of certain funds in this bill he wants to make an allocation to Peru, he could do so.

Mr. KOCH. The second question I have is this: Last year we were told that whatever moneys were set aside for military arms to Greece were not going to be used. It is my understanding, however, that a change is taking place, at least on the administration side, and that the bill before us contains military funds for Greece. I am very distressed about this, because I think it is wrong for us to support a country which has been declared as one that engages in barbarism and terrorism of its own people. I wonder how we can rationalize using funds in an aid bill to provide military assistance to a government which, in effect, may use these very arms against its own people.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say to the distinguished gentleman that for about 3 years, the amount of military assistance to Greece has been very limited—restricted, I believe, to mostly maintenance costs.

Again, military items in this bill are on an illustrative basis. The witnesses indicate where they may have a need, but

it is appropriated in a lump sum, and they may delete completely one nation and add another.

Mr. KOCH. Then let me ask this question: Is it the position of the gentleman that he would not favor the use of these moneys for Greece and that he would suggest to the President that they not be used for this country?

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say to the distinguished gentleman, we usually challenge it on the basis of policy. The policy question has been well established before this is presented to our committee, so what we do is examine on the request, and again, we would be in the field of foreign policy trying to dictate to the President where he should or should not make specific allocations. This program is on an illustrative basis.

I believe the gentleman should correspond with the executive branch and ascertain where the President intends to allocate these funds. This committee has not.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 504. None of the funds herein appropriated for "International Financial Institutions" shall be available to assist in the financing of any project or activity the expenditures for which are not subject to audit by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 22, lines 19 through 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly, once again, legislation in an appropriation bill. It requires amendment of the basic legislation setting up our participation in the International Development Association, the Asian Development Bank. Far from being a retrenchment, it actually requires the expenditure of more money by interposing the Comptroller General into the international process.

It is therefore clearly, under the rulings already made this afternoon, legislation on an appropriation bill and thus subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The committee feels that this is a limitation on expenditures. It does not require any additional duties. It applies only to the appropriation in this bill. The language is:

None of the funds herein appropriated for "International Financial Institutions" shall be available to assist in the financing of any project or activity the expenditures for which are not subject to audit by the Comptroller General of the United States.

We feel it is purely a limitation, and we ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boggs). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the language states "none of the funds herein appropriated."

The Chair finds that this is a limitation on funds appropriated in the bill and is clearly distinguishable from the other points of order heretofore raised today, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 505. None of the funds herein appropriated for "International Financial Institutions" shall be available to assist in the financing of any project or activity for which detailed justification is not available to the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct a printing error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: On line 1, page 23, strike out "projcet" and insert "project".

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RODINO

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RODINO: On page 23, after line 3, insert the following additional section:

"Sec. 506. The use of the funds herein appropriated to assist any country shall be suspended by the President in whole or in part when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs (as defined in Sec. 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended) produced or processed in whole or in part in such country from entering the United States unlawfully. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the government of such country has taken appropriate steps to prevent such drugs from entering the United States unlawfully."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, but I have to reserve a point of order against the amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's action in reserving the point of order. I was impelled to offer this amendment notwithstanding its vulnerability to a point of order because I want to alert the House and alert the Committee on Foreign Affairs. More importantly, I also want to alert some of the governments of foreign countries which are exporting narcotic drugs to the United States which have preyed on the youth of America. I think they should be dealt with. Despite exhortation by our State Department and international organizations, we have not been able to get cooperation from the governments of foreign countries which are illegally producing and processing these narcotic drugs. As a result I believe it is necessary that we enact a provision of the type embodied in my amendment. Although, because of the point of order I will withdraw my amendment, I am hopeful that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and other appropriate committees

of the House will soon take this kind of action.

It is outrageous to know that Turkey, which exports almost 80 percent of the illegal opium entering this country, still refuses to abolish opium production entirely. There is an illegal growth of opium abroad and there is unlawful importation. My God, in one city of the United States alone last year—and this was a declaration which was given at a news conference by the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—Mr. John Ingersoll—stated there were 900 deaths due to narcotics, 224 of them infants. This is one result of the unlawful entry of narcotics into our country. Another result is that in New York City alone more than 1,000 babies each year are born addicted to heroin because of the addiction of their mothers during pregnancy. Still another result is that the typical heroin addict steals some \$50,000 worth of property per year to feed his habit.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that my amendment, which I call to the attention of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, would deal with this simply by directing the President to suspend foreign assistance to any country that does not take the appropriate steps to see to it that illegal narcotics do not come into this country.

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

Mr. RODINO. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman for offering this amendment. It is an important amendment and it is a good amendment. I should support the amendment if I am subsequently given an opportunity to do so. I am sorry it is possibly subject to a point of order, but when the amendment is returned in the Foreign Affairs Committee bill, I will certainly try to support the amendment offered by the gentleman. Again I commend him for offering this amendment.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rodino amendment and I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for proposing what I believe to be an essential step against the terrible scourge of narcotics that is now threatening all of our communities.

As the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out, it is now possible for illegal traffickers in heroin in foreign countries to purchase for a few hundred dollars enough illegally grown opium to reap hundreds of thousands of dollars of illicit profits from sales to addicts in the United States. My own State of New York, containing the major port of entry in the United States, is especially subject to devastation from the inflow of illegal narcotics.

Over the past 4 years, New York State has spent \$90 million on treatment and research with respect to narcotics addiction, and an additional \$160 million on addiction treatment facilities. This year alone, the State is prepared to spend

\$145 million more on treatment programs and has authorized \$200 million in loans for facilities for treating addicted youths.

I find it appalling that while my State, as well as our entire Nation, is being plagued by narcotic addiction and the crime which it produces, our Federal Government continues to use dollars raised from American taxpayers to aid countries which do not fully cooperate in controlling the illegal production of narcotics.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey has my complete support. It is an amendment which no fairminded person, either in the United States or abroad, ought to oppose.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman for what I think is a very salutary amendment. Irrespective of whether or not we are permitted to vote upon it, I think this will serve notice particularly upon Turkey to the effect that the Congress is cognizant of what is going on and, if the amendment does not pass today, it will certainly be given good attention by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the future, of which committee I happen to be a member. I trust that it will pass. In the meantime let me say that I compliment the gentleman.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey for offering this amendment. I would say that in view of the rather poor results which we have had in dealing with the addiction problem in the United States, this amendment will serve as a good effort toward the death knell and to the end of drug traffic in the United States. It will put Turkish officials on notice to make the decision as to whether or not they are interested in foreign assistance from this country, or else eliminate the corruption which makes this traffic possible in Turkey.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey upon his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the increasing tempo of drug abuse across the Nation is reaching critical proportions. We must focus more attention on the international drug traffic which continues to be the supply of the narcotics traffic in this country. Too little has been done to induce foreign countries to cooperate with us in cracking down on international drug smugglers because we have relied on a humanitarian appeal for help instead of implementing forcible and effective controls to combat this problem.

Today I am introducing another drug control bill which I feel rounds out my legislative efforts to halt the drug traffic in heroin, morphine, and cocaine from foreign sources.

Specifically, this bill directs itself to the originating source of the narcotics supply—foreign growers and producers of opium, narcotics, and their ingre-

dients. It attempts to jar these offending nations into an attitude of cooperation in policing the illegal traffic in narcotics internationally by directing the President to suspend American economic and military assistance to any nation which fails to take appropriate action to prevent narcotics from entering the United States through their supply routes.

This legislation would add a new dimension to the drug control picture internationally. The threat of economic sanctions would put teeth in our efforts to dry up the supply of narcotics at its foreign source. It would force producers or growers of narcotics or their byproducts to weigh the value of foreign aid and military assistance dollars against intensified efforts on their part to eliminate the corruption that allows the illegal drug traffic to continue, unabated.

Government corruption in these nations is rampant, even where opium is legalized. The possible loss of American dollars that helps these nations to develop industrially, militarily, and which helps to feed their poor will cause government leaders to look to these within their bureaucracy that are counter-contributors to the illegal drug traffic to America, either through bribery or apathy. It might even prompt new and intensified controls on the part of these nations to curb the sale and export of opium and other narcotics to known American distributors.

Turkey, who is one of the worst offenders, produces about 80 percent of all the heroin which is ultimately smuggled into this country by organized crime. A NATO ally, and recipient of millions of American dollars annually through foreign aid, military assistance, and agricultural trade and development programs, Turkey and nations like her utilize hard-earned American tax dollars while profiting from the illegal sale of opium products that ultimately have a damaging effect on our economy. The kilo of heroin that can be purchased for \$350 in Turkey is resold in the United States for \$225,000, and that is just the beginning of the drug problem in the United States.

Narcotics addiction has consigned thousands of our youth and their families to a living hell. It costs this society billions each year in stolen property. The heroin habit results in approximately \$50,000 a year in thefts per addict, and the initial sales of the pure narcotics nets organized crime millions which they invest in licit and illicit enterprises for profit throughout the United States. This illegal traffic in narcotics must be wiped out.

The economic sanctions provided in this bill would, in my estimation, be an effective stimulus to cooperative efforts between the United States and grower-producer nations. At the very least it would allow us to cut off the flow of American dollars into the treasuries of nations which continue to exhibit ambivalent or apathetic attitudes toward our efforts to stop the illegal supply of narcotics into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the drug problem from every conceivable angle. I have introduced legislation to promote Federal aid to law enforcement agencies

to attack the problem on a grass roots level. I have sponsored legislation to tighten our drug control laws and give Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials the type of legal tools they need to launch an effective counterattack on the domestic traffic in drugs and illegal narcotics. Considering the victims of drug abuse, I have sponsored legislation to institute comprehensive drug rehabilitation and treatment programs. In addition, I have considered the need to implement effective drug education programs on the community level and in our schools.

This bill closes what I believe to be the last hole in the drug supply circle. Certainly it is not the ultimate answer to our international efforts to prod foreign nations into a more active role in combating drug abuse, but it is a good start.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) and rise in support of this amendment.

With respect to the point of order which will be raised, I do want to call to the attention of the Members of the Committee that heroin is not from the country of Turkey, but the basic ingredient, opium, comes from that locale. One will find, upon examination, that for the past 15 years I have called attention to the clandestine heroin laboratory operations in and about the French port of Marseilles. The French port of Marseilles for years has been the focal point for the operations of these clandestine laboratories.

I am hopeful that with this amendment, if we can get it through today, and if not today, we can get it through in another bill that we will compel them to stamp out this drug traffic which is so tragically ruinous to our young people.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin renew his point of order?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, very reluctantly, I must press the point of order. However, it was my understanding that the gentleman from New Jersey was going to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I thought I had, but I now make that request.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. RODINO. I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and

the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Boggs, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17867) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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 OFFERED BY MR. BOW

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill H.R. 17867 to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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. GROSS. 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 191, nays 153, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—191

Albert Anderson, Calif.	Brooks	Coughlin
Anderson, Ill.	Broomfield	Culver
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brotzman	Cunningham
Annunzio	Brown, Mich.	Daniels, N.J.
Arends	Buchanan	Davis, Wis.
Ashley	Burke, Mass.	Dellenback
Barrett	Burton, Calif.	Dennis
Berry	Button	Diggs
Biaggi	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Biester	Byrnes, Wis.	Donohue
Bingham	Carey	Dulski
Blatnik	Cederberg	Eckhardt
Boggs	Celler	Edmondson
Boland	Clay	Edwards, Calif.
Bolling	Cohelan	Elberg
Brademas	Conable	Erlenborn
Brasco	Conte	Fallon
	Conyers	Farbstein
	Corbett	Fascell
	Corman	Findley

Flood	McClory	Reid, Ill.
Foley	McCloskey	Reid, N.Y.
Ford, Gerald R.	McCulloch	Reifel
Ford,	McDade	Rhodes
William D.	McEwen	Riegle
Fraser	McFall	Robison
Frelinghuysen	MacGregor	Rodino
Friedel	Madden	Rogers, Colo.
Fulton, Pa.	Mahon	Rooney, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.	Mailliard	Rosenthal
Gallagher	Mann	Roth
Garmatz	Mathias	Ruppe
Gaiamo	Matsunaga	Ryan
Gibbons	Mayne	St Germain
Gonzalez	Melcher	Scheuer
Gray	Mikva	Schneebeli
Green, Oreg.	Minish	Schwengel
Green, Pa.	Mize	Shriver
Gude	Monagan	Smith, Iowa
Halpern	Moorhead	Smith, N.Y.
Hamilton	Morgan	Springer
Hanley	Morse	Stafford
Hansen, Idaho	Morton	Stanton
Harrington	Mosher	Steiger, Wis.
Hathaway	Moss	Stokes
Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.	Sullivan
Hébert	Murphy, N.Y.	Taft
Heckler, Mass.	Nedzi	Teague, Calif.
Helstoski	Nelsen	Teague, Tex.
Hogan	Nix	Ullman
Hollfield	O'Hara	Van Deerlin
Horton	O'Neill, Mass.	Vigorito
Hosmer	Passman	Whalen
Howard	Patten	Widnall
Jacobs	Pelly	Wiggins
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Wilson, Bob
Jones, Ala.	Perkins	Wolf
Karth	Philbin	Wright
Kazen	Pickle	Wydler
Kee	Pike	Yates
Keith	Pirnie	Yatron
Kluczynski	Podell	Young
Koch	Pucinski	Zablocki
Kyros	Railsback	
Lloyd	Rees	

NAYS—153

Abbutt	Gallifanakis	Poff
Abernethy	Goodling	Pollock
Adair	Griffin	Price, Tex.
Anderson,	Gross	Pryor, Ark.
Tenn.	Grover	Purcell
Andrews, Ala.	Hagan	Quillen
Belcher	Haley	Randall
Bennett	Hall	Rarick
Betts	Harsha	Roberts
Bevill	Hechler, W. Va.	Roe
Blackburn	Henderson	Rogers, Fla.
Bow	Hull	Ruth
Brinkley	Hungate	Sandman
Brock	Hunt	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Saylor
Broyhill, N.C.	Jarman	Shadeberg
Broyhill, Va.	Johnson, Pa.	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Jonas	Scott
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Sebellius
Burlison, Mo.	Kastenmeier	Shipley
Cabell	King	Sikes
Caffery	Kleppe	Sisk
Carter	Landgrebe	Skubitz
Casey	Landrum	Slack
Chamberlain	Langen	Smith, Calif.
Chappell	Latta	Snyder
Chisholm	Leggett	Staggers
Clancy	Lennon	Steed
Clausen,	Long, La.	Steiger, Ariz.
Don H.	Long, Md.	Stephens
Cleveland	Lowenstein	Stubblefield
Collier	McClure	Stuckey
Collins	McDonald,	Talcott
Colmer	Mich.	Taylor
Cowger	Macdonald,	Thompson, Ga.
Cramer	Mass.	Thomson, Wis.
Daniel, Va.	Marsh	Waggonner
de la Garza	Martin	Waldie
Delaney	May	Wampler
Denney	Michel	Watkins
Derwinski	Miller, Ohio	Watson
Devine	Minshall	Watts
Dickinson	Mizell	Whalley
Dorn	Mollohan	White
Downing	Montgomery	Whitten
Duncan	Myers	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Natcher	Winn
Edwards, La.	Nichols	Wyatt
Eshleman	Obey	Wylie
Flowers	O'Konski	Wyman
Flynt	Olsen	Zion
Foreman	Patman	
Fountain	Pettis	

NOT VOTING—85

Adams	Ashbrook	Baring
Addabbo	Aspinall	Beall, Md.
Alexander	Ayres	Bell, Calif.

Blanton	Goldwater	O'Neal, Ga.
Bray	Griffiths	Ottinger
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Poage
Burton, Utah	Hammer-	Powell
Bush	schmidt	Preyer, N.C.
Camp	Hanna	Price, Ill.
Clark	Hansen, Wash.	Quie
Clawson, Del	Harvey	Reuss
Crane	Hastings	Rivers
Daddario	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Hicks	Rostenkowski
Dawson	Ichord	Roudebush
Dent	Jones, N.C.	Roybal
Dowdy	Kirwan	Stratton
Dwyer	Kuykendall	Symington
Esch	Kyl	Thompson, N.J.
Evans, Colo.	Lujan	Tieman
Evins, Tenn.	Lukens	Tunney
Feighan	McCarthy	Udall
Fish	McKneally	Vander Jagt
Fisher	McMillan	Vanik
Frey	Meeds	Weicker
Fuqua	Meskill	Whitehurst
Gaydos	Miller, Calif.	Wilson,
Gettys	Mills	Charles H.
Gilbert	Mink	Zwach

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

On this vote:  
Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.  
Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Hammerschmidt against.  
Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.  
Mr. Weicker for, with Mr. Blanton against.  
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.  
Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Meskill against.  
Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Camp against.  
Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.  
Mr. Beall of Maryland for, with Mr. Fuqua against.  
Mr. Price of Illinois for, with Mr. Ottinger against.  
Mr. Hicks for, with Mr. Baring against.  
Mr. Meeds for, with Mr. Dowdy against.  
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Burton of Utah against.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Crane against.  
Mr. Fish for, with Mr. Frey against.  
Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Goldwater against.  
Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.  
Mr. Esch for, with Mr. Bray against.  
Mr. McKneally for, with Mr. Lujan against.  
Mr. Hastings for, with Mr. Kyl against.  
Mr. Vander Jagt for, with Mr. Lukens against.  
Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.  
Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Dent against.  
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Gaydos against.  
Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Gettys against.  
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. McMillan against.  
Mr. Udall for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.  
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Roudebush against.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Ichord against.

Until further notice:  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Bell of California.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Whitehurst.  
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Bush.  
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Zwach.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Quie.  
Mr. Symington with Mr. Harvey.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.  
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Tunney.  
Mr. Tieman with Mrs. Mink.  
Mr. Mills with Mr. Kirwan.  
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS AND CROSS REFERENCES ON H.R. 17867

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 17867, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers and cross references.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO INCLUDE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed, in addition to having permission to revise and extend their remarks, may also insert pertinent extraneous extracts.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader if he can advise us as to the program for next week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority whip, Monday is District Day but there are no District bills.

We have programed for Monday the following bills:

H.R. 15712, to amend Public Work and Economic Development Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

House Resolution 976, to authorize a select committee to study recent developments in Southeast Asia, with 1 hour of debate.

Tuesday, there is scheduled the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 17070, the Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act of 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time

and that any further program may be announced later.

May I say further that should a rule not be granted on the Postal Reorganization Act, we will announce an additional program because we have other bills with rules. It is expected that the Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act will take at least 2 days.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if this concludes the program for this week?

Mr. ALBERT. We have one matter of agreeing to Senate amendments right now. That is all.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what has happened to the arts and humanities bill?

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

Mr. GROSS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The Rules Committee has not yet acted on that bill.

Mr. GROSS. I noticed that it had been programed.

Mr. ALBERT. It was programed subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered if the country could endure another week without that \$20 million additional cost that was put on by the administration.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the country might endure, but I do not think the program will unless we get it out before June 30.

Mr. GROSS. If we never get it out, it will be too soon insofar as I am concerned.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### RIVER BASIN MONETARY AUTHORIZATION AND MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL WORKS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1970

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15166)

authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, in the table following line 2, strike out:

"Central and Southern Florida June 30, 1948 20,000,000"

Page 2, line 4, strike out "\$830,000,000" and insert "\$810,000,000."

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 2. In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000 for the prosecution of the central and southern Florida comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes approved in the Flood Control Act of 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000,000 of this authorization shall be available solely for the accelerated construction of borrow canal L-70, canal C-308, canal C-119W, and pumping stations S. 326, together with such other works in the plan of improvement as the Director of the National Park Service and the Chief of Engineers agree are necessary to meet the waiver requirements of the Everglades National Park: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable and in any event upon completion of the works specified in the preceding proviso, delivery of water from the central and southern Florida project to the Everglades National Park shall not be less than 315,000 acre-feet annually, prorated according to the monthly schedule set forth in the National Park Service letter of October 20, 1967, to the Office of the Chief of Engineers, or 16.5 per centum of total deliveries from the project for all purposes including the park, whichever is less."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "2." and insert "3."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "3." and insert "4."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "4." and insert "5."

Page 4, line 20, strike out all after "subsection" down to and including line 24 and insert "on an equitable basis among such preference customers."

Page 6, strike out lines 3 and 4.

Page 6, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 6. That the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Texas', approved July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 632), is amended by inserting immediately after 'Fort Worth' the following: ', and with the Benbrook Water and Sewer Authority.'"

Page 6, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 7. That the project for Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Montana, is hereby modified to provide that funds available for such project, in an amount not to exceed \$750,000, may be used in participation with the State of Montana in the construction, operation, and maintenance of fish hatchery facilities, and the performance of related services, by the State for mitigation of fish losses occasioned by the project, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers."

Page 6, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 8. That subsection (c) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the city of Rock Island, Illinois, or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Illinois, and to a place at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa,' approved March 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 110), as

amended is amended by striking out '1970' and inserting in lieu thereof '1972.'"

Page 6, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 9. That section 15 of the Act entitled 'An Act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Illinois', approved July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669; Public Law 811, Eighty-fourth Congress), as amended, is amended (1) by striking out 'three years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six years', and (2) by striking out 'five years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight years.'"

Page 6, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 10. (a) That the project for Denison Dam (Lake Texoma), Red River, Texas and Oklahoma, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), as amended, is hereby modified to provide that the city of Sherman, Texas, is authorized to construct a barrier dam across the Big Mineral Arm of Lake Texoma so as to create a subimpoundment of not to exceed ninety-five thousand acre-feet, for the purpose of providing a municipal and industrial water supply in an amount not to exceed fifty-two thousand acre-feet annually. The city of Sherman shall reimburse the United States the costs, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, allocable to an amount of storage in Lake Texoma equal to that in the subimpoundment, in accordance with the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958, as amended (43 U.S.C. 390(b)-(f)), including the loss in power revenues attributable to the subimpoundment.

"(b) The location and plans for the barrier dam shall be submitted to the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army for approval prior to construction in accordance with section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401).

"(c) Prior to construction of the barrier dam, the city of Sherman shall agree in writing to (1) provide satisfactory means for the transferral of small pleasure craft to and from the subimpoundment and Lake Texoma; (2) obtain any necessary State water rights required for use of the stored waters; (3) hold and save the United States free from all damages due to construction, operation, and maintenance of the barrier dam and subimpoundment; (4) operate and maintain the barrier dam and subimpoundment in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of the Army; and (5) pay the costs of any alterations or relocations of Federal facilities necessitated by the subimpoundment.

Page 6, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the 'River Basin Monetary Authorization and Miscellaneous Civil Works Amendments Act of 1970.'"

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Alabama propose to give us an explanation of what transpired in the conference?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we did not have a conference, we are proposing to agree to the Senate amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, you agreed to the Senate amendments?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give us at least a brief explanation on the amendments? I would like to withdraw my reservation of objection. I do not want to object, but we should at least have a brief explanation of the Senate amendments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield further to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would be pleased to give the gentleman from Iowa an explanation.

H.R. 15166 was originally passed by the House of Representatives on December 9, 1969. The legislation provided for increased monetary authorizations for the prosecution of 13 river basin plans for flood control, navigation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers.

Monetary authorizations were first put into effect by the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938. They limit authority to appropriate and expend funds within specified basins or specified major projects, to levels below the total costs of the authorized basin or project developments. In this way they give the Congress opportunity to review and control the rate of accomplishment of the basin plans and major projects to which they apply.

In these plans, the Congress has approved an entire plan for development of a river basin in the interest of flood control, navigation, power, and allied water uses, but limited the amounts of funds to anticipated appropriations for a specified period of years, allowing accomplishment of only part of the plan.

Subsequently, the Congress has augmented some of the previously approved plans, by authorizing additional projects, or modifications of projects, and increased the monetary authorization, to provide for additional appropriations. When the monetary authorization limit of a plan is approached, legislation is required to provide additional authorization so that appropriations can be made to permit the plan to continue. If such legislation is not forthcoming when needed, construction of projects in the basin plan cannot proceed, even if funds have been appropriated for this purpose.

At the present time there are 22 basin development plans which are subject to monetary authorization limitations. The authorization provided to date is, in most instances, adequate for work to be performed through the 1969 construction season, but it is not sufficient to cover the work to be performed during the 1970 construction season.

Deficiencies in monetary authorization will exist in 12 basins, totaling around \$365 million through the end of calendar year 1970. Based on projection by the Corps of Engineers for calendar year 1971, the deficiencies for the 2 years would involve 13 basin and the total deficit would amount to approximately \$830 million.

H.R. 15166, as it passed the House of Representatives last December contained a table giving a list of the basins, the dates of original authorization, and the amount of increased authorizations needed for the work to be performed through calendar year 1971. The table which I will include in the RECORD contains the 13 basins listed in section 1 of the House version. The total amount of increased authorization needed for work to be performed through calendar year 1971 is approximately \$830 million.

The table follows:

Basin	Act of Congress	Amount
Alabama-Coosa River.....	Mar. 2, 1945	\$45,000,000
Arkansas River.....	June 28, 1938	89,000,000
Brazos River.....	Sept. 3, 1954	5,000,000
Central and southern Florida.....	June 30, 1948	20,000,000
Columbia River.....	June 28, 1938	263,000,000
Lower Mississippi River.....	May 15, 1928	167,000,000
Missouri River.....	June 28, 1938	109,000,000
Ohio River.....	June 22, 1936	69,000,000
Ouachita River.....	May 17, 1950	18,000,000
San Joaquin River.....	Dec. 22, 1944	18,000,000
South Platte River.....	May 17, 1950	21,000,000
Upper Mississippi River.....	June 28, 1938	2,000,000
White River.....	June 28, 1938	4,000,000

Section 2 of H.R. 15166 as originally passed by the House would authorize to completion the present ongoing Chesapeake Bay Basin Comprehensive Study. This very important study was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1965 in the amount of \$6 million. Section 2 would permit its completion by authorizing an additional \$9 million.

Section 3 modified the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, originally authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1962, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1965, so as to change the order of construction and permit the construction of urgently needed local protection works at Chillicothe to proceed prior to initiation of work at the Big Darby Reservoir.

Section 4 modified the authorization for the Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, to be located on the Delaware River, between Pennsylvania and New Jersey, to clarify the authority of appropriate Government agencies to consider an application providing for the use of Tocks Island project water releases as part of a proposed comprehensive pumped storage hydroelectric power development by certain New Jersey electric companies.

The existing Tocks Island authorization provides for the use of those releases by a conventional Federal power plant. The modification clarifies the authority of the licensing agencies to consider a proposal that such releases be used by New Jersey companies, instead, as part of a comprehensive pumped storage development.

It has been estimated that this modification will result in a direct construction savings to the United States of \$26 million. In addition payments are to be made by the companies for use of the Government dam in an amount not less than \$1 million annually for at least 50 years.

The Senate version of H.R. 15166, as it passed the Senate on May 28, 1970,

essentially accepted all the House provisions; however, there were some minor variations and additions of several features.

In connection with the increased authorization for the central and southern Florida River Basin in section 1 of H.R. 15166 as passed the House, the Senate eliminated this river basin from the list of basins in section 1 of the bill and made the central and southern Florida comprehensive plan, section 2 of H.R. 15166. In lieu of the \$20 million which was authorized in the House-passed version, \$25 million was authorized for the prosecution of the project in the Senate version; \$5 million of that authorization was reserved for the construction of specified works necessary to meet the water requirements of the Everglades National Park, and as soon as practicable, and in any event, upon completion of the specified works, the Secretary of the Army is directed to deliver to the park not less than 315,000 acre-feet annually or 16.5 percent of total deliveries from the project for all purposes including the park, whichever is less.

Section 5 of the Senate version pertaining to Tocks Island is essentially similar to that passed by the House, except that it omits as unnecessary the clause inserted by the House. It is understood that the power made available under subsection (c) will be allocated with regard to the critical water resource requirements of the Delaware River Basin area as explained in House Report 91-748, which accompanied H.R. 15166.

I might note at this time the excellent cooperation of my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) who cooperated so splendidly with the Committee on Public Works in the inclusion of this provision.

Section 6 relates to the Benbrook Reservoir, Tex. It authorizes the Secretary of the Army to contract with the Benbrook Water and Sewer Authority for the beneficial use of a portion of the waters now impounded by the Benbrook Dam and Reservoir, Tex., for municipal water supply purposes. This provision in H.R. 15166 is identical to H.R. 5278 as it was reported from the House Committee on Public Works on November 17, 1969, and passed the House on December 1, 1969. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) managed that bill on the floor of the House and did his usual excellent work in securing its passage.

Section 7 modifies the Libby Dam project, Kootenai River, Mont. This section provides that funds made available for that project in an amount not to exceed \$750,000 may be used in participation with the State of Montana to the construction, operation, and maintenance of fish hatchery facilities, and related services by the State of Montana, for mitigation of fish losses occasioned by the project.

Section 8 amends subsection (c) of the first section of the act approved March 18, 1948, as amended by section 108(b) of the act of November 7, 1966, which authorized the city of Rock Island, Ill., to construct an additional span

to the existing bridge between Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, by extending for 2 years, until April 1, 1972, the time for commencing construction of the additional span.

Section 9 amends section 15 of the act of July 26, 1956, as amended by Public Law 89-499, approved July 8, 1966, which authorized the Muscatine Bridge Commission to construct a replacement bridge to be located on the Federal-aid primary highway systems of both the States of Iowa and Illinois, by extending for 2 years, until July 8, 1972, the time for initiating bridge construction, and for completion of such work until July 8, 1974.

Section 10 grants the consent of Congress to the construction by the city of Sherman, Tex., of a barrier dam in Lake Texoma which is the reservoir formed by the Denison Dam, in order to provide a municipal and industrial water supply for the city of Sherman, Tex. The language in section 10 is identical to the language contained in H.R. 15207 which passed the House on April 20, 1970, as a separate bill. I would point out that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS) worked long and hard at getting this bill through the House last April, and I congratulate him on his successful efforts which are now culminated by the inclusion of this section in the Senate version of H.R. 15166.

Finally, a Senate amendment changed the title of the bill to the "River Basin Monetary Authorization and Miscellaneous Civil Works Amendments Act of 1970."

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is urgently needed to carry out the highly important water resources development program of this Nation.

I would include at this point in the RECORD a letter written by the Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works pointing out the critical need of securing this legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE  
OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1970.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,  
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please refer to my letter of 10 September 1969 which furnished information with respect to the status of river basin plans subject to monetary authorization limitations and the need for additional monetary authorization for some of the basins.

You were informed in the referenced letter that the two most critical basins were the Arkansas River and the Upper Mississippi River, where authorizations provided to date were considered insufficient to cover anticipated appropriations through the end of Fiscal Year 1970. We have recently reviewed the situation with respect to existing monetary authorizations in these and other basins, with the following results.

In the Arkansas River Basin, available monetary authorization will be inadequate to permit award of all contracts scheduled through the month of June 1970. Thus, award of further contracts on projects in this basin will need to be discontinued in June, unless additional monetary authorization is provided at a very early date. Among the contracts scheduled for June is a contract

calling for payment to the Missouri-Pacific Railroad Company for the value of a railroad bridge, which will be abandoned in connection with the construction of the Arkansas River Navigation Project, and for which funds were recently released from budgetary reserve by the Bureau of the Budget to permit consummation of the contract. With respect to the Upper Mississippi Valley Basin, although it now appears that the existing monetary authorization will be sufficient for the current fiscal year, it is anticipated that monetary authorization will expire in July 1970.

In addition to the above, it is currently anticipated that, without additional monetary authorization, three other basins will exhaust available monetary authorization early in Fiscal Year 1971. In summary, there are five basins on which existing monetary authorization would be exhausted during the current calendar year unless further authorization is provided. These basins are listed below, showing the month in which we anticipate the monetary authorization would be exhausted.

*Basin and estimated month in which  
authorization would be exhausted*

Arkansas River.....	June 1970.
Upper Mississippi River....	Do.
Columbia River.....	Do.
Missouri River.....	September 1970.
Ouachita River.....	Do.

The above information concerning the urgent need of additional monetary authorization has been furnished the Chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee in connection with his consideration of H.R. 15166 passed by the House of Representatives on 11 December 1969.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. CLARKE,  
Lieutenant General, USA, Chief of Engineers.

Although there are some differences between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 15166, the urgency for securing the necessary monetary authorizations for these basins do not permit the luxury of time for working these differences out in conference. This bill should be passed today—as I have stated before—it is urgently needed.

At this time I would like to express appreciation for the leadership given by the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works (Mr. FALLON), the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors (Mr. BLATNIK), and the splendid cooperation and participation of Members from both sides on the Flood Control Subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, beginning with the 1936 and 1938 Flood Control Acts, Congress has approved a number of basin and project plans but provided limited authority for appropriations. This limitation on authority has been increased by the Congress periodically to permit proceeding on schedule with the construction of the projects in the authorized plan.

There are 22 basin development plans presently subject to monetary authori-

zation limitations. The authorization provided to date, although adequate for work to be performed through the 1969 construction season, is not sufficient in all the basins to cover the work to be performed during the 1970 construction season.

There will be a deficiency in monetary authorization in 12 basins, totaling around \$365 million during calendar year 1970, and the deficiencies through calendar year 1971 would involve 13 basins and would amount to about \$830 million.

H.R. 15166 would authorize the needed additional appropriations for the prosecution of the 13 river basin plans, through calendar year 1971.

Section 3 of the amended bill is of utmost importance to my home State of Maryland and to the other States bordering on the Chesapeake Bay. This section authorizes to completion by the Corps of Engineers the Chesapeake Bay Basin Comprehensive Study in an estimated additional amount of \$9 million.

I had the privilege of introducing the original study authorization which was included in the River and Harbor Act of 1965. This study consists of a complete investigation and study of water utilization control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including but not limited to navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution control, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation.

A hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center was authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained in the State of Maryland for this purpose. The model and center are to be utilized by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, as well as the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania in connection with any research, investigation, or study to be carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin.

This study is a comprehensive estuarine study, multidisciplinary in scope, encompassing engineering and the physical, chemical, biological and social sciences. The first year of the study, fiscal year 1967, was used in developing broad concepts and constraints for this study for unprecedented scope and magnitude.

The second year was used for a more detailed evaluation of procedures for accomplishing the study, for interagency coordination, and for a public hearing at which the views of affected local interests were obtained. The analysis was reevaluated by the Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1969 in response to a request by the House Appropriations Committee with the objective of reducing the cost, including the model, the Corps of Engineers' analysis response to that request included consideration of reducing the physical size of the model, substituting a mathematical model for a hydraulic model, and reducing the scope of the resource study.

It was found by the corps that any of the less costly programs considered would fail to comply with the intent of the original authorization and would not

insure success of the study. The corps also further found that the total cost for the study would be \$15 million and not the \$6 million originally authorized and estimated. Thus, the corps has estimated it will need an additional \$19 million to complete the study.

There are many urgent problems which challenge the environment of Chesapeake Bay which makes it necessary that this study be accelerated and completed as early as possible. Waste disposal is a pressing problem. The Baltimore-Washington urban complex had a population of approximately 3.8 million people in 1960, a number which is expected to double in 25 years. Little study has been done concerning the intricate relationship between exploding urbanization and the estuarine environment. The Washington area places 8 million pounds of phosphorus and 25 million pounds of nitrogen in the Potomac River annually. These quantities are estimated to double in 25 years. The Patuxent River receives the wastes of 78,000 people and has lost 10 species of fish. The rapidly expanding rate of urbanization provides the additional threats of increased thermal loads and other very hard to manage compounds. There are numerous other inflows, the invasion of noxious weeds, land and shore erosion, and silt inflows as a function of increased urban development, agricultural activity, and navigation projects.

This comprehensive study, when completed, will project economic development within the bay area and the consequent resource demands. It will serve as a viable management guide to maintaining the environmental integrity of the Chesapeake Bay while encouraging beneficial resource use and enjoyment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation for the excellent work on this bill by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES), and all members of the full committee and the subcommittee who, in spite of so much other pressing business, devoted so much time and effort to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act, H.R. 15166, was sent to the Senate last year. I do not know why it was delayed so long. Due to the fact that many of the basin authorizations have already run out of fund approval and it is essential to pass this additional authorization for the projects to continue in an orderly fashion, this bill is being considered today.

As chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES), has assured me that, with relation to the amendment adopted in the Senate concerning the central and southern flood control project in Florida, his subcommittee will continue to oversee the effects of the water allocation amendment and has further agreed to consider the matter when and if the circumstances justify.

Everyone agrees that the Everglades

National Park must be supplied water from the storage area. There were no hearings on the House side on this specific amendment. It will be necessary in the future to make sure no inequities will result and to make sure that this is the most practical solution relating to all users. Due to the time exigency, the gentleman from Alabama is bringing the bill up today, but he has assured me that full consideration of the matter will be given when time permits, should any problem develop.

#### BENBROOK WATER AUTHORIZATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, section 6 of the bill as amended by the Senate is a provision which permits the Benbrook Water and Sewer Authority, acting for and in behalf of the city of Benbrook, Tex., to purchase from the Army Corps of Engineers untreated water from the Benbrook Dam, until such time as those waters are needed for navigation purposes on the Trinity River.

This provision, inserted by amendment in the Senate, is identical to a separate bill which the House passed earlier in the Congress.

This provision amends the act of 1956 which allows certain of the waters from that Federal reservoir to be used on a standby basis for the city of Fort Worth. This provision simply extends that same identical right to the city of Benbrook, and with all of the same restrictions applying.

The Congress has received assurances that this right will be willingly relinquished, and the act of 1956 provides that it shall be relinquished, at such time as these waters are needed for navigation purposes on the Trinity River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES)?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### THE PRESIDENT IS LIKE ALICE IN WONDERLAND

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, after listening to President Nixon's Cambodian report to the Nation last night, I was reminded that President Nixon is like Alice in Wonderland: he means what he says, but as Alice was instructed, so should the President be—to say what he means.

No doubt the President meant what he said about keeping to his timetable of withdrawal. But he did not say what that means—after mid-1971 there still will be 260,000 American troops in Vietnam.

No doubt the President meant what he said about winning a just peace. But, he did not say what that means—a slow and partial withdrawal costing the lives of thousands more American young men.

No doubt the President meant what he said that only his administration can end the war. But, he did not say what he means—that he considers Congress and the American people powerless to end the war except on his terms.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think most Americans are weary and disgusted with so-called progress reports about the Vietnam war. For almost 6 years, we have listened to the Alice in Wonderland talk that hides behind the rhetoric of freedom, democracy, and peace to justify the prosecution of this cruel and wasteful war. Freedom, democracy, and peace are powerful and precious concepts and they ought not to be used as slogans to intimidate and deceive the American people.

In the name of freedom, it is claimed we are fighting for the simple principle that North Vietnam should leave its neighbors alone. And yet, the South Vietnam army now intends to remain in neighboring Cambodia to protect Vietnamese living there; and Thais move in to both Laos and Cambodia as a preemptive strike force.

In the name of democracy, our Government continues to prop up a corrupt and repressive Saigon regime that refuses to negotiate a political settlement that reflects the true balance of power among the Vietnamese people.

In the name of peace, American air power has bombed North and South Vietnam with impunity—then Laos and now Cambodia. I remember the late Robert Kennedy invoking the words of Tacitus—"They made a desert and called it peace."

I never have been able to reconcile Presidential speeches with American deeds in Indochina. And last night, President Nixon said nothing that offers any hope of closing that credibility gap.

So while respecting the sincerity of the President's speech last night—he means what he says—I cannot accept, nor should this House or the American people accept, the continuing price the President assumes we will pay for his morally bankrupt policy.

The meaning of what I have said is that the President is wrong—his administration does not have sole jurisdiction in ending this war. The Congress and the American people can and must work together in the weeks ahead to effect the total withdrawal of American troops from the Asian mainland.

#### ELECTRONIC VOTE COUNTERS CAN MAKE YOU NERVOUS

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

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, voters in California's most populous counties again this year must wait—and wait—on computers for the electronically dictated final results of Tuesday's primary elections.

Forty hours after the polls closed in Fresno County, for example, not a single vote had been officially counted, because "the program wouldn't check out."

In my county, San Diego, the situation was somewhat brighter. Our electronic gear had managed to tabulate roughly five votes in every six. Nevertheless, a delay of even this modest sort could leave a candidate and his supporters in a prolonged state of suspense following a reasonably close race.

Our biggest county, Los Angeles, fared well in the first hours of vote counting. By midnight Tuesday, some 2,000 of the 7,000 precincts had been accounted for. But, after that promising start, another "program problem" gummed up the electronic works, and Angelenos at last report were only 92.2 percent certain how they voted Tuesday.

Similar difficulties were reported in Orange County, where computers by a late hour this morning had been able to digest and properly record just 90.9 percent of the vote—36 hours after the polls closed.

I have always been one for progress, as I hope my record in this body attests.

But it is terribly difficult to remain enthusiastic about these costly electronic marvels which have fallen so woefully short of their primary goal of providing swift and accurate returns for the voting public.

Surely our great electronics industry, with its dazzling array of accomplishments in so many fields, can do better in this one.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON COMMENDED FOR RESUMING WITHDRAWAL

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's statement to the American people last night was welcome yet sobering news to our citizens.

I commend the President for his announcement that troop withdrawals from Southeast Asia will be resumed. That is good news to those of us committed to complete American withdrawal. It is noteworthy that the President is confident that the results of the Cambodian intervention assures a more rapid and more complete withdrawal. I hope his assessment is correct and we will progress surely and rapidly toward that goal.

The path to peace is not easy, and the sobering part is the difficulties that hinder the President and our country to establish peace in Indochina. It is also sobering that the President's withdrawal plan is conditioned on the effectiveness of the Southeast Asians. I believe we should turn the war and a settlement of Southeast Asian problems over to the Southeast Asians themselves by broadening the Vietnamization program to an

effective Asian alliance against aggression.

We now see South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand cooperating to curb the aggressions of the Hanoi regime.

I urge the President to turn the conduct of the conflict, and negotiation of a settlement with Hanoi over to this emerging alliance of Southeast Asians. Our presence in the conflict, and domination of the negotiating tables carries with it an outside interference, repugnant to Asians, which complicates rather than encourages settlement. The concerted efforts of the block of Southeast Asians, South Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and Laos, should prove more effective in peace negotiations than what has been accomplished to date. President Nixon noted encouragement from the Djakarta Conference of 11 Asian nations on maintaining Cambodian neutrality. It would be encouraging to the world if this Asian initiative could be broadened toward settlement of the conflict.

In the months and years ahead, only the Asian people themselves can carry the responsibility for stability and peace in that part of the world, and bring it about. It is apparent that the time has come when they can and must cooperate among themselves, and bring about a settlement of, by and for Asians, without an outside power taking all the initiative and exercising a veto.

#### UNVEILING OF POW REPLICAS

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning authentic replicas of the methods by which American prisoners of war are kept confined in Southeast Asia were unveiled in the Capitol during a brief ceremony. Taking part were our Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Latch; our beloved Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK; Dr. G. Warren Nutter, Assistant Secretary of the Pentagon's Prisoner of War Policy Affairs Committee; and Mr. H. Ross Perot, the Texas businessman whose efforts to help free our prisoners are well known. Also present were several Members of Congress as well as the wives, mothers, and loved ones of our prisoners of war together with many citizens of this country.

I know that if I commend my colleagues to view this display, which includes a bamboo cage, an isolation cell, a tree with manacles, and an earthen pit—all used by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to confine American prisoners of war—all who see it will rededicate their efforts in contacting Hanoi and bringing pressure upon Hanoi for an early release of our American prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the proceedings of that ceremony.

The proceedings are as follows:  
UNVEILING OF POW REPLICAS; REMARKS OF PARTICIPANTS, JUNE 4, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We are gathered here today to unveil replicas which depict the methods by which our American prisoners of war are kept confined by the Vietcong in Southeast Asia. It is only fitting and proper to open this ceremony with a prayer. Reverend Latch.

#### PRAYER OF CHAPLAIN EDWARD LATCH

Let us pray. Almighty God, our heavenly Father, source of wisdom and power and light without whom no one is strong, no one is good, no one is wise, we pause a moment in Thy presence, lifting our hearts unto Thee in prayer, for our leaders and for our people, that we may be led wisely and well and that our people learn to dwell together in concord and in peace. We pray for the Armed Forces of our country wherever they are and pray that Thou will protect them from all evil and keep them ever in Thy holy presence. And especially, we pray for our prisoners of war, praying with all of our hearts that Thou will grant unto them courage and strength and keep alive in them the hope of ultimate freedom, that they may be returned to our country and to their loved ones once again. And, we pray for their families, that through these difficult and very trying days they may be aware of Thy presence and receive from Thy hands the kind of strength they need for the facing of this experience. And hasten, we pray Thee, the end of the conflict and the coming of peace when our prisoners of war can be reunited with their loved ones and live again in this free land we love with all our hearts. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

#### STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ZABLOCKI

Thank you Rev. Latch for your beautiful and inspiring prayer.

I want to welcome all of you who have taken time from busy schedules to come here today for the unveiling of this display. I believe this exhibit graphically depicts the hardships of the Prisoners of War. By exhibiting these cells in the very center of the Capitol of our Nation we pay special tribute to the brave men and we further demonstrate the deep concern this Nation has for our American military personnel who are being held captive in Southeast Asia. These replicas can only begin to suggest under what conditions hundreds of young Americans are confined in Southeast Asia.

We cannot duplicate the tremendous heat, the humidity, the insects, the stench, the bad and inadequate food, the brutality and indifference of the captors, the lack of needed medical treatment, the terrors of isolation, the fears of tomorrow and the agony of today.

We cannot recreate those conditions. We cannot even imagine them adequately.

Yet it is under just those conditions that hundreds of American servicemen have been living—some of them for five and six years.

In no war in the past have American fighting men been forced to endure captivity for so long or under such inhumane circumstances. In no past war have American fighting men been forced to endure captivity so harsh in its physical and mental demands.

It should be noted that every nation participating in the Vietnam war has signed or acceded to the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War—including North Vietnam. For that reason, the treatment of prisoners should not be an issue.

Unfortunately, it is an issue and one of the most pressing of the Vietnam conflict, because the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have refused to abide by the provisions of the convention and have been guilty of inhumane treatment of the American servicemen.

The full nature of Hanoi's unjustifiable and illegal acts against American prisoners should be understood by all Americans. It is my hope that this display of replicas will help inform our people of the cruel realities.

On two occasions, last November and last month, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments has held hearings on the problem of American prisoners of war.

The November hearings resulted in a resolution calling on Hanoi to live up to its re-

sponsibilities under the Geneva Convention. That resolution later was passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress.

The replicas which we are unveiling today were one result of the Subcommittee hearings last May. In his testimony H. Ross Perot, the Texas businessman who has been very active on behalf of our prisoners and their families, suggested that an exhibit of this kind be placed in the Capitol.

At the time of the hearing, I promised Mr. Perot that his suggestion would be fully considered. When I conferred with our beloved Speaker McCormack, he was most receptive and enthusiastic about the idea. Within a few days, I was able to tell Mr. Perot that he could go ahead. The display which you see was provided by him, through the organization he founded called "United We Stand."

The replicas were constructed according to descriptions which have been given by former American prisoners of war who either were released by the enemy or were able to escape.

I hope that each of the thousands of tourists who stream through this building—and by this spot—each day will take time to view this display and read the descriptions which are attached to them.

The result must certainly be to banish any ignorance or indifference about the plight of U.S. prisoners and to swell the chorus of Americans who are protesting Hanoi's inhumane conduct toward our men.

By turning the spotlight of adverse world opinion and publicity on Hanoi, we hope to force North Vietnam to live up to its international obligations by providing humane treatment and ultimate release for all prisoners.

At this time I would like to introduce our beloved Speaker, the Hon. John McCormack.

REMARKS OF THE HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to participate in these ceremonies today.

We stand today in a room which is known as the Capitol crypt. Like many of the rooms in this great parliamentary building, it is a room steeped in history.

It is also a room of historical exhibits. Here, in recent years, we have shown—through objects, pictures and text—some of the highlights of American history, with emphasis on the part which the Congress has played in the growth and progress of our Nation.

Today we are gathered to open a very different kind of display.

It is an exhibit which does not remind us of the past glories of our Nation—but rather of the present sufferings of American prisoners of war held captive by hostile nations and powers.

Yet I believe this exhibit is completely appropriate to this setting. When Congressman Zablocki requested permission for these replicas to be built here, I was quick to respond affirmatively for it seemed to me that the idea was a worthy one.

One cannot help but be affected by what is shown here. We see men—human beings endowed with dignity and great spirit worth—treated in ways which we would not treat an animal.

We can be told—as we have been told a thousand times—of the conditions under which our prisoners must try to survive in North Vietnam, in South Vietnam, in Laos and now, perhaps, in Cambodia. Yet seeing these replicas brings home the reality in a way words can never match.

It rends our hearts to see such cruel conditions—to know that some American servicemen have spent every day of the last five years in just such confinement.

And, yes, our hearts are saddened too by

the thoughts of the wives and children, the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters, of our American boys who are prisoners of war or listed as missing in action.

If families are not certain their missing loved one is a prisoner, then their lives are filled with anguished uncertainty about whether he is alive or not.

Yet at last learning that a loved one is alive, is a prisoner, provides only temporary solace. Then the family must face the cruel truth of the conditions under which these men are being held. Those are the conditions we see before us today.

They tell me that the American people are apathetic. I do not for a moment believe it. I do not believe for a moment that the thousands of visitors to the Capitol from all across our great land who see this exhibit will remain unaffected by it.

I believe that they—like us—will be spurred to get involved in the problem of our prisoners of war, to write in protest to Hanoi, to cooperate in the campaigns sponsored by various civic and humanitarian groups.

That is why I have given permission for the replicas to be built here and why I am so happy to be associated with this project.

I pray—as I know all of us do—that in some small way this exhibit and its impact will, in some small way, help hasten relief to our prisoners and perhaps contribute indirectly to their ultimate release.

If only one American military man is able to come home even one hour sooner than might otherwise be the case because of the efforts which have resulted in this display and this ceremony, then we are all more than amply repaid.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. At this point in the program I would like to express our gratitude to Senator EVERETT JORDAN of North Carolina. As Chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, he gave permission for one of the replicas to be located on the Senate side of the Capitol.

Senator JORDAN had hoped to be here with us this morning to say a few words, but the press of Senate business has prevented him from coming.

At this time I am pleased to introduce the man who has been the moving spirit behind this exhibit—a man who has spent great amounts of his own time and money on behalf of our American prisoners of war and their loved ones here at home—Mr. H. Ross Perot. Mr. Perot.

STATEMENT OF H. ROSS PEROT

Speaker McCormack, Congressman Zablocki, Members of the House and Senate, members of the prisoners' families: Talking to released and escaped prisoners living under these conditions my first logical question was: How did you stay alive?

Inevitably, this is what their reply is: A deep, religious conviction, the memory of their families, a great love for their country and finally, and this is the essence of what we're all here about today, a strong intuitive belief that in our country we would do everything possible to get them out. So the clinging to life is based on those four factors, not upon the living conditions. The living conditions would destroy life but the belief that we will get them out keeps the men alive. Some of these men have been in these conditions for nearly six years. The men are literally rotting. The North Vietnamese simply cannot understand and don't believe that the American people could care about just 1500 men. From their cultural point of view a prisoner is a disgraced man. You can confirm this by talking to North Vietnamese prisoners in the prison camps in the South. They simply can't understand why from our point of view we are so deeply interested in getting these men back.

I concluded a long time ago that I could not gain the release of these men, but about

that same time I concluded that I knew how to get these men back. They have no value to the North Vietnamese; their wives and children need them desperately. The key to the release of these men is an aroused America, on the prisoner of war issue. The North Vietnamese never will understand when they see the American people become aroused on this issue that they are extremely practical people. Ending the war is the big issue, the prisoners are an insignificant issue. They don't want the time and attention of the American people distracted at all from what they consider the major issue. They can certainly never understand how people could disagree with the Administration's position on the war and yet stand completely united in outrage about the treatment of these prisoners. It is not important that they understand it; it's all important that they see it. When they see it and when they finally realize that for some reason it's happening, we'll get these men back.

Keep in mind as you look at these exhibits that every American citizen bears part of the responsibility for the fact that those men are there. It's our country. We sent them there. We could be there in their place. And if we were there in their place we, too, would be clinging to life with the intuitive feeling that the people back in our country somehow, some way would get us out. I certainly want to thank the Congress and the Senate on behalf of the families of these men for allowing these replicas to be here. They're not real and yet they are accurate. I challenge the North Vietnamese as they, and they read the papers very carefully, as they see these pictures and look at these cells and cages, to point out anything that's not absolutely accurate. And then to prove their point, by letting the world see as they agreed on the Geneva Accords, how these men are being treated. Thank you very much."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We are privileged to have with us today, a distinguished spokesman for the Department of Defense who himself has been deeply involved in the prisoner of war problem as the chairman of the Pentagon's P.O.W. Policy Affairs Committee. He is Dr. G. Warren Nutter, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Dr. Nutter, would you please say a few words to us.

REMARKS OF HON. WARREN NUTTER, ASSISTANT  
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL  
SECURITY AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Perot, wives and families of our prisoners of war, ladies and gentlemen:

I appreciate the opportunity to share this memorable occasion with you and your colleagues. On behalf of the Department of Defense and particularly its Prisoner of War Policy Committee which I chair, I should like to extend our sincere thanks to the Congress for making possible this quite unprecedented display in the nation's Capitol. We are grateful, too, to Mr. Ross Perot for his energy and imagination in proposing and arranging for the placement of these models. There is no matter of greater concern to Secretary Laird and the Department of Defense than that of obtaining humane treatment for our prisoners of war and their early release.

This grim portrayal of the plight of our men reflects and stirs the conscience of the entire nation. It is most fitting that it should speak its message from these halls, where so many noble causes of this country have found their finest expression. Words are quite superfluous today, for we have here a message more telling than words alone can be.

Let this occasion serve to redouble our resolve to do our utmost to bring these brave, unfortunate men home as soon as we possibly can. You may all be assured that we in the Department of Defense are fully dedicated to that cause.

### HOW FAR WILL THE ADMINISTRATION ALLOW THE ECONOMY TO SLIP BEFORE IT ACTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I challenge President Nixon and the Republican leaders in the Congress to tell the American people just how far they are willing to allow the economy to slip before there is action.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a moratorium on rosy statements concerning the economy. It is time for action. Assurances and reassurances will no longer suffice.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon and the Republican leaders here in the House as well as in the Senate should give some indication of when the rhetoric will stop and the action begin.

How far are they willing to allow unemployment to go before there is action? Since President Nixon has been in office, unemployment has gone from 3.4 to 4.8 percent. At what point do the Republicans act on unemployment? Is it at 5, 6—or will they wait until we are at 8, 10, and 12 percent unemployment?

How long will this administration allow high interest rates to destroy the economy? At what point will the administration act to reverse the high interest rates—to roll them back? I call on the Republican leaders of the House, who often meet with the President of the United States, to give us some idea of the administration's timetable for action against high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, high interest rates have forced homebuilding down to 1.1 million new units a year. The high interest rates of the Nixon administration are eliminating at least a million and a half housing units every year. How far will the administration allow the housing industry to sink into depression before there is action on interest rates?

High interest rates are forcing thousands of small businessmen to the wall and are contributing to the concentration of economic power in the hands of the giants of big business. How many bankruptcies of small businessmen will be allowed before the administration acts on the economy and to roll back high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer—the family farmer—is in dire straits, and high interest rates are the root of his problems. The farmer must borrow large sums for his seasonal operations and for his equipment and high interest rates are requiring many of our family farmers to sell out and leave the land. How many family farmers will be wiped out before the administration acts?

The stock market, of course, has seen a mild rebound in the past week. But the market is still down in a deep slump. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the paper losses in the market have been between \$150 and \$200 billion since President Nixon came into office. And once again, I state that high interest rates are the No. 1 reason behind the drop in the stock market.

The market may rebound to some degree but it will never recover its full vigor and prosperity until the administration acts to roll back high interest rates.

On Tuesday, financial columnist Joseph R. Slevin noted that the administration and the Federal Reserve officials had repeatedly made mistaken predictions that interest rates were coming down. Mr. Speaker, this is a large part of the problem—the administration is depending too much on rosy predictions and too little on action.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Slevin's column, which bears the headline, "Administration Needs Prediction of Lower Rates To Come True":

[From American Banker, June 2, 1970]  
ADMINISTRATION NEEDS PREDICTION OF LOWER RATES TO COME TRUE  
(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—The Administration is predicting that lower interest rates are ahead. It is a prediction that is touched with hope for the Administration badly wants borrowing costs to decline. Steep interest rates are causing grave distortions in the U.S. economy and are politically unpopular to boot.

Top corporations have been paying more than 9% to sell bonds. Some local governments have had to pay more than 7% to sell tax exempt bonds—which yield a mouth-watering 14% to an investor in the 50% income tax bracket.

The steep rates are pricing many would-be homebuyers and small businessmen out of the market. Some cannot—and others will not pay the record-smashing rates that lenders have been demanding.

Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy, who repeatedly and prematurely has forecast lower interest rates, now is renewing his prediction.

"I think we are at the peaks," the white-haired Cabinet officer told Congress last week.

Mr. Kennedy has two reasons for anticipating lower rates. One is that the Federal Reserve System is pumping money into the banks, which means more money is becoming available for loans. The other is that business activity has been slowing and common sense says a reduction in business activity should lead to a reduction in loan demands.

Federal Reserve Board chairman Arthur Burns, who mistakenly allowed on April 30, that rates "have already passed their peak," has made it plain that he shares the current Kennedy expectations. So, for that matter, do Under Secretary of the Treasury Paul Volcker and of the Bureau of the Budget Director Robert Mayo.

The Federal government has a direct, pocketbook enthusiasm for seeing rates come down. When President Nixon sent his 1971 budget to Congress four months ago, he predicted that interest charges on the public debt would cost \$19 billion. He now is glumly estimating that the government will have to pay out \$20 billion interest money and Mr. Volcker forecasts that the outlay will approach \$21 billion if rates stay at their present levels instead of falling.

Interest rates did drop sharply during February and March but they bounced back again during April and May. The government and the bond markets have to share the blame for the disturbing roller-coaster action.

Mr. Nixon and Mr. Burns excited the markets by leading them to expect a far more stimulating Federal Reserve credit policy than actually emerged. "We have not been idle," Mr. Burns assured Congress in early

March, and rates fell rapidly in the wake of his statement.

Bond dealers aggravated the drop because they eagerly bought bonds in a belief that the Federal Reserve would make it possible for them to earn huge profits by creating enormous amounts of money—as it has done in past periods of slowing business activity.

But rates began rising sharply again in early April when the Federal Reserve started the financial community by mopping up some of the extra money it had created in March. Mr. Nixon's decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia then gave a fresh thrust to the upward movement.

The official view is that interest rates have overdone the recent advance just as they overdid the earlier decline. The hope is that borrowing costs now will move down into a range that meshes with the business slowdown and with the continuing Federal Reserve drive to expand the money supply.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I call on the administration to explain why it has failed to act; why it has failed to use the authority that it has to roll back interest rates; why it has failed to require the Federal Reserve System to pursue a course which would bring down interest rates and allocate money to the sectors of the economy in serious need of credit.

The President of the United States has tremendous power, both implied and real, and he should use this against the No. 1 evil in the economy—high interest rates.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the House originated additional powers for the President in this area last December. The Congress passed that law—Public Law 91-151—to give the President standby authority to control all aspects of credit transactions. Part of that power includes the ability to roll back interest rates and to allocate credit to sectors of the economy in need.

Mr. Speaker, the President has not used that power, and he has not explained the reasons for his inaction. Once again, if the Republican leaders here in the House of Representatives have some information on this, I hope that they will share it with us.

Mr. Speaker, there may be many who do not fully realize the wide authority that we gave the President in that law and, therefore, I place in the RECORD a copy of that law, Public Law 91-151:

#### PUBLIC LAW 91-151

An act to lower interest rates and fight inflation; to help housing, small business, and employment; to increase the availability of mortgage credit; and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING ACTS

SECTION 1. Section 7 of the Act of September 21, 1966 (Public Law 89-587; 80 Stat. 823) is amended to read:

"Sec. 7. Effective March 22, 1971:

"(1) So much of section 19(j) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371(b)) as precedes the third sentence thereof is amended to read as it would without the amendment made by section 2(c) of this Act.

"(2) The second and third sentences of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) are amended to

read as they would without the amendment made by section 3 of this Act.

"(3) The last three sentences of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) are repealed.

"(4) Section 5B of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1425b) is repealed."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The authority conferred by this subsection shall also apply to noninsured banks in any State if (1) the total amount of time and savings deposits held in all such banks in the State, plus the total amount of deposits, shares, and withdrawable accounts held in all building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations (including cooperative banks) in the State which are not members of a Federal home loan bank, is more than 20 per centum of the total amount of such deposits, shares, and withdrawable accounts held in all banks, and building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations (including cooperative banks) in the State, and (2) there does not exist under the laws of such State a bank supervisory agency with authority comparable to that conferred by this subsection, including specifically the authority to regulate the rates of interest and dividends paid by such noninsured banks on time and savings deposits, or if such agency exists it has not issued regulations in the exercise of that authority. Such authority shall only be exercised by the Board of Directors with respect to such noninsured banks prior to July 31, 1970, to limit the rates of interest or dividends which such banks may pay on time and savings deposits to maximum rates not lower than 5½ per centum per annum. Whenever it shall appear to the Board of Directors that any noninsured bank or any affiliate thereof is engaged or has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of the provisions of this subsection or of any regulations thereunder, the Board of Directors may, in its discretion, bring an action in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the principal office of the noninsured bank or affiliate thereof is located to enjoin such acts or practices, to enforce compliance with this subsection or any regulations thereunder, or for a combination of the foregoing, and such courts shall have jurisdiction of such actions, and, upon a proper showing, an injunction, restraining order, or other appropriate order may be granted without bond."

(b) Section 5B of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1425b) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5B. (a) The Board may from time to time, after consulting with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, prescribe rules governing the payment and advertisement of interest of dividends on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts, including limitations on the rates of interest or dividends on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts that may be paid by members, other than those the deposits of which are insured in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, by institutions which are insured institutions as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act, and by nonmember building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations, and cooperative banks. The Board may prescribe different rate limitations for different classes of deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts, for deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts of different amounts or with different maturities or subject to different conditions regarding withdrawal or repayment, ac-

ording to the nature or location of such members, institutions, or nonmembers or their depositors, shareholders or withdrawable account holders, or according to such other reasonable bases as the Board may deem desirable in the public interest. The authority conferred by this subsection shall apply to nonmember building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations, and cooperative banks in any State if (1) the total amount of deposits, shares, and withdrawable accounts held in all such nonmember associations and banks in the State, plus the total amount of time and savings deposits held in all banks in the State which are not insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, is more than 20 per centum of the total amount of such deposits, shares, and withdrawable accounts held in all banks, and building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations (including cooperative banks) in the State, and (2) there does not exist under the laws of such State a bank supervisory agency with authority comparable to that conferred by the first two sentences of this subsection, including specifically the authority to regulate the rates of interest and dividends paid by any such association or bank on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts, or if such agency exists it has not issued regulations in the exercise of that authority. Such authority shall only be exercised by the Board with respect to such nonmember associations and banks prior to July 31, 1970, to limit the rates of interest or dividends which such associations or banks may pay on deposits, shares, or withdrawable accounts to maximum rates not lower than 5½ per centum per annum.

"(b) In addition to any other penalty provided by this or any other law, any institution subject to this section which violates a rule promulgated pursuant to this section shall be subject to such civil penalties, which shall not exceed \$100 for each violation, as may be prescribed by said Board by rule and such rule may provide with respect to any or all such violations that each day on which the violation continues shall constitute a separate violation. The Board may recover any such civil penalty for its own use through action or otherwise, including recovery thereof in any other action or proceeding under this section. The Board may, at any time before collection of any such penalty, whether before or after the bringing of an action or other legal proceeding, the obtaining of any judgment or other recovery, or the issuance or levy of any execution or other legal process therefor, and with or without consideration, compromise, remit, or mitigate in whole or in part any such penalty or any such recovery.

"(c) Whenever it shall appear to the Board that any nonmember institution is engaged or has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of the provisions of this section or of any regulations thereunder, the Board may, in its discretion, bring an action in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the principal office of the institution is located to enjoin such acts or practices, to enforce compliance with this section or any regulations thereunder, or for a combination of the foregoing, and such courts shall have jurisdiction of such actions, and, upon a proper showing, an injunction, restraining order, or other appropriate order may be granted without bond.

"(d) All expenses of the Board under this section shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses."

Sec. 3. Section 11(i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1431(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$1,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000,000";

(2) by striking out the last sentence there-

of and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Each purchase of obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection shall be upon terms and conditions as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury and shall bear such rate of interest as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield for the month preceding the month of such purchase on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"The authority provided in this subsection shall be used by the Secretary of the Treasury, when alternative means cannot effectively be employed, to permit members of the Home Loan Bank System to continue to supply reasonable amounts of funds to the mortgage market whenever the ability to supply such funds is substantially impaired during periods of monetary stringency and rapidly rising interest rates and any funds so borrowed shall be repaid by the Home Loan Bank Board at the earliest practicable date."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 19(a) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461) is amended by inserting after the word "interest," the following: "to determine what types of obligations, whether issued directly by a member bank or indirectly by an affiliate of a member bank or by other means, shall be deemed a deposit,"

(b) (1) The fourth sentence of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended to read as follows: "The Board of Directors is authorized for the purposes of this subsection to define the terms 'time deposits' and 'savings deposits', to determine what shall be deemed a payment of interest, and to prescribe such regulations at it may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this subsection and to prevent evasions thereof."

(2) Section 18(g) of such Act is further amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: "The provisions of this subsection and of regulations issued thereunder shall also apply, in the discretion of the Board of Directors, to obligations other than deposits that are undertaken by insured nonmember banks or their affiliates for the purpose of obtaining funds to be used in the banking business. As used in this subsection, the term 'affiliate' has the same meaning as when used in section 2(b) of the Banking Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 221a(b)), except that the term 'member bank', as used in such section 2(b), shall be deemed to refer to an insured nonmember bank."

(c) The first sentence of section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended by inserting "or dividends" after "interest".

Sec. 5. Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The Board may, however, prescribe any reserve ratio, not more than 22 per centum, with respect to any indebtedness of a member bank that arises out of a transaction in the ordinary course of its banking business with respect to either funds received or credit extended by such bank to a bank organized under the law of a foreign country or a dependency or insular possession of the United States."

Sec. 6. (a) Effective as of the close of December 31, 1969, section 404 of the National Housing Act is amended

(1) by striking out "plus any creditor obligations of such institution" in subsection (b)(1), and the amendment made by this subdivision (1) shall be applicable also to any then unexpired portion of any then

current premium year under subsection (b) (1).

(2) by striking out "and creditor obligations" in subsection (b) (2).

(3) by striking out "and its creditor obligations" in subsection (c).

(4) by striking out "and creditor obligations" each place it appears in subsection (g). The condition in the first sentence of that subsection shall be deemed to be met as of the close of December 31, 1969. The words "such year" in that sentence shall be deemed to include also the year beginning January 1, 1970.

(b) The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is authorized by regulation or otherwise

(1) to make such provisions as it may deem advisable with respect to the order in which and the extent to which the components of a pro rata share of its secondary reserve shall be applied or be deemed to have been applied in the case of a reduction of such share through a use under the second sentence of such 404(e) of the National Housing Act or the first sentence of section 404 (g), a transfer of part of such share under the third sentence of section 404 (e), or otherwise.

(2) to take such action, including without limitation such adjustments and refunds and such deferrals of premium payments and other payments, as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the implementation of this section or other legislation amending or supplementing said section 404.

Sec. 7. (a) The following provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act are amended by changing "\$15,000", each place it appears therein, to read "\$20,000":

(1) The first sentence of section 3(m) (12 U.S.C. 1813(m)).

(2) The first sentence of section 7(1) (12 U.S.C. 1817(1)).

(3) The last sentence of section 11(a) (12 U.S.C. 1821(a)).

(4) The fifth sentence of section 11(i) (12 U.S.C. 1821(i)).

(b) The amendments made by this section are not applicable to any claim arising out of the closing of a bank prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 8. (a) The following provisions of title IV of the National Housing Act are amended by changing "\$15,000", each place it appears therein, to read "\$20,000":

(1) Section 401(b) (12 U.S.C. 1724(b)).

(2) Section 405(a) (12 U.S.C. 1728(a)).

(b) The amendments made by this section are not applicable to any claim arising out of a default, as defined in section 401(d) of the National Housing Act, where the appointment of a conservator, receiver, or other legal custodian as set forth in that section becomes effective prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 9. (a) Section 708(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 2158 (b)) is amended by striking out everything after "United States", the first time it appears, and inserting a period in lieu thereof.

(b) Section 708(f) of that Act (50 U.S.C. 2158(f)) is repealed.

## TITLE II—AUTHORITY FOR CREDIT CONTROL

### Sec. 201. Short title

This title may be cited as the Credit Control Act.

### Sec. 202. Definitions and rules of construction

(a) The definitions and rules of construction set forth in this section apply to the provisions of this title.

(b) The term "Board" refers to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(c) The term "organization" means a corporation, government or governmental sub-

division or agency, trust, estate, partnership, cooperative, or association.

(d) The term "person" means a natural person or an organization.

(e) The term "credit" means the right granted by a creditor to a debtor to defer payment of debt or to incur debt and defer its payment.

(f) The term "creditor" refers to any person who extends, or arranges for the extension of, credit, whether in connection with a loan, a sale of property or services, or otherwise.

(g) The term "credit sale" refers to any sale with respect to which credit is extended or arranged by the seller. The term includes any rental-purchase contract and any contract or arrangement for the bailing or leasing of property when used as a financing device.

(h) The terms "extension of credit" and "credit transaction" include loans, credit sales, the supplying of funds through the underwriting, distribution, or acquisition of securities, the making or assisting in the making of a direct placement, or otherwise participating in the offering, distribution, or acquisition of securities.

(i) The term "borrower" includes any person to whom credit is extended.

(j) The term "loan" includes any type of credit, including credit extended in connection with a credit sale.

(k) The term "State" refers to any State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(l) Any reference to any requirement imposed under this title of any provision thereof includes reference to the regulations of the Board under this title or the provision thereof in question.

### Sec. 203. Regulations

The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this title. These regulations may contain such classifications, differentiations, or other provisions, and may provide for such adjustments and exceptions for any class of transactions, as in the judgment of the Board are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this title, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate compliance therewith.

### Sec. 204. Determination of interest charge

Except as otherwise provided by the Board the amount of the interest charge in connection with any credit transaction shall be determined under the regulations of the Board as the sum of all charges payable directly or indirectly to the person by whom the credit is extended in consideration of the extension of credit.

### Sec. 205. Authority for institution of credit controls

(a) Whenever the President determines that such action is necessary or appropriate for the purpose of preventing or controlling inflation generated by the extension of credit in an excessive volume, the President may authorize the Board to regulate and control any or all extensions of credit.

(b) The Board may, in administering this Act, utilize the services of the Federal Reserve banks and any other agencies, Federal or State, which are available and appropriate.

### Sec. 206. Extent of control

The Board, upon being authorized by the President under section 205 and for such period of time as he may determine, may by regulation

(1) require transactions or persons or classes of either to be registered or licensed.

(2) prescribe appropriate limitations, terms, and conditions for any such registration or license.

(3) provide for suspension of any registra-

tion or license for violation of any provision thereof or of any regulation, rule, or order prescribed under this Act.

(4) prescribe appropriate requirements as to the keeping of records and as to the form contents, or substantive provisions of contracts, liens, or any relevant documents.

(5) prohibit solicitations by creditors which would encourage evasion or avoidance of the requirements of any regulation, license, or registration under this Act.

(6) prescribe the maximum amount of credit which may be extended on, or in connection with, any loan, purchase, or other extension of credit.

(7) prescribe the maximum rate of interest, maximum maturity, minimum periodic payment, maximum period between payments, and any other specifications or limitation of the terms and conditions of any extension of credit.

(8) prescribe the methods of determining purchase prices or market values or other bases for computing permissible extensions of credit or required downpayment.

(9) prescribe special or different terms, conditions, or exemptions with respect to new or used goods, minimum original cash payments, temporary credits which are merely incidental to cash purchases, payment or deposits usable to liquidate credits, and other adjustments or special situations.

(10) prescribe maximum ratios, applicable to any class of either creditors or borrowers or both, of loans of one or more types or of all types.

(A) to deposits of one or more types or of all types.

(B) to assets of one or more types or of all types.

(11) prohibit or limit any extensions of credit under any circumstances the Board deems appropriate.

### Sec. 207. Reports.

Reports concerning the kinds, amounts, and characteristics of any extensions of credit subject to this title, or concerning circumstances related to such extensions of credit, shall be filed on such forms, under oath or otherwise, at such times and from time to time, and by such persons, as the Board may prescribe by regulation or order as necessary or appropriate for enabling the Board to perform its functions under this title. The Board may require any person to furnish, under oath or otherwise, complete information relative to any transaction within the scope of this title including the production of any books of account, contracts, letters, or other papers, in connection therewith in the custody or control of such person.

### Sec. 208. Injunctions

Whenever it appears to the Board that any person has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage in any acts or practices constituting a violation of any regulation under this title, it may in its discretion bring an action, in the proper district court of the United States or the proper United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond. Upon application of the Board, any such court may also issue mandatory injunctions commanding any person to comply with any regulation of the Board under this title.

### Sec. 209. Civil penalties

(a) For each willful violation of any regulation under this title, the Board may assess upon any person to which the regulation applies, and upon any partner, director, officer, or employee thereof who willfully participates in the violation, a civil penalty not exceeding \$1,000.

(b) In the event of the failure of any person to pay any penalty assessed under this section, a civil action for the recovery thereof may, in the discretion of the Board, be brought in the name of the United States.

#### Sec. 210. Criminal penalty

Whoever willfully violates any regulation under this title shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

### TITLE III—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITY

SEC. 301. The Small Business Administration shall promptly increase the level of its financing functions utilizing the business loan and investment fund established under section 4(c) (1) (B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633 (c) (1) (B)) by \$70,000,000 above the level prevailing at the time of enactment of this Act. The Small Business Administration shall submit to Congress a monthly report of its implementation of this section.

Mr. Speaker, as I have remarked on many occasions, I am puzzled by the administration's inaction. I am convinced that an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives would vote the President additional authority to stabilize the economy and to roll back interest rates if we had some assurances that he would act. The President should confer with the Congress on these economic matters and let us know what is holding up action. The American people rightfully expect the Congress and the President to do something about the economic crisis before we fall into a total depression.

Mr. Speaker, I sat in this Chamber when President Herbert Hoover was in the White House. The Nation was in a serious economic crisis and we had great difficulty through the land. The President refused to act and all that we got from him were broad rosy reassurances without any action behind them.

Mr. Speaker, this was one of the sad chapters in the history of the Presidency of the United States and many people suffered as a result of inaction and ineptitude in the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, none of us want to see a repeat of those dark days when a President was unable to bring himself to move to save the economy. Therefore, many of us in the Congress intend to speak out early in the present crisis and to goad the President into action on the economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation cannot survive another Herbert Hoover, even if his name is Richard Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote President Nixon on May 20 urging that he permit a meeting with the Banking and Currency Committee so that we could better understand his thinking on the economy and so that we might know of any legislative desires of the administration in the areas of our jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of that letter in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,

Washington, D.C., May 20, 1970.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Many Members of the Banking and Currency Committee are

deeply concerned by the apparent inaction on the part of the Federal Government in the face of a mounting economic crisis.

The continued lack of vigorous action is leading to a severe crisis of confidence in the ability of the Federal Government to deal with the dual problems of inflation and recession. This lack of confidence undoubtedly accounts for the downward plunge of the stock market. All of the economic indicators make it obvious that we cannot long endure a passive attitude by the Federal Government.

Last December, the Banking and Currency Committee originated legislation to provide you with standby authority to control all aspects of credit, including the level of interest rates, down payments, and the allocation of available loan funds. This eventually became Public Law 91-151, which was signed by you on December 23, 1969. The credit control authority was given to you on a "standby" basis with the anticipation that you would trigger the authority immediately when economic conditions deteriorated.

We are deeply concerned that this authority has not been used despite rising unemployment, continued high interest rates, a falling stock market, and a totally-depressed housing industry. The Banking and Currency Committee, and the Congress, are in a position of having passed a law which the Executive Branch fails to carry out despite obvious need. Such a situation creates a serious crisis between the Executive and the Legislative branches, and raises basic questions on the scope and nature of future Congressional action to alleviate the current chaotic economic conditions.

In addition to Public Law 91-151, there have been other expressions of Congressional intent for the Administration to take vigorous action to lower interest rates and provide general economic stability. All appear to have fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. President, I think I speak for the overwhelming majority of the Banking and Currency Committee when I say that we are willing to give you any legislative tools which you feel are needed to bring the current economic situation under control. In light of your failure to carry out our earlier actions, however, many of us are puzzled as to your intentions and desires in this area. Many of us in the Congress feel an urgent need for action which will restore economic stability and renew confidence in our entire economic system.

But such action on the part of the Congress is difficult if the Executive Branch is determined not to carry forward the programs and not to use the weapons which are provided through legislation. It is important that areas of doubt about the Administration's intentions be cleared up before further legislative steps are attempted.

Therefore, I hereby urge and respectfully request that you permit the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives to meet with you concerning the economic crisis facing the nation. Such a meeting, I am convinced, would do much to clear the air and provide a solid background on which the Committee could take action in the remaining days of the 91st Congress. Such a meeting also, I am convinced, would aid in restoring confidence and making it plain that the legislative and executive branches are willing to act and not allow the U.S. economy to go down the drain.

Mr. President, I hope that you will act favorably on this request at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the people of all political persuasions are sick and tired of the talk about economic conditions. They want some concrete action that will bring relief from high interest rates before the economy is totally destroyed.

The administration and the Congress can ignore these pleas for action only at their peril. This feeling is deep seated, and it will not go away simply by holding lavish White House dinners to reassure big bankers and big businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis, Mo., Globe-Democrat, on May 22, urged President Nixon to take action on interest rates. I place a copy of this editorial in the RECORD:

#### ACCEPT PATMAN'S CHALLENGE

Rep. Wright Patman, chairman of the House Banking Committee, has challenged President Nixon to use existing powers to bring down high interest rates.

Patman said that Congress five months ago passed legislation that gave the President broad powers to control credit and interest rates. He contended the President hasn't acted to use the law.

The Texas Congressman also has asked that Mr. Nixon meet with the House Banking Committee to consider actions to deal with the current economic crisis.

The President probably is reluctant to use the standby powers, given him under the law referred to by Patman, because he has been advised by his chief economists that the Federal Reserve Board's monetary policies should be allowed to take their course without his intervention.

But in our opinion Rep. Patman is right about the interest rates. They should come down. Until they do, the housing industry will remain depressed. It is hard to see how the economy can move ahead strongly with rates where they are.

It may well be true, as Patman says, that if the President doesn't use the power of his office to reduce the high money costs, Congress "will bring down interest rates by statute."

If Patman and the Banking Committee have ideas which could help lower interest rates and ease the current economic slowdown, Mr. Nixon would be wise to hear them, and take action where indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD a copy of a transcript of a recent radio interview with Mr. Nat Goldfinger, research director of the AFL-CIO, which contains an excellent analysis of present economic conditions and the need for Presidential action:

#### CURRENT ECONOMIC TRENDS

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDIN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Research.

In the view of the AFL-CIO, President Nixon's campaign against inflation has been a complete failure. Prices continue to rise while unemployment soars. Many feel that the economy has already sagged into a recession. Here to question Mr. Goldfinger about the current state of the national economy and what the labor movement feels can and must be done to stem and reverse the downward trend, are Frank Swoboda, Washington

correspondent for Business Week magazine, and Nell Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Gilbride, I believe you have the first question?

GILBRIDE. Mr. Goldfinger, we see prices still rising at a six percent rate, the highest in some 20 years. At the same time, we see most business indicators going down very rapidly—the stock market plunging to the lowest point in almost 10 years. How would you describe the economy today?

GOLDFINGER. Well, Mr. Gilbride, I don't think that there is any doubt that this country is in a recession.

Furthermore, I don't believe that this country can afford a continuation of the Administration's experiment in classical economy theory.

The Administration's so-called anti-inflation program is utterly bankrupt. It has led us down the garden path into a situation of declining production and rising unemployment, while at the same time, as you pointed out, the Consumer Price Index continues to increase at a six percent yearly rate.

We have the worst of all the possibilities here.

We have the worst inflation in 20 years; we have the sharpest increase in unemployment in 10 years; we have sky-high interest rates—higher than at any time in the past 100 years or more. And in addition, we have a continuing downward drift of the economy, and a continuing drift of government economic policy.

I believe that the situation at present is dangerous.

There is a threat of loss of confidence, because all of this drift just keeps moving with an upward movement of price levels eating away the buying power of working people and everybody. Working hours are being cut back, production is being cut back, and unemployment is increasing.

SWOBODA. Mr. Goldfinger, isn't it more than a "threat" of loss of confidence? Recently, the markets in Europe—the money markets in Europe and Asia—have also started to slump. Isn't this a reflection of how those people—those investors—look upon the Nixon Administration's policies?

GOLDFINGER. Well, unfortunately—most unfortunately—there does seem to be, Mr. Swoboda, a spreading loss of confidence in the Administration's economic policies.

For example, right here at home, in the past couple of weeks, a major public utility corporation floated a bond issue at an effective interest rate of well over nine percent. That's a fantastically high interest rate for a bond issue by a triple-A public utility corporation.

If that's what is happening to major utilities, think of the actual interest rates that are being paid by home builders, ordinary businessmen, and consumers.

Such sky-high interest rates push up all costs and all prices.

SWOBODA. Well, you recently, I believe, met with Labor Secretary George Shultz, as a result of President Nixon's visit to the AFL-CIO Executive Council. Did you come away reassured—did you get any assurance or indication of change at all?

GOLDFINGER. A number of trade union economists and staff people from 11 different international unions and AFL-CIO Headquarters did meet with Secretary of Labor Shultz some days ago. We entered the meeting concerned about the state of the economy—very concerned and very worried about the Administrations' policies.

Unfortunately, Mr. Swoboda, we left the meeting at least as concerned and worried as we entered it.

We have seen no evidence whatsoever that the Administration is taking hold of this situation, except for one move by the Federal Reserve Board a couple of weeks ago, and it was exactly the kind of move that was not needed.

A few weeks ago, after the stock market began to drop rather drastically, the Federal Reserve Board reduced its margin requirements for the purchase of stock, to stimulate speculation in the stock market.

Well, we don't need increased speculation in the stock market—we need the proper allocation of resources—we need increased production—we need increased employment. And we have to get at some of the urgent social needs in this country, such as rebuilding the cities and residential construction.

Home building, as you know, has been clobbered in the past year and one-half, as a result of the tight money and very high interest rates policy. Everything has been going off, and there is no indication—to date, at least—that the Administration is changing its policies.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Goldfinger, you described the Administration's approach to the problem of inflation as a "classical economic approach." The word "classical" usually implies something that is well-established, which has worked in the past, and supposedly, should work again. In this case, why hasn't it worked? They have deliberately dampened business demand. Why haven't prices responded to that and started to level off?

GOLDFINGER. Well, by "classical approach," Mr. Gilbride, I meant an approach developed 100 or 150 years ago by English economic theorists. It's the kind of classical theory that you find in the textbooks. This, apparently, is what Mr. Nixon's Administration has picked up, right out of the textbooks—from the economic theorists in London and the English universities of 100 and 150 years ago. Well, what may have been applicable in England, or even in the United States, 50 or 100 years ago, is not applicable today. This American economy is large—it's a huge continental economy, with all kinds of different structures. The tightened money supply meant that, in effect, from May, 1969, to the end of 1969, we had no increase in the money supply at all.

There has been a very severe squeeze on this economy. The banks have been rationing out the available credit to those people who have lines of credit at the banks—the blue-chip corporations, and the wealthy families, and some other people who can afford to pay these sky-high interest rates. The ordinary businessman can't afford them—the ordinary consumer can't either. Yet this is what's been happening.

Money has been available in the economy, but the banks have been rationing out credit for things like the out-flow of capital to foreign subsidiary operations, and money is moving out of the United States with the export of American jobs.

Money has been available through the banks for building gambling casinos.

Money has been available from the banks for conglomerate takeovers, business mergers, and things of that sort.

But it is in the ordinary business operations that the difficulties have arisen.

The first part of the American economy that got clobbered—by February 1969, one month after President Nixon took office and shortly after the tight money squeeze on the economy became effective—was the home building industry, which immediately went into decline.

This is not only an important industry, in terms of production and employment, it's very important in social terms. We have a

build-up now of the housing shortage in this country. We have the continuing spread of slums in the central cities. We have a shortage of houses, and furthermore, people—ordinary people—even middle-income people—can no longer afford to buy a home or even to rent a new apartment.

Rents have moved up very sharply. The prices of homes have moved beyond the ability of any ordinary family to buy. Things have gotten way out of control.

SWOBODA. Mr. Goldfinger, one of the fall-out results of that economic theory you mentioned before is a trade-off of high unemployment to cool the economy. Well, we have high unemployment, but we haven't, apparently, cooled the economy. Where do you see unemployment going, and, is there any way out of that in the near future?

GOLDFINGER. Well, Mr. Swoboda, you may recall that the AFL-CIO Executive Council, back about a year and one-half ago, stated that the economic theories of this Administration, with this tight money squeeze, can actually work in slowing down the rate of inflation only by bringing down the whole house.

Sure, if we had a depression and massive unemployment—a large army of unemployed people—with nobody able to buy anything, the rate of inflation would probably slow down.

But nobody that I know of wants a repetition of that kind of disaster.

Unemployment is rising. I don't know how high it is going to go. It certainly has been rising much faster than the Administration said it would.

You may recall that last February, AFL-CIO President George Meany stated that there was a distinct possibility that unemployment may rise to six percent.

Administration economists scoffed at that. But, unemployment has shot up. It's now at a 4.8 percent rate, and it's moving up sharply.

All of the things that have been happening have been the reverse of what's needed.

We need credit controls, where the government would somehow directly control the flow of available credit, rather than permit the private bankers to ration credit in the way that they want to.

We need the available credit that is around—the available money—to flow into needed production, for increased employment and so on. State and local governments, in addition to home building, have been very hard hit by the tight money squeeze and sky-high interest rates.

Small- and medium-sized businesses have been hard hit. Often, they haven't been able to get loans at all—and if they've been able to get loans from the banks, you know, for expanded production and ordinary business operations, they have had to pay extremely high interest rates, which then go right into the cost structure and the price structure. At the end of the line is the American consumer—you and I and all the rest of us, who have to pay the price.

In addition, many workers are paying the additional price, in the form of reductions in working hours and higher unemployment.

The rise in unemployment, since December, has been 1,100,000.

GILBRIDE. How would you go about changing the credit system, so that large amounts of money could go into such things as housing and the kind of business that creates jobs?

Would you have two different sets of interest rates, and the government telling the banks that they must loan to, say, housing construction firms at four or five percent, and that somebody with an un-needed project would have to pay the 10 percent, or whatever?

GOLDFINGER. Well, something along those lines. This kind of program did work back in the early 1950's. From roughly 1950 to 1953, we did have selective credit controls in the United States, and they worked.

Moreover, Mr. Gilbride, last December, Congress passed a bill entitled "Lowering Interest Rates, Fighting Inflation, Helping Small Business and Expanding the Mortgage Market," which grants broad authority to the President to set selective credit controls to curb the specific causes of credit inflation. On the other hand, it would expand the amount of credit and money needed for ordinary business operations, for home building, and for state and local governments. It also gave the government a flexible means to rebalance the whole credit structure of the country—to prohibit the banks from rationing credit into places where it is not needed, such as gambling casinos and foreign business operations of U.S. companies—and to get this thing going on the right track here at home—in the United States.

Well, more than four months have gone by since Congress passed this bill and the President signed it.

It's now the law, but the President has not used it.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council, on May 12th, said, "confronted by the President's failure to use his authority, we urge the Congress to direct the Federal Reserve System to establish selective credit controls, maximum interest rates on specific types of loans, and allocation of available credit to where it will do the most good for America."

GILBRIDE. Mr. Goldfinger, there has been a good deal of talk also, in Congress and elsewhere, about the possibility of flat-out federal controls—freezes on wages, prices, rents, corporate income, and all that. How do you view that—how does the Federation view that?

GOLDFINGER. Well, Mr. Gilbride, the AFL-CIO does not believe that voluntary "jaw-boning" or voluntary guideline approach can work.

We don't believe that it's effective or workable in the American economy.

However, ever since the beginning of 1966, the AFL-CIO leadership has said and repeated, in convention resolutions, Executive Council statements, speeches by the leadership—President Meany and others—that if the President of the United States determines that the situation warrants overall stabilization controls—that's real direct controls—the AFL-CIO would cooperate, so long as such controls are equitably placed on all costs and incomes, including all prices, profits, dividends, rents, executive salaries and other executive compensation, as well as the wages and salaries of employees.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Meany has been even stronger than that. I believe that he has said a year or so ago, that the only way to stop it is with such controls. Is this still the feeling, do you think? Would you advocate that?

GOLDFINGER. Well, as Mr. Meany pointed out when he said that, Mr. Gilbride, we're not advocating controls, but we believe that temporary controls can work, and we would cooperate, provided that they are equitably placed across the board.

However, I want to emphasize that price controls like these we would cooperate with, if necessary, in themselves, would not do the job that is needed, unless we have selective credit controls to stop the misallocation and bad rationing of credit by the banks.

Somebody has to get in—and it can only be the U.S. government—it has to get in there and direct the banks to stop loaning the scarce amount of available money for all kinds of unnecessary ventures, such as foreign out-flows of capital, gambling casinos

and things like that, and get the money where it's needed—into home building, and state and local government projects, and ordinary business operations.

SWOBODA. Mr. Goldfinger, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Arthur Burns, a close economic advisor to the President, recently suggested that maybe we need a form of income policy, on a short term basis. Do you see any real indication that this will happen, or is it just a bit of fluff?

GOLDFINGER. Well, I can't make head nor tail of what's going on within the Administration, Mr. Swoboda. I'm afraid this is one of the difficulties in the economy.

One spokesman for the Administration says one thing, and another spokesman for the Administration says another.

But the actual fact is that we have a drift—we have a downward drift in the economy—we have a downward drift in confidence in the American economy—and we have a drift in government policy.

The government seems to be moving on the basis of this classical economic theory that they picked up in the old textbooks.

SWOBODA. We've talked about recession, is it possible that we could drift into a depression in these times—in this age?

GOLDFINGER. Well, I sure would hope not. I would not rule out a depression, but the current situation certainly is one of economic recession, and the economic recession is getting worse.

There is no sign of improvement in production, in employment, and there is no sign of improvement on the inflation front.

GILBRIDE. Do you see any good news in the fact that the wholesale price index seems to have eased off a little bit? Do you think it could be a tip-off that that six percent rise might start coming down, as the wholesale feeds into the retail level?

GOLDFINGER. Well, I certainly hope so, Mr. Gilbride. But I don't believe that there is any assurance that this will happen.

Actually, the price level has been accelerating, rather than slowing down. The rise in consumer prices last year was 5.4 percent, and in the past four months—since December 1969—the increase in consumer prices has been at a yearly rate of six percent.

SWOBODA. Can the nation win under the Nixon Administration "economic game plan"?

GOLDFINGER. I don't think that this forecast or "game plan" of the Administration will necessarily hold at all.

Their "game plan" spells rising unemployment for the next several months, and they have admitted it. However, even that kind of "game plan" may well go off. There is no assurance that we're going to get the kind of strengthening—the kind of improvement in the economy that the Administration's economists talk of, even by the end of the year.

Things may continue down.

There is absolutely no assurance that this so-called "game plan" is working. It hasn't worked up to now, and there is no reason to believe that it will work in the next several months.

We are extremely concerned about what they have been up to—what they have been doing.

HARDEN. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Research. Representing the press were Neil Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press, and Frank Swoboda, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President and his Republican leaders to speak up and let the American people know what they plan to do to reverse the present economic trends. It is time that the administration announced a definite program to roll back high interest rates.

#### BITTER MEDICINE FOR A BAD DISEASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call attention to a bill which I have today introduced which will bear the title: "A bill to aid and control inflationary pressures."

Our country today faces a lot of problems. Our country is divided over the incursion into Cambodia. Student unrest is at the highest level that any of us can remember. The crime problem remains unsolved. Notwithstanding, the urgency of the foregoing matters have one overriding problem in my judgment that affect all of us adversely and that is the present condition of our country's economy.

Last week we saw the stock market plunge to the lowest level in 8 years. Not since 1962 were the Dow-Jones averages as low as 641. The only day in recent times the market had plunged as low as 20 points was on November 22, 1963, the day President Kennedy was assassinated.

It is true the stock market has made somewhat of a recovery but not a substantial one and that decline in the values of stocks on the big board was a reckless way of saying that our country is in trouble and we may be approaching an economic crisis. Whatever the contributing causes may be, whether it is heavy Vietnam expenditures and now additional Cambodian costs; whether it is the prospect of a large Federal deficit; whether it is the necessity to raise the debt ceiling this past week by \$18 billion; the fact remains that inflation goes on unchecked and the greatest worry on the minds of most of the people in this country is this cancerous growth of inflation. The prescriptions we have been using have failed. We tried the surtax and it did not work. There are some who honestly believe that the surtax was really inflationary. Tight money has certainly failed and has resulted in a burdensome load on the backs of just about everyone in our society.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the time has come we can no longer postpone the day for administering a more effective measure against inflation. It is for this reason that I have prepared and today introduced a measure which will provide the President with authority to freeze prices and wages for a 90-day period. My bill will further provide at the end of 90 days that the Congress could, by concurrent resolution, extend further authority to the President or, at the end of 90 days, the Congress could determine controls were no longer necessary and

the freeze, if ordered by the President, would be immediately lifted by a concurrent resolution of the Congress.

A most appropriate and timely question that may be asked is why have I reached the conclusion that such bitter medicine as price and wage controls are now needed? Well, the action of the stock market should be reason enough. But there are more compelling reasons. In the 29 months since January 1, 1968, the ravages of inflation have eaten 16.3 cents out of every consumer dollar. This is not only a burden on consumers but a most unfair kind of burden and hurts badly those young people who are struggling to raise a family. It most adversely affects those homebuyers who are trying to maintain their payments on their equity. Those who may be more affluent and are trying to save a few dollars are hurt along with the rest as the following statistics will demonstrate. Take, for example, those who made deposits in their savings accounts in January of 1968. If they analyze the facts they will find that dollar is no longer in that savings account. The reason is that after drawing interest at 5 percent for 29 months those who have tried so hard to save will find they have only 82 cents today in that savings account measured in terms of purchasing power.

I am most mindful that price and wage controls are strong medicine, but we are in a most unusual economic state in this century if not in all economic history. We have been witnessing cutbacks in business and increasing unemployment but with an uninterrupted price rise. The question we must ask ourselves is are we in an inflationary recession or are we in a recessionary inflation?

All of us in Congress know we have tried to help those who need help most. We enacted a 15-percent increase in social security retroactive to January 1 of his year. We followed that with a 15-percent increase for railroad retirees, but the awful facts are the growth of inflation has already wiped out over one-half of those increases. The average median settlement won by organized labor through the process of collective bargaining in 1969 was a 8.2-percent increase. Once again, the reality we must face is that those gains have nearly all been absorbed by inflation.

If the Congress and the executive branch fail to take the needed steps to check inflation, then all of the present Federal aid programs may be to no avail. If we fail to stem the tide of inflation, we will be giving with one hand Federal grants and loans, but taking away from the recipients with our other hand in the form of unchecked inflation.

Let me emphasize that I, for one, want to be fair with our President. There is nothing partisan about my remarks on this proposal or any other that would be advanced to try to control inflation. So far as I know, he has been sincere in his efforts to control inflation, but, once again, the realities have demonstrated that the methods he has used to control inflation in the past 6 months have just not worked.

Recognizing the danger of being bore-some by repetition, I must say again that while price and wage controls are bitter medicine, in the case of inflation we are fighting a stubborn disease. A drastic remedy is indicated. Controls were proven to be effective remedies in World War II and the Korean emergency.

Some of my colleagues told me that my proposal would meet with resistance from the AFL-CIO. It is my understanding organized labor will support controls if there is a national emergency. I submit that we may be close to a national emergency, particularly after the recent behavior of the stock market.

I am told that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce will oppose economic controls. As I understand the attitude of the chamber, they have clearly stated that "controls have no place in a peacetime economy." Well, then the chamber should be for such controls because we are not at the present in a peacetime economy.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out some of the specifics of how my proposal would work. The Congress gives authority to the President to order prices and wages frozen at the highest level prevailing 30 days before the freeze. After the freeze, it would be unlawful for any goods, commodities, services, or properties to be sold at a higher price than the freeze level. Penalties would be imposed on persons who knowingly pay higher price than the ceiling, as fixed by the freeze.

Wages would be treated similarly; that is, frozen at the highest level prevailing in the 30 days before the freeze, with accompanying penalties against those who either pay or receive a higher wage, salary, or commission than set by the freeze.

My bill provides that the President could use any existing facilities in the Federal bureaucracy to administer and enforce price and wage ceilings. Under my proposal the President could declare an economic freeze for a period of less than 90 days but Congress will still retain the option to extend controls beyond the initial 90 days or end the period of freeze if controls are no longer needed.

There is nothing in my proposal to prevent the President from extending ceilings for a second 90-day period if Congress did not act by resolution to avoid such an extension.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to point to these built-in safety valves. Here we have set up provisions which enable the Congress to leave controls in effect for longer than 90 days and yet suspend the controls at any time by a simple concurrent resolution.

I firmly believe all of our people are entitled to enjoy the least possible governmental controls. That is a principle which is best for the country over the long pull. But to cope with what will hopefully be a short-lived emergency the inconvenience of controls become a necessity. I am convinced our people are at the present the victims of rampant inflation without the ability to help themselves without governmental assistance.

My friends tell me that my farm constituents will not be happy with controls because their prices will be frozen at a level they feel will be too low. On the other hand, I have consulted with many farmers and I came away convinced they believe controls will be beneficial to them because it will put a clamp on the prices of things they will have to buy.

One of the best comparisons that I can point to is that our economy is running unrestrained like a wild horse out of control. We all know that the horse can ruin itself or can kill itself. That same thing can happen to our economy. We have all hoped that we would see a leveling off of prices and wages. Now we can no longer rely on hopes. We must take a positive, assertive action.

We hear today that everyone is tax conscious. If we do face the facts we should be ready to agree that inflation is really a tax and the cruelest and most discriminatory of all taxes.

Controls may be onerous and somewhat burdensome. Yes, controls may not be popular, but neither will a prolonged recession or depression. Those of us who lived through the 1930's remember the great depression. We all believe in a free economy. None of us will exactly welcome price and wage controls. The point is, there may be no other way.

#### THE TREATY OF TRIANON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the Allied Powers concluded a peace treaty with Hungary, one of the successor states to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy which for centuries preserved a power balance and provided security and relative material affluence to the peoples of Central Europe.

Hungary formed an independent yet interrelated part of the monarchy. It possessed its own government and the 1,000-year-old Hungarian Kingdom was a bulwark of Western culture in this marginal zone of Europe, defending time and time again the area against Tartar, Turkish, and other raids.

Unfortunately the peacemakers of 1920 did not consider the past accomplishments and merits of the Hungarian nation which did not seek the First World War and whose Prime Minister in the Crown Council warned against the ultimatum to Belgrade in July 1914.

Among the peacemakers our President Wilson had relatively the most sympathy for them. He tried to create ethnically contiguous territories in this racially hopelessly mixed region. Following this principle, the peace conference began its work, only to be bogged down by the demands of the smaller allies claiming Hungarian territories not only on the basis of ethnicity, but also on economic and strategic grounds. Our generation which has seen the use of this argument by totalitarian aggressors like Hitler, is aware of the absurd character

of such nationalist demands by any nation. The peacemakers of Trianon were not, especially as it was in the French interest to punish Hungary. The proposals of the American delegation for a just peace were too often disregarded, and in the end accepted even by the American negotiators. On June 27, 1968, I spoke about the American proposals on the frontiers between Hungary and Rumania which were never followed, and the examples could be multiplied by reading the documents of the peace conference and Miller's diary of the same. Finally, 3.3 million Hungarians were put under the rule of the neighboring nations who usually treated them as second-class citizens and tried to assimilate them as soon as possible. This created an irredenta which could not be disregarded by any Hungarian Government in the interwar period and helped to fan the flames of extreme nationalism and fascism all over the region, pitting nation against nation. The result was, as we know the collapse of the anti-Hungarian Little Entente and Hitler's predominance in the region until expelled by the Red Army. The latter brought its own dictatorship with it, in the case of Hungary, an even bloodier one than before.

Hungary gained nothing by exchanging masters. The peace treaty of 1947 only reconfirmed the settlement of 1920 and to this day, the Hungarian minorities, especially the largest group in Transylvania, is exposed to the subtle, or often even overt, pressures of the neighboring countries' government to deny their national identity and to become Communist in ideology and spirit.

Thus, unfortunately we have the national ethnic issue still smoldering in the region, overshadowed, but not erased by the present anti-Soviet nationalism of the region which is held down by sheer Russian military power.

Under these circumstances, it is only proper that those American citizens of Hungarian origin remember the anniversary and use it to express their views and the need for new initiatives in the general problem which, in the last analysis can only be solved by the peoples themselves upon a withdrawal of Soviet forces. Thus, it is my privilege to ask for unanimous consent for the insertion of the memorandum drafted by the American-Hungarian Federation in active cooperation with other American Hungarian national organizations on this sad anniversary, a copy of which was submitted to President Nixon.

The memorandum follows:

**DECLARATION OF AMERICAN HUNGARIAN NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF TRIANON TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT**

Fifty years ago, the peace treaty of Trianon redrew the political map of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and mutilated the Hungarian Kingdom. In contravention to the right of self-determination, the Trianon Treaty distributed almost sixty percent of population and two-thirds of the territory of Hungary among states which either did not exist before, or constituted small entities.

The new order created a number of multinational states of limited political and economic viability in Central Europe and forced

over three-million Hungarians (about one-third of all Hungarians then living in the Carpathian Basin) to live against their will under foreign governments. Repression practiced against the Hungarians by the successor states of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy filled volumes of League of Nations proceedings and contributed both to a lowering of living standards and to politico-military weakness of the nations of the region. This created a vacuum filled first by Hitlerite, and later, by Soviet Russian imperialism against the wishes of United States policies.

The 1920 Settlement, reconfirmed under Soviet pressure in the 1947 Treaty of Paris, again destroyed the geopolitical and economic unity of the Carpathian Basin (the area of the Hungarian Kingdom) which for a millennium provided economic prosperity and military security to the peoples there. This violent disintegration of a historically and geographically integrated area constituted a grave injustice to all the nationalities living in the Basin.

The consequences of these unfortunate settlements still survive and the grievous errors committed at the expense of stable peace must be faced also by us in the United States. Three and a half million Hungarians still live in the neighboring countries under foreign rule, and are repressed both on ideological and nationality grounds by the Czechoslovak, Rumanian, and to a lesser degree, by the Yugoslav Government. These Hungarians do not enjoy their basic human rights, not even cultural autonomy. In turn, the continued partition of the Carpathian Basin reinforces Soviet Russian imperialism in the region.

Grievous consequences suffered during half of a century compel the undersigned organizations of American citizens of Hungarian heritage to declare their opposition to the existing settlement and to Soviet hegemony in the region. We earnestly hope that the United States Government will establish a policy aiming at applying in the long run the right to self-determination and basic human rights and cultural autonomy to the Hungarian minorities in the Carpathian Basin with as short a delay as it is feasible. We also hope that the United States Government will, when opportunity presents itself, work for an equitable general settlement created by the 1920 and 1947 Treaties. Such a new settlement would have to include a reestablishment of the geopolitical and economic unity of the Carpathian Basin in particular, and Central Europe in general, organized for collaboration and peace, thereby restoring the national independence and individual freedoms of the Hungarian people.

Dr. Tibor Eckhardt, Chairman, North American Common Hungarian Foreign Policy Council; Prof. Andras H. Pogany, President, Hungarian Freedomfighters Association (U.S.A.); Dr. Stephen Eszterhas, Chairman, Hungarian Liberation Committee; Mr. Ernest Czikke, Chairman, Collegial Society of Hungarian War Veterans (U.S.A.); Mr. Laszlo Sirsich, President, Hungarian National Committee on Hungarians of Czechoslovakia; Mr. Louis Lote, President, Committee on Transylvania; Dr. Janos Nadas, President, Hungarian Society; Mr. Gabriel Bodnar, President, Hungarian Boy Scout Association of U.S.A.; Prof. Charles Pulvari, President, Piarist Alumni Association; Hon. Albert A. Fiok, National Chairman, American Hungarian Federation; Rt. Rev. Zoltan Beky, D.D. Bishop emeritus, President, Hungarian Reformed Federation of America; Dr. Laszlo Varga, President, Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists;

Mr. Remig Papp, Executive Vice President, American Transylvanian Federation; Dr. Antal Leibach, President, Council for the Liberation of Southern Hungary; Mr. Stephen Miko, President, American Hungarian Federation of State of New York, Inc., Msgr. John Sabo, President, Hungarian Catholic League of America; Professor Albert Wass de Czege, Chairman, American Hungarian Literary Guild.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with pleasure the speech of my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. HALPERN) in remembering the 50th anniversary of the peace treaty of Trianon which deprived Hungary of two-thirds of her territory and 60 percent of the population in 1920.

Recently, I was given a background paper on the subject by the American-Hungarian Federation which was drawn up in active cooperation with several other national organizations who also signed the Trianon Declaration inserted by my distinguished colleague. I include the background paper in the RECORD as it is well written, objective, and expresses in great detail not only the losses and grievances of Hungarians everywhere, but also their undaunted will to overcome them in cooperation with the neighboring peoples and to rid themselves from the yoke of Soviet communism.

The paper follows:

**BACKGROUND PAPER OF AMERICAN-HUNGARIAN NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF TRIANON, JUNE 4, 1920**

In 1918 President Wilson called in his Fourteen Points for an equitable peace. He included in these demands also a call for the free development of the peoples of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

The efforts of the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, aiming at the application of the principle of national self-determination in Central Europe remained unsuccessful, however.

The victim of the new settlement became Hungary which for a millennium occupied the leading position in the Carpathian Basin which area forms a natural geopolitical and economic unit. Almost sixty percent of the population and two-thirds of the territory of the Hungarian Kingdom were transferred to selfish claimants, and close to three and a half million Hungarians were detached from the surviving Hungarian state. A large percentage of them still live in areas immediately adjacent to the frontiers of the surviving Hungarian state.

However, the creation of several new nationality states in lieu of the one multinational Austro-Hungarian Monarchy failed to solve the problem of equitable coexistence in a racially mixed area. The only beneficiaries were the protagonists of ethnic nationalism, and the peace treaty created a power vacuum by destroying the historical unity of Central Europe while lowering living standards, a sad result of new tariff walls and trade wars.

Oppressive measures against the Hungarian minorities, despite the Minorities Treaties imposed upon the new states by the Allies, filled many volumes of League of Nations proceedings, but failed to resolve the underlying issue of excessive chauvinisms, resulting in a second-class citizenship status and persecution of the Hungarians in the neighboring countries. Under Hitler's control, national passions were further exacerbated and

helped in the long run only the task of the second invaders: Stalin's Red Army.

Hungary was again the victim of the new peace treaty signed in 1947 at Paris. The returning Czechoslovak and Rumanian authorities in the areas reattached to Hungary under the First and Second Vienna Awards (northern Transylvania and some districts in Upper Hungary with Hungarian majorities) treated the Hungarian population as if they were not entitled to the protection of any laws. Thousands of them were expelled, and hundred thousands of them were forced to declare themselves Slovak in Czechoslovakia. These facts were even exposed by the Hungarian Communist cultural organization in Czechoslovakia during the spring of 1968. In Rumania, reemerging Rumanian nationalism resulted in widespread oppression against them particularly in the 1960s. Many instances of this oppression were exposed and denounced in both Houses of Congress of the United States.

The national organizations of American citizens of Hungarian descent reiterate therefore, that even beyond the present oppression of the peoples of the region by the Soviet Union, the present state structures can accommodate only inadequately the aspirations and interests of the peoples of Central Europe.

They believe that a stable peace in Central Europe cannot be achieved until Soviet control is removed by a neutralization agreement on the Austrian model and until thereafter the peoples of the region are allowed to concentrate upon their outstanding ethnic, political and economic problems, leading to a reorganization of the area.

This reorganization must be left to the peoples involved. We believe that American policy should promote the integration of the Carpathian Basin and Central Europe which formed an economic and political unit, for many centuries.

However, even until such a reorganization may be realized, there are short-term measures which may be taken. Even according to Leninist principles, discrimination on the basis of nationality is a grievous error. Supporting the demand to national self-determination cannot be considered a forbidden intervention. We believe that the nationalities of Central Europe should be entitled to enjoy equal rights with the majority and that ethnic nationalism should not be the guiding force of state politics regardless of the general ideological line adhered to.

The national organizations of American citizens of Hungarian descent know that the politico-economic interests of the Soviet Union do not favor the above approach. Today, the U.S.S.R. exploits the surviving enmities among the nations of Central Europe in order to maintain her own hegemony. She is afraid that the undeniable rise of a new, anti-Soviet nationalism, based on the common aspiration of freedom by all oppressed peoples of the region could provide the nucleus of a more powerful and united resistance against the Soviet Union and create a more prosperous region.

The national organizations of American citizens of Hungarian descent strongly believe that while Hungarians, whether living in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, or Yugoslavia can and will not accept the unjust settlements imposed upon them at Trianon (1920) and Paris (1947), they are interested in working out with the interested peoples a reintegration of the Carpathian Basin and of Central Europe.

They call, therefore, on our Government to take whatever steps are feasible in the coming talks with the Soviet Union on European security to effect the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the Carpathian Basin and to promote closer ties among the nations of Central Europe. They also call for initiatives to secure the protection of the three and a

half million Hungarians living as minorities in the Carpathian Basin until a lasting solution of the regional problems may be found.

#### PANAMA CANAL SOVEREIGNTY AND MODERNIZATION: LATEST DEVELOPMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, despite the series of problems in Southeast Asia, the Near East, and on the domestic front that have been thronging upon us, there are other matters of the gravest importance requiring attention and which cannot be safely ignored. In recent weeks a convergence of events relative to the Panama Canal is most significant.

First, on April 22, 1970, Gov. Walter P. Leber of the Canal Zone, in a statement before the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, discussed some little understood angles of the interoceanic canal question. He confirmed the wisdom of the choice of the high-level lake and lock canal and expressed the view that the Panama Canal will survive the new competition of oil pipelines and supersize vessels, predicting a long and healthy future.

Because of the importance of the Governor's statement, I wrote an appraisal of it to Chairman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN of the subcommittee emphasizing that its effect is to place additional nails in the coffin of the sea-level-canal cadaver.

The full text of the April 22 hearings will be available at an early date and should be consulted in connection with comments that I have circulated to all Members of the Congress.

A second development of significance was the White House announcement on May 16, 1970, of the appointment of 33-year-old Daniel W. Hofgren, a Presidential assistant with no background of Canal experience, as Special Representative of the United States for renewed interoceanic canal negotiations between the United States and Panama with the personal rank of Ambassador. He would become the principal assistant for Chief Negotiator Robert B. Anderson who is also the Chairman of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission and an advocate for the surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, the construction of a sea-level canal, and eventually giving to Panama not only the existing Panama Canal but also any new canal constructed at the expense of the American taxpayer, all all without a cent of compensation.

In this connection, the attention of the Congress is invited to the fact that more than 100 Representatives are supporting identical House resolutions in opposition to any surrender at Panama, either of the Canal Zone or the Canal; also to the fact that measures have been introduced in both House and Senate to provide for the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal.

Because of the relation of the recent developments to the overall canal situa-

tion, I quote as parts of my remarks my April 27, 1970, letter to Chairman SULLIVAN, the May 16 White House release on the Hofgren appointment, and a May 18 editorial of the Chicago Tribune as follows:

APRIL 27, 1970.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Panama Canal,  
Committee on Merchant Marine and  
Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: I have read with much interest the statement by Governor Walter P. Leber of the Canal Zone on April 22, 1970, before your subcommittee. Though the views expressed by him were ably delivered and contain much valuable information for future reference, the picture presented is not complete. It is regrettable that he did not give his observations on the Third Locks Project and that no questions touching this subject were asked him at the hearings.

The task before the Congress as regards the Panama Canal is twofold: (1) increase of capacity and (2) improvement of operations. What is needed to effect both of these objectives is a two way ship channel in the summit level with ample and logically located consolidated locks at each end of the Canal. The required increase of capacity and operational improvement would be attained under identical bills for the major modernization of the existing Canal now before the Senate and House, S. 2228 and H.R. 3792.

The program for the full modernization therein contemplated, known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan, in the opinion of competent experienced canal experts not only would provide the needed increase of capacity and improvement in operational efficiency, but also would enable the maximum utilization of all work on the Canal so far accomplished, and with the certainty of success. This plan would supply the best operational canal practicable of achievement at least cost and, most importantly, without the necessity for negotiating a new treaty with Panama.

By way of explanation, the original Third Locks Project was authorized in 1939 pursuant to a 1932 report of the U.S. Army Interoceanic Canal Board at a cost not to exceed \$277,000,000. This Board estimated that additional lock capacity would be required about 1970. (H. Doc. No. 139, 72d Congress, p. 27).

Construction on the Third Locks Project started in 1940, but was suspended in May, 1942, because of the exactions of World War II. The total expenditures on it were \$76,357,405, mainly on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, which are usable in the full modernization program. No excavation was started at Pedro Miguel, which is fortunate.

The enlargement of Gaillard Cut, scheduled for completion in 1971 at a cost of more than \$81,000,000, together with the expenditures on the suspended Third Locks Project, totals more than \$157,000,000 expended toward the major modernization of the existing canal. Including defense, the Panama Canal represents an investment of more than \$5 Billion of our taxpayer's money. If converted into 1970 dollars, this figure would be far greater.

There are a number of points in Governor Leber's statement which I shall summarize:

1. Despite the competition of oil pipe lines, giant tankers and ore carriers, huge aircraft and "land bridges" (railroads), the Panama Canal is not about to go out of business but is destined for "a long and healthy future". (See Par. 4 of the Governor's statement).

2. History confirms the wisdom of the 1906 adoption of the high level lake and lock type

canal, described as a "prudent decision". (Par. 10).

3. The super ocean vessels now being constructed were planned because of toll considerations, for use on trade routes that do not require transit of the Panama Canal, and which vessels would not use this canal even if they could transit it. (Par. 16).

The three points just summarized are important in the evaluation of misleading propaganda as regards type of canal, for they are never presented by advocates of the so-called sea level plan. Thus, they are additional nails from an official source in the coffin of the cadaver of the ancient sea level idea.

In the 1945-47 lock canal studies by the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, it provided for raising the present Gatun Lake maximum water level of 87 feet to 92 feet, a raise of 5 feet doubling the reserve water supply, for a "fully modernized lock canal at Panama". (A.S.C.E. Transactions, Vol. 114 (1949), p. 619).

As to the current short and long range canal improvement programs discussed by Governor Leber (See pars. 26-30), with exception of the question of additional water, these consist of routine repairs, alterations or maintenance projects of non-basic character necessary for efficient administration. Even if all such programs are accomplished, the canal would still remain essentially what it was in 1914, with the same navigational bottleneck at Pedro Miguel causing a series of operational problems and reducing capacity.

In regard to Governor Leber's discussion of provisions for additional water (Par. 29(b)), he does not mention the raising of the Gatun Lake water level. This angle is fundamental and cannot be ignored in any program that purports to be realistic.

Instead of expanding large sums for the improvement of the existing canal (87' maximum water level), past experience in its operations indicated that the wiser course would be to authorize its major modernization so that the improvement program could be developed and applied to the canal of the future at a higher lake level and not to that of 1914. Unless this is done, much of the improvement expenditures could prove a waste of money.

A recent example of poor planning in the Canal Zone was the construction of housing at Pedro Miguel in an area that will be flooded if and when the present Miraflores Lake is elevated to the level of Gatun Lake.

Governor Leber's testimony is a step in the right direction—but only a step. Much remains to be clarified before the Congress can legislate with confidence that its action is in the best interest of the United States, Panama and shipping in general.

Though the Governor's statement is very helpful so far as it goes, it should be followed up with extensive hearings on the above indicated bills. Otherwise, the Congress will not have adequate information on this vital matter and be limited by Governor Leber's testimony now under discussion. Certainly, Governor Leber's views on the subject of the fully modernized canal should be obtained.

I would add that the problems presented can be satisfactorily solved only by enactment of the pending legislation for the full modernization of the existing canal at far less cost and on which more than \$157,000,000 will have been expended on completion of Gallard Cut widening, all of which can be constructed without treaty involvement with Panama.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
Member of Congress.

WHITE HOUSE PRESS RELEASE

The President today announced the designation of Daniel W. Hofgren of New York

City as Special Representative of the United States for Inter-Oceanic Canal Negotiations, with the personal rank of Ambassador. He succeeds John N. Irwin II, who resigned on April 21, 1968.

The Inter-Oceanic Canal Negotiations between the United States and Panama were undertaken in 1964 for the purpose of reaching new agreements regarding the Panama Canal, to replace the original 1903 treaty. Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury, has headed the United States negotiating team since the talks began. Daniel Hofgren will become Ambassador Anderson's principal assistant.

Hofgren, 33, has served as a Special Assistant to the President since January, 1969. Prior to joining the White House staff, he had spent seven years as financial advisor to the Edwin Jay Gould estate in New York and had been active in the investment business in the United States and Latin America. In the summer of 1957, while still an undergraduate at Colgate, Hofgren worked at the White House as an aide to Cabinet secretary Robert Gray. Following his graduation in 1958, he had several assignments in international youth affairs—in 1958 as a consultant to the American Council on NATO for Atlantic Youth Affairs and in 1959 as Director of the Paris Conference for Political Youth Leaders and Organizations and as a delegate to the Atlantic Congress in London. Hofgren was a member of the Board of Foreign Scholarships from 1959 to 1962.

Hofgren is married to the former Alexandra Walton Smith; they have one son.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 18, 1970]

LET'S KEEP THE CANAL WE ALREADY HAVE

The White House has announced that Daniel Hofgren, a Presidential assistant, will leave soon to take charge of negotiations with Panama for a new Atlantic-Pacific canal. This is an ominous step, not only because no new canal is needed but also because it portends revival of proposed treaties with Panama on the status and defense of the existing canal.

Under a secret agreement between the Johnson administration and the government of Panama, the 1903 treaty granting effective sovereignty in the Canal Zone to the United States "in perpetuity" would be replaced by a new treaty expressly acknowledging Panama's sovereignty in the zone and surrendering ownership and control of the canal to a joint United States-Panamanian authority. A second treaty on the defense of the canal would restrict United States bases to a smaller area and require Panama's consent for operations outside the zone in case of aggression. A third treaty would authorize the construction of a sea level canal with the same concessions to Panama.

The proposed treaties were shelved by both governments when their texts were obtained and published by THE TRIBUNE and a storm of controversy ensued. Solomon Cady Hollister, dean emeritus of engineering at Cornell university and former chairman of a board of congressional consultants which had studied problems of the canal exhaustively, said the proposed treaties would jeopardize the existing canal as a dependable waterway and that no new canal was needed.

President Johnson appointed a commission headed by Robert B. Anderson, former secretary of the treasury in the Eisenhower administration, to study possible sites for a sea level canal, and its report is due late this year. Without waiting for it, however, the Nixon administration has moved to resume negotiations with the Panamanian government, now headed by a military dictator, Brig. Gen. Omar Terrijos.

Maj. Gen. Walter P. Leber, governor of the Canal Zone and president of the Panama Canal company, recently presented to a House of Representatives subcommittee the results of two expert studies, one on the ca-

capacity of the canal with projected improvements and one on potential traffic. These studies indicated a traffic potential of 18,400 transits a year [17,900 of them commercial] by 1985, compared with 14,602 transits [13,150 commercial] in 1969. Improvements now being made or projected will permit more than 19,000 transits a year by 1985, and the ultimate capacity of the canal is 26,800 transits a year. This would be sufficient for all potential traffic well into the next century, and Gen. Leber said the improvements, with an ultimate cost of 92 million dollars, could be made "at a very favorable cost-benefit ratio."

Gen. Leber explained that the advent of the superships—tankers, bulk carriers, and container ships for general cargo—has changed the economic importance of canals. They are designed to avoid payment of canal tolls by taking longer routes, which they can do economically because of their size. The closing of the Suez Canal in 1967 meant a tremendous loss of revenue to Egypt, but it has had little impact on world shipping because it is cheaper for super-tankers to go around the Cape of Good Hope than it would be to pay Suez canal tolls.

A ship from Japan saves 13 days by going through the Panama canal to the east coast of the United States, but the transportation cost for a ton of coal in a 150,000-ton ship going around the Cape of Good Hope to Japan is only \$2.25, compared with \$3.11 in a typical 50,000-ton ship using the Panama canal.

A sea level canal, costing billions of dollars, would have to charge tolls so high that no ships that are too big for the present canal would use it.

#### REFORM AND REORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning Congressman VANIK and myself proposed that the Democrats in the House of Representatives who aspire to leadership positions make clear their stands on reform of the House. I hope that between now and the leadership elections in January all of my colleagues will give thoughtful consideration to the reforms needed in this body, and to the role of the House leadership in bringing about those reforms.

I ask that the joint statement of Congressman VANIK and myself be included in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMEN HENRY REUSS AND CHARLES A. VANIK, REFORM AND REORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House Democratic Caucus will choose a new Speaker and a new Majority Leader in January.

It is important that the candidates for these positions make clear now their positions on reform and reorganization of the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives as it now operates cannot deal effectively and responsibly with the problems of the 1970's, a conclusion shared by an increasingly large number of Americans.

The needed changes can come about only with the vigorous support of those who aspire to lead the House. Accordingly, we believe that candidates for the leadership posts should make clear now—to their colleagues and to the country—their stand on the following four essential reforms:

(1) Seniority: Open, democratic selection

of Committee chairmen in the Democratic Caucus through record ballots;

(2) Record voting: Provision for record votes in the House on all important issues, by abolishing the Committee of the Whole;

(3) Committee democracy: Divesting Committee Chairman of arbitrary powers;

(4) Secrecy: Abolition of all secret sessions of Committees except where national security is clearly involved.

#### PROGRESS AT THE FCC FOR LAND MOBILE

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1970, the FCC took what is for it and for the public a historic step in meeting its responsibilities to make possible and encourage the larger and more effective use of radio in the public interest, as required by the Congress in the Communications Act of 1934. It was a historic step for the FCC because, by its own statement, it had been "studying the land mobile frequency congestion problem for over 13 years" without taking any action to deal with the basic problem of an apparent imbalance in spectrum allocation, and the problems faced by the land mobile services were, in the words of the FCC, urgent enough to require decisions "without further delay."

It was a historic step in the public interest because of the importance of adequate land mobile radio communications to our society. Even the Commission has said that this is beyond question. It has also said that there is little, if any, dispute that "congestion and the unavailability of frequencies are seriously affecting the public interest in that vital services are being hampered because of inadequate radio communications."

For their part in bringing these actions about, much credit must be given to the present chairman of the FCC, Dean Burch, and to his immediate predecessor, Rosel Hyde. It was not until Mr. Hyde became chairman in 1966 that the FCC stopped its foot dragging, and began to focus on the need for doing something to solve this problem, and the present chairman has indicated a determination to keep up the pressure to achieve the solution. Indeed, the situation had become so critical even by the time the 1966 annual report of the FCC was prepared that the Commission described the congestion in the land mobile services as one of the thorniest problems confronting the Commission and it compared the land mobile congestion to "a main highway on a summer weekend, so overcrowded with vehicles that traffic has come to a standstill."

So, at last, after 13 years of study the FCC has taken the first steps to provide additional frequency spectrum in order to make improved land mobile communications possible. These land mobile communications include not only the radio communications used by police and fire departments, but also by business and Government activities ranging as widely as airline terminal operations and the operation of public zoos, and including small businesses, taxis, tele-

phone and utility repair crews, doctors, and ambulances. They are all included under the term "private land mobile communications services" because they are communications systems serving specialized purposes.

The situation had become so desperate that, after the FCC had been studying this matter for over 9 years without taking any action, the Select Committee on Small Business found it necessary to hold a series of hearings on the matter to provide specific evidence of the harm which was being done to the country by the failure of the FCC to take the necessary action. These hearings were conducted by a subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, under the able direction of the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman Joe L. Evins, who is chairman of the full committee. I am pleased to note that the record of those hearings and the conclusions and recommendations which followed, which were transmitted to the House of Representatives by the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, have been taken note of by the FCC and that action has now been taken by that agency to at least begin to provide the urgently needed relief.

The subcommittee began its inquiry into this problem in 1966, by hearings which included witnesses from Salisbury, N.C.; Dearborn, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Northampton, Mass.; Atlanta, Ga.; Belleville, Mich.; Charlotte, N.C.; and New York City. All of these witnesses pointed out the urgent need for the FCC to make additional spectrum space available in order to permit improved land mobile radio communications.

Then, in a series of hearings beginning in February 1968, our subcommittee heard as witnesses the Special Assistant to the President of the United States for Telecommunications, the chairman of the Joint Technical Advisory Committee of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers and the Electronic Industries Association, the director of Radio Communications for the city of New York, a director of the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, a physicist with the Institute of Telecommunications Sciences, Department of Commerce, the executive director of the Association of Maximum Service Telecasters and its consulting engineer, the president of the National Association of Broadcasters, and the chairman of the Frequency Utilization and Administrative Committee of the joint FCC-Industry Land Mobile Advisory Committee, as well as witnesses from New Jersey, Detroit, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

In order to obtain the greatest possible understanding of the problem, the committee personally visited many of these communities. The witnesses which appeared before it at the hearings included police chiefs, a State police director of communications, representatives of Government agencies, and utility companies providing water and electricity to the people, officials of State highway agencies and city transit authorities, as well as the wide range of other business activities which provide services to the public.

In 1969, we heard from representatives of the utilities industry, the airline industry and the newspaper publishers, and also from a doctor from Miami, the director of communications for the city of Miami, the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, Department of Transportation, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Department of Justice, the Director of the Institute for Telecommunications Sciences, Department of Commerce at Boulder, Colo., the Director of Telecommunications Management in the Executive Office of the President, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, the Land Mobile Communications Council, the chairman and members of the FCC, and representatives from the television broadcasting industry.

There was no doubt from the testimony our committee received in these hearings that it was essential that additional frequency spectrum be provided by the FCC for land mobile communications, and I am proud of the role which our committee, a part of the Congress, played in nailing this point down.

However, while there has been progress at the FCC, much more remains to be done. The Commission has provided relief only in the largest of our cities and we have heard witness after witness from communities of smaller size across the country who have also eloquently stated the need for relief applicable to their areas. Now that the FCC has established the principle that it can provide additional spectrum space for the land mobile radio services without, in its own words, "any significant interference to television reception," it is essential that it apply this same principle throughout the country in order to make additional spectrum available for land mobile use. I will not consider that the Commission will have carried out its responsibility of serving the public interest in the communications field until it has expanded the relief it has now found possible to provide to include land mobile users wherever they may be.

I also do not consider that the Commission will have carried out its responsibility to the public until it has provided an adequate amount of frequency spectrum. By its own admission, in just the next 10 years communications requirements now being met in the private land mobile service can be expected to at least double. And yet, in its actions on May 20, 1970, the FCC provided only a fraction of the additional spectrum space which will be useable to accommodate requirements now being met in the private land mobile service. It is essential that the Commission take the necessary steps now to insure that useable additional land mobile spectrum will become available during the next 10 years to meet the needs of the users in the private land mobile services.

Our urban areas are constantly growing in population and the need for mobile radio communications is increasing even more rapidly as a result of this growth. Furthermore, our smaller cities are becoming larger and their needs cannot, and must not, be permitted to be

stified by an inadequate amount of frequency spectrum for land mobile communications, as has been the case in our largest cities today. The test for relief in such areas should be whether additional spectrum can be made available without significant interference of television reception, not just whether a city's land mobile communications are as congested as they are in New York, Los Angeles, or Chicago.

Indeed, the same type of test should be applied everywhere as a first step. The FCC cannot rest until it achieves the goal for providing additional land mobile spectrum in adequate quantities wherever it can be made available without such interference to television reception. At times this may necessitate making use of unused or idle UHF TV assignments, as the FCC has proposed. In its actions of May 20, 1970, the FCC has dealt with the tip of the iceberg. It must now cope with the whole problem.

#### "HEART-SAVER SQUADS" BILL

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1969, I introduced legislation to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act in order to provide Federal assistance and encourage local initiative to demonstrate the effectiveness of emergency "heart-saver squads" for heart attack victims.

At that time I called to my colleagues' attention the fact that proper medical care administered to victims of congestive heart failure within the first 60 minutes following the heart attack can mean the difference between life and death.

Nearby Montgomery County, Md., has one of the five such "heartmobile" units in this country. According to an article in Sunday's Washington Post, this emergency heart-care unit has been operational since March 16, 1970, and has already responded to about 140 calls for help.

There are few counties that have the resources of Montgomery County, and the purpose of my legislation is to provide the necessary Federal assistance so that appropriate local units can establish their own heartmobile facilities. Funds could be used to provide emergency care for the patient by dispatching specially trained persons in specially equipped ambulances. The bill also provides funds to supplement the training of specialized personnel in the use of pertinent portable equipment and emergency care techniques.

I want to include the entire article from the Washington Post so that the Members can note a vivid example of the kind of lifesaving services provided by this heartmobile. Without this unit, no doubt many men and women stricken with congestive heart failure would not have survived the attack.

I hope that my distinguished colleagues will unite with me to secure passage of H.R. 6956 which will result in sharply lowering the fatality rate of one

of this Nation's greatest killers—heart attacks.

The text of the article follows:

#### LIFESAVING HEARTMOBILE SPEEDS CARE TO VICTIMS

(By Stuart Auerbach)

Abraham Katz had not been feeling well all week. He thought he had the flu, and was taking antibiotics and orange juice.

Suddenly, he started gasping for breath. It was about 6:30 p.m.

His wife did not know it, but Katz, 75, was suffering an attack of congestive heart failure. His heart was unable to pump out all the blood that was flowing into it. As a result, his lungs became so filled with fluid he was unable to breathe.

As his breathing became more labored, Mrs. Katz called a Montgomery County rescue squad. An ambulance arrived at the Katz apartment, 1220 East-West Highway, within 2 minutes.

At the same time, buzzers sounded in the emergency room and cardiac care unit at Holy Cross Hospital, a few miles from the Katz apartment.

The buzzer sent into action the heartmobile—a 21-foot-long van completely equipped to give sophisticated, on-the-spot care to heart attack victims. Five days a week, 16 hours a day, the van responds to all calls that sound like heart attacks within a four-mile radius of Holy Cross—an area that includes half a million people.

Nurse Mary Beth Lagoey and cardiovascular technician John A. White ran down seven flights of stairs from the hospital's cardiac care unit—they find it faster than the elevator—while driver Dan Hutchinson raced from the emergency room and started the van. Technician Al Fagles was already aboard.

The van arrived at the Katz apartment less than minutes after the rescue squad was called, bringing with it everything modern medicine offers to save heart attack victims.

Mrs. Lagoey grabbed a black bag filled with drugs, syringes, intravenous fluids and other medical equipment.

Fagles picked up the most sophisticated piece of portable equipment on board—an electronic box that records the patient's heart rhythm so the heartmobile crew can see it while at the same time transmit it by radio to a machine in a doctor's home or office so he can diagnose the problem.

#### SHOCK MACHINE

The same battery-powered machine also can be used to apply a severe shock to the patient's chest in case he goes into fibrillation—wild, uncontrolled heart beats that fall to produce pumping power and lead to death.

The heartmobile team's performance in the Katz apartment was swift, sure and practiced.

Mrs. Lagoey quickly asked Mrs. Katz what had happened and tried to calm her. Fagles and Hutchinson attended Katz, who was gasping for breath on his bed.

The rescue squad attendants already had clamped an oxygen mask over Katz' face to help him breathe. One held the paddles on his chest to provide the electrocardiogram. Recognizing the symptoms of congestive heart failure, Fagles began putting tourniquets on Katz' arms and legs to cut the flow of blood to the heart and reduce the amount of work it had to do.

Mrs. Lagoey, relying on standing signed orders from doctors in charge of the program, began giving drugs to stop some of the heart's premature contractions.

#### HEART MONITOR

In the van, White spoke by radio to the doctor on call, who was watching the electro-

cardiogram sent from Katz' bedroom the same way doctors in Houston monitor astronauts' heart action during space flights.

Katz was clearly in pain. His breathing, despite the oxygen and the drugs, became increasingly labored. He fought the oxygen mask on his face.

"Okay, Mr. Katz. You're going to breathe easier now," said Mrs. Lagoey. "Don't move. This will make you breathe easier. You're going to be all right."

Within 20 minutes of his wife's call to the rescue squad, Katz was breathing easier and looking better. By 7:14 p.m., he had been carried down to the van where he was given other drugs. By the time the van reached Holy Cross Hospital, he looked like a new man and was talking to the attendants.

Katz had been treated by one of the newest and most sophisticated weapons of medicine.

#### RECENT WEAPON

Mobile coronary care units, relying on space-age technology, were first used in Belfast, Northern Ireland, two years ago. The first one in the United States was put into service last year in New York.

Montgomery County's heartmobile put in service March 16, is only the fifth in the nation. It already has answered about 140 calls.

The Montgomery County unit is unique in that no doctors ride on it. It relies, instead, on the intensive training of nurses and technicians and the close radio communication with one of six cardiologists who always are on call.

Saving heart attack victims, doctors agree, demands quick action—the use of drugs and sophisticated equipment as soon as the heart stops or begins to beat wildly.

Heart attack deaths have been cut in half since hospitals opened special cardiac care units, with their constant monitoring of patients and ready response to crises. But 65 per cent of all heart attack deaths occur outside a hospital. These are the people mobile coronary care units are designed to help.

#### DEATH REDUCTION

Dr. William J. Grace of St. Vincent's Hospital in New York, who ran the nation's first unit, estimated heart attack deaths could be halved by a network of mobile units.

The problem is they are expensive, and the highly trained staff they demand are in short supply.

The Montgomery County unit cost \$145,000 to build, equip and run for a year.

It was financed by a \$100,000 grant from the Regional Medical Program to the Montgomery County Heart Association, \$35,000 donation from American Optical Co. for the electronic equipment and \$10,000 from the fraternal Order of Eagles.

A shortage of trained staff members means that the heartmobile now operates on the limited 16-hour, five day schedule.

#### COMPLEX EQUIPMENT

The equipment on board is so complex the technician has to be a combination master electrician and doctor's assistant to run it. As on spaceships, everything has a backup unit. Besides the portable electrocardiogram machine, there is one attached to the van. The van has its own defibrillator.

If the patient stops breathing, there is a portable resuscitator that massages the heart and pumps air into the lungs.

And if a doctor should need it, there is even a demand pacemaker on the van.

Despite the cost, Katz' son Julius has no doubt about the value of the mobile coronary unit.

"My father would be dead now if it wasn't for that heartmobile," he said. "I think it's a wonderful thing. There should be more of them."

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND UMW ELECTION

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently, Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz testified before the Senate Labor Subcommittee on his Department's role in the United Mine Workers election last year. Having personally participated in that campaign, I was amazed by the Secretary of Labor's statements. It is a sad commentary that the Department of Labor was guilty of inaction and lack of responsibility in facing up to the tyranny and violence which marked the 1969 UMW election campaign. The following sworn rebuttal statement by Joseph A. "Chip" Yablonski, son of the late Joseph "Jock" Yablonski, and Attorney Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., is pertinent to the issues raised in the UMW election campaign and Secretary of Labor Shultz:

MAY 26, 1970.

HON. HARRISON WILLIAMS,  
Chairman, Senate Labor Subcommittee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: On May 4, 1970, the Secretary of Labor, George P. Shultz, his Assistant, Willie J. Usery, and his Solicitor, Laurence H. Silberman, testified before your subcommittee in connection with the Department's activities concerning the United Mine Workers of America, with particular emphasis on the recent UMWA election. That same day we requested by telegram and telephone the opportunity to respond and rebut the guilt-ridden and baseless statements made by the Secretary and his associates. We were denied this opportunity. Having been denied this right to respond promptly in person, we wish to insert in the record our review of the Secretary's statement and indicate for the subcommittee its most serious inaccuracies.

**Refusal to conduct pre-election investigation.**—Let us begin with the Secretary's continued insistence that the Labor Department's policy of refusing to conduct an investigation during the course of an election is a proper one. That policy flies in the face of the Secretary's admissions concerning the "broad language of section 601" (p. 2) and the decisions of "two courts of appeal [that] have held that the broad investigatory authority under Title VI is not limited by the express procedural requirements of section 402" (p. 4). These damaging admissions conclusively establish that the Secretary's refusal to investigate in the pre-election period had no basis in the law (LMRDA) or in the court decisions interpreting it.

Indeed, the primary justification for the Secretary's inaction is his own previous inaction and that of his predecessors since 1959. The other asserted reason, stripped of the obfuscating rhetoric, is that to enforce the law—to conduct an investigation—might injure or harm the party accused of breaking the law. The Secretary's fear that an investigation might help or hurt candidates is no reason to decline to carry out his responsibilities. The emphasis should be placed on screening the allegations and charges to discard the baseless and frivolous ones, and to investigate those with merit. A policy against pre-election investigation might make some sense in the ordinary case; an inflexible rule against pre-election investigation in the face of the UMWA bosses' massive violations of law makes no sense at all. The Secretary's investigatory presence would insure greater compliance with the law and no accusatory proceedings would be required

until after the returns are in. Thus, the Secretary's fear that his action "would almost surely influence the outcome of the election" (p. 6) is a hollow one. It is simply a boogie man erected to justify a bureaucratic indifference that contributed to the murder of the Yablonski family. Contrary to the Secretary's suggestion that the Act must be amended to permit pre-election investigations, it is clear from the foregoing and the general intent of the legislation to protect union members' rights and promote union democracy, that the Act need not be amended so much as the Secretary must be directed to perform the responsibilities Congress imposed on his office.

In dealing with his inaction in the UMWA election case, the Secretary states that "the only purpose of such a pre-election investigation in this case would have been to publicize the existence of violations of the statute" (p. 6). But that was not the reason we requested an investigation; we have said since the outset that a *federal presence* would have prevented further violence and other daily violations of the law. Only through the most tortured reasoning could the Secretary arrive at the conclusion that because the UMWA had broken the law—and that Mr. Yablonski's pre-election suits conclusively demonstrated this—Mr. Yablonski's requests for an investigation should not have been heeded. The Subcommittee should have recognized this as sophistry, but the Secretary was not even questioned on this matter.

**Violence.**—The discussion of violence during the campaign further demonstrates the Secretary's lack of candor. On February 21, 1970, we wrote to the Secretary describing in detail much of the violence that occurred during the course of the campaign. The letter ended with the following request:

"We know we cannot affect your decision, but we do have the right as American citizens to demand answers to our verified evidence of violations of law. We ask that you give us an answer point by point to each illegality we have charged. We ask you to take each such illegality separately and tell the public whether it was proven, erroneous, or not investigated."

To this day, we have never received a *seriatim* disposition of our verified charges. We have yet to be informed of the results of any investigations or even to be informed that there were any investigations on most of these incidents, despite the Secretary's assertion that "[e]very one of those allegations was investigated" (p. 7).

The testimony on the two incidents of violence which were allegedly investigated is illuminating. Contemporaneous with the events in Shenandoah, the Shenandoah Evening Herald carried a banner headline, pictures and a very descriptive article and editorial relating to the manner and fashion that the meeting was broken up. Subsequently, we obtained affidavits which corroborated the impartial newsmen's story. In sum, they disclose that a union meeting of union members supporting the candidacies of Yablonski and Brown was scheduled for the Shenandoah High School at 3:00 o'clock p.m. on June 29, 1969. Before the meeting started, International and District representatives, including John Karlavage and Boley Ovara, led a group of shouting, placard waving individuals into the school auditorium. They prevented the meeting from being held and threatened the old pensioned miners and ordered them to go home. The attached newspaper story and affidavits speak for themselves. The Secretary's indication that the law permits this type of conduct is so incredible that it should easily have been discredited by the committee.

No one paragraph in the Secretary's 22 page statement more clearly illustrates the manner in which the federal agencies combine not to

enforce the law than the one on page eight where the Secretary describes the events at Springfield, Illinois on June 28, 1969 where Mr. Yablonski was brutally assaulted and knocked unconscious. Within a day after the incident the Justice Department through Henry Peterson was given a factual summary of what had occurred. In another day or so, the names of eight people who attended the meeting were also given to him. Neither Mr. Yablonski (to our knowledge) nor anyone else was ever interviewed at that time concerning this incident.

On December 23rd, Mr. Peterson informed Mr. Rauh that the F.B.I. had been unable to determine who the assailant was, and that the matter had been dropped. Secretary Shultz, nevertheless, testified that the assailant had been identified, that he stated that he had struck Mr. Yablonski on the chin from the front,<sup>1</sup> and "that it was strictly a spontaneous action and that he was not paid or otherwise induced to commit the assault . . ." (p. 8). A phone call to the Department of Justice after the Shultz testimony revealed that the assailant had indeed been identified but not until the investigation was reopened following the murders.

But neither Mr. Rauh nor anyone in the Yablonski family or anyone connected with the Yablonski campaign has ever been interviewed or consulted during this investigation. Apparently the Labor Department feels compelled to accept the explanations of the perpetrators of union crime without reservation. The testimony of Messrs. Usery and Silberman on this point are illustrative of their utter refusal to discuss this matter with Mr. Yablonski, his sons or campaign aides. The Justice Department was initially informed that the Springfield meeting had been set up by a Mr. George Morris, Jr., who was erroneously believed to be a leader of the anti-Boyle forces in Illinois. Only a dozen or so local union officials attended the meeting in a hotel room at the State House Inn. It was not a "rally" (as Mr. Usery stated, p. 666), but was a preliminary, introductory session with a handful of local leaders. Though Mr. Yablonski was led to believe those in attendance favored his candidacy, he was not warmly received. Thus, when Mr. Usery states the group was "Yablonski supporters", he is again wrong. Finally, his statement about the substance of the discussion—voting rights of pensioners—is drawn directly from a Tony Boyle press release. Mr. Yablonski never at any time, let alone in the company of a dozen hostile Boyle supporters, maintained that pensioners should not vote. Either Boyle propounded this lie for the assailant which the Secretary readily accepted, or Mr. Boyle has access to the Department's investigatory files. Nevertheless, even the contrived set of facts described by Shultz and Company makes out a *prima facie* case of a violation of Section 610 rather than being deserving of the white-wash applied by the Labor Department.

But more significantly, after the Shultz testimony the Labor Department admitted they did not know that George Morris, Jr., the man who set up the meeting, had received more than \$1500 from UMWA District 12 (Illinois) last year. Nor did they know that four of the other men that Mr. Yablonski identified as attending the meeting received

<sup>1</sup> The F.B.I. interviewed Emil Sposato, M.D., the doctor who examined Mr. Yablonski, the night of the incident. But neither the F.B.I. nor Labor Department ever interviewed or asked to see the report, records and notes of the treating physician, Robert Schwartz, M.D. Doctor Schwartz has unequivocally stated that Mr. Yablonski was struck on the back of the neck. Nor has the treating neurologist, Doctor Stohl, ever been interviewed to our knowledge.

more than \$500 each from District 12 in 1969.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Chairman, the investigation of the Springfield matter was a massive cover-up operation. It indicates that in the enforcement of this law (LMRDA), the Government accepts the word of the attackers and does not even interview the victim.

**Blatant misrepresentations by the Secretary.**—Needing an opportunity to cast doubt on the motives of those critical of his performance, the Secretary next resorts to an outright lie. Our pleas to have him commence an investigation are regarded as "appeals . . . to the Department . . . [for] assistance in [the] campaign" (p. 8). The only evidence cited by the Secretary to support this assertion is that in the meeting of December 15, after the election was over, we "stated that an early investigation was necessary to maintain the campaign's momentum" (p. 89). The word "momentum" was Mr. Silberman's; it was used by him to describe our contention that a prompt investigation was necessary because readily available sources of information would dry up after the official results of the election were made known. Local union members and officers would be more cooperative if they believed the election was still hanging in the balance, that reprisals might not be visited on them for cooperating. Though Solicitor Silberman used this word "momentum" in the presence of no less than a dozen people, his brazen effort to distort the word, as he used it, is conduct which even the Labor Department should find reprehensible.

The Secretary tries to but cannot justify his conduct by saying that both sides found fault with his performance (p. 9). The matters contained in the Department's November 26, 1969 Summary Report of Investigation, though sharply criticized by UMW incumbents, were not earth shaking; most were, in fact, public knowledge. If this was the sum total of six months investigative work, the investigation uncovered little.

The same can be said of the post-election investigation. The manner in which the Secretary glosses over the \$30 million purchase of pensioner votes shocks even our by now dulled senses. Our research has uncovered nothing in the history of the LMRDA which compels a restrictive reading of the words "improper interference" with an election, as used in Section 401(e). Indeed, basic principles of statutory construction require that the words be broadly defined; otherwise they are redundant with the other words in the series: "subject to penalty, discipline, or improper interference or reprisal of any kind . . ." Apparently recognizing the shallowness of this line of reasoning, the Secretary trots out another boogie man—that a proper reading of the statute might imperil collective bargaining during an election campaign (pp. 14-15). We urge the committee to see through this transparent effort by the Secretary to evade his responsibility for enforcing the Act. In no way could the Secretary bring into "question any agreement negotiated . . . during an election campaign." The agreement itself could not be set aside; only the election could be set aside and it should not unless improper motive (an intent to influence the election by aiding an incumbent) could be demonstrated—a fact highly unlikely since most unions, unlike the UMWA, deal at arms' length with employers. The Secretary's vague generalizations concerning the soundness of the increase are in no way related to any complaint to that effect. We have never contended that the soundness of the increase was subject to his or anyone else's review. It is merely illustrative of the haste and political motivation behind the increase itself.

<sup>2</sup>Erne Bigham, \$548; Robert Elmore, \$755.45; Bernard Martin, \$1,115.85; Jack Ponsetti, \$530.

The Secretary's position regarding bogus locals is but another example of blindly accepting the word or position of the UMW. Unwilling to make a decision concerning this matter, the Secretary has refused to examine the plain language of the UMW Constitution, which states that "local unions shall be composed of ten or more workers . . . working in or around coal mines" and "[i]f any mine or colliery is abandoned . . . the [local union] charter and all its moneys . . . shall be taken over by the International Union [and] . . . any remaining members . . . given transfer cards." Despite statements like Judge Hart's—"they apply the Constitution when they want to, they don't when they don't"—the Secretary accepts the weak explanation that the union has always interpreted the constitution to permit non-functioning locals to exist. Mr. Chairman, is it a defense to an unconstitutional act that one has always disregarded the constitution? Only Secretary Shultz could answer this in the affirmative.

The most incredible display of naivete is his concluding statement on the bogus local question that "even if there had been a technical violation [of the Constitution], it could not have had any effect on the outcome of the election" (p. 17). Apparently, the Secretary believes there is no difference between 1250-1300 locals voting in an election and about 700 locals voting. Apart from the logistics of supplying observers, etc., to about half of the number of locals that supposedly voted, there was the additional problem of finding the polling places of these locals, and the myriad of difficulties of guaranteeing a secret ballot vote once they were found and observers sent. Worst of all, old pensioners were the prey for the hired Boyle men that "ran" the elections in these "bogus" locals.

The other remaining matter which the Secretary left out of the "election case" was the massive group of dust committeemen, organizers, etc., that were added to the UMW payroll in 1969 at an estimated cost of more than \$500,000. First, let us deal with the question of "organizers," since Mr. Usery suggested that the union "had stepped up its organizing at that time" (p. 680). Aside from the union's bald assertion, where does Mr. Usery get his facts? From Lou Antal, who testified before this subcommittee that he was paid \$400 a week, but did no organizing? From Tony Dovshek, who told the Labor Department investigators that he was paid for "organizing" though he was in Canada fishing? How many new mines were organized last year? At what mines were these organizing drives conducted? How many NLRB elections were held in comparison with prior years? Why were so many organizers hired in Mr. Yablonski's Pennsylvania home district (which is predominantly organized) when the most substantial unorganized territory is in Eastern Kentucky, where none were hired? Could it be because of the torrid election contest in Pennsylvania whereas Mr. Yablonski hardly campaigned in Kentucky for fear of violence?

The same applies to "dust committeemen." What did they do? They weren't allowed inside the mines to check the dust; and even if they were, they had no equipment to monitor it. Why were six full time dust committeemen added to the payroll in District 4 (which borders Mr. Yablonski's home) at a cost of \$70,000, while District 20 (Alabama), which has more mines and more active miners than District 4, had no dust committeemen? Neither did Utah or Colorado. Was it because there was no dust in the mines in those states or because there was no real election campaign in those states? Why are some of these all important dust committeemen being laid off and required to return to work after the election? If these men could not get inside the mine, what did they do—educate the men that

dust exists in coal mines? Why is it that regardless of the designation given to employees hired in 1969, they come from the coal areas where Boyle had the stiffest election fight (West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio)?

Then there is the separate question of lobbyists (contrary to the Secretary's testimony, the "dust committeemen" were not lobbyists). All were apparently paid two or three times their lost salaries for participating in lobbying junkets. The fact that most of these novice lobbyists were pro-Boyle boosters was apparently of no consequence to the Secretary.

Finally, there is the argument that many of these 1969 hires were put on the payroll before Mr. Yablonski announced his candidacy (p. 18), as though that would legitimize the practice. But the Secretary should know that other anti-Boyle candidates had surfaced early in 1969, and certainly Boyle and Company were aware that nominations and an election would be held (regardless of who the opposition would be) during the year. The Secretary seems to say that any union incumbents may hire at exorbitant salaries as many partisans as they wish at union expense, and that so long as they appear to perform some type of work—the Department will not interfere with their freedom to campaign for their benefactors. We trust that the subcommittee does not share this construction of the Act.

The Secretary seems to go out of his way to characterize us as being uncooperative in not making available the names and addresses of Mr. Yablonski's election observers (p. 19). Having failed in his duty to investigate, he now seeks to shift the blame to those who begged for action. Again, the Secretary must resort to a distortion of the record to serve his purposes. The facts are that sometime in mid-January a caller from the Department asked for the names and addresses of our observers. The Department was furnished with hundreds of observer reports, but there was also a small card catalogue containing additional names and the addresses of observers assigned out of Mr. Yablonski's Washington, D.C. Campaign Headquarters. Mrs. Clarice Feldman informed the Labor Department that the card catalogue was in Mr. Yablonski's home, which was under guard by the FBI and state authorities. Since no family member was to be admitted, Mrs. Feldman advised the Department to check with the authorities. Apparently this was never done; nor was the request ever renewed after the house was finally released. Yet, the Secretary castigates us for his Department's own failure.

**The Yablonski murders.**—The final two pages of the Secretary's statement deserve special mention. The Secretary says this was just another election campaign, and then in an effort to publicly cleanse his conscience he says twice that the murders had nothing to do with the election. Who is the Secretary of Labor to make such an assertion? Has he read the indictments returned by the Cleveland Grand Jury? Is he aware that one count deals with a conspiracy to violate a union member's rights, and that another involves an obstruction of justice to prevent Mr. Yablonski from testifying before a UMW Grand Jury Probe in Washington, D.C.? Is he aware that Mr. Silas Huddleston, President of a Local Union of the UMWA in LaFollette, Tennessee, has been indicted on these charges? Is he aware that the United States Attorney in seeking the grand jury indictment had to have evidence of probable cause and that the grand jury had to find that probable cause to indict? While no one questions that all five of the indicted persons are innocent until proven guilty, the fact remains that all the evidence to date points to a clear connection between the murders and the election through the participation of Huddleston (and another Local

Union President indicted for perjury); the presumption of innocence does not require an administrative official to reject known facts. Indeed, the real remaining question is not whether this was an election-connected offense, but just how high in the union the culpability runs. What Secretary Shultz did in his testimony was to challenge the F.B.I., the United States Attorney and the Grand Jury; only a guilt-stricken man would deliberately undercut the enforcement efforts of his own Government.

Before concluding this statement, Mr. Chairman, we would like to call to your attention one paragraph from our letter of February 21, 1970, to Mr. Shultz. That paragraph reads as follows:

"Mr. Secretary, you and your advisers are apparently the only people in the whole United States who do not know how rotten things are in the Mine Workers. Why do you refuse to see what even a blind man could not miss? Is it the influence of Mr. Usery who denounces the Yablonski group with allegations that they accepted money from Walter Reuther and the UAW (a false statement which Joseph A. (Chip) Yablonski under oath denied as "garbage" before the Senate Labor Subcommittee)? Is it your lawyers' prattlings about "volunteerism" in the labor movement and Mr. Silberman's desire to play the wheeler-dealer role with the UMWA? Or is it your own personal desire not to take any steps of which the powerful UMWA might not approve? We do not know your motivation for inaction and apathy in the face of tyranny and violence, but there is one thing we do know: We shall keep up this fight, whatever you do, because the American people will not forever tolerate bureaucratic indifference to UMWA corruption any more than they would in the case of the Teamsters. The Yablonski supporters will never let you sweep this mess under the rug."

Sadly enough, Mr. Shultz's testimony was just such a deliberate effort to do what we feared—to try and sweep the mess of the United Mine Workers of America under the rug. You and your Subcommittee have the opportunity to prevent this from happening. We have been disappointed in the investigation to date, but we hope and trust that you and your Subcommittee will soon undertake a real investigation in the great tradition of the United States Senate.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, we are shocked and appalled at the Secretary's distortions, innuendoes, and fabrications. It is frightening to believe that such a high public official would resort to such conduct to justify his unjustifiable actions. Your Subcommittee unfortunately did little to clear the air while Messrs. Shultz, Usery and Silberman were before you. At least you could have required the Secretary and his associates to go under oath as have all other witnesses.<sup>3</sup> But, in any event, we reiterate our request to appear before the Committee, hopefully, *simultaneously with the Secretary*, so that the real facts can be made known. In the event the Secretary should decline a new invitation, we ask that you recommend to the President that all of the Mine Workers' investigations be conducted by a crime task force under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General. Surely, you would agree that Mr. Shultz and the Labor Department have demonstrated an unwillingness to enforce the law which Congress entrusted to them. They should not be permitted to impede and frustrate the work of the Justice Department and the F.B.I., which appear to be genuinely concerned with cleaning up this union.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,  
JOSEPH A. ("CHIP") YABLONSKI.

<sup>3</sup> To highlight this failure, we have sworn to this rebuttal.

#### TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JEFFERY COHELAN OF CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and most beloved Members of the House of Representatives is Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN of California.

JEFF COHELAN has earned a reputation as one of the most constructive and conscientious legislators among the distinguished membership of this body. His solid record of achievement, especially in the areas of education, conservation, and peace through processes of law, has marked him over six terms of service as one of the most valuable Members California has ever sent to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time both to pay tribute to my dear friend and colleague and to say how sadly distressed his friends and admirers in Congress, on both sides of the aisle, were by the news of his primary election defeat in California last Tuesday.

JEFF COHELAN will be sorely missed in the 92d Congress.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this morning's New York Times contained an editorial commenting on the California primary election and Mr. COHELAN's defeat which should be read by every Member of the House.

I insert the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

#### AND YOUTHFUL ENERGIES

Elsewhere in the country Tuesday's primaries were the usual mixed bag. Perhaps their greatest significance lay in the fact that young citizens, rejecting the extremism of the streets to work within the democratic context, made a showing that should at least convince them that they are on the right track.

A considerable proportion of their efforts seemed to be concentrated in two Congressional districts and a senatorial campaign. In California's Seventh, which includes the Berkeley campus, hundreds of student volunteers, working day and night, put across the nomination of a young Negro councilman running for the House of Representatives. Their success in this case was not only remarkable but excessive, for the victory of Ronald V. Dellums, however good a Congressman he may turn out to be, meant the elimination of Jeffery Cohelan, a first-rate incumbent with twelve years experience who was one of the most valuable members of the California delegation.

It is too bad that these newcomers to California politics failed to take on more deserving targets—like the two Birch Society candidates who won Republican nomination in districts all but certain to impose them on the country in November. In the same way, we regret that they poured out their energies to get the Democratic senatorial nomination for Representative George E. Brown, who lost to Representative John V. Tunney. Both were good candidates, with Tunney the likelier bet to beat the ineffable George Murphy in the fall. At the other end of the country, Princeton students did themselves proud in helping a young antiwar candidate wage a strong if vain campaign against an old-line Democratic incumbent.

Irrespective of one's opinion on the merits of the choices of these young campaigners, the basic question was how effective could they expect to be in a political world which too many of their contemporaries had already

written off as hopeless. The answer seems to be that, working an extremely short time, they have been decidedly if not decisively effective. As they gain experience, they will be even more so, with the result that by 1972 they should be in a position—if they avoid the quixotic—to have a real voice in local and national politics and politics.

I should also like, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the Members of the House to another article which aptly describes the splendid contributions of Congressman COHELAN to his district and to the Nation.

This article, by Leo Rennert, entitled, "Another Test in Berkeley," appeared in the May 26 issue of the Sacramento Bee:

#### ANOTHER TEST IN BERKELEY

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—Of all the contests in California's primary elections, the race for the Democratic congressional nomination in Berkeley may provide the most accurate measurement of the ravages of polarization in major urban centers.

Fighting for his political life is Rep. Jeffery Cohelan, 55, a six-term veteran with impeccable liberal credentials. His challenger is Ronald Dellums, 34, a Negro city councilman who claims the incumbent has outlived his political usefulness.

Their race has attracted nationwide attention because it is viewed as a clear test of the attitudes of key groups in large cities toward sharply different brands in politics.

The district is a microcosm of urban America. It has a growing proportion of minority groups, sizable pockets of poverty, a dwindling middle class, a fair mixture of professional people and a big slice of the student and faculty population of the University of California.

In this setting, a Cohelan victory would be a big morale boost to hundreds of other big-city elected officials who still cling to the notion of "one society" and the belief that solid progress is possible within the system.

A Cohelan defeat would mean just the opposite—a warning cities are splitting apart, that radical politics is the wave of the future and that the days of ethnic bridge-builders may be numbered.

Rules—By the old rules of the game, Cohelan should be a shoo-in. Since his election to the House in 1958, he has been a consistent champion of labor, the poor and the oppressed. He has fought relentlessly for urban programs, aid to education, civil rights and conservation. He has opposed with equal vigor the war in Vietnam, the ABM and other new expensive weapons systems.

Moreover, he has been eminently successful. And that perhaps could be the biggest offense in the eyes of many of his opponents. After all, what happens to the claim of the New Left that the political system is thoroughly rotten if it can be shown that Cohelan consistently has managed to produce outstanding results for his community, his state and the nation?

Exponents of confrontation politics do not want to be reminded that Cohelan, by working diligently and without fanfare, has managed to:

Lead a successful fight which shattered President Richard Nixon's effort to reduce education expenditures and ended up adding more than \$600 million to the administration's budget request for school aid programs.

Blunt the perennial attempts of Rep. Jamie Whitten, D-Miss., to cripple federal enforcement of school desegregation.

Win congressional authorization and funding for Redwood National Park and the Point Reyes National Seashore as one of the most tireless and effective conservationists on Capitol Hill.

Muster growing congressional resistance to the ABM, MIRV and other multibillion-dollar weapons systems which siphon precious dollars away from domestic programs.

Incredible—in view of this record, it seems almost incredible that Cohelan admittedly should be in the toughest primary race of his political career. What other member of the California congressional delegation can point to as many accomplishments?

But that, of course, is not what concerns his opponents. They appear far more interested in symbols than substance. They want a crusader, not a legislator. A dashing orator, not a quiet political craftsman. His style is too old-fashioned, his method too conventional.

"One, two, button my shoe," is a favorite Cohelan saying when he discusses political strategy. The point he tries to make is that there are no instant, heroic solutions; problems must be surmounted a step at a time, however tedious the process.

Target—Four years ago, the New Left also singled him out as a prime target. But he survived that challenge.

What remains to be seen is whether the intervening, strife-ridden years have boosted the level of anger and despair in one corner of urban America to a point that a major unifying, constructive voice finally is drowned out.

If that time has arrived, Cohelan will not be the only loser when the votes are counted on primary night in Berkeley.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION URGING PRESIDENT TO CALL FOR WITHDRAWAL OF RUSSIAN PERSONNEL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. On Tuesday, June 2, 1970, I introduced, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from New York, Mr. RED) House Resolution No. 1052, a resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East.

I take this opportunity to list those Members of the House of Representatives who, as of this date, have indicated their cosponsorship of this resolution:

#### COSPONSORS

Brock Adams of Washington, Glenn Anderson of California, William Barrett of Pennsylvania, Jonathan Bingham of New York, Benjamin Blackburn of Georgia, Edward Boland of Massachusetts, Frank Brasco of New York, Jack Brinkley of Georgia, James Burke of Massachusetts, Phillip Burton of California.

Daniel Button of New York, Don Clausen of California, Barber Conable of New York, Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, John Conyers of Michigan, William Cramer of Florida, Emilio Daddario of Connecticut, Don Edwards of California, Gerald Ford of Michigan, Donald Fraser of Minnesota.

Richard Fulton of Tennessee, James Hanley of New York, Richard Hanna of California, William Hathaway of Maine, Ken Hechler of West Virginia, Henry Helstoski of New Jersey, Andrew Jacobs of Indiana, Peter Kyros of Maine, Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, Frank Horton of New York, James Mann of South Carolina.

Clark MacGregor of Minnesota, Lloyd Meeds of Washington, Thomas Meskill of Connecticut, Abner Mikva of Illinois, Joseph Minish of New Jersey, Robert Mollohan of West Virginia, Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, David Obey of Wisconsin, Richard Ottinger of New York, Claude Pepper of Florida.

Otis Pike of New York, Bertram Podell of New York, Thomas Rees of California, Fred Rooney of Pennsylvania, Benjamin Rosenthal of New York, Edward Roybal of California, William Ryan of New York, James Scheuer of New York, William Steiger of Wisconsin, Robert Taft of Ohio.

Fletcher Thompson of Georgia, Lowell Weicker of Connecticut, Lawrence Williams of Pennsylvania, Charles Wilson of California, Lester Wolf of New York, John Wylder of New York, Louis Wyman of New Hampshire, Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania, Roman Pucinski of Illinois, Paul McCloskey of California.

#### BILL TO OBTAIN PARKLANDS

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would convey five parcels of land at Cape Henlopen, Del., from the Army and the Navy to the State of Delaware.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal may be of more than ordinary interest to you and the other distinguished Members of Congress, their families, and their staffs, for it concerns an area where many of you vacation: Rehoboth Beach, Del. I believe it is safe to say that many of you and thousands of others in this metropolitan area will have a personal stake in the course and outcome of this bill.

The parcels of land in question are all either enclaves within or barriers between parkland already operated by the State of Delaware. To the north of the 820-acre military land is the 540-acre Cape Henlopen State Park. To the south is another State park, known as Gordon's Pond.

All of this land—worth about \$100,000 per acre—is located on the Atlantic Ocean, where it enjoys the benefits of beautiful beaches and imposing sand dunes. The land is undeveloped commercially, and the State is determined to maintain it in its natural state.

Four of the parcels are owned by the Department of the Navy. Reserve forces are trained on one 15-acre plot; some little-used equipment sheds are located on two other plots totaling three-quarters of an acre; and on the remaining 614 acres of Navy land some important oceanographic work is conducted. The Army owns a 190-acre plot used for recreation and some Reserve training.

Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, we in Delaware have long wanted these lands for the use of outdoor recreation and for the benefit of all our citizens. Our resolve and desire were recently strengthened by recent actions by the Department of the Army.

It was on the Army land during Earth Week last April that an operation began; an operation that caused consternation and shock among the citizens of Delaware. I should note here that located on the Army land is—or was—one of nature's wonders, which we in Delaware call the "Big Dune." It is—or was—the largest sand dune between Sandy Hook, N.J., and Cape Hatteras, N.C. The Big Dune was over 70 feet high and had been the subject of scholarly articles in both Scientific American and National

Geographic magazines. I say was, because during Earth Week the Army began an operation covering 13 acres of the Big Dune's area. As I understand it, the purpose of the operation was to create a parking space for five to 10 trailers. To create this parking place, the 13 acres were leveled, reducing their height to 40 feet.

This destruction was undertaken without consultation with Delaware officials or with the citizens who live in the area. Quite understandably, all of us were upset. Since then, Senators JOHN J. WILLIAMS and J. CALIB BOGGS, and I have been discussing this matter with the Department of Defense. We told them that we were interested in the land, and asked that, if possible, they justify military retention of any parts of it.

In response to our inquiries, officials at the Department of Defense said verbally that they might be responsive to conveying the 15-acre plot, the two plots totalling three-quarters of an acre, and a corridor through the 614-acre plot. We have received no confirmation of that offer.

The Army, however, maintains its need to retain the 190-acre plot. They say the land is necessary for recreation and training, even though only 14,000 persons used it for recreation last year. On the other hand, more than 1 million persons used the State-operated recreational beaches last year.

As I indicated earlier, many—perhaps even most—of the 1 million vacationers last year were from the Washington area. I am sure you are all familiar with this portion of Delaware. If you personally have not visited the area, members of your staff almost certainly have. The fine beaches provide a momentary respite from the daily drive of work here in Washington.

In light of these and other facts, my colleagues and I cannot agree that the Army needs this land. If, in fact, the Army requires land for training, the Governor of Delaware has agreed to find them other, more suitable sites.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would simply convey all of the lands in question to the State of Delaware. We realize that there may be a perfectly valid justification for the Navy to retain its part of the land, and we are willing to consider such justifications and accommodate them through the legislative process.

#### CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the availability of the latest Government-wide "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance," dated April 1970. This latest official effort lists and describes 1019 assistance programs administered by 57 Federal departments and agencies, and is the single authoritative Governmentwide compendium of Federal domestic assistance program information produced by the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Congressional offices should have, or

should be receiving copies of this, and the public can purchase it through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20401 for \$6.75.

I would like to applaud this effort as a substantial improvement over the previous edition issued April 1969. The introduction to the new catalog lists three basic improvements: namely, first, it contains more detailed and specific information on each program; second, it has an expanded and improved system of indexing to provide quicker access to the appropriate programs; third, it is packaged in a looseleaf format to permit periodic updating of information.

These improvements are important, and I am pleased to observe that on the whole they have been made.

In remarks on the floor of the House, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 8, page 10222, I pointed out, "The OEO catalog fails to set forth clearly the eligibility requirements for a particular program." A strong effort has been made in the new catalog to provide such information in greater detail and with greater specificity. The distinction in the new catalog between "applicant eligibility" and "beneficiary eligibility" should help local governments and educational institutions in particular. Often, a local government or a local group—the beneficiary—must submit an application to a State or city governmental body—the applicant—in order to receive Federal aid. Or, students—the beneficiaries—must submit their requests for aid to the educational institution—the applicant at the Federal level—before they may receive aid. This chain of applications is most confusing to people back home and needs to be clarified; the catalog is the first step in this direction.

Likewise, on April 24, 1969, I pointed out that the only source of cross-referencing in the 1969 comprehensive catalog was "a 16-page, generalized subject-matter index of little use, characterized by generality and lack of coherent precision." The new catalog contains considerable improvement. There is a list of programs, by agency. Such a listing can be of great use, because related programs are often administered by the same agency.

In my 1969 "Listing of Operating Federal Assistance Programs" I subdivided this agency listing down farther than did the latest Government-wide catalog. For example, I subdivided the Office of Education into the following categories: Civil rights, education of the handicapped, education in foreign languages and world affairs, education professions development, elementary and secondary education, higher education, libraries and community services, miscellaneous, research and training, school assistance in federally affected areas, Teacher Corps, and vocational education. I think this is more useful than just to list 105 programs under the Office of Education as was done in the latest catalog.

In addition, the catalog includes a 34-page subject index that is more useful than that in previous editions. What will assist people back home even more, I

believe, is the functional index placed at the beginning of the new catalog. A good effort has been made to group Federal domestic assistance programs according to their primary function or purpose. One hundred and twelve categories have been chosen that attempt to relate to people's needs back home—"air pollution control," "education—handicapped"—and programs have been listed under them. This 35-page effort helps considerably to identify Federal programs in terms of people's needs, rather than in terms of organization or Federal administrative convenience, which has been the general practice until now. I hope this kind of index will continue to be included.

As I said, however, on September 17, 1969, before the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, "I have found that one of the most serious defects in the present federal system is the lack of information about related programs. I believe it to be vitally important to establish what programs are interrelated and for this information to be easily accessible to the average user of the catalog as part of the program descriptions." The Program Information Act, H.R. 17112, would require that each description of a Federal domestic assistance program also identify closely related programs. People back home may not understand the Federal jargon which describes related Federal assistance; an index would only confuse them—assuming the indexer would know what programs are, in truth, related.

Second, only a program manager will possess the knowledge and expertise in his field to know of other, closely related programs. He will, for instance, know that some Federal programs can accomplish much the same results as his; and that one program, in time, leads to a second program—that is, preschool assistance for the disadvantaged leads, in time, to inschool assistance for the disadvantaged. I hope that all future editions of the catalog contain an entry under each program for "closely related programs."

The final improvement mentioned is that the catalog provides for periodic updating. September 17, I said, "Current information is essential if the catalog is to be relied upon." It has been a source of great satisfaction to me that the Bureau of the Budget Circular A-89, dated September 30, 1969, was modified after this to provide that the catalog shall be "issued annually with quarterly updating supplements." And, the Program Information Act (H.R. 17112) requires that these revisions reflect changes in program information, current status of funding, and other relevant changes, as well as provide full information on any new or reorganized programs. I am hopeful that with greater accuracy and timeliness, the Government-wide catalog will be relied upon more and more, which will reduce the need and dependence on other duplicative information sources and simplify the job of those who attempt to apply for Federal assistance.

I do not wish to indicate by all of this that the job is over, or that the catalog is perfect. It is not. Some agencies ob-

viously have made a more thorough and complete effort to satisfy the program description format than others. Under the item, "Output measure," called for in each program description, a distressingly large number of program managers answered, "Not available." I do hope that the program managers in truth know what their outputs are, and will let us know what they are, perhaps in the next quarterly updating of their program descriptions.

The problem of defining a program is and has been most difficult. My 1969 listing describes 1,315 operating Federal assistance programs; the current catalog describes 1,019. I do not wish to quibble over what is largely a matter of judgment, but I do hope that every effort will be made to make the different kinds of Federal assistance available as visible as possible. People back home are primarily interested in program descriptions which identify available benefits and the possible beneficiaries.

Administrative criteria such as financial accounts, departmental organization, and legal authorities have often been used as the basis for defining and describing programs. Such administrative criteria are basically irrelevant to the person back home. He is interested in his needs and qualifications, and not the sometimes erratic organization of Federal Government. The catalog and its list of programs should reflect the needs of the people back home, not provide a means of forcing Federal organizational attitudes and thinking patterns on the public.

In light of this improved catalog, and the interest that has been shown in it, I hope that the Congress will give prompt attention to the Program Information Act (H.R. 17112). This proposed legislation calls for the creation of a basic catalog of Federal domestic assistance programs to contain all information required by a potential applicant.

If this legislation is enacted, the catalog should provide a single, reliable overview of all sources of Federal assistance, divided into visible, discrete program entities. It should provide the potential applicant or beneficiary with an overview of all programs which might bear on his needs; it should provide a basis for him to evaluate and make a preliminary choice of programs best suited to his needs; and it should provide him with contact points for further inquiry. Furthermore, to help Congress, the catalog should list all programs, including those not funded at present.

The latest catalog is an improvement. The Program Information Act would improve it still further. I emphasize that legislation is still required to perfect the catalog.

Passage of the Program Information Act (H.R. 17112)—with one useful amendment proposed by the Bureau of the Budget—would accomplish the following:

First. A demonstration of congressional support for such disclosure efforts as the recent catalog and a set of minimum standards for future catalogs;

Second. An assurance that the executive branch will maintain the higher

standards of disclosure evidenced by the new 1970 catalog:

Third. An assurance that all agencies will describe their programs in detail and will participate fully in the collection effort; and

Fourth. An established principle of one basic catalog for all Federal activities. Other publications could be continued only as the need were established.

I am also happy to report that the Bureau of the Budget, in a recent letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, recommended early enactment of H.R. 17112, with one clarifying amendment. I seek your support in accomplishing this.

#### MR. BLOUNT'S ADDRESS ON THE PROBLEMS OF OUR YOUTH

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, recently the Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Winton M. Blount, addressed the annual meeting of the Delaware Bankers Association in Wilmington, Del. In his speech, Mr. Blount commented on what I believe may well be the most pressing problem confronting our Nation today—the confusion and disenchantment of our youth. Many of the Postmaster General's observations were cogent and well-taken. I recommend them to your attention. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Blount's address be entered into the RECORD.

#### ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL WINTON M. BLOUNT

I know it would be fitting, in addressing so distinguished a group of financial authorities, to discuss the state of the economy, or the outlook for business, or some such related topic. But, I think there is a matter which cuts even closer to the heart of America than her economic stability, and that is the stability of the relationship between her generations—between her sons and fathers.

One of the popular cliches of recent years has been "generation gap." I suspect it began as a way of observing that children rebel against their parents. But this is the way and the nature of life. Children break the bonds of childhood and become adults, and they make a new relationship with their parents. So there was nothing new in this.

But this last ten years was the decade of the "gap." It began with a missile gap and ended with a credibility gap, and somewhere between the phrase-makers produced some other gaps—one of which was the generation gap. And the phrase became self-fulfilling prophecy.

In thinking about how well or how poorly Americans succeed in raising their children, I suppose we could say that we never did as well as we intended, nor as poorly as we might.

But something came unstuck in the last decade, and it came unstuck right where most Americans live—in the family. I don't profess to know what it was, but the result was a generation with some of our young who had a lot of education and little maturity; a lot of independence and little dependability and little discipline; a generation with the normal needs of youth for security and assurance, and nowhere to turn to get it. Society turned upside down and the young were on top, where they never wanted to be.

The youth cult blossomed and was fueled

by business and by the media, and the young were courted and coddled wherever they laid their dollar down.

And they were used politically: sometimes in positive efforts like the Peace Corps, for their idealism; other times in more cynical or quixotic ways, simply because they brought devotion and energy to whatever course they pursued, and because they made good copy.

They warmed the hearts of those political boy scouts who featured themselves at the front of youth crusades, and they inflamed the neuroses of those politicians whose "suffer-the-little-children-to-come-onto-me" complexes thrive on adolescent adoration.

Through it all, our young people got a sense of power and importance all out of proportion to reality. And they never understood that their importance lay in their usability.

Throughout this manic period, the agony of Vietnam not only persisted but escalated, and chewed into the lives of these young people. When they objected, they thought no one listened; when they protested, they thought no one cared, and in time they realized just what their apparent importance consisted of. They turned in on themselves in bitterness, and where once youngsters rebelled against their parents to grow and mature, there was now real alienation in the process.

Everyone talked about generation gap, and the only hands that tried to reach across it were the hands of economic or political opportunism—the so-called "peace" candidates, for example, who spoke so bravely of peace for the world when what they were really looking for was a piece of the action. So we had our young people pulled between cynicism on the left and indifference on the right. Small wonder that some of them said: "A plague on both your houses" and turned to radicalism.

And as always in this country, there was a vast majority of students and other young people who were concerned with America, but who kept silent and allowed the image of youth to be established by the radicals.

Perhaps we should fault them for not speaking up.

Perhaps we should ask ourselves who would have listened.

Whatever the questions, whatever the answers, we have been on a collision course with reality in America. We came to reality in a burst of gunfire in Ohio two weeks ago and, as the country held its breath in that dark silence, we understood finally that America cannot move to the third century of its freedom at war with its children.

In his Inaugural Address, President Nixon said: "Government will listen. We will strive to listen in new ways—to the voices of quiet anguish, the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart—to the injured voices, the anxious voices, the voices that have despaired of being heard." And he said: "We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."

I think the significance of the past ten days rests in the fact that Americans are beginning to lower their voices. One might wish that we could have the time now to breathe and examine where we are without the pressures of publicity and the passions of politics, but we cannot. Still, I think our young people are ready to believe that the promise to listen to the voices that have despaired of being heard—that that promise stands, and it will be kept.

But it must be kept all over America, and not just in the halls of government. You have something to learn from our young people. I urge you to listen to them.

It is important to listen to the questions they are asking and also to examine the answers they are offering. There is a vast basis

for mutual understanding with the young; there are vast differences as well. But difference is the driving force in the dialectical process that takes us forward. So let us understand those differences, and respect them.

Where we see war as a political reality, they see peace as a moral imperative. When we speak of making the world safe for democracy, they speak of making the world safe for humanity. When we point to history and the lessons of past wars, they point to the future and answer with the hope that we can put wars by. When we point to what has been accomplished, they point to what remains to be accomplished.

It is a simple matter to see in our differences that the young are naive, that their view of the world suffers from a super-abundance of idealism, and a lack of reality and the hard lessons that come with responsibility. And if we see only in these terms, then we miss the more important fact that beyond our differences we share a vast community of interest from which we may together seek a newer world.

It is from this base that we can reach out and help the young to grow and come to civic maturity. And it would be wrong to ignore what has already been accomplished here, both with and for the young.

This Administration has gotten the first positive changes in the draft system, and draft reforms continue. This is a matter which has been discussed with students. So are the SALT talks underway in Vienna. So is de-escalation in Southeast Asia. So is the effort to lower the voting age.

I think that as the young make demands, they should recognize that there is movement—that there is progress.

These are all matters which concern them. These are matters which affect their welfare, and these issues have been discussed with students and other young people.

So there has been communication. But we can have more. We can listen to their ideas. And I think we can and must expect them to listen to ours. They have not always done this. We can weigh their concerns. We can explain our actions. We can take them into those councils where decisions are made.

Good universities have done this for years. President Nixon has asked his department heads to do this, and we have done so, and we will do more. But let business do it as well. Let industry do it. Let local government do it. Let us together find ways to bring these people into their society.

Last March, a group of students from Princeton asked if they could visit me in my office, and I invited them down. Last Friday they came.

They were naturally very much concerned about Cambodia. But in a deeper sense they were concerned about America—concerned about our priorities, and about the assumptions on which we base those priorities. And they were concerned about their place—their future in America.

I was greatly impressed with their understanding, with their ability to advance an argument, and their ability to analyze differences of opinion. I was impressed with their willingness to listen.

We reached no agreement in our discussion. We clarified some disagreements. But the most hopeful note, it seemed to me, came at the end. I asked them if young people felt so closed out and alienated that we could no longer find a mutually acceptable basis for action. And they said no. They said generally that young people wanted to try again, to stay within the system, and make it work.

I think there is cold political comfort here. They indicated they will try to change the Congress to their liking—that they will be in opposition to many of the policies of the Nixon Administration. I think we would be very foolish to underestimate the effect they are going to have in the upcoming elec-

tions, and in 1972. The brains, the devotion, and the energy they can bring to their cause is a formidable combination. So they are going to try to make their views prevail. Some of them are going to be disillusioned if they aren't completely successful. There will always be those who think that, because the whole country doesn't suddenly swing into line with their views, the system is unresponsive.

They must understand that those who have power are going to try to hold it. Those who decide are going to defend their decisions. This doesn't mean they are invulnerable, that power can't be transferred, and decisions changed. They can.

But it has to happen in the center. It has to happen through the system. It has to happen at the ballot box. I don't think our troubles are over. The radicals on both fringes can't survive without turmoil and bitterness and they're going to try to create more of it. But I think we've turned the corner. There was a silent majority too among the young, and among the students, and they are speaking out now. I think we're going to get an accommodation with this generation.

Now, I want to say a word about the action that precipitated the events of the past few weeks.

President Nixon came to office in the midst of an escalating war in Southeast Asia. He came committed to de-escalate that war and to terminate it. He has been working steadily toward that goal since he became President.

About a month ago, he announced the pending withdrawal of some 150,000 men in addition to the 115,000 that have already been withdrawn from Vietnam in the last year. He also has said that any effort by Hanoi calculated to take advantage of our withdrawal would be met with strong action. Hanoi chose to test his will. They stepped up attacks on our forces. They moved strongly in Cambodia to outflank our forces. They increased their logistical build-up in Cambodia. And they were met with strong action. It would not be otherwise if our will and our determination to meet our commitments were to continue unquestioned in the world.

This was a difficult decision to make. This is a difficult war to fight. There are those who say the President should have sought the permission of the Congress for his action in Cambodia. The Constitution does not require this, nor may the Congress demand it without amending the Constitution. And to do so would be to tie the President's hands in those life and death matters of state which do not admit of lengthy debate. In those circumstances, such as the present case, where speed and secrecy are crucial, such a requirement would be fatal.

The President put his political future on the line to do what the safety of our men in Vietnam requires. On the basis of all available advice, the decision was tough-minded and it was wise. It has already proven extremely successful.

Nearly 2,500 years ago, a Greek Army, outnumbered ten to one by the Persian forces of Darius, stood at Marathon. They fought there and they won, and they preserved Athens for that flowering of Greek genius which would determine the course of Western history from that time forth.

We remember the battle and the victory. We sometimes forget that the decision to stand at Marathon was taken by a scant majority—just six of the eleven Greek generals determined that the battle at Marathon had to be fought.

History proved them right. But when the decision was made, there was no way to know this.

I believe history is going to prove President Nixon right, and very soon. But when the decision was taken, there were only the best opinions, plus tremendous courage, on which to base it.

It is regrettable that the President's action was misunderstood by so many whose concern is genuine. It is more regrettable that his action is misrepresented by so many who know better, but whose concern is first and foremost to serve themselves. It is a simple thing to call for peace. It is a harder thing to make peace, and still harder to make a peace that can be kept.

This is the President's task and his goal, his responsibility to America, and his special commitment to the young of this nation—they want peace, so does the President. It is both ironic and unfortunate that the most deeply held desire of both—the desire for a world without war—should separate, rather than unite, the President and the young.

Perhaps, if we keep our voices down and keep the dialogue going, we can move together once more in the pursuit of this common goal, in the pursuit of a peace that can be kept, a peace that will buy time for some future age of innocence when, in Sandburg's words: "they'll give a war and nobody will come."

#### KEENE SENTINEL ACTS ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of articles and background materials on highway safety. My purpose then was, and now is to bring this appalling slaughter to the attention and, hopefully, concern of the American people. I am ceaselessly amazed that the news media, government, and the people tolerate and even seem to accept this unending, mounting carnage on the highways.

We are now killing more than 50,000 people a year, more than have died from all causes in the entire Vietnam war. One well-known Senator has described Indochina as a "bloodbath." Yet needless accidents in the United States are much worse killers and maimers than the war. Where is our perspective? Where is our concern and alarm?

Since the waste of lives and resources was brought vividly to my attention in hearings before the House Public Works Committee, on which I serve, I have been looking for ways to focus needed attention and reflection on this issue. It is a serious matter, and the news media are in an excellent position to make a constructive contribution towards its alleviation.

The type of educational service which the press can provide is evident in a recent editorial in the Keene, N.H., Evening Sentinel, a daily newspaper with an outstanding record of community service. In citing a Department of Transportation study of the importance of the use of seat belts, the Sentinel points out that there is no known case of a highway fatality when the occupants were wearing lap and shoulder belts and the vehicle was traveling at less than 60 miles an hour. In pointing out this remarkable study, the Sentinel makes an important and perhaps life-saving contribution to its community.

At this time when some segments of the news media are under what in my opinion is deserved criticism for certain failings, it is especially good to be able

to point to an example of the press at its best, in performing a constructive, educational public service in an area where education of the public is most needed.

This excellent editorial follows:  
[From the Keene (N.H.) Evening Sentinel, June 1, 1970]

#### SEAT BELT SAFETY

Many automobile safety experts have for years been stressing the importance of seat and shoulder belts as a means of reducing traffic injuries and deaths.

There is now a report from a federal highway safety agency which indicates there are no known fatalities in accidents in which occupants were using safety belts and the vehicles were traveling at less than 60 miles an hour.

This fact alone should make legislators pass laws requiring all vehicle occupants to use the safety belts, both lap and over-the-shoulder. Legislation requiring such vehicle safety items as sound brakes and tires, leak-free exhaust equipment and adequate lighting is fully accepted, so why not now require operators and occupants to use one more proven means to save lives?

Often heard in discussion of compulsory use of seat belts is the argument that a person should be permitted to do as he pleases and that compelling use of seat belts is somehow an infringement on one's liberties. The same sort of hyperbole was raised recently in the instance of compulsory use of protective helmets while riding on motorcycles.

The answer, of course, is that society inevitably bears some or all of the burden of death or injury from auto or motorcycle accidents.

The person injured in an auto accident occupies space in a hospital that some other person needs; the person killed in a traffic accident often leaves a family without a breadwinner.

Dr. Sven Gundersen of Hanover, at the time of his retirement from the staff of the Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Complex, cited the mounting carnage on U.S. highways as one of the greatest public health problems facing the country.

If the means exist in the form of a simple safety harness to reduce substantially the number of deaths and injuries, does it make sense from a health standpoint to delay any longer mandatory use of such devices?

#### SALE OF .22 CALIBER RIMFIRE AMMUNITION

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure designed to remove the remaining restrictions on the sale of .22 caliber rimfire ammunition. These restrictions were imposed as a part of the 1968 gun control law. Subsequently, restrictions on sales of other rifle ammunition and shotgun ammunition have been eliminated by an act of Congress but the sale of .22 caliber ammunition still requires reporting and recordkeeping by dealers. There has been general dissatisfaction with all features of the present gun control law. Law-abiding citizens simply resent the type of regulation which it requires. Criminals ignore the law and this the general populace realizes. At the time the bill was approved by Congress, it was the lesser of the evils which had been proposed as antigun legislation. This, however, has not made it palatable to the public.

Possibly the most aggravating single

feature of the present act is the restriction on the sale of .22 caliber ammunition. It is part of the pattern of our outdoor heritage in America that marksmanship training should begin at home or in clubs under proper supervision. Through this type of training, restraint and good sportsmanship in the good use of weapons is best taught. This is important not only in later life but important as an adjunct to the military training many young men will receive. It is more than a little significant that today young lads can be drafted to fight at age 19 in Vietnam but they are unable to purchase a box of .22 caliber ammunition for practice at home. It is also inescapably true that States and cities which have the most stringent antigun laws, including Washington, D.C., are experiencing a constantly worsening crime problem.

The .22 caliber weapons are among those most generally used by law-abiding sportsmen, and particularly younger people. It should be very clear that the removal of the restrictions on the sale of .22 caliber ammunition will be welcomed by law-abiding sportsmen and in particular by young people who are just being taught the pleasures that come with the proper use of firearms. This action also will be welcomed by businessmen who have been steadily harassed by the recordkeeping restrictions required by the present law.

In the introduction of today's bill I am joined by a substantial number of my colleagues. They are: Mr. ABBITT, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLAUSEN of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HALL, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HUNT, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MARSH, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. RARICK, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WAMPLER, and Mr. WYATT.

#### SOME CALL IT DISSENT

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable BILL CHAPPELL, enjoys the unique distinction of having had a speech selected for inclusion in the Vital Speeches of the Day magazine. The speech appeared on May 1, 1970. This is a distinct honor which attests to the high caliber of the work and statements of the Congressman from Florida's Fourth District.

The speech was presented on March 30, 1970, before a joint civic clubs meeting of Rotary and Kiwanis in his district in Ocala. It is, indeed, an outstanding address and one which I feel should be called to the attention of the Congress. I

submit it for printing in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SOME CALL IT DISSENT

(By Congressman BILL CHAPPELL)

On December 6, 1967, San Francisco State College erupted into a state of chaos. Rioting students and off-campus militants broke into buildings, smashed property, and beat students and newsmen. Some called it dissent.

In Washington, several weeks ago, four thugs ran out from a darkened building, surrounded an elderly lady, robbed her of the fifty cents she had on her person, and bludgeoned her into unconsciousness. Some excused their behavior as dissent.

On April 4, 1969, shots rang out in Memphis, Tennessee, and Martin Luther King was dead from the unlawful use of an assassin's gun. Minutes later, thousands of people marched into the streets of Washington and for five days they burned and looted like invaders from another land. Fire after fire lighted the night. One . . . then another . . . a total of 711 were reported. 645 buildings were damaged or completely destroyed, while people wandered at will into the broken store fronts and walked away, weighted down with their plunder. Over one thousand people were injured, eleven were killed and property damage cost \$24,000,000. Some excused the assassin's act and the mob's behavior as dissent.

A few months ago, the Black Panthers in San Francisco handed out coloring books to little Negro children. The book portrayed blacks shooting and knifing policemen, with the caption: "The only good pig is a dead pig." Should such action be excused as lawful dissent?

In Los Angeles, drug addicts Charles Manson and his cohorts are awaiting trial for the brutal slaying of Sharon Tate. Last week, Manson threw a copy of the United States Constitution into the waste basket in defiance of law and order. His supporters called it dissent.

What do you call it when a man robs another, when he steals, when he burns a building, when he threatens another with a gun, when he murders, when he teaches others to burn and to kill? I call it crime.

Crime . . . and the paralyzing fear of crime . . . has exploded into one of the most serious threats to America today. And if we are going to correct this problem, then we must understand a few of the reasons behind the rising crime rate.

Many in this country have come to regard the Supreme Court with such reverence that they believe it can do no wrong—even when it hands down irresponsible decisions that cripple the police in their efforts to prevent crime, detect criminals and prosecute them. Its rulings on mob marches, riots, pornography and subversive activity are all contributing to the crime wave.

One of the great deterrents to crime is realistic penalty. A criminal law without an enforced realistic penalty is no law at all. Yet, the courts have encouraged criminal irresponsibility by handing out light and unrealistic sentences.

During the past forty years, one man has been arrested fourteen times—seven of them for violent crimes—but he has served only thirty days in jail on five convictions. Recently convicted of a serious gambling violation in connection with the dice operation he was running with a payroll of over \$350,000, he is still free while appealing the length of his sentence—obviously unaccustomed to a realistic one.

Rulings by the courts on subversive activity in this country have left the door wide open for these groups to continue their activity.

The Students for a Democratic Society flaunt their disregard for any bounds to their subversive speech, press and demonstrations. Last year, their national secretary told his

organization: "Our primary task is to build a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement." They followed up by sending hundreds of students to Cuba for training in the ways and methods of Communism.

Too often we underrate the influence of the New Left in creating chaos in our midst. J. Edgar Hoover says that many of our disturbances and campus riots are caused by a "steadily increasing degree of hard-core Communist influence."

The Constitution guarantees to every American the right to lawfully dissent, to speak his piece, but not to do as he pleases. Our forefathers gave us one of the most powerful methods of dissent that any country has ever known—the ballot box, a free press, the right to lawfully assemble. But when the courts ruled that certain disruptive marches were in order because of their own sense of social reform, the destruction and riots that followed must be laid at the judicial doorstep.

In the city everyone is a stranger . . . and the criminal is the first to take advantage of the fact that he's just another "face in the crowd." He feels more secure in escaping detection for his acts. And, of course, mob looting and violence, the latest scourge of the urban area, seems to be the easiest of all; a riot-type situation is natural camouflage for law breakers of all sorts. But we hear the tongues of permissiveness echoing the voice of the courts—such is the right of the underprivileged to express their dissent. Since when did being poor give reason for being a criminal? It is not so. Witness the Depression when crime was much less prevalent. Look at the poor in European countries—Britain, France, Germany—their crime rates are far lower than ours.

Pornography and smut peddlers certainly benefit from Court rulings which allow them to publish and profit from their filth. Surely they contribute as much to the crime problem as does television violence. Yet, they continue their \$2 billion-a-year smut operations unhindered.

Another factor in the alarming crime rate is the very institution which is supposed to rehabilitate criminals. FBI reports show that 46% of persons arrested for serious crimes have been previously convicted. The parole practices and bonding procedures are often so lax and ineffective as to encourage lawlessness of the paroled or bonded offender.

In June, 1967, a twenty-four-year-old parolee was killed by gunshots after he had committed armed robbery at a District of Columbia store. It is interesting to note that he was:

- 1—on parole for auto theft;
- 2—free on bond for a 1966 robbery;
- 3—on probation for housebreaking; and
- 4—free on a \$2,500 bond posted the day before on charges of shooting a high school student who had tried to remove him from the school grounds for yelling profanities at girl students.

Could it be, however, that the reasons for our high crime rate spring from even deeper rooted causes than smut peddling, subversive groups, outmoded penal practices and too-lenient Supreme and lower Court rulings? The very prevalence of these conditions are brought on by the type of society in which we live today.

America has never cradled a more permissive society than she does now. Parental, educational and religious guidance and governmental enforcement have all permitted and encouraged the individual to "do his own thing," even to the extent of participating in civil disorders, and of selecting the laws which he will or will not obey. As Americans, we find ourselves virtual prisoners within our own walls . . . with the criminals in control of the streets.

Our society leans over backward in an apparent effort *not* to influence and discipline our young people toward our ideals and

hopes, lest we spoil their personalities. How alienated and unloved many of them must feel!

Police in New York City were able to identify Diana Outhon by the tip of a finger found in the wreckage from a sensational blast. According to news reports, this young woman was killed as she helped manufacture powerful dynamite bombs to be used in terrorist raids on Columbia University. Teachers admitted they knew of the planned bombing, but didn't want to "interfere." The sister of the dead girl was quoted as saying that her father "never, never told the girl she was wrong," and that he would never condemn her or her sister for their actions. This young woman's actions included sit-ins, a trip to Cuba, an arrest for inciting mob action in Chicago, participating in the Moratorium, working actively as a Weatherman in the S.D.S., and living in a commune in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Permissiveness by the parents of America spreads its tentacles into the courts, into our churches, and imbeds itself deeply in our schools. It encourages our young people to form revolutionary groups, stimulates illegal sales and uses of drugs, fosters organized criminal activity and heightens every area of crime.

Consider how we let organized crime flourish behind its facade of respectability.

The syndicates of organized crime have both the power and money to control such operations as global smuggling of heroin and cocaine and other dangerous drugs. Young people throughout the country have been their victims. This is a challenge which we must meet as parents, as citizens, as lawmakers. Loan sharking, gambling, labor racketeering are other sources of income to them, although they do not limit themselves to these areas. They seek more money and power while they hide vast sums of money in Swiss bank accounts, as they continue their prey on our society.

Those of you familiar with the problem, realize that illegal traffic in drugs is an important factor in the rising crime rate. As much as 75% of the street crime is attributed to the drug addict, and juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose 800% in the United States between 1960 and 1967. There isn't much the drug addict won't do to support his \$100-a-day habit.

Crime has risen over 120% since 1960—11% alone in 1969. While most crime previously has been in poor and ghetto areas, the largest increase now is in suburban and even rural areas. The cost of crime zoomed past \$31 billion in 1968. And one of the most heartrending statistics we have noted is that 75% of the serious crimes are committed by the under-twenty-five age-group.

There can be no doubt that our nation is in the grips of a wave of lawlessness and subversion which can only be combated by immediate action against those who would act wantonly without regard for the just laws and ideals of order upon which this country was founded.

Crime certainly will not fade away by itself. Everyone has his share of responsibility—the federal government . . . the state government . . . and the local government . . . as well as every individual citizen.

Let us look at some of the things being done to combat this staggering wave of crime:

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice provides funds to police to cut down on street crime, furnishing \$63 million in 1969 for police training, community relations, new electric alarm systems in high burglary rate areas and statewide teletype networks. It also creates a federal-state racket squad in New York City to combat organized crime with the coordinated efforts of both governments. If this proves successful, it will pave the way

for more cooperation in the crucial fight against organized crime.

The new appropriations for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs provides \$35 million for the Bureau's enforcement operations and to train 22,000 state and local law enforcement officers in the latest and most effective ways of combatting the drug problem. The Illegal Gambling Business Control Act directed against organized crime, additional penalties for people who use guns in the commission of crime, and anti-smut measures are pending bills which we hope to pass to help cut crime.

Too often, however, we find people looking to the federal government as a cure-all for their problems. Even now, there are those who are suggesting a federal law enforcement system. We hope no American really wants this, for only local law enforcement can be both creative and flexible enough to respond to the particular needs of a community. None of us want a federal police.

All the federal legislation in the world won't help this country if its citizens are not aware of their invaluable function to keep our communities safe. Many of you are aware of some strange trends which have developed in this country. There are people willing to overlook crimes which imperil us each and every day.

Many shirk their responsibility for the crime rise by "scapegoating" the police and other law enforcement officers. But I believe all responsible people will agree that the accusing finger has been pointed at our nation's law enforcement officers too long. It is the local law enforcement officer who stands between the law abiding citizen and the criminal . . . between the looter and the shopkeeper . . . between the child and the molester . . . between the Students for a Democratic Society and the targets of their storm trooper tactics . . . between anarchy and violence and the peace and security of the United States. And too often he has stood alone.

How long will we permit the tacit acceptance of criminal acts just because some thug was raised in a "poor environment," or because some murdered had an unhappy childhood? There are always those who are ready to explain the "motivation" behind criminal activity . . . but are unwilling to lift a hand to protect the innocent against a killer or rapist.

In our schools, we must teach with greater emphasis respect for and obedience to law and order. Let us demand that teachers get back to the job of teaching and leave the changing of the social order to other forces.

Let us return to our law enforcement officers the power to enforce the laws.

Let us join together in support of our Crime Control Committee in the Fourth District. Already citizens are offering their pledges and suggestions for ridding our area of crime.

We must bring crime under control in order to preserve the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. Whenever we allow conditions to exist that permit people to select the laws they will or will not obey, we have surely created anarchy.

The law abiding citizen must not be stifled by fear of the lawless. Americans can again know the peace and security that comes from obedience to the law. The strength we gain . . . the peace and security we have . . . is up to each of us.

Let us, the citizens of the Fourth District, lead the way. We can make the Fourth District of Florida a shining example of what can be done to control crime.

Each one of us has a job to do—

First, a turn-around on permissiveness . . . in the home, school, church or court. Quit coddling criminals insist courts do their job; deal more firmly with subversives; teach our own child respect for discipline.

Second, work for community safety

through street lighting campaigns, as a volunteer police "aide", by reporting suspicious loiterers, by helping organize anti-delinquency programs, by offering job opportunities to released prisoners under proper supervision.

Third, support measures to cut down the drug trade.

Fourth, enlist the positive aid of young people. The 95 percent of our college youth who support the American way, need to know how to help our institutions back to order.

Fifth, show respect for our law enforcement officers and support research for crime control techniques.

Within each of us, then, lies the power to control crime. Let us use that power wisely and for the good of all. Let us, by our actions, transmit to future generations a clean and lawful land.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE TREATY OF TRIANON

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 50th anniversary of the Peace Treaty of Trianon, which re-drew the frontiers of Hungary and detached from her two-thirds of her territory and 60 percent of her population.

Americans of Hungarian descent regard this as a day of mourning, because as a result of this treaty, three and a half million Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin became a minority and were treated as second-class citizens by the regimes of the successor states of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

In reflecting upon these events, Americans recognize that this 50-year-old treaty destroyed the economic unity of a region and thereby eased the way for Nazi, and later Soviet, invasion of the area.

Today the Hungarians and other successor nations of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, except for the Austrians, live under Communist domination. And as the Hungarian and Czechoslovak examples in the last 15 years have shown, they are still ruled by the leaders of the U.S.S.R.

I express my sympathy to the American-Hungarian community on this day and the hope that Soviet domination will ultimately recede from their homeland and from the countries where their brethren live as a minority. I also hope that more cooperation will become possible between the peoples of the Carpathian Basin and Central Europe, leading to increased collaboration for peace and freedom. In the meantime, we will pay sharp attention to the mistreatment of Hungarians and other peoples of the region by their governments on ideological and nationality grounds.

#### OUR SPEAKER RETIRES

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for someone who has been in this grand House for any length of time to contemplate the workings of the body without the guiding hand of the Hon-

orable JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I have been privileged and honored to have been called "friend" by the gentleman from the Bay State. As my colleagues know, that is a very great honor.

I know that my own effectiveness as a minority member of the House has been enhanced because of the advice and counsel of our Speaker. One measure of our Speaker's greatness is that he never allowed his partisanship to obscure the merits of legislation, nor did he allow his position as Speaker and majority leader to dictate his personal and warm relations with all Members.

The Speaker has enjoyed a long and distinguished career in this the greatest legislative body in the world. His expertise, experience and intelligence during 40 years of dedicated service has been stamped onto every piece of major legislation debated in this House during that time. Many tributes have been spoken regarding JOHN McCORMACK's record tenure as Speaker of this House, and such accolades are richly deserved, but I will always remember with a special sense of awe, the times when JOHN McCORMACK relinquished the prominence and security of the rostrum and came into the Well of the House to debate the issues. When in the well, JOHN McCORMACK was at his very best—in debate, he had no peers.

In times of peace and in times of war, during times of domestic tranquility or domestic turbulence, JOHN McCORMACK's steadying influence, fully consistent with the great and honorable traditions of the House has been influential, necessary and welcomed. One cannot simply pick out one or two or a half dozen major achievements and say that "this" represents the spirit of the Speaker's impact on our work. Rather, one must look at the soundness of the Nation, the integrity of its institutions, and the position of the United States of America in the world today to truly assess the measure of this man we honor.

We shall miss JOHN McCORMACK when the 92d Congress convenes next year, but we pray that he and his lovely wife have many years of enjoyable and well-deserved retirement together.

#### FIELD AND STREAM AND THE CHALLENGE OF OUR ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the 75th anniversary, June 1970, issue of Field and Stream, the editors have published an impressive array of articles on the subject of the future of man's environment.

However, before commenting on the substance of the articles therein, I want to extend my congratulations to the editors and publisher of the magazine on their diamond jubilee. As an avid sportsman and lover of America's natural wonders, as one reared in a family of outdoorsmen, I consider it a special and

pleasurable duty to extend my felicitations to those responsible for the publication of one of America's leading magazines of interest to the outdoorsman and the conservationist. For myself, I cannot remember a time when I have not read the magazine, and usually, from cover to cover.

During its years of service to the American sportsman, its aim to inform and arouse America to the protection and enhancement of our natural resources has been a consistent policy. For most of the 75 years of its history, the magazine has fought a lonely battle. In the past 2 or 3 years the "environmental concern" has captured the attention of the American public and more and more people are joining the crusade to save America from despoilation which Field and Stream has been leading for three-quarters of a century.

In the current issue of the magazine, Mr. Franklin S. Forsberg, publisher, outlines the policy of Field and Stream for the future. It is an important statement for old and new conservationists alike and I commend its message to our colleagues. The message follows:

#### A SYMPOSIUM ON THE SHAPE OF TOMORROW

A seventy-fifth anniversary is a fitting occasion to celebrate; to reflect upon Field & Stream's past achievements and to take pride in what we presently stand for as the voice of America's sportsmen. It is, however, more meaningful to reflect upon the challenges of the future, especially because of the threat to our natural resources posed by the problems of pollution, overpopulation, and exploitation of resources.

From the beginning, Field & Stream has been deeply rooted in the American tradition of the great outdoors. Field & Stream has been the crusader, from conservation to sportsmen's product innovation. This magazine has fought against those things that threatened our fish, game, and the very land itself. In its earliest years, Field & Stream crusaded for an end to market hunting, and for laws to protect the rights of future generations to the natural bounty of this country. It campaigned for the purchase by Government of wild lands so that they would be continually protected from private profiteering. Today Field & Stream, in its tradition, turns to the problems we face and asks its readers to involve themselves in the hard questions of the future.

In this June Anniversary Issue, Field & Stream publishes a statement of environmental purpose by President Richard M. Nixon and a symposium of leading North American scientists and educators, all active in classroom and laboratory and the broad areas of decisionmaking. They offer hope for our precious natural heritage that could help stem the tide of its destruction. President Nixon states his belief to Field & Stream readers that we will be able to both conserve what we have and refurbish much of what has been overused. For any of this to materialize, sportsmen throughout America must continue to be dedicated and informed. Millions today have become aware of the environmental crisis in America. It has become a popular cause. This powerful concern must spread to millions more so it will not fade away or be turned aside. Field & Stream looks to you, America's sportsmen, and pledges to continue in the spirit of its past seventy-five years to work for the preservation and broadening of our fields, streams, and waterways.

FRANKLIN S. FORSBERG,  
Publisher.

The lead article in the Diamond Anniversary edition of Field and Stream is entitled "The State of the Union Between Man and Nature," and is written by President Nixon. The President makes a particular point of stressing the dual problems of conservation and restoration and sounds the clarion call for this environmental decade when he says:

We now realize that conservation and restoration are not the exclusive cause or rhetorical domain of any single group—they are the duty of all Americans.

Knowing our duty and following through are two very different matters as I am sure the President would agree. This administration has announced some giant and long overdue steps designed to follow-through and those of us who read Field and Stream are heartened by the depth of the President's commitment to improving this land of ours.

The public does not question the President's commitment to improving the environment but here is the rub—translating the President's desires into action throughout the Federal bureaucracy is a problem of herculean proportions. I want to make it very clear that by this I mean to include the bureaucracy which has become the White House staff. The goals, challenges and desires outlined by the President, approved by conservationists, environmentalists and most of the public, are frustrated day-in and day-out by bureaucratic lethargy and "mind sets" against conservation in the agencies. Unless this state of affairs in the Government itself ends, there is little hope for saving the American environment. Perhaps the way to drive home the President's environmental commitment is to make his article required reading throughout the Government.

Following the President's article, many of the scientists we have come to associate with the new national thrust of environmental concern speak out on various segments of the pollution problem. The writers include Dr. Paul R. Ehrlich, Dr. Barry Commoner, Dr. Charles F. Wurster, Dr. Douglas Pimlott, Dr. Hugh H. Ittis, and Dr. Eugene P. Odum. The President's article and those just mentioned follow—I urge their close examination by our colleagues.

#### THE STATE OF THE UNION BETWEEN MAN AND NATURE

(By Richard M. Nixon)

The January 1899 issue of Field & Stream contained an article, "Hunting the Grisly," written by Theodore Roosevelt. It recounted his true hunting adventures, culminating in the killing of a "huge grisly" bear. Roosevelt's great feeling for the wonder and beauty of the outdoors was reflected in this sentence: "At my feet ran a rapid mountain torrent, its bed choked with ice-covered rocks; I had been lulled to sleep by the stream's splashing murmur, and the loud moaning of the wind along the naked cliffs."

That same sentence seems to mock us today, when so many of our rivers and streams are choked not with ice but with municipal and industrial waste, while the moaning wind carries deadly pollutants. In a sense, it is our nation that has been "lulled to sleep" during these years—and we have only recently awakened to a discovery of the terrible price we have paid for ignoring the ever-increasing perils to our natural surroundings.

Theodore Roosevelt loved nature and fought for it. We can do no less. In my State of the Union address and subsequent message to the Congress, I outlined a program to meet the challenge of the present state of another union: the union between man and nature in the United States.

Readers of *Field & Stream* are no strangers to the struggle for conservation. Yet as we enter the last third of the century, conservation, while it is admirable and needed, is not enough. What we need today is not only *conservation*, but *restoration* as well. We must continue to conserve our remaining natural resources and wild places—but we must also restore to our nation and our people much that has been taken away from them.

Our task is not so much to bring Americans "back to nature," but to bring nature back to Americans. The United States must become a nation in which Americans can, if they wish, retreat for a time from the glories of technology. All Americans should be able to find places where the leisure that a technological society has made available is not spoiled by the harmful side effects a technological society has often created.

Can we do it? We can, provided we understand the profundity of the problem and the commitment necessary to solve it. We need the resources, the knowledge, and, above all, the will to bring about this restoration. I am convinced that we have these—and something more. We also have finally reached an understanding that unless we begin to conserve and restore now, there can be an ecological point of no return for future generations.

Nearly three-quarters of a century separates us from the America of which Theodore Roosevelt wrote in *Field & Stream* in 1899. We know—all too well—what has occurred to the state of the union between man and nature during that time. But what will that state be seventy-five years from now? What will an American President have to say about the state of our natural wonders and resources in the year 2045?

If we do our work well—if we not only restore in our own time but also teach our children the importance of this restoration so they can continue the work—I am certain that the citizens of that far-off decade will find an America in which:

There is *more* land than we now have in use for recreational and leisure purposes. Not only will thousands of square miles of wilderness remain undisturbed, but thousands of acres in cities, suburbs, and rural areas will be turned to recreational uses. One of the chief restoration priorities of this Administration is to see to it that the Federal Government contributes as much land as it can to this need.

There is a *diversity* of recreational uses to match the diversity of needs of Americans. Some love hunting and fishing amidst the rugged grandeur of the mountains and forests; others love quiet strips of beach, unmolested by man and his works; still others simply need a park within easy reach of home where a person can enter a green and restful world.

A firm, continuing commitment to the conservation and restoration of our natural resources has become one of the cornerstones of our national policies. The restoration of nature in the United States is not a political fad—it is an ecological imperative.

Too often in the past the conservation struggle was hampered by a misunderstanding of its fundamental and universal importance to all Americans. Some saw "conservation" only in the narrowest of terms, as something that would protect what a special group enjoyed—and nothing else. Others saw it as a good excuse to set aside some parts of the land in order to do what they wanted with the others. Still others were convinced that it concerned nothing but the wilderness and its wonders.

We now realize that conservation and restoration are not the exclusive cause or rhetorical domain of any single group—they are the duty of all Americans.

Whether we succeed in our struggle to bring a humane balance between what we do with nature and what nature can do for us is up to us—up to all of us. The man who never tracked a bear must be as concerned with preservation of the wilderness as the most avid hunter. The man who has lived all his life outdoors must be as much concerned as the city-dweller with the need for green places in urban and suburban areas.

We can never go back to the comparatively simple America of Theodore Roosevelt, but neither can we retreat from his commitment to the protection of the natural wonders of our nation. I am confident that with the help of all Americans, we will see in the coming years a restoration of the American environment in the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt, and perhaps even beyond his dreams. We must conserve; we must restore. On the state of the union between man and nature depends the physical and psychological well-being of all Americans—not just those alive today, but those who will come after us.

I urge the many readers of *Field & Stream* to continue their fine efforts in this field, and to join with all Americans in a national effort to restore the environment so that we—and later generations—can use it in a way in keeping with our total human needs.

#### POPULATION OVERGROWTH—THE FERTILE CURSE

(By Paul R. Ehrlich)

In the early 1960's I was able to catch my limit of trout regularly on the East River (a tributary of the Gunnison) in an hour or so before dinner. The western slope of Colorado in those days was relatively empty of tourists—a sportsman's paradise.

Now all that has changed. Mobs of vacationers roam up and down the dirt roads in clouds of dust, often driving bulky campers. Artificial flies often seem to outnumber their natural counterparts over the trout streams, and to fish in solitude one must hike high into the back country. The same story is, of course, being repeated all over the nation as population growth and increased mobility produce crowding in what once was unspoiled wilderness.

The same population growth that is turning our country into an esthetic shambles is, through its coupling with a waste-oriented economy and an ecologically incompetent agricultural system, causing much more serious and subtle problems.

Chlorinated hydrocarbons, including such pesticides as DDT and polychlorinated biphenyl industrial chemicals (PCBs), have been released into the ecological systems of the planet in such quantities that they may now threaten the very ability of Earth to support humanity. Serious effects are already appearing in animals that feed high on food chains (several steps removed from the green plants that are the source of food for all animals). We are now watching the process of extinction of many sea birds, which occupy that unenviable position and fishermen may soon be bidding farewell to the larger game fishes.

Indeed, it is conceivable that in a decade or two all marine fishing, both commercial and sport, will have ceased because of irreversible changes in the oceans.

Furthermore, if we continue dosing our environment with chlorinated hydrocarbons and related compounds, we may soon lose the trout and numerous other freshwater game species.

But, then again, if we keep it up we ourselves may follow the game fairly rapidly, since a loss of a substantial portion of the ocean fisheries would create a world protein famine that could lead to the end of civilization.

There are many threats to the animals

treasured by the sportsmen besides those posed by chlorinated hydrocarbons. Deterioration of our fresh waters can only increase if we don't change our ways. More chemical pollution from industry, more thermal pollution from power plants, more dams, more use of inorganic nitrogen fertilizers, more high-powered cars (each a miniature fertilizer factory), more sewage-producing feedlots, and more sewage-producing people threaten all the fresh waters of our continent.

The increased demands of burgeoning population will take precedence over the maintenance of game fishes. And, of course, overpopulation and pollution will take their toll of game animals also. Already many species around the world are jeopardized, as they represent a source of decorative apparel for the thoughtless affluent or competition for the domestic animals of increasing numbers of people.

Furthermore, a pollution-induced change in the climate could—and soon may—throw the United States into a grave food crisis. This could lead to the quick extermination of our edible wildlife. In a world which already has many more human beings than it can properly support and which is adding 70 millions to its population each year (in spite of 10-20 million deaths by starvation annually), the future of "useless" large animals is easy to predict.

I could continue with horror stories galore—but presumably most readers of *Field & Stream* are already aware of the immense threat both to our wildlife and to ourselves. What can we do about it? We have a few years to act, at most.

First, we must force the government to take the responsibility for stopping the growth of the U.S. population and then reducing its absolute size. It must be made clear to all Americans that from now on it is unpatriotic and irresponsible for a family to have more than two children. Subsidized contraception and abortion must be made available to all, and if necessary, financial incentives provided for small families.

Then, we must convert from a "cowboy economy" which emphasizes waste, pollution, and growth-for-growth's-sake to a "space-man economy" which emphasizes the quality and durability of everything—especially the quality of life. America is the prime example of an overdeveloped country, looting the world's resources and polluting the air, water, and land of our globe, all in the name of making the gross national product even grosser. We must clean up our mess; achieve population, economic, and environmental equilibrium; and then lead others to do the same.

For the average sportsman such a change would perhaps mean driving one small, very durable low-emission car for most of his life. He might have to get by with one color TV, and no electric toothbrush, electric can opener, power mower, or trail bike.

But he would be able to raise two healthy children, free of the fear of thermonuclear war, disease, and starvation. He would be able to introduce them to the beauty of the out-of-doors. He would be able to fish a major river, own a gun, stalk a bear, and bring home pheasant for his family. He would retain the freedoms that are possible only when people are not jammed together cheek-by-jowl. Are we going to fight to preserve the things that impart quality to each individual's life, or shall we just sit back and wait for total regimentation or the fate of the passenger pigeon to catch up with us? The choice is up to you.

#### NEEDED—LAND TRUSTEESHIP, NOT JUST OWNERSHIP

(By Eugene P. Odum)

Human ecology, rather than wildlife ecology, must become the chief concern of sportsmen and other conservationists in the coming decades.

If we don't intelligently "manage" our own population, there not only will be no outdoor recreation as we now enjoy it, but the quality of human existence in general will deteriorate just as surely as the quality of the individual deer or elk deteriorates on an overcrowded range. Fortunately, attitudes toward the natural environment are slowly changing as people (and especially the youth) realize that the optimum density is something less than the maximum that could be supported, and, therefore, that control of both human population growth and economic development is necessary.

Clearly, it is time for the conservationist to relate to the larger picture of human needs by campaigning for natural area preservation on the basis (1) that natural-area open space is a necessary part of man's total environment, and (2) that land-use planning can be a most effective means of preventing overpopulation of his own species.

Here is what we face in the next fifty years. As of 1970, the average population density of the U.S. (and, interestingly enough, also the world) is one person to ten acres of ice-free land area. Even with the expected reduction in birth rates our population will double in the next thirty to fifty years, leaving us with only about five acres for every man, woman, and child. Although as little as one-third of an acre can produce enough calories to sustain one person, the kind of quality diet we want—one that includes a lot of meat, fruit, and leafy vegetables—requires almost two acres per person to produce. We also need another acre to produce the fibers we now use in this country (paper, wood, cotton, etc.). This would leave only two acres per person for all the other diversity of uses that makes man something more than an "organic machine."

It is becoming increasingly evident that adequate living space free from water and air pollution, not food, should be the key to determining the optimum density for man. We can feed more "warm bodies" than we can support quality human beings who have a reasonable chance for liberty and the pursuit of happiness! A reasonable goal is to make certain that at least a third of all land remains in protective open-space use.

This means that this portion of our total environment must be in national, state, or municipal parks, forests, refuges, green belts, or wilderness areas; or, if in private ownership, it must be protected by scenic easements, zoning, or other definitive legal means.

The individual sportsman and his organization can play a key role in achieving the quality environment objective through sensible land-use planning. He should focus on his own state and region first because his best strategy will vary with the region. In the Western States, for example, 40 to 60 percent of land is already in the public domain; here the problem is to build strong public opinion against any reduction in extent of these natural areas, and any uses that degrade them. In the Southern States there is a lot of "open space," but very little of it is protected. Here open-space acts, statewide zoning laws and commissions, and more parks and refuges are needed. In the East all states should do as New Jersey has done, that is, enact a "green acres" act that empowers cities to buy up all available unoccupied land for preservation and use in its natural state.

Throughout the country a special effort must be made immediately to preserve wetlands. Coastal marshes, swamps, fresh-water marshes and lakes are not really suited for intensive "production" of food, fiber, or goods, even though considerable harvest can be obtained as a byproduct of recreational and other use. The public, not to mention some segments of our Federal Government, has not yet been completely "sold" on the value of wetlands for water and air conservation and recreation. Wetlands now loom

as extremely valuable as just plain "buffers" to prevent overcrowding. Most people and some government bureaus still think marshes and swamps are somehow "unhealthy" or "undesirable," and must be drained on general principle. "Selling" wetlands preservation is a job that can be done by the sportsman who knows these resources!

Finally, the conservationists should join, and help direct, our young people's all-out war on pollution. The first thing to do is to find out if one's state has adequate laws that are being enforced. The next step is to convince industry that waste treatment and control is good business. To do this there must be economic pressure on polluters.

I am optimistic enough to believe that the next fifty years will see Aldo Leopold's "Land Ethic" become a part of the human Bill of Rights. The land ethic is based on the old English concept that land ownership is a "trusteeship" in the sense that ownership entails the responsibility for maintaining its quality and is not a privilege to exploit and destroy. I foresee the courts increasing rule against the despoilers (whether they be individuals, corporations, or even our own Government) and in favor of man's right to a quality environment.

Until such time as the legal basis for this can be worked out, there is no time to lose in making certain that at least one-third of the environment remains under nature's wise management for our own protection.

#### MAN'S FORGOTTEN NECESSITY—ECO-VARIETY

(By Hugh H. Itlis)

Cornfields and cows inherited the tamed earth, the curse of concrete spread upon a denatured land, and woe became the soul of forsaken man.

This is a world no reader of *Field & Stream* would wish to live in! Yet in less than seventy-five years of current technology, production-oriented economics, and exploding populations continue, one can safely predict utter destruction of wild animal and plant life from Alaska to the Amazon, from Africa to Australia, a simplification of biotic communities serving but one end—the feeding and housing of the billions of Man.

To any man whose heart belongs to the out-of-doors, the main lesson of the 20th century should be clear: the earth is well on the road to becoming a crowded cesspool, an ultracivilized wasteland with thousands of factories for wingless, feather-less chickens and mutated blobs of "cow" perpetually milked, with synthetic bacon for breakfast and algae steak for lunch, with controlled climates without season, a world of plastic flowers, endless television and frantic tedium, an inhuman inferno, a "Human Zoo."

Though you hunters, who read this, can still dream today about stalking bear, mountain lion, tiger, or rhinoceros, these and a thousand others are considered by some to be endangered species. In seventy five years, most mammals, birds, reptiles, even fish, clams, and insects, might well be stuffed curiosities in museums or pretty pictures in books, as irreversibly extinct as the magnificent Dodo.

The living world then will indeed not be the same, but a simplified biological factory producing corn, cows, and people and, perhaps, tame semi-domesticated deer.

So what? Has not human vision always been shortsighted: to kill, to use, to destroy all living things edible, cuttable, plowable, or salable; has this not been man's essence for a long, long time? Should we not simply accept the inevitable?

The innate "wisdom" of our bodies will not let us. We cannot change our animal nature to fit a polluted, crowded, denatured, technological environment, since our genes were shaped by natural selection of the uncrowded, clean, natural environment over millions of years. If each person has "a fundamental and

inalienable right to a healthful environment," then we must accept the natural environment as indispensable and modify our culture to satisfy the environmental demands of our genes.

To the endless arguments as to what kind of environment man needs, the generalized answer is obvious: The optimum human environment is one in which the human animal can have maximum contact with the natural (evolutionary) environment in which he evolved, and for which all his basic processes are innately programmed, yet one in which at the same time the many advantages of urban civilization are not sacrificed.

This compromise is not simply something to work toward; it is necessary and possible. The powers of man, the speed and extent of his destruction, are of an unprecedented magnitude, true; but so are his powers for cultural change. While his science and technology, his brain, allowed man to escape temporarily the laws of evolution, to conquer, exterminate, pollute and disrupt the environment in every corner of the earth, this very same science could lead man back to ecological sanity.

We need clean air and water, open spaces and forests, hunting and fishing, uncrowded towns and quiet streets, human companionship and love. We also need a diverse environment for very practical reasons. Thus, studies of insect pollination on alpine meadows, of territoriality in white rhinos or red-winged blackbirds, of energy cycles in tropical forests along the Congo River, or of social behavior of chimpanzees in the wilds of Africa are all essential to understanding man's role and control of the environment, are all impossible to know without undisturbed, *deliberately preserved* "wild" nature.

#### SUPER TECHNOLOGY—WILL IT END THE GOOD LIFE?

(By Barry Commoner)

With startling suddenness, environmental pollution has soared to the top of the agenda of public concern. The immediate reasons for this intense concern are not difficult to detect, for they constantly assail our senses. Our eyes smart from smog; our ears throb with the noise of automobiles, aircraft, and construction tools; we are assailed by the obnoxious odors of polluted waters and the repugnant sight of mounting heaps of rubbish.

Less apparent than pollution itself is what can be done about it. The problems are enormous in size. Cities are running out of places to dump garbage and rubbish, and a lake as large as Erie has been nearly totally polluted. The problems are bewildering in their complexity. If we expand sewage treatment facilities, we only intensify the pollution due to rotting masses of algae; if we incinerate garbage, we intensify air pollution. If we attempt to control smog by means of exhaust devices which reduce waste fuel emission, we worsen the pollution due to nitrogen oxides.

Why has a society which is so enriched by the progress of technology now become so impoverished in the quality of the life which that technology supports? What are the causes of this dismaying paradox? What can be done to resolve it?

I believe we are in an environmental crisis which threatens the survival of this nation, and of the world as a suitable place of human habitation. Environmental pollution is *not* to be regarded as an unfortunate but incidental by-product of the growth of population, the intensification of production, or of technological progress. It is, rather, an intrinsic feature of the very technology which we have developed to enhance productivity.

Our technology is enormously successful in producing material goods, but too often is disastrously incompatible with natural environmental systems. Yet, the survival of all living things—including man—the quality of life, and the continued success of all human

activities—including technology, industry, and agriculture—depends on the integrity of the complex web of biological processes which comprise the environment—the earth's ecosystem. And what man is now doing on the earth violates this fundamental requisite of human existence.

With tragic perversity we have linked much of our productive economy to precisely those features of technology which violate the environment that supports us.

Unless we start now with a *fundamental* attack on the environmental crisis, we will find ourselves, in a decade, locked into an irreversible, self-destructive course.

President Nixon has declared enhancement of the environment a major goal of his administration. I hope that he truly recognizes the urgency of a *fundamental* attack on the environmental crisis, and that he will lead in mobilizing the total resources of the nation for this task.

For example, the President should enable the scientific community to take the first steps toward environmental survival by releasing it from the paralyzing effects of the most severe cutbacks in the research support in twenty-five years. In addition, he can find the immediate means to devote Federal resources to a simple, yet enormously meaningful, program: Let us declare that every piece of land not in actual use by its owners must be returned, until otherwise needed, to grass and trees; let us find the means to remove the abandoned buildings and junk piles from blighted city streets and restore them to nature's green. Once cleared, these parks will be nurtured, I assure you, by the people who enjoy them.

I would hope, as well, that the President will see the wisdom, in the name of ecological sanity, of halting the development of the SST—an environmental horror which, if it is ever flown in the nation's airplanes, will expose a fourth of the nation to noise equivalent to that which surrounds our airports.

In sum, I hope *the President can lead the people in the fight for environmental survival by declaring a state of national ecological emergency.*

For, clearly, these huge undertakings cannot even be begun unless we dramatically reorganize our national priorities. We cannot continue to devote the talent of our engineers and the competence of our workers to the production of overpowered, pollution-generating cars that do violence on the road and in the ecosystem. We cannot continue to waste manpower and resources on a futile war, and on weapons that become obsolete before they are produced—and which if ever used, will destroy this planet as a place fit for human life.

The environmental crisis has brought us to the most awesome turning point in this country's history. We have become a nation that wields the greatest power in the saga of man: power in the form of food, industrial plants, vehicles, and the weapons of war. We have also become a nation beset by violence: on the battlefield, on the highways, and in personal encounters—but more fundamentally in the destruction of the natural, harmonious fabric of the environmental system which supports us. It is this fundamental violence to the world in which we live that divides us, as we compete among ourselves for the earth's goods, unaware that each of us, in his own way, is thereby contributing to the destruction of the whole that supports us all.

The time has come to forge a grand alliance in this nation. All of us now know that if we are to survive, the environment must be maintained as a balanced, harmonious whole. We must all work together to preserve it. If we fail, we shall abandon the place where we must live—the thin skin of air, water, soil, and living things on the planet Earth—to destruction. The obligation which our technological society forces upon

all of us, young and old, black and white, right and left, scientist and citizen alike, is to discover how humanity can survive the new power which science has given it. Every major advance in the technological competence of man has enforced new obligations on human society.

The present age of technology is no exception to this rule of history. We already know the enormous benefits it can bestow, and we have begun to perceive its frightful threats. The crisis generated by this knowledge is upon us.

The environmental crisis is a grim challenge. It also is a lofty opportunity. From it we may yet learn that the proper use of science is not to conquer nature, but to live within its scope. We may yet learn that to save ourselves we must save the world that is our habitat. The time is at hand to devote the wisdom of science and the power of technology not simply to the welfare, but to the survival, of man.

#### PRODUCT PUSHERS VERSUS THE PEOPLE

(By Charles F. Wurster)

As we look ahead into the decades to come, we might well wonder whether our lovely blue-and-white spaceship called Earth will gradually turn to various shades of gray. If our biosphere is to be burdened by a continued exponential increase in human populations—if billions upon billions of people are to consume and degrade the irreplaceable natural resources of our planet—then our future is bleak indeed. The present rates of population increase cannot continue on a little world of finite, limited resources. No scientific miracles can bail us out of that truth. We cannot overflow to some other celestial body or create resources out of empty space.

Although continued population increase is the road to sure and certain disaster, population stability itself is no guarantee of paradise on Earth, for even a thin population can plunder its environment. It is essential that we protect at all costs the environmental quality on which the quality of human life depends; yet our polluted air, waters, and land, the rapid depletion of natural resources, and the unbalanced biotic communities tell us we have often been unwise masters, rather than guardians of our precious planet.

Most obvious pollution problems are not created by gangsters and fly-by-night operators, but by many of our respected private and public enterprises that are not yet housebroken. It is cheap and "profitable" to discharge wastes into the water or air—profitable for the polluter. But the total social cost somehow seems forgotten as the rest of society picks up the tab in the form of a degraded environment.

Another group of environmental problems, also caused by respected private and public enterprises, we might lump under the category of "product pushing"—the salesmanship of a product that damages the environment more than it benefits society. DDT and certain other chlorinated hydrocarbons fall into this category. There was a time when DDT had no substitutes, but that time is long past. We can have its benefits by employing a variety of biological and chemical techniques that are often more effective in controlling insects anyway.

Exhaustive studies by scientists all over the world show that DDT has contaminated our biosphere and is causing serious, permanent, and irreparable environmental damage. DDT residues are found in nearly all human food, including foods never treated with DDT, and in the tissues of all human beings. Unlike the cyclamates, people cannot choose to avoid DDT, and their tissues remain contaminated from conception to the grave. DDT constitutes a threat to human health because it causes cancer.

Sportsmen should recognize the particular impact of DDT on wildlife. Because its resi-

dues are chemically stable, mobile, virtually insoluble in water but soluble in fatlike material, DDT residues leave the site of application and contaminate the tissues of living, nontarget organisms far from where the chemical has been used. Residues become increasingly concentrated as they move up the food chain, thereby reaching the highest levels in certain fish, birds, and man at the top of the food chains. By reducing the reproductive success of fish and birds DDT threatens important fresh-water and marine fisheries, and has caused the great decline of the osprey, bald eagle, brown pelican, black duck, Cooper's hawk, peregrine falcon, and other species.

DDT inhibits reproduction in birds by causing them to lay abnormally thin-shelled eggs, which break prematurely in the nest and thereby do not produce chicks. It inhibits reproduction in fish by killing the fry after the contaminated adult female passes the residues into the eggs.

Residues do great damage to useful invertebrates of many species. Insect communities are frequently disrupted by the killing of beneficial predatory and parasitic insects, thereby frequently aggravating the very insect pest problem DDT was intended to control. It kills pollinating insects, and damages crustaceans, such as crab and shrimp. Even phytoplankton, at the base of oceanic food chains, can have their photosynthetic activity reduced by a few parts of DDT per billion parts of water.

DDT usage continues nevertheless because narrow interests among pesticide manufacturers and the agricultural establishment want it that way, have a position of political power over national pesticide policies, and will fight to keep it.

Cyclamates were ordered from the market only five days after the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare received evidence that they cause cancer in mice, yet the Federal Government has not taken any effective action in dealing with the chlorinated hydrocarbons. In spite of much talk from Government, the use of DDT continues. More than 100 million pounds of DDT are released into the environment each year. Instead of recognizing the truth about these chemicals and helping to alleviate the problem, the product pushers in the pesticide industry attack and attempt to discredit those scientists who research and describe it. In future decades we must hope that such forces will become responsible and responsive to environmental and human values rather than the dictates of their own economic interests.

Although pressures on legislative and administrative bodies for protecting the environment are growing, these bodies are slow to respond. A direct way of countering the economic and political pressures of vested interests lies in the judicial—the courts. Environmental law has emerged as a powerful new tool for protecting the environment, and litigation has been used with striking success by such organizations as the Environmental Defense Fund and the Sierra Club.

The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), founded in 1967, has centered much of its attention on efforts to eliminate DDT. It is a nonprofit, public benefit coalition of scientists, attorneys, and distinguished citizens devoted to the protection of environmental quality. Where more conventional approaches fail to achieve a public policy that makes wise use of natural resources, EDF is prepared to take legal action to protect these resources. It believes the judiciary is the one social institution structured to provide the wise decisions that may enable us to avert ecological disaster. Scientific support for EDF actions is provided through the Scientists Advisory Committee, which includes more than 200 scientists who serve without fee.

Experience shows clearly that scientific knowledge presented as testimony from the witness stand exerts far greater influence on

public policy than the same knowledge exposed through the more conventional channels of scientific literature or the advisory panel. This has been repeatedly demonstrated in actions against persistent pesticides on Long Island, and in Michigan and Wisconsin. Joined by the Sierra Club, National Audubon Society, West Michigan Environmental Action Council, and six California individuals, EDF more recently asked the United States Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., to require the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare to take effective action in eliminating the use of DDT.

EDF is also investigating the supersonic transport plane (SST). If we are not vigilant, this will become the DDT of the future for similar economic and political reasons—the environmental nightmare that takes three decades to eliminate from use. For the benefit of aircraft manufacturers and airlines, and their willing collaborators in Government, vast sections of the Earth will be subjected to powerful, ear-shattering sonic boom that will make our current jets sound like mosquitoes by comparison. Why? Because those who stand to benefit from construction and use of the SST are politically powerful, while those who worry about environmental quality, though more numerous, are disorganized and politically weak.

We are promised that the SST will not fly over densely populated areas; this means it will fly over thinly populated areas, so those who most hate the noise, and therefore retreat from large cities, will be the most intensively boomed. Once built, however, there will be pressures to fly the SST everywhere to recoup the investment in the name of "progress," and the promises of 1970 will be long forgotten. If the public permits the SST to be built, we will likely find ourselves in a world without solitude, where sportsmen and other vacationers will find no refuge from noise.

Product pushers who degrade the environment are by no means limited to the private sector; the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a public enterprise whose empire exists to build dams and canals, dredge wetlands, and do other unnatural things with water. In its own myopic way it proceeds with a project at public expense, whether we need it or not, and regardless of the environmental price. In northern Florida it is building a canal we don't need by destroying a priceless and irreplaceable wild river that we do need. Litigation to block the project is pending in a Federal court.

The hour is late and there is no time for complacency. The world we save will be our own, and we had better set to it for we will not get another. If the meek someday inherit the Earth, they will have to thank the activists for saving it for them. Sportsmen, in particular, will have to become activists themselves, learning to identify the environmental problems and zeroing in on the target issues.

#### CANADA IN THE 1970'S—MAKE OR BREAK

(By Douglas H. Pimlott)

If the sportsmen of the United States have hopes that their sons and daughters will enjoy the "unspoiled wilds" of Canada during the years to come, they should be apprised of the environmental crisis north of the border. We are at the crossroads.

Until now, nature has not fared badly in Canada. Salvation has not been in our foresight, but in the fact that our population of twenty-one million people lives in a relatively narrow ribbon of land. But big changes are coming on fast.

Many options are still open. They won't remain so for long. The 1960's witnessed a tremendous surge of exploitation in areas critical to the future. At the current rate, the shape of things for the next century will be cast in the 1970's, or the 1980's at the latest.

Constructive action is imperative, or Canada will go down the drain. We need to work closely with our conservation colleagues below the border; we need to forge an environmental entente for North America, for the good of all.

This is abundantly plain in the Arctic, where the big things center around the potential development of oil and minerals. Panarctic Oil, a consortium which includes the federal government, is moving ahead very rapidly with oil exploration over a large area. "Canadian Prudhoe Bays," with all the damage they imply, are definite prospects. Even now, a pipeline is planned to cross the Yukon and Northwest Territories from Alaska. A major strike of iron ore has been made on Baffin Island. Prospecting teams are everywhere running their tests.

Exploration for oil and minerals poses almost as big a problem as pollution from mining, since both tracked vehicles and seismic equipment cause serious erosion. The notion of transporting oil through Arctic ice packs in 250,000-ton tankers causes Canadian ecologists—as well as those of the United States and other nations—to grow green around the gills, for sooner or later one must sink; yet no one knows how long it takes oil to decompose under arctic conditions, so the potential consequences to ducks, geese, sea birds, seals, and whales are awesome to contemplate.

Developments in forestry and agriculture are equally disturbing. Eighty percent of the ducks harvested in North America are raised in the wetlands of Canada's great plains. But for how long can this resource endure, considering these areas are being steadily drained through one form of subsidy or another? Likewise, our Canadian forests are used primarily not to sustain wildlife, but to produce raw materials for pulp and paper products. The logging industry has gone mechanical in a big way; it is clear-cutting larger and larger areas in dimensions it might not get away with in some of the more progressive States. At one time the cutovers provided excellent habitat for big game, but now they leave the country in such poor condition that it is almost unusable by deer and moose in winter.

The prospects for water resources are about the same as those of the land. The fact that the ten provinces have primary responsibility over water means that Canada will never have an organization comparable to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developing high-pressure schemes for rivers all across the nation. Good, you say? Yes, I almost thought so, too, until the 1950's and 1960's, when the provincial governments began damming everything in sight without making any pretext of multiple-use management. Except in Ontario, the great majority of water impoundments are a sea of treetops or an almost impenetrable mass of floating debris.

The big moves in water are likely to be in the diversion of north-flowing rivers. The first "Grand Design" was to have been the Churchill River, at Southern Indian Lake in Manitoba. But the people rebelled when they learned the full implications of the scheme, and a change in government resulted in killing it. Ontario has several rivers flowing into James Bay that are also being surveyed with a view to diverting them into the Great Lakes. No one has any idea of what the diversion of rivers might mean to the ecology of James Bay and Hudson Bay. No one is conducting studies to find out. No one is yet considering the value of maintaining such glorious rivers in their free-flowing state for the benefit of young people of days still to come.

Canada is also thwarted by complexities of jurisdiction over natural resources that make it extremely difficult to develop integrated national programs for protection and management. Simply stated, the British North America Act (BNA), which serves as Canada's

constitution, made lands and forests a provincial responsibility. It gave the federal government jurisdiction, but not proprietary rights, over fisheries. Wildlife was not mentioned and became a provincial responsibility as a result, though the federal government became involved with wildlife when the Migratory Bird Treaty was signed in 1916 and now has considerable initiative in this important area.

The issues of resource protection under the BNA are currently being hotly debated, but the fact is that Canada has no national forests or national lands comparable to those managed by the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management in the United States. The few national parks, such as Banff and Jasper, are merely showpieces, brought into the system when the western provinces were still territories. Quebec and Ontario, the large central provinces, resolutely refuse to turn over any sizable portions of land to the national system. Even in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, where it is still the boss, the federal government is too "chicken" to establish parks or wilderness areas against the wishes of mining interests which dominate the Territorial Councils.

In the face of such imponderables, what are the prospects of maintaining a quality environment in Canada? The answer is not very bright unless big things happen and happen fast. But there is hope. There was dynamic evidence in the late '60's that the sleeping giant of public opinion has finally awakened and opened its eyes to the problems.

In Ontario, the government suddenly found itself fighting major battles over water and air pollution, park policies, the use of DDT. In March it declared that DDT was not a serious problem at all, then banned it in August. Quebec and the federal government climbed on the band wagon and also introduced restrictive regulations.

Also in the late '60's a major fertilizer industry was closed down for several months in Newfoundland because of a phosphate pollution problem. The federal government became very concerned about pollution in the Arctic and elsewhere and announced new legislation to protect the environment. The Algonquin Wildlands League began fighting a major battle for parks and wilderness and got a nationwide hearing; people at last began saying, "We want wilderness close to where we live." Anglers and hunters joined together to form the Canadian Wildlife Federation and received an immediate payoff in direct action programs. Students at the University of Toronto formed Pollution Probe, turning dissent into very constructive channels, and similar organizations are now being established at many other college campuses.

Canadians need the cooperation and expertise of scientists, sportsmen, and citizen conservationists of the United States. Above all, the lesson of the '60's is that battles of the environment can be fought successfully—but not by diplomacy. Success or failure in keeping options on North America open during the critical '70's will depend on how willing we all are to fight battles harder and longer. The organizations now exist; all they need are people willing to take off their gloves and get into the fray. How North America exercises its options—whether it is a continent of the future or of the past—will depend on how hard and how skillfully the battles of the '70's are fought.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S INTERIM REPORT ON THE CAMBODIAN OPERATION

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address by the President of the United States.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased to see the President make an interim report to the American people last night on the results of the Cambodian operation.

I was personally impressed by that report and I feel certain that most other Americans were also. It seemed to me that President Nixon's presentation could not help but reassure the Nation regarding the Cambodian operation.

The President's report was a dramatic outline of the facts surrounding events in Cambodia. I agree with the President that the Cambodian operation must be described as the most successful military mission we have ever undertaken in the Vietnam war.

I was glad the President reviewed the reasons for our attack on the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia. Americans now recognize the necessity for the Cambodian operation since, as the President explained last night, the Communists were making the entire 600-mile Cambodian-South Vietnamese border a launching area for attacks on American and allied forces in Vietnam.

There is no question but that we have achieved the basic objectives of the Cambodian operation. And those Americans concerned about a widening of the war should be reassured by the President's promise that the only U.S. activity in Cambodia after July 1 will be air missions to interdict the movement of enemy troops and materiel. They should also be reassured by the President's statement that the door to a negotiated peace is "wide open."

Mr. Speaker, the President deserves the broadest possible public support for his continuing efforts to win a just peace in Vietnam. I believe his report to the Nation last night will earn him support except from those persons and groups who would be satisfied with nothing less than immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, regardless of the consequences.

President Nixon has kept his word to the American people. He has demonstrated himself to be a strong leader, a man the people can look to for strong decisionmaking, a man they can trust, a man in whom they can believe. The American people should give peace a chance by giving the President a chance.

The President's address follows:

RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE CAMBODIAN SANCTUARY OPERATION

Good evening, my fellow Americans.

One month ago, I announced a decision ordering American participation with South Vietnamese forces in a series of operations against Communist-occupied areas in Cambodia which have been used for five years as bases for attacks on our forces in South Vietnam.

This past weekend, in the Western White House in California, I met with Secretary Laird, General Abrams and other senior advisors to receive a firsthand report on the progress of this operation.

Based on General Abrams' report, I can now state that this has been the most successful operation of this long and very difficult war.

Before going into the details which form the basis for this conclusion, I believe it would be helpful to review briefly why I considered it necessary to make this decision, what our objectives were; and the prospects for achieving those objectives.

You will recall that on April 20, I announced the withdrawal of an additional 150,000 American troops from Vietnam within a year—which will bring the total number withdrawn, since I have taken office, to 260,000. I also reaffirmed on that occasion our proposals for a negotiated peace.

At the time of this announcement I warned that if the enemy tried to take advantage of our withdrawal program by increased attacks in Cambodia, Laos, or South Vietnam in a way that endangered the lives of our men remaining in South Vietnam, that I would, in my capacity as Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, take strong action to deal with that threat.

Between April 20 and April 30, Communist forces launched a series of attacks against a number of key cities in neutral Cambodia. Their objective was unmistakable—to link together bases they had maintained in Cambodia for five years in violation of Cambodian neutrality. The entire six-hundred-mile Cambodian-South Vietnam border would then have become one continuous hostile territory from which to launch assaults upon American and allied forces.

This posed an unacceptable threat to our remaining forces in South Vietnam. It would have meant higher casualties. It would have jeopardized our program for troop withdrawals. It would have meant a longer war. And—carried out in the face of an explicit warning from this Government—failure to deal with the enemy action would have eroded the credibility of the United States before the entire world.

After very intensive consultations with my top advisors, I directed that American troops join the South Vietnamese in destroying these major enemy bases along the Cambodian frontier. I said when I made this announcement: "Our purpose is not to occupy these areas. Once the enemy forces are driven out of the sanctuaries and once their supplies are destroyed, we will withdraw."

That pledge is being kept. I said further on that occasion, "We take this action not for the purpose of expanding the war in Cambodia, but for the purpose of ending the war in Vietnam." That purpose is being advanced.

As of today I can report that all of our major military objectives have been achieved. 43,000 South Vietnamese took part in these operations, along with 31,000 Americans. Our combined forces have moved with greater speed and success than we had planned; we have captured and destroyed far more in war material than we anticipated; and American and allied casualties have been far lower than we expected.

In the month of May, in Cambodia alone, we captured a total amount of enemy arms, equipment, ammunition and food nearly equal to what we captured in all of Vietnam in all of last year.

Here is some film of the war material that has been captured.

This is some ammunition you see. We have captured more than 10 million rounds of ammunition. That is equal to the enemy's expenditures for nine months.

Here you also see a few of the over 15,000 rifles and machine guns and other weapons we have captured. They will never be used against American boys in Vietnam.

This reality was brought home directly to me a few days ago. I was talking with a union leader from New York. His son died in Vietnam this past February. He told me that—had we moved earlier in Cambodia—we might have captured the enemy weapon that killed his son.

Now you are looking at some of the heavy mortars, rocket launchers and recoilless rifles that have shelled U.S. base camps and Vietnamese towns. We have seized over 2,000 of these along with 90,000 rounds of ammunition. That is as much as the enemy fires in a whole year. Had this war material made its way into South Vietnam and had

it been used against American troops, U.S. casualties would have been vastly increased.

Here you see rice, more than 11 million pounds of rice. This is more than enough rice to feed all the enemy's combat battalions in Vietnam for over three months. This rice will not be feeding enemy troops now, but rather war refugees.

Now with the rainy season now beginning, it will take the enemy months to rebuild its shattered installations and to replace the equipment we have captured or destroyed.

The success of these operations to date has guaranteed that the June 30 deadline I set for withdrawal of all American forces from Cambodia will be met. General Abrams advises me that 17,000 of the 31,000 Americans who entered Cambodia have already returned to Vietnam. The remainder will return by the end of this month. This includes all American air support, logistics and military advisory personnel.

The only remaining American activity in Cambodia after July 1 will be air missions to interdict the movement of enemy troops and materiel where I find that is necessary to protect the lives and security of our men in South Vietnam.

Our discussions with the South Vietnamese government indicate that their primary objective remains the security of South Vietnam, and that their activity in Cambodia in the future—after their withdrawal from the sanctuaries—will be determined by the actions of the enemy in Cambodia.

When this operation was announced, the critics charged that it would increase American casualties, that it would widen the war, that it would lengthen our involvement, that it might postpone troop withdrawals. But the operation was undertaken for precisely the opposite reasons—and it has had precisely the opposite effect.

Let us examine the long-range impact of this operation.

First, we have eliminated an immediate danger to the security of the remaining Americans in Vietnam, and thereby reduced our future casualties. Seizing these weapons and ammunition will save American lives. Because of this operation, American soldiers who might not otherwise be ever coming home, will now be coming home.

Second, we have won precious time for the South Vietnamese to train and prepare themselves to carry the burden of their national defense, so that our American forces can be withdrawn.

From General Abrams' reports and from our advisors in the field, one of the most dramatic and heartening developments of the operation has been the splendid performance of the South Vietnamese army. Sixty percent of all the troops involved in the Cambodian operations were South Vietnamese. The effectiveness, the skill, the valor with which they fought far exceeded our expectations. Confidence and morale in the South Vietnamese army has been greatly bolstered. This operation has clearly demonstrated that our Vietnamization program is succeeding.

Third, we have insured the continuance and success of our troop withdrawal program. On April 20, I announced an additional 150,000 Americans would be home within a year. As a result of the success of the Cambodian operations, Secretary Laird has resumed the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. Fifty thousand of the 150,000 I announced on April 20 will now be out by October 15.

As long as the war goes on, we can expect setbacks and some reversals. But, following the success of this effort, we can say now with confidence that we will keep our timetable for troop withdrawals.

Secretary Rogers and I have been particularly encouraged by the resolve of 11 Asian countries at the Djakarta Conference to seek a solution to the problem of Cambodia. Cambodia offers an opportunity for these 11 na-

tions, as well as other countries of the area, to cooperate in supporting the Cambodian government's efforts to maintain Cambodian neutrality, independence and territorial integrity. We shall do what we can to make it possible for these Asian initiatives to succeed.

To the North Vietnamese tonight I say again—the door to a negotiated peace remains wide open. Every offer we have made at the conference table, publicly or privately, I herewith reaffirm. We are ready to negotiate, whenever they are ready to negotiate.

However, if their answer to our troop withdrawal program, and to our offer to negotiate, is to increase their attacks in a way that jeopardizes the safety of our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall, as my action five weeks ago clearly demonstrated, take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation.

As all of you know, when I first announced the decision on Cambodia, it was subjected to an unprecedented barrage of criticism in this country. I want to express tonight my deep appreciation to the millions of Americans who supported me then and who have supported me since in our efforts to win a just peace.

But I also understand the deep divisions in this country over the war. I realize that many Americans are deeply troubled. They want peace. They want to bring the boys home. Let us understand once and for all that no group has a monopoly on those concerns. Every American shares those desires; I share them very deeply.

Our differences are over the best means to achieve a just peace.

As President I have a responsibility to listen to those in this country who disagree with my policies. But I also have a solemn obligation to make the hard decisions which I find are necessary to protect the lives of 400,000 American men remaining in Vietnam.

When I spoke to you a month ago, a clear threat was emerging in Cambodia to the security of our men in Vietnam.

Ask yourselves this question: If an American President had failed to meet this threat to 400,000 American men in Vietnam, would those nations and peoples who rely on America's power and treaty commitments for their security—in Latin America, Europe, the Middle East or other parts of Asia—retain any confidence in the United States? That is why I deeply believe that a just peace in Vietnam is essential, if there is to be a lasting peace in other parts of the world.

With this announcement tonight, we have kept the pledge I made when I ordered this operation, that we would withdraw from Cambodia on a scheduled timetable—just as this Administration has kept every pledge it has made to the American people regarding the war in Vietnam and the return of American troops.

Let us look at the record.

In June of 1969 I pledged a withdrawal of 25,000 troops. They came home. In September of the same year I said I would bring home an additional 35,000. They came home. In December I said an additional 50,000 Americans were coming out of Vietnam. They, too, have come home.

There is one commitment yet to be fulfilled. I have pledged to end this war. I shall keep that promise. But I am determined to end the war in a way that will promote peace rather than conflict throughout the world. I am determined to end it in a way that will bring an era of reconciliation to our people—and not an era of furious recrimination.

In seeking peace, let us remember that at this time only this Administration can end this war and bring peace. We have a program for peace—and the greater the support the Administration receives in its efforts, the greater the opportunity to win that just peace we all desire.

Peace is the goal that unites us. Peace is the goal toward which we are working. Peace

is the goal this government will pursue until the day that we reach it.

Thank you, and good night.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days we have heard some carping and sniping at the President of the United States for going before the American people on television to report to them on a war which divides us all and troubles us all.

I rise in response to that criticism.

We are divided about this war—but God knows the more information and candor we can receive on how it is progressing, on how American troops are doing, the better. A month ago, the President ordered American troops into Cambodia—and last night he presented to the Nation one of the most open and candid assessments of that operation or any operation I have heard. Now what is wrong or partisan or political about that? Do the American people not have the right to know what is going on. Does their elected leader not have the right to go before them to tell them of the success their sons have achieved, when they will be coming out of Cambodia, and when they will be coming home from Vietnam.

I fear that some of the critics of the President's policy on Vietnam have become so acerbic and hostile to this war effort that they have indeed, like Oedipus, blinded themselves. Not only do they reserve the right to attack the President at the time of his decision—they want now to deny him the right to merely describe what has been accomplished; and today of course they are working to tie his hands so that he cannot act freely again in defense of the 400,000 men for whom he is responsible.

Last night's open, candid, forthright report was the President's right—and to the Nation and peoples' benefit—all of them, dissenters as well as supporters. Indeed, both enjoy the right to know and the President has the obligation to tell them.

Let us disagree about policy but not carp about the President's right to communicate freely for 15 minutes with the Nation that elected him to end this Vietnam war.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in these past 4 weeks, we have seen headlines in magazines and newspapers—and heard ponderous voices on radio and television—sloganeering about a "crisis of leadership" in the United States.

How wrong can these pundits be?

President Nixon studied a most complicated problem in Southeast Asia, made a most courageous decision, stuck with it through a storm of violent and mindless criticism, and now has reported success. American lives have been saved. American men are coming home. The end of the war is nearer.

This is leadership. This is the very essence of a great Presidency at work. Can the critics be so blinded that they cannot see this?

What we have, I submit, is a crisis of readership. And I ask all of the pundits who have been thrusting their knives into the back of the President—and into the backs of American fighting men in Southeast Asia—to change their ways and to inform their readers and view-

ers and listeners rather than try to sell their own distorted opinions.

Let us end this crisis of readership.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been a premise of democratic theory that if the people of a nation are properly informed they will usually reach a true and proper judgment. I believe the accuracy of that premise is being demonstrated anew these days in connection with the President's decision to send American troops to clean out Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia. For a majority of the people have continually supported that decision—despite the loud voices of opposition. And every indication is that the President's latest effort to better inform the citizens of the United States concerning the results of the Cambodia action are producing even more strong support for his action.

There is nothing like a little evidence, after all, to dispell all of the abstract doubts and uncertainties which inevitably arise concerning a difficult decision. There is nothing like a little evidence, moreover, to answer critics who have been so active in recent days. And evidence—hard evidence—is what the President presented. He has seen to it that the American public is properly informed—and he has every confidence that they will as a result make even better decisions about the great issues of our time.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, if there is a single virtue which all Americans admire in a man, it is honesty. We like a man who keeps his word, who can be trusted to do what he says.

President Nixon is such a man. When he makes the American people a promise, they can count on it being kept.

President Nixon promised to end this war and bring our boys home. He is keeping that promise. In the last year, over 115,000 men came home from Vietnam; in the next year another 150,000 will join them.

When he announced the attacks on the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia, the President promised that all American forces would be withdrawn from that operation by July 1. He is keeping that promise.

Mr. President, one would assume that frankness of purpose and honesty of speech would characterize all who occupy positions of trust, but unfortunately we know this has not always been the case. It is, therefore, worthy of our notice that the President is such a man, that he is a man of his word. He has earned the confidence of the American people by his courage, by his firmness of purpose, and by his determination to keep his word. He has closed the credibility gap and that, Mr. President, is no small achievement.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, when I turned off my television set last night, after listening to President Nixon's speech on the Cambodia operation, I sat for a moment and then one thought went through my mind: I now thank God the President had the courage and the foresight to move against the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia. Now I have many of the facts he had then,

During these past 4 weeks, when the critics were screaming at our President in a strident and hysterical chorus, I will admit that at times I had some doubts about whether this operation in Cambodia was worth all the bedlam that these shortsighted negativists were stirring up in our country.

But, despite the uproar, despite the abuse, despite the vilification, President Nixon calmly stood his ground.

And now, after 4 weeks, there he was with the hard evidence that his difficult decision had been proven to be right. There he was—calmly, coolly, quietly—saying that he understood the critics but pointing out that the Cambodia operation is an enormous success, that American lives have been saved, that our withdrawal of American troops can proceed and that we can and will turn the war over to the South Vietnamese.

I submit that we have seen one of the great examples of Presidential leadership under the most difficult circumstances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Presidency of the United States has been called the loneliest office in the world. I imagine that it is never more lonely than during the period between the time when a great decision is made and the time when the results of that decision are clear.

The month of May was such a time for President Nixon. He made a tough decision in the closing days of April. He announced that decision on April 30—and then had to sit patiently by while his critics conducted a vigorous attack on his policy. He knew that the most convincing answers to those attacks would come only with time—and he waited confidently until those results vindicated him.

During this interval between the decision and the clear result, a majority of Americans did stand by the President. The President's report on the success of the Cambodian operation indicates that this loyalty was well placed.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with the President's speech last night, not merely because I believe he made a convincing case for the wisdom of his original decision, but because I admire his courage as a man and his determination as a President.

There has been tremendous pressure on the President since he first announced the operation against the Cambodian sanctuaries. Students have staged large, frequently violent, demonstrations. Columnists and commentators have bitterly criticized him, some in rhetoric lacking in restraint and moderation. Some political leaders have seized the occasion to launch a frontal assault upon the President and a flanking attack against the powers of the Presidency. Yet, in spite of all, President Nixon has remained cool, firm, resolute.

Presidents, even great Presidents, are not always correct; but great Presidents are always courageous, firm, determined. It is no small consolation in these troublesome times to know that we have such a President, a man who is moved by logic and reason and not by emotion and passion—a man who does his duty as he understands it without regard to the temporary whims of an aroused minority. I salute him, Mr. President, for his courage,

his honesty, his sense of purpose—all of which were evident to the American people last night.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, for 4 weeks now, we have heard in this land a din of strident criticism of President Nixon's decision to send U.S. forces into Cambodia to clean out the enemy sanctuaries. Last night, the President reported on the overwhelming success of that operation—a success that means American lives saved and American men coming home. It is clear, now, that the critics were wrong.

And so today, I invite those critics—Members of the Congress, journalists, educators, students—to join with the supporters of the President in recognizing genuine Presidential leadership at its best under the most trying conditions.

I do not ask the critics to apologize or even to openly confess error. I simply ask them to examine their own consciences now, and chart their future words and deeds on what is good for their country and not on what relieves their own frustrations.

President Nixon made a most difficult decision. He suffered the most vile of criticism with the greatest restraint. He has been proven right.

Now let us all—for the good of the United States of America—and without recrimination—support our President in his consistent effort to end this war with honor.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon last night laid out for the Nation the success of the Cambodian campaign. At the same time he reiterated his pledge that all American troops will be out of Cambodia by the end of June. In fact, he said, 17,000 already are out.

The President described the operation as "the most successful" of this war. I have no doubt that it is.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has dared and has succeeded. At one bold stroke he has set the enemy back from 6 months to a year. With this one stroke he has turned the South Vietnamese Army into a competent and proud fighting force.

It is evident that he has, in fact insured the success of our plans for an orderly withdrawal through the Vietnamization process.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that through the President's unwavering leadership we have taken a giant stride toward peace. For this, we can all be thankful.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's progress report last night on the Vietnam war was candid, succinct, direct—and most hopeful. Once again he took the American people into his confidence and performed the service of education and leadership.

The President has made clear that he has no intention of widening the war, that he will have American troops out of Cambodia by the end of this month, and that the entire purpose of the Cambodian operation was to shorten the war and our involvement in it, not to lengthen it. For those who may have questioned either the wisdom or the procedures involved in making this decision, I believe we owe it to the President of the United States to take him at his word, and to give him time to implement his full purpose.

I believe that the President should have the support of the American people in his announced objective of ending the war.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, "Peace is the goal that unites us," the President said to a divided nation in his report on the military operations in Cambodia. The details of that report demonstrated clearly that the action in Cambodia has brought the goal of peace closer than it had been before the action was begun. And that means that the cause of national unity has also been served—despite the apparent divisions of the last few weeks.

Because of the success of the Cambodian incursion all U.S. troops will be out of Cambodia by July 1.

Because of the success of the Cambodian incursion another 50,000 U.S. troops will be out of Vietnam by October 15.

Because of the success of the Cambodian incursion still another 100,000 U.S. troops will come out of Vietnam between next October and next June.

All of these benefits give strong and direct answers to the unprecedented barrage of criticism which the President has recently received. The appropriate response of the American people at this point would be to give the President an unprecedented outpouring of support.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to insert their remarks in the RECORD concerning the President's address.

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

There was no objection.

#### CAMBODIA

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, 5 weeks ago when President Nixon made his decision on Cambodia we heard many voices calling his decision a tragic mistake. The job is far from done yet, but I think those who criticized and added to the chaos and turmoil that ensued ought to come up with a new line. After hearing the President's report last night and recognizing the facts as they are, any American must know that the security of 400,000 men in Vietnam and our withdrawal program are in much better shape than they were.

I applaud the President for his courage and wisdom and add my further support to his open invitation to the enemy to come forward to negotiate a just and peaceful end to this difficult war.

#### LEGISLATION TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON SALE OF .22 CALIBER AMMUNITION

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring legislation intended to re-

move the remaining restrictions on the sale of .22 caliber ammunition from the recordkeeping requirements of the 1968 Gun Control Act.

Last year we accepted a Senate amendment to the interest equalization tax bill which repealed certain recordkeeping requirements with respect to the purchases of shotgun ammunition and ammunition suitable for use only in rifles generally available in commerce. Ammunition presently interchangeable between rifles and handguns, such as .22 caliber rimfire ammunition, has continued to be subject to the recordkeeping requirements.

H.R. 9056, a bill I sponsored earlier, would have accomplished the same goals of the Senate amendment to the interest equalization tax bill, with the exception that .22 caliber ammunition, while included in my bill, was not included in the amendment.

I have received numerous complaints from citizens in my district in North Dakota about the Treasury Department's regulations. It does not make sense to require the sportsman in North Dakota to register himself every time he wants to buy a box of .22 caliber ammunition.

The tight restrictions placed upon the American sportsman by the passage of the 1968 Gun Control Act were unfair, unnecessary, and a needless burden. I do not believe that persons buying .22 caliber rimfire ammunition should be subject to registration. It was not the intent of Congress to burden the hunter and sportsman as the present Treasury regulations are doing. We have already acted to remove some of the burdens. Let us now act to remove the restrictions on .22 caliber ammunition.

#### ROBERT F. KENNEDY

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, June 6 marks the second anniversary of the death of Robert F. Kennedy. Two years have passed since that tragedy, and during this period the Nation's fabric, which he sought to mend, has been further torn.

Robert Kennedy understood that a nation off course had to be led in the right direction.

Robert Kennedy believed that our policy in Vietnam was having disastrous consequences for both Vietnam and America.

Robert Kennedy believed that America could not fulfill its promise as long as injustice and prejudice exist.

Robert Kennedy realized the lack of responsiveness of our institutions and our Government to our citizens' needs.

Robert Kennedy acknowledged the crisis in the cities and the need for a reevaluation of our national goals.

Robert Kennedy believed that every American had the right to decent housing, education, health care, transportation, and a suitable living environment.

Robert Kennedy stressed the need to bridge the gap between generations by listening to and hearing our youth.

And Robert Kennedy deplored the violence that he felt was splitting America apart.

If he were alive today, this country might be reaching for some of these goals. It might be moving in the right direction.

But he is dead. The country has lost its way, and the situation today is even more perilous than it was in 1968.

The war in Vietnam continues and has been expanded. If Robert Kennedy had become President, this Nation would have taken the steps necessary to end the conflict long ago. Instead, the Government pursues an illusory military solution to a political problem.

Injustice and prejudice still exist. If Robert Kennedy had become President, this Nation would have had a Government dedicated to enforcing civil rights laws and making equal rights a reality. Instead, the Government has turned its back on civil rights.

Our Government institutions have become no more responsive. If Robert Kennedy had become President, American citizens would be able to communicate with, and be listened to, by their Government. Instead, the Government not only does not hear the people, but Cabinet members find they are unable to reach the President.

The crisis in our cities is still unsolved, and little has been done to help stem the crisis. If Robert Kennedy had become President, the Government would be devoting its resources and energies to the cities and to housing, health, and education needs. Instead, the health, education, and welfare budget is vetoed as inflationary, while massive funds are spent on the SST.

Today, the gap between youth and the Government is wider than ever. If Robert Kennedy had become President, the Government would be listening to what youth is saying, because it would realize that the future cannot, and should not, be ignored. Instead, the leaders of our Government not only do not listen to the voice of youth, but denounce young people through name calling.

And last, violence is as prevalent, if not more so, than in 1968. If Robert Kennedy had become President, we might be living in a country where love and understanding transcended hate and violence. Instead, we are living in a Nation that has seen within the past month, the deaths at Kent State and Jackson State, the beating of peace demonstrators by construction workers in New York, and calls for violence from many segments of our fragmented society.

When Robert Kennedy died, many Americans decided to dedicate themselves to those values for which he stood. Today, 2 years later, that dedication seems all but forgotten.

If America is ever to be the Nation that Robert Kennedy envisioned, we must earnestly rededicate ourselves to picking up the torch where it was dropped 2 years ago, and lighting up our Nation again.

Let us rededicate ourselves by remembering and committing ourselves to his vision. Let the words he spoke the night

that Martin Luther King, Jr., was murdered make the vision clear:

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence or lawlessness, but love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or they be black.

So I shall ask you tonight to return home, to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther King, that's true, but more importantly to say a prayer for our own country, which all of us love—a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.

We can do well in this country. We will have difficult times. We've had difficult times in the past. We will have difficult times in the future. It is not the end of violence; it is not the end of lawlessness; it is not the end of disorder.

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life, and want justice for all human beings who abide in our land.

Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and to make gentle the life of this world.

Let us dedicate ourselves to that, and say a prayer for your country, and our people.

#### THE SITUATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous amount of mail I have received concerning our military moves into Cambodian sanctuaries is an expression of citizen interest unprecedented during my 18 years in the Congress. I am most pleased to have heard from so many northern Virginians, both young and old, and while it has been impossible for me, due to staff limitations, to respond to each individually, I would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm my own views concerning the situation in Southeast Asia for their benefit.

In Congress and in rallies and meetings across the Nation, Americans have argued all aspects of this matter. Many have expressed strong support for the President, but many others have expressed concern about whether he had constitutional authority to move into Cambodia; whether the action would involve expansion of the war; whether it would cause misunderstanding throughout the world; whether it involved needless risk of the lives of American soldiers; whether it would delay bringing American boys home from Vietnam.

President Nixon, in speaking to the Nation last night, has laid many fears to rest. When he took office last year, he inherited a full-scale war in which approximately 542,000 U.S. military personnel were already engaged. The "morality" or "legality" of the war was beside the point, since it already existed and he had to try to bring it to a conclusion without endangering American men fighting it or prisoners of it.

Already 112,000 Americans have been brought home, one out of every four who

were there when he became Commander in Chief. He has done exactly what he said he would do within the timetables he has announced. To reasonable people this fact alone should be ample assurance that he will continue to do what he says.

Last night the President said our military objectives have been achieved in Cambodia, and that as a result of the gains made there 50,000 of the 150,000 men he had promised to bring home by spring will now be home by October 15.

This will mean that by spring force levels will fall below 280,000, almost a 50-percent cut from the high mark, and for all practical purposes we will have withdrawn our combat troops and the forces remaining will be primarily supply and logistics units. We will have disengaged and turned the fighting over to a well-trained, million-man South Vietnamese Army, and our noncombatants also can come home as this army develops its capability to handle the supply and logistics tasks. Anyone remotely familiar with military operations knows these things cannot be accomplished instantly.

All of us want out of this war as fast as possible, the President of the United States most of all. We have differed not about whether to get out, but about how to do it; about the minimum time required to do it without inviting costly consequences.

Those who say we should "cut and run to stop the killing" are silent about what would happen to 11 million South Vietnamese, at least half of whom would be liquidated by the North Vietnamese regime if they got their hands on them. Abandoning them a few short months before the South's capability is developed to prevent a bloodbath would, far from stopping the killing, facilitate it. To do so would make the United States a passive accessory to an act of genocide. And the fate to which it would relegate over 1,500 American prisoners of war is unthinkable.

The President has chosen the alternative of withdrawing in stages while building the South's ability to defend itself. The strategy was endangered when, immediately after his April 20 withdrawal announcement Hanoi ordered 40,000 troops in the sanctuaries to take over most of Cambodia, and particularly to reopen the Port of Sihanoukville through which 80 percent of its munitions used against the lower two-thirds of South Vietnam had reached the sanctuaries until the fall of Prince Sihanouk. Had Hanoi succeeded, an intolerable situation would have stretched for 600 miles along South Vietnam's western border. By our capture of vast amounts of Communist war material, we have prevented Hanoi's troops from carrying out their orders to kill no less than 100 Americans per week from the sanctuaries to keep the political pressure on Washington.

The President's move against the Cambodian sanctuaries was, despite assertions to the contrary, legal both under article 51 of the U.N. Covenant and under international law. Cambodia's inability to enforce its own neutrality gave injured parties the right to take action, and both the United States and South

Vietnam did so and notified the United Nations. This right of action does not depend on a declaration of war, because war is a fact which may legally exist independently of a declaration, and when war exists, declared or undeclared, the rules of war apply. The only illegality in Cambodia is on the part of North Vietnam, which invaded a part of a neutral country and took it for its own use.

The so-called "end the war amendments" are being hailed by some as a means to make the war disappear. Actually they would use the withholding of money as a means to restrict how, when, and where the President can take action to get us out of the mess, and they are extremely dangerous in my opinion. Hamstringing the President cannot possibly speed the end of the fighting, and a lot of men in uniform might easily get killed waiting for Congress to repeal some unwise restrictions on something they might have to do immediately to protect themselves. We can only try to imagine how World War II might have ended if Congress had tried to make such military decisions for Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have all the answers, but I believe the President, who has more information available to him concerning this conflict than any other man, deserves our support in attempting to resolve it. I respect the right of those who disagree with me to their own outlook. If I am in error, I am prepared to change my mind, and I hope all others, regardless of their opinion at the moment would do likewise. The important thing here is ending this war and keeping out of others. Whether we agree or disagree with the way in which the President is attempting to end it, it is of the utmost importance that in any debate and dialog concerning the war we maintain decent respect for our country and its President. It is likewise essential that we never lose sight of the deep and grave responsibility which rests with the Hanoi government for its perpetuation.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. SYMINGTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for June 4, 1970, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following members (at the request of Mr. MYERS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANDALL, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MELCHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. PEPPER, for 60 minutes, on June 9.  
Mr. WOLFF, for 60 minutes, on June 9.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, to extend his remarks following those of Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, to include tables and extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 17868.

Mr. NATCHER, to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee on the Whole today on H.R. 17868 and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT.  
Mr. ROBINO, to revise and extend his remarks in debate on H.R. 17867.

Mr. PERKINS, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WYLIE, to extend his remarks following those of Mr. GROSS during general debate today on H.R. 17887.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), to extend his remarks following those of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN during general debate today on H.R. 17867.

Mr. PASSMAN, during general debate today and to include extraneous matter and tabular material.

Mr. BUCHANAN, during debate on the foreign aid bill in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MYERS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.  
Mr. HASTINGS.  
Mr. RIEGLE.  
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. PELLY.  
Mr. MYERS in two instances.  
Mr. MORSE in two instances.  
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.  
Mr. LANGEN.  
Mr. NELSEN in three instances.  
Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. ROBISON in two instances.  
Mr. MICHEL.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.  
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in three instances.  
Mr. HARSHA in two instances.  
Mr. WHALEN in three instances.  
Mr. LLOYD.  
Mr. BURTON of Utah.  
Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.  
Mr. BUTTON in two instances.  
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.  
Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.  
Mr. RUTH in two instances.  
Mr. HUNT.  
Mr. BOW.  
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.  
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MELCHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MAHON in two instances.  
Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.  
Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
 Mr. HULL.  
 Mr. MONTGOMERY.  
 Mr. FRASER in seven instances.  
 Mr. KYROS.  
 Mr. WALDIE in four instances.  
 Mr. RYAN in six instances.  
 Mr. DINGELL in three instances.  
 Mr. GARMATZ.  
 Mr. JACOBS.  
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.  
 Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.  
 Mr. RARICK in two instances.  
 Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.  
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.  
 Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.  
 Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.  
 Mr. FASCELL in two instances.  
 Mr. McFALL in five instances.  
 Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.  
 Mr. DORN in three instances.  
 Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.  
 Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
 Mr. BINGHAM.  
 Mr. FALLON in two instances.  
 Mr. NEDZI.  
 Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12619. An act to amend section 11 of an act approved August 4, 1950 entitled "An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 8, 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:

2109. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of disbursements made against the appropriation for "Contingencies, Defense" during the period July 1, 1969–March 31, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2110. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract for the provision of facilities and services for the public within the portion of Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area lying within the State of Montana, for a term ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to the provisions of 67 Stat. 271, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2111. A letter from the Chairman, National

Transportation Safety Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Board for 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(g) of the Department of Transportation Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2112. A letter from the president, Communications Satellite Corp., transmitting the annual report of the corporation, pursuant to the provisions of section 404(b), title 4, of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2113. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2114. A letter from the executive vice president, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit of the association, for the year ended March 31, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of 64 Stat. 869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4587. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Indians certain lands in Alpine County, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14984. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142, 359-363, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15866. A bill to repeal the act of August 25, 1959, with respect to the final disposition of the affairs of the Choctaw Tribe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 16416. A bill to reimburse the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 885. An act to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets No. 314, amended, 314-E and 65, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 887. An act to further extend the period of restrictions on lands of the Quapaw Indians, Okla., and for other

purposes; (Rept. No. 91-1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 11833. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1155). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 16327. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WATTS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10517. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1063. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 15361, a bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1158). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 914. Resolution providing for agreeing to the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 4249) to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests and devices (Rept. No. 91-1159). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 976. Resolution to authorize a select committee of the House to study firsthand the recent developments in Southeast Asia and then report its findings to the House of Representatives within thirty days of its adoption; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1160). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 17923. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1161). 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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 13601. A bill to release and convey the reversionary interest of the United States in certain real property known as the McNary Dam Townsite, Umatilla County, Oreg.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1148). 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. BIAGGI:

H.R. 17914. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced in such country from entering the United States un-

lawfully; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 17915. A bill to define the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17916. A bill to investigate, study, and construct a project for flood protection at Quincy, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 17917. A bill to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 17918. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles, articles of leather footwear, and mink skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 17919. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20-percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. HUNT, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. FISHER, Mr. RARICK, Mr. MARSH, Mr. HALL, Mr. BRAY, Mr. FUGUA, Mr. HALEY, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. ALBERT):

H.R. 17920. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SLACK, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. WYATT, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MYERS, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, and Mr. ABBITT):

H.R. 17921. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 17922. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 17923. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 17924. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a delegate to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 17925. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas (for himself and Mr. BUSH):

H.R. 17926. A bill to eliminate the 50-percent fraud penalty against an innocent spouse and to relieve an innocent spouse of the tax liability for stolen or embezzled funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWGER (for himself, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 17927. A bill to improve law enforce-

ment in urban areas by making available funds to improve the effectiveness of police services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 17928. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 17929. A bill to permit expenditures in connection with the provision of certain public improvements or public facilities in the city of Hayward, Calif., to be counted as local grants-in-aid to federally assisted urban renewal projects in the city of Hayward, Calif.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 17930. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Kallispell Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 17931. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 17932. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17933. A bill to adjust the postal revenues and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. PATTEN):

H.R. 17934. A bill to amend section 106 of title 4 of the United States Code relating to State or local taxation of the income of residents of another State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 17935. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans and certain of their dependents; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17936. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 17937. A bill to authorize the use of Federal funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to pay for certain toll roads on that system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 17938. A bill to reduce the salaries of certain officials of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 17939. A bill to aid in controlling inflationary pressures; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 17940. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to establish economic incentives for the return, reuse, and recycling of packing, to reduce the public costs of packaging and other solid waste disposal, to require national standards for controlling the amount and environmental quality of packaging, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 17941. A bill to help prevent pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink, beer, and alcohol containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter, by imposing a tax on such containers (subject to refund in certain cases) when they are filled and sold on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 17942. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain unneeded Federal lands of the Fort Miles Reservation, Del., to the State for public education and park purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 17943. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a more effective program to improve the quality of the Nation's air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 17944. A bill to amend section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 17945. A bill to authorize the lease and transfer of Burley tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 1249. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the advice and consent of both Houses of Congress before any treaty or agreement providing for the commitment of U.S. Armed Forces to a foreign nation may be made; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. Con. Res. 656. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H. Res. 1064. Resolution expressing the sense of the House regarding the combat use of U.S. Armed Forces as an instrumentality of foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 17946. A bill for the relief of Fernando Jesus Ontiveros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 17947. A bill for the relief of Trinidad Trevino-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 17948. A bill for the relief of Konrad Ludwig Staudinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 17949. A bill for the relief of Ieonor Creus Matro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIAL

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

397. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to vehicle license plates, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.