labeling and promotional policies, a study of the First National City Bank of New York's loan practices and trust activities, the economic and sociological influence of Maine's paper and pulp industry (It owns half the land in the state), use of enzymes in household detergents, the nursing home industry, the "corporate responsibility" of the big Du Pont chemical firm, the "quality of medical care dispensed in hospitals," and the influential Washington law firm of Covington and Burling.

Mostly from congressional committee witness chairs, Nader has complained—almost invariably with accuracy that has led to eventual reforms—about fatty hot dogs, unclean fish and poultry, excessive radiation leakage from color TV sets (The Federal Trade Commission has warned viewers to sit back at least six feet) and health dangers of taste-enhancing monosodium glutamate in baby foods (Producers have since stopped using the substance).

In one way or other, Nader and his "Raiders" have taken on and forced changes in a number of government agencies—the Interstate Commerce Commission, Agriculture Department, Food and Drug Administration, air and water pollution agencies, Bureau of Labor Standards, Bureau of Mines, Civil Aeronautics Board and National Railroad Administration.

One group of "Raiders" now is probing into the Justice Department's antitrust division.

Nader has taken on Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, on the effectiveness of anti-pollution efforts and Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., on the wisdom of creating public counsel corporations to represent consumer interests before federal agencies.

As a result of such activities, Nader has become something of a folk hero. He gets more mail than does President Nixon's consumer adviser, Mrs. Virginia Knauer (5,000 letters a month for Nader to 3,800 for Mrs. Knauer). This summer, more than 3,000 students applied for the 200 jobs available at the Responsive Law Center. Already, plans are under way for a bigger staff next year.

The center has published three paperback books stemming from its studies of air pollution, the Interstate Commerce Commission and Food and Drug Administration. Three more are planned this year. Profits will be plowed back into the center's projects and used to hire more "Raiders."

Thus while young radicals storm about the need to change America's bureaucracies and establishments—often relying on demonstrations and even violence to push their demands—Nader and his "Raiders" consistently have shown that change can be brought about by using weapons available to any citizen—the law and the force of public opinion.

"My job," Nader says, "is to bring issues out in the open where they cannot be ignored."

Jacobs says Nader and the Responsive Law Center have proved the "validity of our belief that a professional in America has a responsibility beyond his private client, whether that client be the government or a private organization.

"The professional—the engineer, lawyer, scientist—also has a responsibility to the general public, a responsibility that was being ignored until Nader appeared on the scene," Jacobs adds.

For his part, 36-year-old Nader remains the same slim, ascetic six-footer he was when he first burst on the national scene. He still lives in an $80-a-month furnished room that has no telephone (he uses one in the hall).

He owns no major appliances, no TV set, no car. One reason is that he really doesn't care about material things, another is that he thinks his personal choices might be interpreted as a sign of endorsement.

100 SPEECHES A YEAR

Nader makes about 100 speeches a year, mostly to academic groups, either free or for fees ranging up to $2,500. Most of that income is plowed back into his work.

Nader has two small personal offices in Washington with unlisted telephones. He remains a bachelor. One friend says: "When Ralph marries, the girl will have to be as intensely interested in causes as he is."

The Responsive Law Center now operates on an annual budget of about $250,000. Nader is board chairman; one director is his sister, Laura, a University of California professor and one of the nation's leading anthropologists.

The center's income comes mostly from a half dozen foundations (Carnegie Corp., Stern Family Fund, New York Foundation, Taconic Foundation, New World Foundation and Wallace Eljaber Foundation) and a half dozen individuals who remain anonymous.

Each "Raider" is paid between $500 and $1,000 for a summer's work.

The growing national concern over consumer rights, pollution, safety and the environment has worked, of course, to Nader's advantage.

Even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has criticized "the tardiness of business in responding constructively to consumer gripes."

Nader is not without his critics. Businessmen still puzzle about his motives (GM was so puzzled that it undertook its now-celebrated personal investigation of Nader). They charged Nader with being interested merely in publicity and overly self-righteous.

The New Left doesn't like Nader because he works within the system—and gets results—instead of trying to tear it down. Some politicians don't like Nader because he sometimes gets more publicity and credit than do they.

Like most crusaders, Nader knows how to get and use publicity. He does exaggerate, sometimes for effect and sometimes because of excessive zeal. He has been trapped by hasty accusations, but rarely. In a crowd of strangers, Nader appears painfully shy.

He inevitably is cautious about striking up friendships lest persons try to use him for their own advantage.

But Nader does have a sense of humor and wit. He tells of the day when a "Raider" showed up at the Agriculture Department to have a 20-year employee exclaim, "I've never seen a citizen before."

He insists he is as much an enemy of the funeral industry as Jessica Mitford, but while she wrote a book ("The American Way of Death") "I'm trying to reduce the number of its customers."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, August 4, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever.—Psalms 73:26.

O God, who hast given us minds to think, hearts to love, and hands to work, help us to use our minds to think Thy thoughts, our hearts to love in Thy spirit and our hands to do Thy work according to Thy will. Make us so conscious of Thy presence that amid trials and troubles we may put first things first, grow in sympathetic outreach in our concern for others, and become stronger within ourselves.

Bless the statesmen of our country who give nobility to life and purpose to human destiny; who seek faithfully to protect our land from mortal enemies without and moral weakness within; who make no peace with oppression but are ever seeking the way to justice and peace among the nations of the world.

So guide us and sustain us in all our ways this day and every day. In the spirit of Him who is the Lord of life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Capt. Melvin A. Kaye.

H.R. 1697. An act for the relief of Jack Brown.

H.R. 1703. An act for the relief of the Clayton County Journal and Wilber Harris.

H.R. 1728. An act for the relief of Capt. Norman W. Stanley.

H.R. 2209. An act for the relief of Carlo DeMarco.

H.R. 2241. An act for the relief of John T. Anderson.

H.R. 2407. An act for the relief of Elbert C. Moore.

H.R. 2458. An act for the relief of Frank J. Enright.

H.R. 2481. An act for the relief of Cmdr. John W. McCord.

H.R. 2950. An act for the relief of Edwin E. Fulk.

H.R. 3558. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Smith.

H.R. 3723. An act for the relief of Robert G. Smith.

H.R. 5337. An act for the relief of the late Albert E. Jameson, Jr.

H.R. 6375. An act for the relief of Amalia P. Montero.

H.R. 6377. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Earl Spofford Brown, U.S. Army Reserve, retired.

H.R. 6850. An act for the relief of Major Clyde Nichols, retired.

H.R. 9092. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Condon.

H.R. 9591. An act for the relief of Elgie L. Tabor.

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Walter L. Parker.

H.R. 11890. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Peter Elias Gianutsos, U.S. Air Force, retired.

H.R. 21176. An act for the relief of Bly D. Dickson, Jr.

H.R. 12622. An act for the relief of Russell L. Chandler.

H.R. 12887. An act for the relief of John A. Avdeef.

H.R. 15118. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Ohio Northern University.

H.R. 15354. An act for the relief of Anthony P. Miller, Inc.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8470. An act for the relief of Capt. Jackie D. Burgess.

H.R. 11833. An act 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.

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program.

FARM BILL

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to report to the House that the whip check on the Democratic side shows very substantial support, majority support, of the farm bill which will be brought up here today.

I am very curious about the other side of the aisle. Yesterday word came that there was great confusion at the White House about the farm bill—and I am not surprised about the White House confusion. Then I am told that the White House today supports the farm bill. Now I am told that there was a great conference here this morning of the Republican Members and I think it would be enlightening if the minority leader would tell us what his party's position is.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to tell the gentleman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman. I want some information.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The President has from the very beginning supported the bill reported by the committee, the Poage-Belcher bill.

The President has sent a letter to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) which the gentleman will read to the House during the debate on the farm bill.

Mr. BOGGS. What does it say about the $55,000 limitation?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The letter will speak for itself. The gentleman from Michigan is going to support the farm bill as recommended by the Committee on Agriculture—the Poage-Belcher farm bill, and I am going to say so during general debate.

Mr. BOGGS. I understand the gentleman's position—that is his own position. Will the gentleman be good enough to tell me what the President's position is on the $55,000 limitation?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Oklahoma may do so if he is on the floor.

Mr. BOGGS. He is on the floor.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The letter is from the President of the United States to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER).

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Oklahoma is on the floor and he can speak for himself right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am very delighted to hand the gentleman the letter.

Mr. BOGGS. That is fine. I thank the gentleman very much. I want to look at the $55,000 limitation—it is not in here.

Mr. BELCHER. Read the letter.

Mr. BOGGS. Where is it?

Mr. BELCHER. Can you not read it?

Mr. BOGGS. No; I cannot read it.

Mr. BELCHER. Here it is—$55,000."

Mr. BOGGS. Oh, now we have it. It says:

Secretary Hardin and a bipartisan majority of your Committee therefore recommend $55,000 as the limitation. I am aware of the widespread desire for a much lower figure——

Mr. BELCHER. So—you have not read it all.

Mr. BOGGS. And it continues—

and it is easy to share that desire.

I understand that—he is on both sides. Thank you very much.

NEW FARM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 18546, the new farm legislation, has been receiving considerable attention throughout the Nation and in the Nation's press. On July 23, the Memphis Press-Scimitar had an editorial entitled, "Farm Bill Shenanigans." This editorial attacked the $55,000 farm payment limitation agreed upon by the House Agriculture Committee and argued instead for a $20,000 limitation.

On July 24, Mr. C. L. Denton, Jr., who operates a farming and ginning operation at Ryronza, Ark., replied to the Memphis Press-Scimitar's editorial. His letter discussed in a very rational, informed, and experienced manner the economics facing today's farmers.

As we prepare to begin consideration of the farm legislation, I want to share both this editorial and Mr. Denton's reply because I believe this information deserves the consideration of every Member of the House as we begin consideration of this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the editorials in the Extensions of Remarks today for the information of the Members.

THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the majority whip did not yield to me. I am sorry he is not present in the chamber at this time, because I would like to direct a question to him. When we get into the amendment stage of consideration of the farm bill, I shall offer an amendment, together with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) providing for a limitation of $20,000 per crop rather than $55,000 per crop. I would like to know where the gentleman from Louisiana stands on that amendment, and how he stands as the majority whip, if he is going to get some votes over there. They have the votes. They have the majority of the Congress, and they can help us greatly to put this limitation of $20,000 in the bill.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Though the majority whip may speak for himself, I am sure he is for the $55,000 limitation, I wish to express myself also as in favor of the $55,000 limitation. We are opposed to the $20,000 limitation. We hope the gentleman does not succeed in his efforts to have such an amendment adopted.

Mr. CONTE. I am pleased to hear where the gentleman stands on that question, because this amendment for $55,000 is the biggest farce the House could ever pass. This will save the taxpayers $48 million without slippage, and with slippage it will save the taxpayers zero. It would further help out the rich farmers in this country, across this land. If this Congress is interested in stopping inflation—and Members have made a lot of speeches on the floor of the House—one way to help stop inflation is to stop paying out these large payments to farmers across the country.

My amendment will save $170 million. It will contain language that will prevent farm splitting, which I understand some farmers have already done. If you want to do a service for this country, if you are sincere in the fight on inflation—and we have heard a lot of talk in the well of the House on that subject—stand up there and fight with me today for the little man in this country.

THE EFFECT OF THE SST ON OUR ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, at the conclusion of a month-long seminar at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a group of the Nation's leading scientists called for a halt to the SST program because of possible harmful effect on the world's environment. They declared that regular stratospheric flights by supersonic aircraft could cause an increase in cloud formation and higher stratospheric pollution with consequences that are unpredictable.

Mr. Speaker, there has been such a hurry to build the SST that almost no thought has been given to what may happen in consequence to our environment. The MIT scientists are to be congratulated. They have performed a most valuable service in raising a warning flag of possible permanent damage to the world's environment.

The SST will be a major contributor

toward building pollution in three ways. The first way is in the one described by the MIT scientists in pointing out that regular stratospheric flights by supersonic aircraft could cause an increase in cloud formation and higher stratospheric pollution with temperature changes.

The second method of pollution is through the incredible airport noise it will generate. As has been testified before congressional committees, the noise at take-off made by the SST will be equivalent to 50 subsonic jets taking off at the same time.

Finally, its new and powerful engines will emit a greater amount of pollution than present subsonic jet engines. Contrary to the impression sought to be given by the Department of Transportation that the SST will have cleaner engines than other aircraft, it now appears that the contrary will be true, that the pollutants discharged per passenger mile will be 1.5 times greater than the 707 and as much as 1.9 times greater than the 747. The plumes of smoke that now follow jet aircraft may no longer be emitted by the new engines, but the carbon monoxide, the water vapor, and the carbon dioxide will each be increased.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

JOSE LUIS CALLEJA-PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1747) for the relief of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez.

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

H.R. 1747

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Luis Calleja-Perez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Jose Luis Calleja-Perez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. ANTHONY S. MASTRIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15760) for the relief of Dr. Anthony S. Mastrian.

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

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

There was no objection.

ATKINSON, HASERICK & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10534) for the relief of Atkinson, Haserick & Co., Inc.

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

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

There was no objection.

CLAUDE G. HANSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13807) for the relief of Claude G. Hansen.

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

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

There was no objection.

JOHN R. GOSNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13469) for the relief of John R. Gosnell.

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

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

There was no objection.

CAL C. DAVIS AND LYNDON A. DEAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2427) for the relief of Cal C. Davis and Lyndon A. Dean.

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

S. 2427

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Cal C. Davis and Lyndon A. Dean, of Salt Lake City, Utah, are relieved of all liability for payment to the United States of the sum of $12,441.87, representing cash and stamps in their custody as superintendent and clerk, respectively, of the Granger-Hunter Branch of the Salt Lake City Post Office, which were taken from such branch in a burglary occurring the night of March 17, 1966. In the audit and settlement of the accounts relative to such sum, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Cal C. Davis and Lyndon A. Dean the sum of any amounts received or withheld from them on account of the loss referred to in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of any amount appropriated by this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same is unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of this section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed $1,000.

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

SAMUEL R. STEPHENSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10704) for the relief of Samuel R. Stephenson.

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

H.R. 10704

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Samuel R. Stephenson (Serial Number AF 1474–1025) of Bessemer, Alabama, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $336.51, representing the total amount of overpayments of various allowances and other benefits made to him by the Department of the Air Force during the period beginning June 19, 1962, and ending April 30, 1968, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Samuel R. Stephenson an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$336.51" and insert "$447.59".

Page 2, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

DAVID L. KENNISON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15272) for the relief of David L. Kennison.

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

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

There was no objection.

GEORGE F. MILLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15415) for the relief of George F. Mills.

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

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

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF H.R. 1390 TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called House Resolution 108, referring H.R. 1390 to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

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

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

There was no objection.

THOMAS J. BECK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4982) for the relief of Thomas J. Beck.

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

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

There was no objection.

OK YON (MRS. CHARLES G.) KIRSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4670) for the relief of Ok Yon (Mrs. Charles G.) Kirsch.

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

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

There was no objection.

MAUREEN O'LEARY PIMPARE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12962) for the relief of Maureen O'Leary Pimpare.

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

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

There was no objection.

MARIA DE CONCEICAO BOTELHO PEREIRA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12990) for the relief of Maria de Conceicao Botelho Pereira.

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

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

There was no objection.

VINCENZO PELLICANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13712) for the relief of Vincenzo Pellicano.

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

H.R. 13712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vincenzo Pellicano may be issued visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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

ANAN ELDREDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2849) for the relief of Anan Eldredge.

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

H.R. 2849

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anan Eldredge shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Louis and June Eldredge, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 line 8 after the words "of such" strike out the word "parentage," and insert in lieu thereof the word *"relationship,"*.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. MARCELLA COSLOVICH FABRETTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13383) for the relief of Mrs. Marcella Coslovich Fabretto.

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

H.R. 13383

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act the periods of time Mrs. Marcella Coslovich Fabretto resided in the United States since December 21, 1955, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

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

VERNON LOUIS HOBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1087) for the relief of Vernon Louis Hoberg.

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

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

There was no objection.

ROSA PINTABONA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1703) for the relief of Rosa Pintabona.

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

S. 1703

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

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

LILLIAN BIAZZO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1704) for the relief of Lillian Biazzo.

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

S. 1704

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lillian Biazzo shall be deemed to be a returning resident alien within the meaning of section 101(a)(27)(B) of that Act.

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

MRS. CUMORAH KENNINGTON ROMNEY

The Clerk read the bill (S. 2863) for the relief of Mrs. Cumorah Kennington Romney.

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

S. 2863

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 201(g) of the Nationality Act of 1940, Mrs. Cumorah Kennington Romney shall be held and considered to have been residing in the United States for a period of five years after attaining the age of sixteen years.

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

MARGARITA ANNE MARIE BADEN (NGUYEN TAN NGA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2976) for the relief of Margarita Anne Marie Baden (Nguyen Tan Nga).

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

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

There was no objection.

TO CONFER U.S. CITIZENSHIP POSTHUMOUSLY UPON GUY ANDRE BLANCHETTE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3136) to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Guy Andre Blanchette.

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

S. 3136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, Guy Andre Blanchette, a native of Sainte Garard, Quebec, Canada, who served honorably in the United States Army from May 13, 1968, until his death on August 26, 1969, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1062 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1062

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 11, 1971, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1970 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1970, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Ninety-first Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of the subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 11, 1971, as hereinabove provided.

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Speaker, this is the biennial special committee to investigate campaign expenditures. Normally the first thing the committee does when it is in operation is to compile a list of the State and Federal laws dealing with campaign contributions and expenditures and the judicial interpretation of relevant statutes. This booklet is sent to every candidate for Congress in the United States. When the campaigns start functioning, Mr. Speaker, we receive many requests for information and many complaints about violations of these laws. We insist that these complaints be in writing and under oath. Such complaints, when received, are investigated when the facts that are set out in the complaint justify such an investigation.

After the reports come back from the investigators, the committee meets and we decide whether or not we should have hearings to further examine and determine the case. This year, Mr. Speaker, we expect many more complaints than we have had in the past. For the first time in history there have been 17 indictments under the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. There is a rigorous enforcement of this act, and there has never been enforcement of it in the past.

Since the last time the committee functioned, the Committee on the Code of Ethics for the House has been in existence, and the acceptable action of Congressmen is more clearly defined than in the past.

Then also, Mr. Speaker, we have this year the Reorganization Act, and we have the Voting Rights Act, and it is expected that there will be a predominance of "squeak" elections in which the losers may challenge the election.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, this committee was authorized to spend $50,000. Actually, we spent $24,385.85, less than 50 percent of the money. I appeared before the Committee on House Administration this morning and asked for a budget of

$70,000, which I hope will be approved some day later in the week. The reason for that is, as I say, that we expect many more cases than we have had in the past. The regular staff of the committee is traditionally a small one, with a majority counsel and a minority counsel, and two or three secretaries, but we do have to have additional investigators. The more challenges and complaints, the more people and time must be devoted to conducting investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the resolution is adopted.

I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the same resolution, word for word, that has been passed many times here in the House of Representatives during previous elections. It has been adequately explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) who heads up this committee.

I urge the adoption of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 254]

Anderson, Tenn.	Evins, Tenn.	Pelly
Ashley	Fallon	Pepper
Aspinall	Flynt	Pollock
Baring	Fulton, Tenn.	Powell
Blanton	Gallagher	Quillen
Bolling	Giaimo	Randall
Brock	Gilbert	Rarick
Broomfield	Gray	Rees
Burleson, Tex.	Griffiths	Riegle
Burton, Utah	Hagan	Rostenkowski
Cabell	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Caffery	Hébert	Ruppe
Camp	Hull	Ryan
Carey	Hungate	Scheuer
Casey	Ichord	Shriver
Celler	Jarman	Stafford
Chappell	King	Stuckey
Chisholm	Leggett	Symington
Clark	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Lujan	Thompson, Ga.
Conyers	Lukens	Thompson, N.J.
Cramer	McDonald, Mich.	Tiernan
Cunningham	McEwen	Tunney
Daddario	MacGregor	Weicker
Dawson	Meskill	Wilson, Charles H.
Dent	Moorhead	Winn
Diggs	Nelsen	Wright
Dingell	O'Hara	Young
Edwards, La.	Ottinger	
Erlenborn	Patman	

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

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

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1165) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18546) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1165

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18546) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the provisions contained in title VII and on page 54, line 10 through page 55, line 14 of said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideraiton of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1165 provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 18546, the Agricultural Act of 1970. The bill is to be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections and all points of order are waived against the provisions contained in title VII and on page 54, line 10 through page 55, line 14 of the bill. Points of order are waived against title VII, which is a 3-year extension of Public Law 480, because it continues the availability of foreign currencies without appropriation, in violation of clause 4, rule 21. Points of order are waived against the language on pages 54 and 55 of the bill because it contains a transfer of funds.

H.R. 18546 is a 3-year program to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The bill establishes an annual ceiling of $55,000 per crop on payments to producers of upland cotton, wheat, and feed grains.

The bill clarifies and reaffirms authority for base excess and seasonal plans and extends and amends the authority for the dairymen's class I base plan in Federal milk market order areas. It guarantees competitive access to class I base plan markets by established producers outside the market order area. Operation of the mandatory butterfat price-support program for farm-separated cream is suspended and the Secretary is permitted to set lower price-support prices on butter. Dairy products owned by the CCC may be donated to the armed services and veterans' hospitals. The Secretary's authority is extended to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers whose milk is contaminated by and condemned because of pesticides.

The National Wool Act is extended through December 31, 1973, and the present incentive prices for shorn wool and mohair are continued for each year.

The bill suspends the marketing quota program for wheat for 1971, 1972, and 1973 and domestic marketing certificates are provided to farmers participating in the set-aside program in an amount equal to U.S. food consumption.

A voluntary feed grain program is established for 1971, 1972, and 1973, which provides that price support payments to participating farmers on one-half their feed grain base will be the difference between not less than $1.35 a bushel for corn and the average market price for the first 5 months of the marketing year—which starts on October 1 on corn and grain sorghum, and July 1 on barley. However, no payments would be less than 32 cents a bushel for corn, with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley.

In the wheat program and the feed grain program additional set-aside and public recreational access payments are authorized; a set-aside program is established; and preliminary payments are provided.

A guaranteed support on upland cotton of 35 cents a pound is provided on the estimated production from 11.5 million acres for the 1971 crop and an equivalent amount for the 1972 and 1973 crops. Assistance is made available to participating farmers through loans and payments. The legislation allows the sale of cotton allotments within a State, permits the lease of allotments within a State, and provides for the release and reapportionment of allotments during the 3-year life of the legislation.

Public Law 480 is extended without change.

Long-term land retirement programs, "Cropland Conversion" and "Greenspan" are continued at an authorized appropriation level of $10 million annually for each program. The current exemption for marketing quotas for boiled peanuts is continued. Those who do not desire to hold an allotment on any crop under a Government program would be permitted to voluntarily relin-

quish it. An indemnity program is established to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticides.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1165 in order that this comprehensive bill may be considered.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. To what does the waiver of points of order apply? What is sought to be protected in the bill?

Mr. SISK. That has to do with Public Law 480. Actually, points of order are waived as to the language on pages 54 and 55 of the bill. This, as my friend understands, is not a complete waiver but only of that language on pages 54 and 55 of the bill dealing with certain transfer funds.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, as one deeply interested in the welfare of our Nation's farm families, it is needless for me to say that I am pleased to bring this rule to the floor today. It makes in order the consideration of the Agricultural Act of 1970, and provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate. An open rule will permit Members of the House to offer any and all germane amendments and will permit the House to work its will on these amendments.

Before discussing some of its provisions, permit me to make a few comments concerning the evolution of this bill. In years past, the Secretary of Agriculture—as a representative of the administration in control of the White House—would send a farm bill to the Congress and then spend considerable time trying to convince the agriculture committees and the Congress that the answer to our farm problems could come only through the passage of the legislation recommended by him. When one considers the fact that we have suffered the almost unbelievable loss of 3.6 million farming units in the United States since 1935, and that corn and wheat are bringing less on the market today than they did in 1950, one must surely conclude—to put it mildly—that these farm programs should have done more for the farmer rather than so much to him.

The bill to be considered under this rule is different, at least, in one respect. It did not originate in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture. It was truly formulated and drafted by the Committee on Agriculture. It is true that the Committee on Agriculture did have the benefit of the counsel and advice of the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee informed the Rules Committee that his committee had some 27 night meetings with the Secretary of Agriculture before this bill finally evolved. It was then approved by a 27-to-6 vote in the House Committee on Agriculture.

Notwithstanding some of my reservations concerning the ability of certain provisions of this bill to increase farm income, I wish to commend the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, its ranking member and the other members of the committee for the many weeks they spent in producing this bill. Mr. Speaker, it was rumored for weeks that a new farm bill would not be forthcoming, and that the farm programs now in effect would be permitted to expire at the end of this year. I am glad these rumors were unfounded. Such a course of action would have caused a sharp drop in farm income. In the interests of time, I will mention what would happen to only two of these crops without this bill in order to prove my point.

FEED GRAINS

The authorization for the acreage diversion and direct payment features of the present feed grain program would expire. There would be no direct payments and no restrictions on feed grain acreage. The Secretary of Agriculture would be required to support the price of corn between 50 and 90 percent of parity, but would be precluded from using any support prices which would increase wheat CCC stocks.

WHEAT

The Secretary of Agriculture would lack authority to carry out the wheat certificate plan without first obtaining a favorable vote in a producer referendum. Marketing quotas would be in effect as proclaimed by the Secretary and approved by two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum. If quotas were approved, the certificate plan also would be in effect. The value of domestic certificates would be the difference between the loan rate and a support level of not less than 65 percent and not more than 90 percent of parity. There would be no diversion payments, but there would be a land use penalty for failure to make mandatory acreage diversions. Should wheat producers vote to disapprove marketing quotas, there would be no quotas, land use penalties or wheat certificates. Price support would be available to producers who comply with their allotments at 50 percent of parity.

Mr. Speaker, when one fully understands what would happen if these programs are permitted to expire, the need for the passage of new farm legislation in this Congress really comes into focus.

Mr. Speaker, this committee bill contains dairy, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other titles, as well as extends Public Law 480. I am particularly interested in the dairy, wool, wheat, and feed grain titles as they are so important to Ohio agriculture in general and to the farmers in my district in particular. Briefly, here is what these titles provide:

DAIRY

Extends and amends the authority for the dairymen's class I base plan in Federal milk market order areas. It specifically guarantees competitive access to class I base plan markets by established producers outside the market order area. Appeal procedures under present law remain unchanged.

Suspends the operation of the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm-separated cream and permits the Secretary to set lower support prices on butter.

Extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by CCC to the armed services and veterans hospitals.

Extends the Secretary's authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who through no fault of their own have their milk contaminated by and condemned because of the presence of pesticides and residues.

WOOL

Extends the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, through December 31, 1973.

Continues the present incentive price of 72 cents per pound for shorn wool and 80.2 cents per pound for mohair for each year of the extension.

WHEAT

Suspends the marketing quota program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

Provides domestic marketing certificates to farmers participating in the set-aside program in an amount equal to U.S. food consumption—about 530 million bushels annually.

Sets the face value of these domestic certificates at the difference between the wheat parity price—currently $2.82 per bushel—and the average price received by farmers during the first 5 months of the wheat marketing year—which starts on July 1.

Provides for a preliminary payment to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. This payment would be the amount estimated by the Secretary to be 75 percent of the value of the domestic certificate. The balance of the payment—if any—would be paid in December. If the Secretary's estimate were too high, no refunds by farmers would be required.

Continues the cost of certificates to wheat processors at 75 cents per bushel.

Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans to participating farmers from zero to 100 percent of the parity price for wheat.

Establishes a "set aside" program under which wheat farmers, in order to be eligible for loans, certificates, and payments under the program, must set aside or divert from the production of wheat and other crops an acreage determined by the Secretary.

Authorizes payments to participating farmers for any additional set-aside acreage and for permitting public recreational access.

FEED GRAINS

Establishes a voluntary feed grain—that is corn, grain sorghum, and barley—program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

Provides that price support payments to participating farmers on one-half of their feed grain base will be the difference between not less than $1.35 per bushel—for corn—and the average market price for the first 5 months of the marketing year—which starts on October 1 on corn and grain sorghum and July 1 on barley. In no event, however, would these payments be less than 32 cents per bushel for corn—with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley.

Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans at 0 to 90 percent of feed grain parity prices.

Authorizes additional set-aside and public recreational access payments.

Establishes a "set-aside" program under which participating farmers would be required to set aside or divert feed grain or other cropland in order to become eligible for feed grain loans and payments.

Provides for a preliminary payment of 32 cents per bushel on corn to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. If the difference between the average market price and $1.35 were more than 32 cents during the first 5 months of the marketing year, an additional payment would be made. In no event would refunds by farmers be required.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding some of the statements which have been made concerning the ability of this new legislation to maintain farm income, I would like to see some amendment made during the consideration of this bill, which will make certain that farm income is not only maintained but increased. Our farmers are suffering from the inflation in this country as much or more than any other group and to fail to provide for an increase in his income would be extremely unfair. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the amendments which will be offered to make certain that our farmers receive the additional income to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. I rise to bring up a couple of questions about the rule as well as some questions I have about the possibility of error in the language of the bill.

The rule provides for reading the bill by title instead of by section. This is not an unprecedented procedure. Am I correct that in reading the bill by title the members of the committee can expect that the complete language of each title will be read and that we simply will not be hearing "Title I" and then that will be the end of the reading of the title? Am I correct on that point, that it is contemplated each title will be read in full? Does anyone have an answer on that?

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

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I think the rule is very clear. This is not unprecedented but a common practice, to let the rule be read by title. As to whether or not each title would be read in its entirety would be up to the House. I would assume, as we sometimes do, we may have a unanimous-consent request to consider a title or section as read and open to amendment at any point.

It will be considered by title and it will be read, or a unanimous-consent request will be made, which in essence is tantamount to having it read.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, on pages 13 and 29 and 46 are provisions that strike me as very likely errors in the language of the bill. I wonder if the Committee on Rules had any indication from those who testified that there are substantial mistakes in the language of the bill, which will have to be corrected?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, again if the gentleman will yield, so far as the Committee on Rules, we have no information as to any errors, grammatical or otherwise, in connection with the bill. There was no reference made to such errors. Therefore we are not knowledgeable in the Committee on Rules as to any errors of this type.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I favor this "rule," because for 10 years now, I have sat in these Chambers listening to, and ofttimes participating in, debate about what is good and what is bad for the American farmer. It has been alluded to today. Although I do not criticize past programs and agricultural policies, I do suggest that they have been and are inadequate. From where I sit, in a rural district, it appears that in all these years we have accomplished little more than to pass a series of temporary stopgap measures, which in turn begat more temporary stopgap measures. I think it is time we set aside this type of thinking and put our collective minds to the task of dealing with the basic problem.

Farm legislation annually concerns itself with dollars going to farmers as the final goal. I contend that the final goal should be agricultural values, bought with dollars for the benefit of both the farmer and the consumer. In place of just dollars spent, it should be dollars buying the solution to the problem.

Farm legislation has traditionally been guided by averages. We are inundated with—the average farmer, average income, average food needs for people, average acres per farm, whereas our thrust should be directed to individual farmers, acres, soil, and consumers.

Last year a publication produced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "Agriculture Situation" stated that 17.2 percent of the consumer's income—after taxes—went for food. A record low. A commendable achievement, and one I am told has no equivalent anywhere in the world or history. I am told that by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. It is easy to agree that this low percentage was brought about by a combination of many good things: Farm programs, county agents, research, machinery—including rubber-tired tractors—insect and weed sprays, fertilizers, hybrid seeds, farm journals, and many other items, all involved in helping the farmers produce. However, let us not neglect to turn the coin over and look at the other side.

We find that parity of income for farmers, promised for more than 35 years is still unattainable. In fact, 2 years ago it was at an all time low.

We find surplus agricultural products that no one wants to buy at a fair price.

We find that thousands of farmers have left the land. Low income farmers have not been helped.

We find that small "family" farms are fast disappearing.

We find that rural communities are beginning to show a higher level of true poverty.

What has caused this to happen? I contend that it is the end result of paying too low a price per acre—for lowering the production of the small farmer without increasing the price for his products.

It is my considered judgment, therefore, that any farm legislation enacted by the Congress should have a threefold objective:

First. To provide an abundance of good food at a reasonable cost to the consumer.

Second. To preserve and restore the potential of the farm land.

Third. To give farmers the opportunity to earn a fair parity of income for their efforts.

In order to accomplish these objectives, I offer as the key, a proposal that I call the "second market."

The "second market" will give to the farmer the option to produce food or fiber on his land, or take that land out of what I will term "normal production," and produce on it instead a crop that would retain or enhance the value of that land. Such a "restoration" crop could be—cover for wild life, land beautification, sweet clover to be plowed under—any number of items that would tend to make scientific use of the unused land until it is ready, at the option of the farmer, to be placed back into "normal" production again. The farmer would be encouraged, by a predetermined payment, to take acres out of production based on supply and demand of the local conditions of price, cost, and yield—in other words, an open marketplace under the law of supply and demand. In addition should he, for example, build a farm pond to be used for irrigation, one approved by the Soil Conservation Service, he would receive a bonus payment from the ASCS. We would be paying a reward for contributing to the enhancement of the land and soil, not placing it in a "soil bank" to lay idle and deteriorate.

Later, when the farmer would—by his own determination—decide that the conditions were right, he could voluntarily move those "restored" acres back into production to help feed and clothe the 95 percent of our population that is not involved in producing for the whole, and at the same time, be paid a parity price for so doing.

The effect would be:

First the Government would be out of the business. It would instead be in the business of restoration and protection of vital food producing God-given resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Second, supply and demand, cooperative buying and selling, even collective bargaining, and all other various farm organization objectives are not interferred with.

To the cotton farmer: We would not pay you not to grow cotton, we will pay you for restoring the land that you will voluntarily not grow cotton on. The same for wheat, corn, and so on right down the line.

For the Nation as a whole, the results would be:

Surplus control managed by the farmers, voluntarily.

Abundance assured in steady, nutritious supply at a reasonable price for the consumer.

Net profit for the farmer is assured at or above the parity of income level.

The Nation is assured of a permanent potential in case of emergencies for the production of food and fiber by a constant program of soil and water restoration.

Past and present farm programs are not adequate to reach these objectives at the same time. In their workings, abundance is associated with low prices. They have no control over the effects on the people or on the resources of soil and water when farming is done as we now do it. The success of present-day agriculture, as measured by the abundance we now have, is reduced by a considerable amount when we must also admit the high percentages of rural poverty, the loss of water and soil resources, the contamination of wells and streams, the possible accumulation of poisons in foods and drinking water, the destruction of wildlife and the beginning of malnutrition and hunger.

All these are signs of the failure of agriculture—Government plans and formulas. We must dedicate ourselves to turning the minus signs into pluses for all mankind.

It is not only a farm problem, Mr. Speaker, not only one of agribusiness, but one for the consumer. The end product of food and fiber stuff is human bodies. In our present and in the immediately foreseeable delicate balance of nature we must get right along with this job. Here is an admitted solution. Let us work the plan.

At the proper time I shall move a substitute for titles III through VI of the committee farm bill in the form of an amendment, which—my Seventh Missouri Farm Advisory Council, and I—have developed over a period of years as a result of the book, "Our Balance of Nature," by master farmer, agronomist, and conservationist, E. M. "Gene" Poirot, and second, as a result of demonstrated farm products which we have shown to the Committee on Agriculture, with respect to which they journeyed to the district I am privileged to represent, in order to investigate. They know they will work to this very end, and finally to a solution to the problem with which we are all concerned.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

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

ANNUAL FARM SUBSIDY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today the House again considers the annual $3½ billion farm subsidy.

Last year, this House curtailed this subsidy "Bonanza" to the large corporation farms to a $20,000 annual limitation. When the bill was taken up in the Senate that body defeated the $20,000 limitation.

Three weeks ago, the Senate acted on the 1970 version of this legislation and upheld the House action of 1 year ago by limiting the annual rural subsidy to $20,000.

I do hope that the House will repeat its action of 1 year ago and also uphold the Senate's action of 3 weeks ago and save the American taxpayers millions of dollars by again limiting this annual rural subsidy to $20,000.

Our greatest newspaper in the Middle West during the last week has come out strongly in favor of the $20,000 limitation.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 1, 1970, the Chicago Tribune had a very interesting and highly informative article which further reveals additional reasons why the American farmers should be aroused by the fabulous sums paid to several thousand farm operations for idle acres.

The vast majority of Members of Congress are very much in favor of a reasonable subsidiary to aid farmers economically, but we should confine it to the smaller-sized farms which are really the backbone of our agricultural system.

I submit in the RECORD the article in the Chicago Tribune for the Members' information:

NIXON RENEGED ON PROMISE: FARM BUREAU

(By Richard Orr)

The nation's biggest farm organization yesterday accused the Nixon administration of reneging on campaign promises to support new legislation designed to improve farmers' income from the market place and make them less dependent on federal subsidies.

Instead, the American Farm Bureau Federation charged, the administration is promoting a "patched up version of present unsatisfactory" laws to continue cash subsidies to farmers at current rates of about $3.7 billion annually.

The federation urged defeat of the legislation, scheduled to come before the House next week. The legislation, it said, is not supported by a single major farm organization.

RECALLS PROMISE

"In the campaign of 1968, President Nixon promised to change the direction of government farm policy," said Charles B. Shuman, federation president, in a statement issued from headquarters in the Merchandise Mart.

"In spite of this promise, the farm bill developed by his secretary of agriculture, Clifford Hardin, and Rep. Bob Poage (D., Tex.), chairman of the House Agriculture committee, is a camouflaged extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. . . .

"The legislation before Congress with administration support most certainly would increase the farmer's dependence on government payments for his income."

LISTS OTHER OBJECTIONS

Shuman also charged:

1. That altho Nixon promised to end the "dumping" of government-owned surplus crops on the market to depress farm prices, the proposed bill would continue the government's authority to do so.

2. That the bill ignores the problem of low income farmers and other rural people, despite Nixon's pledge of new rural development programs to provide "major improvements in the opportunities and quality of rural life."

"BANKRUPT STRATEGY"

"The apparent intention of the Nixon administration is to attempt to please the vested interests that have learned to profit from present farm programs by continuing to keep farmers dependent on subsidy payments as a substitute for market prices," Shuman said. "This is a bankrupt strategy; the administration cannot afford to take farmers for granted."

The Farm Bureau is backing another bill that would phase out subsidies on wheat, feed grains and cotton over a five-year period, with the aid of a massive crop land retirement program, while establishing a permanent price support system. The bill also authorizes retraining and other programs for low-income farmers who want to get out of farming and find employment elsewhere.

The Farm Bureau has the support of 20 senators and 40 members of the House, including three Illinois Rpublicans—Senators Smith and Percy and Rep. Paul Findley.

The Chicago Tribune, a newspaper that is consistently supporting all activities of the present administration, is very much alarmed regarding the pending farm bill which we are now considering on the floor of the House. This great daily newspaper is joining all the various farm organizations, especially the wheat and feed grain producing areas, in opposition to the pending farm bill. On Monday, August 3, 1970, the Chicago Tribune had the following editorial setting out its thoughts regarding some of the reasons why this annual $3.7 billion bonanza should be curtailed:

QUESTION FOR THE ADMINISTRATION

The American Farm Bureau Federation has accused the Nixon administration of reneging on campaign promises to support new legislation designed to improve farmers' income from the market place and make them less dependent on government subsidies. Instead, the administration is promoting legislation, scheduled to come before the House this week, which would continue farm subsidies at current rates of about $3.7 billion annually and extend other important features of present laws.

The federation also charges that Mr. Nixon went back on his promise to end the "dumping" of government-owned surplus crops on the market to depress farm prices. The proposed new legislation also ignores the major improvements in opportunities and quality of life for low-income farmers and other people in rural areas, as promised in the Nixon campaign, according to the federation.

The legislation was developed over months of conferences between Secretary of Agriculture Hardin and Rep. Bob Poage (D., Tex.), chairman of the House agriculture committee, and other committee members. It contains more of the features of the farm programs long espoused by Democratic administrations than any "new directions" in farm policy that the President talked about when he was campaigning for office.

If this legislation should be enacted, billions of more dollars for farm programs will be exacted from the taxpayers, despite warnings of increasing deficits in the federal budget. Inasmuch as they would have to pay for it the least taxpayers should expect is an explanation from Secretary Hardin, if not the President himself, of why the administration went back on its commitments.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Indiana. The gentleman is absolutely right. And when we get down to the amending stage I will offer an amendment together with the gentleman from Illinois, to provide for a $20,000 limitation per crop.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the gentleman:

When the gentleman was before the Committee on Rules, did the gentleman ask the members of the Committee on Agriculture how much this $55,000 limitation would save the taxpayers?

Mr. MADDEN. I thought that the $55,000 was for each farmer, but I found out in the Committee on Rules it is per crop. My gracious, if a farmer had six crops he would get six times $55,000. That is one of the hidden secret features in this bill.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to inform the gentleman from Indiana that I have directed this question to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin, and I am told that it would save only $48 million. So if we are interested in helping the little guy out, and helping the taxpayers of this country on this runaway program, then the least thing we can do is put in the $20,000 limitation and nothing else.

I would inform the gentleman from Indiana that as far as I am concerned if we do not get the $20,000 limitation I am going to vote against the entire farm bill, and urge all of the Members from the cities to vote against the farm bill.

If we get the $20,000 limitation I will then do everything I can to see the bill is passed.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say further in explanation why I am 100 percent in favor of this limitation. In the first place, when farmers are not prosperous the steel mills and other industries in my district are affected, but I am against these farmers who receive payments, these annual six-figure checks for idle land.

Four large farm operations in Arizona and California received over $1 million a year for idle land. Thousands receive annual bonanzas in six figures.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Indiana that I am very pleased and very happy at long last that he is following the policy of the world's greatest newspaper, the Chicago Tribune. I hope that from here on we will find him following the views and suggestions of the Tribune all the time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER).

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it has always amazed me which one of the three gentlemen were going to get the most publicity out of this thing. I have never been able to figure out whether the gentleman from Massachusetts was the original or whether the gentleman from Illinois was the original, but at least they got another gentleman horning in on the act.

Now the gentleman from Indiana voted for all these high payments. The gentleman from Massachusetts I do not think did. I think he read the bill before he voted for it. But the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Massachusetts have been in a feud for the last year or two as to which one of them were going to get the most publicity—and here comes a gentleman horning right in on the act.

Now I just do not know which one is going to claim the credit for getting this down to $20,000. I do not know which one even is going to offer the amendment to cut it down to $20,000, but I guess it will be whichever one gets up first.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be very much interested in the President's next broadcast complaining why the Congress is throwing money in all directions, when he sees the number of Republicans who are going to vote for this $3½ billion bonanza.

Mr. BELCHER. I would like to say to the gentleman from Indiana that he has thrown more money away with both hands in the 20 years he has been here than I have. I have never seen him vote against a boondoggle that he was in on.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the point of personal privilege.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Oklahoma referred to a Member of the House as "another guy." I also would like to have a definition of "horning in."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chairman suggests that the gentleman from Oklahoma might supply the definition.

Mr. BELCHER. What is the question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Oklahoma has finished speaking.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, may I speak further on a point of personal privilege?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman from Massachusetts have an hour on the question of personal privilege?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not heard the gentleman from Massachusetts' point of personal privilege.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has been harsh on one of his fellow colleagues who is working very hard and sincerely on this measure.

I am sure this House has not taken as lightly as maybe the gentleman from Oklahoma has taken this issue. Twice on a rollcall on my amendment they have passed a $20,000 limitation per farm over his objection. In fact, 1 year—I had a motion to recommit, which he gave me. He did not take it lightly at that time. It is not a frivalous issue. It is a very serious issue.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Massachusetts is not directing his remarks to the question that he raised about "horning in" or calling another Member "guy." The gentleman is discussing a matter which will be fully discussed when we get to the general debate.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make the point that I am not horning in on anyone.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair rule on my point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The gentleman from Massachusetts will confine his remarks to the point of personal privilege.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma certainly has abused the prerogatives of the House. He doubted my sincerity by saying that I have "horned in" on this thing, when I collaborated with him at one time in offering the $20,000 limitation, which is costing the taxpayers of this great country over $4 billion a year, paying a farmer over $4.5 million a year. I think this is a serious subject and it should not be taken lightly. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege——

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I suggest that the procedure on a point of personal privilege is to submit the words to which there is objection by the Member who wishes to make the point, and then the Chair rules and determines whether the point is well taken. The gentleman is then entitled to an hour but only after a favorable finding by the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana that his point comes to late.

Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to yield time?

Mr. LATTA. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the words of the gentleman from Oklahoma "the other guy" be stricken from the RECORD and that there be inserted in lieu thereof "the gentleman from Massachusetts."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. SISK. 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. POAGE. 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. 18546) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

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. 18546, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) will be recognized for 2 hours. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is generally recognized, I think, that agriculture desperately needs some kind of legislation if it is going to continue to supply the needs of the American consumer. Agriculture has supplied the needs of the consumer very creditably in recent years.

The gentleman from Missouri cited some very significant figures. They were correct but I believe they are a year late. It just shows what a good job we are doing. We are doing a good job. Last year the figures were 17-plus percent as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri. It is now only 16.5 percent of the disposable income of the average American family which is spent at the grocery store, and that is all. That is lower than the percent spent in any country in the world or any time in the history of this world.

We must have a rather effective agriculture if we are able to feed our people for that small percentage of their income.

As the gentleman from Missouri pointed out, the cost of the food is not the only thing which should be involved, but it is an important factor, and it is a factor which, as I said, pays the highest possible compliment to the ingenuity, the ability, and the hard work of the American farmer.

I think it also pays somewhat of a compliment to the ingenuity and the intelligence of this Congress in passing the legislation under which we have operated, because we have been doing at least a better job than anybody else has been doing. I hope we can do even a better job. I hope this bill lays the foundation to do an even better job. This bill does some of those things which almost all of us have said should be done.

For a long, long time we have been criticized for making payments not to cultivate land and not to produce, and there have been a great many jokes told about the Government payments for not producing this, and for not producing that and the other. We have used that technique of not producing, but we have been gradually growing out of it over a long period of time.

Do Members recall when we actually killed little pigs and plowed up cotton? Do Members know when that was? It was the fall of 1933. We have not killed any little pigs since then and we have not plowed up any cotton since then.

But half the people in my district still believe that the farm program still pays for killing little pigs and plowing up cotton. That was 37 years ago, but the story still hangs on.

It is true that for many years we have made some payments for not producing certain types of crops. We have gradually reduced such payments over the years since 1933, until now we have practically abandoned this practice, and with the passage of this bill we will cut loose from all of this with one little minor exception—in feed grains. There is a provision in this bill that if the Secretary finds he has to retire an excessive amount of feed grain land, that he can make payments for it. He cannot pay for wheat and he cannot pay for cotton retirements, but he can pay feed grain producers in Illinois. He cannot pay anything for retiring cotton land under the terms of this bill.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas says we will cut loose, or the land will be cut loose for general planting with less restrictions. Am I not correct that there is language in the bill which gives the Secretary the authority to delay this cutting loose until the third year? Am I not correct that there is language in the wheat and feed grain sections which permits him to regulate the percentage of certain areas so as to effect an orderly transition, as it says in the bill, but this would give him the latitude actually to continue the Agriculture Act of 1965 for the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. POAGE. I do not so understand it. It does give the Secretary the time to make the orderly transition, but I know of nothing in the bill that gives him authority to make any land retirement payments except in connection with this very minor item, which ought to be of great importance to the State of Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. But he can fix limits on the planting of feed grains and on planting of cotton and wheat on the same basis as the Agriculture Act of 1965. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. He has indeed the authority under the grains sections to make certain payments.

They will be minimal. They will be small. But they will be only in the case of feed grains or wheat.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I believe we might clarify this, since I have a copy of the bill in my hand. The exact language is on page 12 of the bill, line 16:

> The Secretary is authorized for the 1971 and 1972 crops to limit the acreage planted to wheat.

And this is the same language in the feed grains section—

> On the farm to such percentage of the domestic wheat allotment as he determines necessary to provide an orderly transition to the program provided for under this section.

Mr. POAGE. That is true, and there is not any other place in here for land retirement payment.

All I say is this is a very, very minor provision. The crux of the thing, which I want all of us to remember, is that with passage of this bill, for all practical purposes, we will have abandoned the old philosophy of paying for not planting. The payments under the terms of this bill are going to be on production, and not on land that is not producing.

The payments are going to be on the production of this land, and on that percentage of the production which is used at home—domestically consumed. The payments are not going to be made on exports. The payments will be made on what is used at home.

If that is not a consumer subsidy I have never seen one. I am sorry that none of the consumer audience, usually over here, is present. The profesional spokesmen for the consumers are not here today.

I would call attention to anyone who will carry the word to them that this bill makes payments only on that portion of production which is to be consumed at home. That reduces the cost of living at home. That does not pay somebody for not growing. It pays him for growing. It pays him for what he can produce and put on the domestic market. That is as direct as we can make it in the way of helping consumers.

I want to get it very clear that the great thrust of this bill is to help consumers.

I believe it always helps producers when we provide a market for their products. I believe that when we can help the consumers buy the food we have helped the producers who have to sell. That is a good combination.

That is what this bill does. But I believe it is unfair when certain Members will get up and make the statement, as some of those who are not here today will tomorrow, "Oh, you are taking this money away from the consumers and you are giving it to those wealthy producers." Most of them are making, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, just about two-thirds of what the people in the cities are making. That is their income.

But those are the people who will be helped by this bill, to the extent it helps producers to create a market. I think it will help producers and consumers, and to that extent it is highly desirable.

Now, why is it we have to help the producers of farm products? Why do we have a farm program at all? We have a farm program because for a great many years, even for some 7 or 8 years before the great depression, beginning after the year 1921, from about 1921 down to the present time, the market place has not provided enough in the way of payment for farm production to pay the cost of producing these things.

Down in my country where cotton is an important crop, all of the figures indicate that it costs somewhere between 28 and 32 cents to produce cotton. It will cost different amounts for different individuals just as it will cost different amounts for different corn farmers to produce corn. But the world market on cotton hit about 22 cents in recent years. Well, no farmer can stay alive at that price long even if he was just getting that market. He has to have something additional. But you say, "Oh, the Government ought never to step in and make up any of the difference."

Let us see now. Let us see about transportation. I submit that there is not a single form of public transportation in the United States today that is not subsidized in some form or another. Then you say, "Oh, the railroads do not get anything." Well, the railroads got 1 acre out of every 10 acres in the United States. It was deeded to the railroads to help them get going, and they still have a whole lot of it.

The trucks operate over publicly built highways. The barges operate over publicly built waterways. The airlines, some of them, are not receiving a direct subsidy today, but they all have at one time or another, and most of them are right now receiving the benefit of publicly built terminals and publicly built navigation aids, all paid for at the expense of the public.

Take overseas transportation. What about the maritime bill? We voted on it about 2 months ago—I voted for it, and I do not believe there was a single vote against it—a bill that provided a subsidy for building oceangoing vessels. The U.S. Government paid 55 percent of the cost of building these vessels and then paid half the cost of operating them after they got into operation. We did all of that so that we might have these facilities which we think the public needs. I think they need them, too, and we pay these subsidies so that we might have these facilities and still maintain an American standard for those who work in those forms of transportation.

Now, is it more important to provide transportation or is it more important to provide for the production of food? I think production is far more important than transportation, but we have long since recognized that we must subsidize transportation if we are going to have the transportation we need. I am not condemning the transportation subsidies, but I am merely pointing out that in this modern world the farmers are no different from other segments of our economy.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I simply wanted to point out that some airlines also receive a direct cash subsidy, that is, feeder airlines.

Mr. POAGE. Many of them do. Many of them do. They are receiving hundreds of millions of dollars of cash subsidies.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. And the railroads and other forms of transportation. They have rates that are fixed by the Federal Government which provide presumably for a net profit and a reasonable return on investment added to the subsidy.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct. That is the typical utility theory. They work on percentages. The utility theory holds that a company providing a public service should be assured of a fair return. It goes to a great many companies like gas companies, electric light companies, telephone companies. I am not again condemning the utility theory.

Mr. GROSS. I am not, either, but I am simply pointing out that no one guarantees the farmer a return on their investment.

Mr. POAGE. I believe so. I believe the gentleman is right.

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

Mr. POAGE. I cannot yield now. I will be glad to yield at various times in the course of the next 2 or 3 days, but I think I should proceed here now and discuss this bill rather than discuss some of those headline-grabbing proposals which the gentleman is so prone to present to us.

Mr. FINDLEY. My question related to——

Mr. POAGE. No; I do not yield further. I want to discuss this bill in my own way, if the gentleman please.

I think it is very important to think about this bill from a standpoint other than merely who is going to get the credit for something. I think we have been trying to do a good job to help the farmers, and I will continue to try to help the farmers so that they can help us all.

If we are going to discuss this question of limitation of payments which is so attractive to so many, I would point out the I think it is bad. I have voted against it right along, I think it is a bad proposal, because it is just like trying to say to the man who owns a number of low-rent houses in some big city, and you have an urban renewal program of some kind going on, and you need to take 100 houses from one landowner, and for that you would pay him only $20,000, no matter how many houses he puts in, no matter how much he contributed to the slum clearance of the city, you would not pay him any more than $20,000 because after all, he ought to be able to live on $20,000.

Now, of course, we are not talking about what anybody is going to get to live on. We are talking about making a good program work. We are talking about inducing enough people to go into the program which we need to balance supply and demand, so as to maintain the maximum degree of production at the minimum cost to the Government. That is what we are trying to do. And to the extent that we can keep supply and demand in reasonable balance we do provide for all the needs of the people, and we do it at the smallest cost that we could hope to do it with.

But if you do not give any encouragement to the large producer, to the large farmer, if you give no encouragement to him to get into the program he is not going to get into it, he is not going to participate in the program, unless he feels that it is advantageous to him. Now we are trying to make it advantageous to all our farmers because, after all, when it comes to balancing supply and demand it does not make any difference whether you take water out of a spigot or out of the bung hole. You can take a barrel of water and you can dip out of it with a 1-pint cup 100 times, and you will get the same amount of water as if you took a 10-pint dipper and dipped out 10 times—there will be exactly the same amount of water taken from the barrel. It is the same with agriculture, whether you take this balance from a few large farmers or whether you get thousands of small farmers to provide the balance.

But by the time you forced all of this balance of the small farmers you do them a grievous injustice because you can put the small farmers out of business by taking too much of their land for balancing purposes, even though you pay them. You would still take too much of their land, they would still have to go out of agriculture. Whereas, the larger farmer can continue in business.

So we try to take from those where it will hurt the least.

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

Mr. POAGE. I will yield to the gentleman in just one moment.

But let me make this point clear, because so many have overlooked it. In recent years we have had a program, and I again refer to cotton, but there are similar programs for wheat and feed grains, that has required a certain retirement. It has only been 5 percent in the last 2 years or 3 years for cotton, but it allowed the retirement of 35 percent on which these farmers could get paid. Now, did they retire all of the land that they could have? Did they retire all of that land on which they could have received payment? We have been told these payments are some sort of a gift; that these farmers are getting greatly enriched. If they are being greatly enriched, is it not logical that they would retire all of the land that they could if it was really profitable? But did they retire all they could? We have received the figures from the Department of Agriculture in 1968—which is the last year for which I actually have them—and they retired exactly 50 percent of what they could have.

They could have retired twice as much as they did and would have been paid for it. But they did not retire it because they did not think it was profitable. In other words, only half of the farmers thought it was profitable—and only half of them used their maximum.

I think that pretty well illustrates that the farmers as a whole did not think that they had something on which they were getting immensely wealthy.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman because I have been sitting here listening to his remarks. I guess I do not speak for the consumers but I will try to pass the word on to those who do.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you.

Mr. ADAMS. I am worried about this question, the point that the gentleman has made on supply and demand and that is why I rose to my feet.

I understand that a number of farmers and farm organizations are opposed to any farm bill on the basis we ought to have a free market and they should be able to charge what they want and to produce what they want, and let supply and demand do it.

That is one group of people who come in and oppose these bills.

There is another group who say that we are putting all kinds of Government money into keeping up prices of a product, which then the consumers have to pay more for.

So what I am trying to get from the gentleman, and my question to you is—Do you think we should have a free market? If we did, as the gentleman suggested, would not supply and demand balance out the prices and they would drop to a level so that the farmers would receive a return on their investment and production would then match what was required?

I know that sounds overly simplified and I might state to the gentleman that I am not completely unfamiliar with farm problems because I grew up during my boyhood on a farm in Iowa and I remember when they refused in a referendum to go into the program because they did not believe that anybody would pay them more than what the market was worth.

I wish the gentleman would answer that question for me. You just mentioned cotton—I notice that production is going up on cotton and if we were not to subsidize it or if we were to limit subsidization to small farms to keep people on them, would not then, with the larger farms, and with the law of supply and demand set a price and set the production.

Mr. POAGE. I will try to answer the gentleman's question because I think it is a perfectly fair question.

I do not think you are going to get it in our economy, as it now stands—an economy in which the farmers sell in a basically free market and buy in a completely controlled market.

By that I mean that the farmer sells his products—nobody buys them. The farmer goes out and sells them for whatever he can get.

When the farmer goes into a store, whether it is a grocery store or a hardware store or a gasoline filling station, he buys at a price that the other fellow fixes.

Under that situation, I do not think it is reasonable to assume that if we had no programs at all that the farmer would be able to get a price that would pay him enough to continue in business. I think that the great mass of the farmers, by number, that is possibly 95 percent of them, who produce possibly not more than 50 percent or even less of our total production, would be forced out of business in a very short period of time.

There would be a few super farms, that is, industrialized farmers who would stay in business. They would be those who have a bankroll which would enable them to live over a few years of low prices. But, by the time 3 years were up, the great majority of the farmers would be out of business, and let us say, 100,000 large farms would still be in business in the United States. I think they would be able to get together very much like the automobile manufacturers do, and set their prices. Instead of paying 16½ percent of their disposable income for groceries, the housewives would pay at least 30 percent. That is what would happen, as I see it.

The suggestion is made that if farm prices go down, the farmer should shift around and produce something else. That is what the Farm Bureau tells us, I know. They say that the farmer should shift around and find something that is profitable. But what is it that is profitable? I do not wish to ask the question of the gentleman, who has said that he does not claim to know about agriculture, but I see gentlemen right behind him, on either side, both of whom are agriculturists. What crop is there that the farmer can turn to?

Surely you can apply these limitations. You can put a lot of cotton farmers in the San Joaquin Valley out of producing that crop, but what will they grow? Why, they will grow grain, of course. They will grow grain instead.

You can put a lot of farmers in Arkansas out of cotton and they will grow soybeans. But you cannot tell me what they can grow that we need or what would be profitable to them. Should they turn to rye or should they turn to oats or some of those crops? We have an abundance of those things now. If you shift from one of the major crops into another major crop, you simply change the form of your problem and do not change the problem at all. That is what we are faced with. Yet none of us wants to actually finally reduce the capacity of America to produce food. We want to retain that capacity because we expect an even larger population than we have today.

If farmers had no greater capacity to produce food today than they had even 20 years ago, we could not have our great cities. There would not be enough food to feed the people living in them, and the people would have to move to farms. You would have to reduce the production per individual to increase the production per acre, as many parts of the world have to now. We in the United States are now trying to increase our production per individual, the man working, the individual, because we have the acres to provide him with his needs.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The problem, as I see it, is that the number of farmers has been steadily decreasing even though we have had these programs. I am worried about people being pushed off the farms. I think some of us even would consider—the gentleman mentioned subsidies to transportation and so on—we would consider some type of direct check to farmers of $5,000 to $10,000 apiece, or maybe even a higher amount, to match what we are spending on subsidies, and let them grow what they wanted, because in that way we might be able to get some compromise and solution to the problem. The sudsidy program does bother some of us because we accumulate surpluses under it, and I do not think it was ever the intent to accumulate surpluses with subsidies.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. In line with the implication of the gentleman from Washington, and I am afraid that we hear this on the floor of the House a great deal because people are not informed, the gentleman mentioned agriculture 20 years ago. I have before me a record that shows commodity prices, that is, the price received by the farmer in July of 1950 compared to July of 1970, a period in which wages have gone up 131 percent in this whole country. Yet, as shown by the statement, the price of corn has gone from $1.44 down to $1.24; the price of wheat from $1.99 to $1.23; the price of cotton from 39 cents to 22 cents; and the price of soybean oil from 13 cents down to 11 cents. The farmer is getting less money today. Yet we hear on the floor of the House about the rising cost of farmers' products. That increased amount simply is not going to the farmer. He is getting fewer dollars today than he did 20 years ago. I would like to see any person in this Chamber face one of his labor unions and suggest that they take cuts like those which the farmers have taken in the past 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, I include the statement to which I have referred:

AVERAGE HOURLY EARNINGS (MANUFACTURING GROSS EARNINGS FROM THE EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS PUBLICATION, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS)

April 1950	April 1970	Overall increase (percent)
$1.434	$3.32	131.5

	1950 (July)	1970 (July)
Corn	$1.44 per bushel	$1.24 per bushel.
Wheat	$1.99 per bushel	$1.23 per bushel.
Oats	$0.76 per bushel	$0.58 per bushel.
Cotton	39.11 cents per pound.	22.65 cents per pound.
Soybeans	$2.93 per bushel	$2.72 per bushel.
Cottonseed	$52 per ton	No quote (March: $47.10 per ton).
Beef cattle	$24.40 per hundredweight.	$27.90 per hundredweight.
Hogs	$20.90 per hundredweight.	$23.90 per hundredweight.
Soybean oil	13.10 cents per pound.	11.40 cents per pound.
Cottonseed	15.20 cents per pound.	14.20 cents per pound.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Tennessee is so correct. There is no other group in America that I know of that has taken reductions in the prices of their labor or products thereof than the farmer has taken—actually less than he got 20 years ago when all of his costs were lower.

All we are trying to do with all this legislation is to try to enable the farmer to continue to operate. We are not even going to try to tell Members we should keep him up where he should be. We are not even trying to keep him as high as we would like to keep him.

I know some will say we did not maintain the parity feature in the bill. When we reach section 2, it ties the price support to parity. I believe the next thing is wheat, and it ties support to 100 percent of parity. So it is unfair to say we have abandoned the parity principle. We have not abandoned it at all. We have not carried it to the extremes many of us would like to have carried it. We have not carried it as far as I would like to. I would like to have peaches and cream all the time, all year around, but I cannot afford it, and we cannot afford everything we would like to have in this bill.

This bill does not give us everything we would like to have, but it gives us a great deal.

It gives us some red beef for dinner, and I think that is rather important. I think it is rather important that we have the basics, and this bill gives that to us. I am afraid that by looking at the reflection in the creek, we are going to drop the meat we have in our mouth in the effort to try to take something away from that reflection.

So we did not go as high as some of the farm organizations wanted us to go or as most of us wanted to go. We did not go as far toward tearing everything down as one of the insurance companies wanted us to go. We did not go as far as tearing everything down because we have not destroyed all the programs.

We do contemplate putting into agriculture approximately what we have been putting in in terms of dollars. This is what the Secretary has told us it will be, approximately the same input into agriculture as we have had in the last several years—about $3 to $3½ billion a year. So we do not have a bill here that changes the whole foundation of things, but we have a bill that will enable the farmers to continue in large part to farm.

I hope the membership of this House will recognize that if we deny those farmers the right to farm, the housewife over the country is going to find it extremely difficult to provide for our dinners.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, before I pose my question, I want to say that I as one Member of this House congratulate the chairman for his leadership and the committee for the many months they have put in on this bill.

In my remarks on the rule I said this is the first time in my memory that we have had a bill of this magnitude formulated in the committee and not sent down by the Department. The committee has done its job in doing this work for the House, and as one Member I want to congratulate the committee for doing that.

I want to ask a question about the matter of dropping the Commodity Credit stocks. We have had a quite a discussion over the years in the committee and on the floor about "out of condition" corn being dumped—and I am putting "out of condition" in quotation marks—and other commodities being dumped by the Secretary of Agriculture and its depressing effect on the market.

Is there some change in this bill about the amount or the cost or the price whereby these stocks can be dumped? Has there been any change?

Mr. POAGE. The basic change in this bill in connection with what the gentleman is referring to, instead of relying upon the loans as a basic method of supporting the price, this bill relies almost entirely—not entirely but much more heavily, let me say—than we have in the past—upon the payments, the additional prices of the domestic-consumed proportion of the crop, so that very few commodities will be purchased by Commodity Credit Corporation under this program. There is no opportunity to make the extensive purchases here that existed under the previous legislation. Consequently, if we acquire less of these commodities, we are going to have smaller stocks. When it comes to dealing with those stocks, I must state it is my understanding that this bill contains the same provisions for the sale of stocks that we have had in the past—that is, we have to get $1.15 plus carrying charges for certain commodities.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is saying that under the provisions of this bill, if they are carried forward, we will not have Commodity Credit Corporation stocks dumped.

Mr. POAGE. I will not say we will not have any, but I will say that we cannot possibly have such large Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

Mr. LATTA. There is one further thing which I believe needs to be pointed out about the so-called payments. Regardless of the amount of the payment, I believe the public has been led to believe that this is net to the farmer. It is not net at all.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly not.

Mr. LATTA. If he gets a payment of $10,000, the cost of production will have to come out of that. This is not all "gravy."

Mr. POAGE. Had these payments been net to the farmers, certainly every cotton farmer in 1968 would have put in all the land he could. As a matter of fact, they put in only 50 percent of what they could have put in and drawn payments on. I believe that is conclusive evidence that the payments are not profit or net payments but, on the contrary, are payments from which substantial costs must be paid.

Many farmers figure they are not worth the cost.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I believe some misinformation has been spread across the country that this is all "gravy" and net to the farmer; and it is not.

Mr. POAGE. It is not.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. I believe the gentleman is doing an excellent job of explaining how the consumer is as much the recipient of the benefits of this type of legislation as the farmer himself.

Is it not true that Americans consume about 530 million bushels of wheat each year? This wheat is processed into flour and made into bread, cake, and so forth.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

Mr. MIZE. The fair market value of 530 million bushels of wheat is about $1.5 billion as adjusted by the parity for the cost of production and the cost of living in the United States. If the farmers were to be able to collectively bargain for the sale of this needed 530 million bushels of wheat we consume in this country each year, the absolute floor price would be about $1.5 billion, but the American consuming public pays only about $870 million and Federal Government pays the remaining $615 million through this type of legislation. Without this consumer subsidy element of this bill, for those items which the housewife buys made out of flour products, made out of wheat, she would have to pay that extra $615 million, is that not correct?

Mr. POAGE. I would think there is no question about it, because that money has to come from somewhere.

Mr. MIZE. Exactly.

Mr. POAGE. It has to come from somewhere. If it is not provided in the subsidy then it must come out of the market, if we are to continue to get the wheat. We could get it for 2 or 3 years. We would take it out of the farmers' hide for the next 2 or 3 years, and certainly many farmers would stay for awhile. When the time came they could not, of course the whole cost would go up.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 40 minutes.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for over three decades, the Federal Government has been actively and intimately involved in American agriculture. As a natural and predictable result of this involvement, the farm economy has become greatly dependent upon Federal assistance for survival. Accordingly, the Federal Government has a clear obligation to help maintain the well-being of this segment of the Nation, in much the same fashion as it assists other segments of society.

The Government is quite concerned about the well-being of other groups in the Nation. In the past 18 months it has provided payment increases of 15 percent for social security recipients—with an additional 5 percent planned; 15 percent to recipients of railroad retirement benefits; 10 percent for veterans com-

pensation; 6 percent to Federal employees—with an additional 8 percent planned under postal reorganization; 50 percent to welfare recipients—recommended; and grants for education, hospitals, schools, airports, country clubs,

Yet despite its largesse to other groups, the Federal Government has neglected to adequately maintain the income of the American farmer. I believe he is entitled to the same benefits as are granted to other segments of society; justice and fairness demand nothing less.

Part of the reason why the farm sector has not received its fair share of Federal benefits is that an increasing number of individuals lacking agricultural backgrounds are being elected to Congress. While this certainly reflects the Nation's population shifts, it renders Congress less than fully able to appreciate the complexities of American agriculture and the central role it plays in our national life.

The changing political composition of Congress is reflected in the Agriculture Act of 1970. On the whole, I think the House Agriculture Committee has reported out a basically workable farm program that will help promote a certain measure of vitality in the agricultural sector at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer. I have, however, grave reservations about that section of the bill which would limit farm payments to $55,000.

Since coming to Congress I have consistently opposed limiting Federal payments to any one farmer, farm, or commodity. Based on my life-long association with agriculture, I am of the firm conviction that payment limitations and a healthy farm economy are mutually exclusive. I still hold to this position despite the committee's action. I fear this is a false economy, one that will dislocate the farm sector in significant respects. It is, however, a cutback that will not prove disastrous to the farm program provided Federal payments are not further limited by Congress.

Perhaps a strict payment limitation could be justified in a farm economy comprised of small individual production units; but, the unadorned fact of the matter is that this Nation's agriculture sector is not so comprised, and has not been for over two decades. The United States, once a nation of small family farms, has become a nation wherein 40 percent of the farms produce over 80 percent of the country's food and fiber. The reasons for this shift may be summarized in one word; namely, "economics."

Farming, like other areas of the economy, has been beset with rising costs for land, labor, and capital, as well as shrinking profits from farm production. The extent of this condition is aptly illustrated by examining the economic changes in key areas over the last 10 or so years. Since 1959, the average value per acre of land has increased 83 percent. Land values themselves have risen 70 percent. Variable costs of farming and ranching have skyrocketed as well. During the last 7 years the investment in farm machinery required for farms and ranches has climbed 79 percent. Annual outlays for fertilizers have increased 64 percent. Feed costs have risen 33 percent.

In terms of fixed capital investment requirements, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin has stated that the average investment for 200 to 400 acres of land alone might run from $40,000 to $160,000, buildings would probably cost from $20,000 to $40,000, and land improvements could amount to an additional $20,000. These figures are based on USDA findings that the scope of farming has widened significantly in the last decade—in 1959 the average farm contained 288 acres; in 1969 it contained 398. The Department also reports that commercial farms had an average value of $100,000 as of March 1968.

Farming also provides significant underpinning to the economy in general. It comprises the largest single market for labor and industry—it employs 5 million individuals; which is more than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, auto manufacturing, and steel industries. The agriculture sector consumes $50 billion worth of goods and services each year. Farmers pay more than $4.8 billion alone for tractors and equipment. In addition, they pay an annual transportation bill of well over $4 billion just to move their produce and livestock to market. Finally, farm transportation needs are so extensive that out of the 17 million trucks in America, more than 3 million are used in agriculture.

The conclusion is obvious. Agriculture has become a very significant component in the commercial life of the Nation. This is in addition to its historic role of producing the food and fiber necessary to fuel the dynamic growth of our country.

Mr. Chairman, given the economic realities of today, it is clear that to utilize land, labor, and capital in a successful farming operation requires ingenuity, initiative, and courage. Modern farmers have to surmount many obstacles not faced by their predecessors. They are forced by the very nature of our 20th-century economic system to expand their operations to the most efficient point of production if profit rather than loss is to be their harvest. Yet, their activities are defined and delimited by the amount of food and fiber they are able to sell in the marketplace.

To regulate this process by which the production of the farmer and the consumption needs of the American people are correlated, the Federal Government has instituted massive and complex farm programs. As an integral part of these programs, the Government has offered to make payments to producers of certain crops if in return the producers would agree to limit their production of the crops in question to levels specified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In my judgment, to place a limitation on the amount of payments the Government can make to farmers for reducing their production in prescribed areas, handcuffs the large and efficient producer who expands operations in an effort to surmount the adverse economic conditions prevailing in the agriculture sector. More importantly, payment limitations benefit neither the farm economy nor the consumer of farm products. For, if successful farmers find payment limitations too burdensome, they will refuse to participate in the Federal farm programs. They will utilize their land to full capacity, and plant and harvest in such abundance that the artificial supply and demand system established by the Government to relate agriculture supply to consumer demand will buckle and collapse.

Paradoxically, Mr. Chairman, if the farm program is destroyed as a result of Congress imposing a limitation on Federal farm payments, the ultimate loser will be the American taxpayer; the very person whom the supporters of payment limitations maintain they are trying to protect. At the present time, approximately $7 billion per year in tax revenues goes to agriculture related uses. Of this amount, $3.5 billion is allocated to social uses such as the food stamp program and the school lunch program. The remaining $3.5 billion is spent on the farm program itself. The $3.5 billion in tax revenues enables the agricultural sector to produce almost $90 billion worth of food and fiber each year. Yet, the taxpayer-consumer spends only 16 percent of his disposable income to purchase this abundance; a bargain unparalleled in the world today.

This fortuitous condition wherein American agriculture produces the greatest variety of rich and wholesome farm products in the world at a cost to the American consumer that is lower than at any other time in our Nation's history is only made possible through the creative partnership between the public and the farming sectors. It is a partnership that works. It is a partnership that is reasonable in cost. It is a partnership that should not be lightly discarded.

The following letter to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) is the position of the President in regard to limitation of payments and the committee bill:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 4, 1970.

HON. PAGE BELCHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAGE: The Poage-Belcher farm bill reported to the House by the Agriculture Committee is good legislation. I hope it will be enacted promptly, and with minimum change.

The proper payment limitation would seem to me to be peculiarly within the province of Congress, and I will, of course, abide the Congressional judgment. For my part, I subscribe to the analysis by your Committee and the Secretary of Agriculture. Both advise that too low a limitation would make it impossible for many farm producers to participate efficiently in the program. It would poorly serve the country to develop a farm program, then impose so severe a limitation as to impair its effectiveness.

Secretary Hardin and a bipartisan majority of your Committee therefore recommend $55,000 as the limitation. I am aware of the widespread desire for a much lower figure, and it is easy to share that desire. However, I must agree with Secretary Hardin that in present circumstances this could be harmful to the constructive farm program which your Committee and the Department have so painstakingly evolved.

You may, therefore, inform your colleagues that despite the obvious appeal of

a lower limit, for these technical reasons I must prefer the limitation proposed by your Committee.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago last week, on July 31, 1968, to be exact, this body had under consideration basic farm legislation. At that time, the issue was whether or not we were going to extend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 and whether or not, if we did, for 1 or for 4 years.

On that July day 2 years ago it was finally decided by the House that with the inclusion of a $20,000 per person limitation on payments, the bill should be extended for 1 year, through December 31, 1970. In going back to the record of that debate it was interesting to me to find a common threat of argument from both sides of the aisle. From solid supporters of the act of 1965 to those who had voted against its original passage came the plea of "give us 1 additional year of time so that we can come up with legislative changes that will make the farm bill more acceptable to the farmers and taxpayers of the Nation." I did not agree with that argument and opposed the 1-year extension, feeling that it served no useful purpose.

We are here today considering a bill which, when stripped of a few of its new legislative bangles and beads, stands as a poor copy of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. Like the 1965 act, this bill would continue expensive compensatory payment programs. It is estimated that in excess of $10 billion would be spent over the next 3 years on three of our most important crops; that is, wheat, feed grains, and cotton.

You will note that I said over the next 3 years, because that is the life of this bill. Going back to the debate of 2 years ago, I find that at that time opponents of a 4-year extension thought they had killed a bear when they got the $20,000 payment limitation added and held the bill to a 1-year extension. What a hollow victory that is now. Those opponents lost their payment limitation in conference that year and are now being offered the other 3 years of the original 4-year plan.

But back to the bill before us. Like the 1965 act, it will preserve farm allotments and bases as ineffective instruments of governmental supply management.

Like the 1965 act, this bill continues the concept of low market prices for the producers of three major crops.

Like the 1965 act, this bill will, when it expires in 1973, cause farmers again to be confronted with old and unworkable programs that are imbedded into the archives of the permanent farm law.

And like the 1965 act, this bill before us will continue the hopeless patchwork of crop control and subsidy programs which have wasted so much of the public treasure for so long, while never really helping farm people adjust to modern technological change.

You will be told, of course, that this act is different and that changes have been made. Yes, changes have been made, but they are more in sound than in substance. No matter what the program of acreage retirement is called, whether "set aside" or some other retired acre designation, it all represents acreage taken out of production. Furthermore, direct payments are the same, whether considered as income supplements or as acreage diversion. The results are the same, with farmers being made ever more dependent for their income on a check out of the Federal Treasury at heavy cost to the taxpayer.

Inasmuch as the spotlight of this bill falls heavily on the three major crops of wheat, feed grains, and cotton, one automatically wonders what crop is getting the best deal. If one is talking about dollar outlays in comparison to the importance of the crop, cotton is king. About $800 million per year will go to farmers involved in the production of 12 million acres of cotton. A like amount will go to wheat farmers growing nearly four times that many acres of wheat. And around $1.6 billion, or double the cotton money, will go to corn farmers planting some 60 million acres. This figures out to a direct Federal subsidy of about $66 for every acre of cotton produced, $26 for every acre of corn produced, and $18 for every acre of wheat to be produced. Yes, cotton is still king.

When one sees where the money is going, he knows cotton is king. According to USDA figures, payments to Texas farmers in 1969 totaled $501,905,837, of which more than half was for cotton. In the same year Pennsylvania did not have a comparable beneficial effect in the payments area, for Pennsylvania farmers received payments amounting to $27,866,192.

After noting this $475 million difference between my State and Texas, I decided to do a little simple arithmetic to see how many States it took to match Texas in payments. By adding the total 1969 payments going to farmers in the 17 adjoining States to Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennslyvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, I came up with a total of $459,439,476. This is still more than $40 million less than the single State of Texas.

The 17 States just mentioned contain, according to the 1964 census of agriculture, 797,218 farmers. Texas had 205,110 farmers. In 1969 gross farm sales in the 17 States were $8,317,000,000, nearly four times as much as Texas' gross farm sales of $2,669,000,000. Yet Texas farmers got more Government payments than went into the 17 States combined.

Now let us look at congressional representation. The 17 States I named have 193 House Members, while Texas has but 23. In the other body of the Congress, Texas is outnumbered by the 17 States by 34 to 2.

I am not here today to fight Texas, Texas farmers, or my colleagues from Texas. Last year I took a trip to Texas and really enjoyed the famed Texan hospitality. I am also not here to suggest that since the 17 States concerned have 10 times more Congressmen than Texas they should get 10 times as much in payments. That would be the politics of equal shares, which is alien to our form of government and my way of thinking. I am here today to call upon each of you to vote to put an end to these programs which threaten to destroy American agriculture.

Some of my colleagues will argue, of course, that agriculture is just as entitled to subsidies as are the railroad and shipping industries. I offer this word of caution. If subsidies lead our farmers into the same dead-end alleys into which they have taken our railroads and shipping lines, then we should take a wide berth of them.

The hour is getting late for saving our maritime fleet, just as it is getting mighty late for the railroads. It is not, however, too late to change the course of events for American agriculture. It is time to recognize farm payments for what they are, an inept mechanism that fails to deal efficiently with the problems of the average American farmer and imposes a heavy cost burden on the back of the American taxpayer.

In summary, I feel as was stated in the minority report on this bill signed by my colleague, Mr. TEAGUE of California and me:

> This multi-billion dollar extension of the costly and ineffective failures of the past should be rejected by the House in order to set the stage for meaningful and long-overdue reform of our farm program.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, farmers in our area of the country and in all production are in the same boat.

The gentleman in the well has one of the country's foremost orchards. He has lovely orchards in the State of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania recommend to a young man today to start in the orchard business?

Mr. GOODLING. Under our present system of agriculture I would not recommend to any young man that he get into any branch of agriculture.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I will have some comments to make later, but now I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for what he has had to say and I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being prosaic, I thought I might direct at least a few of my remarks to the actual contents of the bill that is before us today. Before I do that, I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who just preceded me in the well, that I have one or two comments on his remarks.

In his comparison of the amounts of money for various agricultural payments

that go to the States in his area versus those in Texas, it rather reminds me of how often I am asked as a representative of the eastern part of the State of Washington about why I have so many dams in my district. I say, "Well, it is simply because that is where the Columbia and the Snake Rivers are." We have to look at our payments by region in connection with where the great food production of this country comes from, where the commercial growing areas exist for wheat, feed grain, and cotton.

Second, I quite agree with my highly respected colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that our goal should always be to have a farm program that is equally acceptable to the farmers and to the taxpayers. I can only say to the gentleman that for 12 years I have been working for just that magical combination. I would have liked to ask him if he felt it would be possible for our House Committee on Agriculture to have passed a bill that pleased the majority of the farm groups that were working with us, and at the same time have it acceptable to the taxpayers and the majority of this House. This, of course, has been the basis of the whole problem as we worked on this bill for the many months behind us.

When the new administration took office last year, the need for new farm legislation was clearly defined. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 had been temporarily extended for an additional year, and would expire at the end of the 1970 crop year. It was recognized that a new farm bill would definitely be required, since the alternative—reversion to the old, permanent law—would have disastrous effects on the U.S. farm economy.

It was also recognized that no one group could, by themselves, obtain passage of a new farm bill. It was clear that the administration, Republicans and Democrats in Congress, the farm organizations and others, working individually and on their own could never hope to marshal sufficient support in the Congress to enact a bill of their own choosing. But, working together, it might be possible to develop compromise legislation which could receive congressional approval.

Farm programs had increasingly come under fire from many sources, both from the standpoint of escalating Federal costs and, in the view of some, an apparent failure to achieve the objectives for which the commodity programs were originally enacted. Concern over the size of payments to farmers under the programs had been dramatically expressed in the House of Representatives by the adoption of payment limitation provisions on the agricultural appropriations bill. A growing disposition on the part of many to drastically reduce farm program expenditures or eliminate them entirely, had become apparent.

It was in this environment that the House Agriculture Committee and the administration began working last year to draft a new farm bill. A series of meetings between our committee and Secretary of Agriculture Hardin and his staff was begun. Public hearings before our committee were initiated in July and some 25 days were devoted last year to hearing witnesses describe their views on what approaches new farm legislation should take. Everyone who expressed an interest in appearing before our committee had the opportunity to do so. We heard from all the major farm organizations, from Government officials, and from many other groups and individuals.

Over the months, working together, our committee and the administration first looked at all alternatives open to us—massive land retirement, extension of the present programs, expansion of present programs as proposed in the coalition bill, and a number of other approaches which had been presented to us. Through this process we began to come up with our own guidelines and parameters.

I want to emphasize that all through this period, all major farm groups as well as other interested organizations and individuals were meeting with members of our committee and were given every opportunity to make their views known.

We recognized that the three basic commodities—wheat, feed grains, and cotton—would be the core of the omnibus farm bill. Our Livestock and Grains Subcommittee, on which I have the privilege of serving as senior minority member, held 6 days of public hearings on the wheat and feed grains section of the bill after the full committee had conducted open hearings.

Our subcommittee, after weeks—and months—of deliberation, drafted an approach which appeared to be the best compromise approach to new farm legislation which could be achieved under the circumstances. Further changes were made in full committee, and the end result is the bill we have before us today—a compromise bill about which many of us have some reservation, but which is the best bill possible under the circumstances:

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

This bill is made up of eight titles which contain the following major provisions (unless otherwise noted, all provisions will be in effect for the next three years):

TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

1. Establishes an annual ceiling of $55,000 per crop on payments to producers of upland cotton, wheat, and feed grains.

2. The limitation imposed considers all payments made for price support, set-aside, diversion, and public access as well as marketing certificates.

3. The Secretary is authorized to adjust set-aside acreage and is directed to issue regulations necessary to insure fair and reasonable application of this title.

TITLE II—DAIRY

1. Clarifies and reaffirms authority for base excess and seasonal plans and extends and amends the authority for the Dairymen's Class I Base Plan in federal milk market order areas. It specifically guarantees competitive access to Class I Base Plan markets by established producers outside the market order area. Appeal procedures under present law remain unchanged.

2. Suspend the operation of the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm separated cream and permits the Secretary to set lower support prices on butter.

3. Extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by CCC to the Armed Services and Veterans Hospitals.

4. Extends the Secretary's authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who through no fault of their own have their milk contaminated by and condemned because of the presence of pesticides and residues.

TITLE III—WOOL

1. Extends the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, through December 31, 1973.

2. Continues the present incentive price of 72 cents per pound for shorn wool and 80.2 cents per pound for mohair for each year of the extension.

TITLE IV—WHEAT

1. Suspends the marketing quota program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

2. Provides domestic marketing certificates to farmers participating in the set-aside program in an amount equal to U.S. food consumption (about 530 million bushels annually).

3. Sets the face value of these domestic certificates at the difference between the wheat parity price (currently $2.82 per bushel) and the average price received by farmers during the first five months of the wheat marketing year (which starts on July 1).

4. Provides for a "preliminary" payment to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. This payment would be the amount estimated by the Secretary to be 75 percent of the value of the domestic certificate. The balance of the payment (if any) would be paid in December. If the Secretary's estimate were too high, no refunds by farmers would be required.

5. Continues the cost of certificates to wheat processors at 75 cents per bushel.

6. Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans to participating farmers from zero to 100 percent of the parity price for wheat.

7. Establishes a "set-aside" program under which wheat farmers, in order to be eligible for loans, certificates, and payments under the program, must set aside or divert from the production of wheat and other crops an acreage determined by the Secretary.

8. Authorizes payments to participating farmers for any additional set-aside acreage and for permitting public recreational access.

TITLE V—FEED GRAINS

1. Establishes a voluntary feed grain (i.e., corn, grain sorghum, and barley) program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

2. Provides that price support payments to participating farmers on one-half of their feed grain base will be the difference between not less than $1.35 per bushel (for corn) and the average market price for the first five months of the marketing year (which starts on October 1 on corn and grain sorghum and July 1 on barley). In no event, however, would these payments be less than 32 cents per bushel for corn (with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley).

3. Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans at zero to 90 percent of feed grain parity prices.

4. Authorizes additional set-aside and public recreational access payments.

5. Establishes a "set-aside" program under which participating farmers would be required to set aside or divert feed grain or other cropland in order to become eligible for feed grain loans and payments.

6. Provides for a "preliminary" payment of 32 cents per bushel on corn to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. If the difference between the average market price and $1.35 were more than 32 cents during the first five months of the marketing year, an additional payment would be made. In no event would refunds by farmers be required.

TITLE VI—UPLAND COTTON

1. Provides a guaranteed support of 35 cents per pound (middling one inch basis) on the estimated production from 11.5 million acres

for the 1971 crop and an equivalent amount for the 1972 and 1973 crops.

2. Makes assistance available to participating cotton farmers through loans and payments. The loan would be 90 percent of the estimated average world price. The payment would be the difference between 35 cents and the average market price for the first five months following the beginning of the marketing year (which begins August 1), but in no event less than 15 cents per pound. No refunds by farmers would be required in the event market prices were greater than 20 cents per pound.

3. Authorizes payments to participating farmers on acreage made available to the public for recreational purposes.

4. Provides for a set-aside of cropland (not to exceed 33⅓ percent of the cotton allotment) as a condition of eligibility for benefits under the program.

5. Establishes a voluntary program under which marketing quotas, penalties, and acreage restrictions would be suspended for three years.

6. Requires participating farmers to plant cotton to receive payments with two exceptions: (a) if unable to do so because of natural disaster or other condition beyond producers' control; (b) if not less than 90 percent of allotment is planted.

7. Allows the sale of cotton allotments within a State, permits the lease of allotments within a State, and provides for the release and reapportionment of allotments during the 3-year life of this legislation.

TITLE VII—PUBLIC LAW 480

1. Extends without change the provisions of P.L. 480 (the "Food for Peace" program) which authorizes donations and long-term dollar credit and foreign currency sales of U.S. farm commodities to underdeveloped nations. Under the Act most foreign currency sales are scheduled to end by December 31, 1971.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

1. Continues the "Cropland Conversion" and "Greenspan" (long-term land retirement programs) at an authorized appropriation level of $10 million annually for each program.

2. Continues the current exemption from marketing quotas for boiled peanuts.

3. Permits farmers or other land owners who do not desire to hold an allotment on any crop under a government program to voluntarily relinquish it. (This would be a permanent provision.)

4. Establishes an indemnity program to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticide residues.

The Agricultural Act of 1970

(Statement on H.R. 18546 by Secretary Hardin)

The Agricultural Act of 1970 approved by the House Agricultural Committee on July 22, 1970 is the result of a bi-partisan effort by members of the Committee and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This proposed legislation meets the four basic agricultural goals of this Administration—(1) To protect and improve farm income; (2) To provide more flexibility for farmers in making their own farm operating decisions; (3) Develop greater reliance on the marketplace, enabling producers to become less dependent on government programs; and (4) Balance our supply of agricultural products to the demands of the marketplace and the consumer. At the same time, this legislation would assure consumers adequate food and fiber supplies at reasonable prices without a continued rise in cost to the taxpayer.

EFFECT OF NO ACTION

The need for new legislation for 1971 crops is clear-cut. Current laws expire at the end of 1970, and old legislation still on the books under the 1958 Act is simply inadequate. Under old laws, purchasing power of farmers would be drastically reduced with resultant impact on business and industry. Low feed grain prices would lead to a sharp expansion in livestock and poultry numbers and product prices disastrous to the livestock-poultry economy. This in turn would have a detrimental effect on the thousands of workers employed in farm oriented industries.

Without new legislation, we can look for an end to a balanced supply use situation for grains and cotton, which would result in glutted markets with rapidly increasing Government stocks.

This poses a threat to the farmer and an increasing expense to the taxpayer.

COTTON

If no agricultural legislation is passed by this Congress, the cotton program would be devised under older (1958) legislation. This legislation would provide high price supports but would result in prohibitive prices to consumers for cotton products and a resulting substantial loss in sales for farmers. It would be only a matter of time before cotton would be priced out of the market.

The bill is made up of eight Titles which contain the following major provisions:

TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITS

Title I of the Bill sets limitations on the amount of payments any individual farmer may receive from the cotton, feed grain, and wheat programs.

Under this provision, a producer could receive up to $55,000 from each program.

This Administration supports the Committee's action on this limitation since it is reasonable and can be administered without seriously affecting the effectiveness of those programs.

TITLE II—DAIRY

Title II of the Act, which relates to dairy producers, amends and extends authority for Class I base plans in Federal Milk Market Order areas.

It specifically guarantees competitive access to Class I base plan markets by established producers outside the market order areas, and leaves appeal procedures under the present law unchanged.

This Title also suspends the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm-separated cream, and permits the Secretary to use discretion in setting the support price on butter together with other milk products. It also extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by CCC to the Armed Services and Veteran's Hospitals, and continues his authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers.

TITLE III—WOOL

Title III of the Bill extends the National Wool Act of 1954 to cover marketings of wool and mohair through December 31, 1973. It continues the present wool incentive price of 72 cents a pound and the present mohair support price of 80.2 cents a pound through each year of the extension. Payments to producers depend upon prices growers receive in the market place.

The cost of the program is well below the duty collections used for financing payments and is therefore self-supporting.

In the absence of extension of the Wool Act, the only provision for wool and mohair producers is the general price support authority in section 301 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which previously resulted in large accumulations of Government-owned stocks.

TITLES IV, V, AND VI—WHEAT, FEED GRAINS AND COTTON

Titles IV, V and VI relate to wheat, feed grain, and cotton. Wheat, feed grain, and cotton producers who agree to set aside a portion of their farm from crop production and put it to conservation type uses and who maintain the normal conserving acreage on their farm will be eligible for program benefits.

THE 100 PERCENT OF PARITY

Wheat producers who participate will be assured of a return equal to 100 percent of parity on that portion of their wheat production which represents their share of wheat utilized for domestic food use.

On farms where wheat can be produced more efficiently than other crops, producers can grow additional wheat for the market at prices which will be competitive for world markets, and for domestic feed and industrial uses.

PROCESSOR CERTIFICATES

The cost of certificates to food processors will remain at 75 cents per bushel—the same as in prior years—and thus the program will not contribute to an increase in food costs.

FEED GRAIN GUARANTEES

Feed grain producers who participate will be eligible for payments on a portion of their feed grain production. In the case of corn, this payment will be a minimum of 32 cents per bushel with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley. Corn growers will be assured of a return of not less than $1.35 per bushel through a combination of market price and direct payments on about one-half of their normal corn production.

LOANS

Non-recourse loans would be available to feed grain and wheat producers at a level which would make these commodities competitive in world markets. This would encourage expanded domestic consumption and would avoid excessive and costly accumulation of these grains in Government hands.

EARLY PAYMENTS

Under both the wheat and feed grain programs there is provision for making payments to farmers as soon as possible after July 1 of the crop year involved. These early payments would total 32 cents per bushel in the case of corn, with corresponding rates for grain sorghum and barley, and about $1.25 per bushel in the case of wheat.

These early payments would assist farmers in meeting production expenses involved in planting, harvesting, and marketing their crops and in many instances would permit producers to avoid the burden of added credit and high interest costs.

COTTON

For cotton, the Bill would suspend marketing quotas and penalties. Farmers who participate would be eligible for payment on their share of the domestic market and for price support loans on their entire production of cotton. The loan would be at a level which would make cotton competitive in both domestic and world markets.

The preliminary payments will be a minimum of 15 cents per pound. An overall price guarantee of not less than 35 cents a pound would be applicable on a specified portion of their production. The early payment to farmers would be made as soon as possible after July 1 of the crop year involved.

FINAL PAYMENTS

Final payments on wheat, feed grain, and cotton will be based upon market prices for the first five months of the marketing year and will be made after these are known.

TITLE VII—P.L. 480

Under Title VII of the Bill, the provisions of Public Law 480—the Food for Peace Program—which authorizes donations and long-term dollar credit to underdeveloped Nations would be unchanged. Under the Act, most foreign currency sales are scheduled to end by December 31, 1971.

TITLE VIII—CONSERVATION AND ENVIRONMENT

Title VIII of the Bill will provide important authority to deal with several critical

environmental problems facing both farmers and non-farmers.

In addition to the necessity to adjust the acreage of land used for crops during the next few years, there is urgent need to provide assistance to farmers who due to age, poor health, physical disability or other reasons, must retire or reduce their farming activity.

There is also need, as evidenced by the increasing concern about our environment, to provide more opportunities for open spaces, clear water, clean air, and outdoor recreation. The programs authorized under this Title will help meet all of these problems at the same time.

This Title will supplement the more widespread crop adjustment efforts authorized under other Titles of the Bill. The costs for obtaining production adjustment under these long-term agreements will be even less per unit than that obtained under annual programs. With the assurance of program assistance over an extended period of time, farmers can retire or reduce their farming activity. They will thus be able to live on the farm and continue to be a viable part of the economic and social community while providing a valuable service to an ever expanding recreation-minded public.

HUNTING, TRAPPING, FISHING, AND HIKING

The act will make land available to the public for hunting, trapping, fishing and hiking by providing appropriate compensation to farmers who agree to cooperate. Assistance will also be given to develop wildlife food plots and other wildlife habitat. Standards will be developed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior who will also appoint a public wildlife advisory board with whom they can consult on wildlife phases of the program.

GREENSPAN

Another important feature of this Title is the "Greenspan" program. This program will provide significant recreational and open space benefits to nonfarm people.

It will provide assistance to Governmental agencies in purchasing surplus-producing cropland for the preservation of open spaces, natural beauty, the development of wildlife or recreational facilities, or the prevention of air or water pollution.

This will supplement the millions of acres which will be set aside from crop production under the annual programs authorized by other Titles of this Bill. This will also make a major contribution toward providing more open space, clean air, clear water and outdoor recreational opportunities.

PEANUTS AND HONEY

Title VIII also continues the current exemption from marketing quotas for boiled peanuts. In addition, farmers or other land owners who do not desire to hold an allotment under any crop under a Government program may voluntarily relinquish it. There is also provided an indemnity program to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticide residues.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. KLEPPE).

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I could not come into the well of this House talking about a farm bill without expressing my gratitude and appreciation to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and the ranking minority member (Mr. BELCHER) and then to Mr. PURCELL, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, and Mrs. MAY, the ranking minority member on our side.

It has been said—and I want to reiterate this—that the hours spent bringing this farm bill to its position today have been so numerous that it would be ridiculous to try to tabulate them. I have had a lot of experience in my life spending a great deal of time on a lot of projects and things, but never have I spent as much personal time on anything as I have on this legislation. I use those remarks advisedly because we consider many very important pieces of legislation in this House, but I consider this to be also, a very important piece of legislation.

It is a little disappointing, Mr. Chairman, to note that there are so few of our colleagues on the floor this afternoon.

This is complicated legislation, but it is vitally important to a declining minority of our people today, although they are a very vital minority.

We do not have before us the bill that I would like, and I think that is a true statement that everybody in this House could make. However, it evolved from a great deal of compromise and a great deal of give and take on the part of some of the individuals I have mentioned. I want to add to that the Secretary of Agriculture and his people who really put their minds to the stone to do the best they could to bring about a compromise and bring the bill to us, as I would like to define it, as a very minimum farm bill. In this farm bill we were agreed that we should bring out legislation that would bring us the relatively same level of spending on the three major crops which we are spending today. This was our objective and goal. In my own personal and humble opinion, we did not quite reach that goal. I cannot prove it, but I think time will develop the fact that it will fall a little short. Again I want to say that it brings us, and the farmers in rural America, a minimum farm bill that we can live with.

There are a couple of very basic concepts in this legislation that are different from what we have today. One is the freedom of the producer to plant once he has provided for the set-aside. The other is the set-aside approach as it was presented by the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary to make us more competitive in world markets. There is a great deal of argument about this and rightly so. Nevertheless it is one of the objectives of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I make no bones about the fact that I am very much of a producer oriented man. I want to give you a couple of examples. When you come from a State like North Dakota where possibly 85 percent of our total economy is dependent upon agriculture and agriculturally related industries, then you know and realize that when you have spent all of your life there you are going to be producer oriented.

And now I do not want to treat lightly anybody who is consumer oriented, because that is all of us. The reason I want to bring out this particular point is to call attention to the fact that the consumers have a stake in this legislation. America today consumers, you and I and all of the rest, are spending 16.5 percent of our total disposable income for food, the cheapest in the history of the world. Now, if you and I and the rest of us do not make certain that the producers of our Nation are kept economically healthy we, the consumers, will ultimately be the losers in my opinion.

I want to give you an example. A few years ago there was a local dairy doing a thriving and profitable business in a small community in California. A large corporation decided that they were going to put this guy out of business because he was not in favor of raising the price of milk, he was doing all right the way he was. So this big corporation cut the price of milk nearly in half in that community, and that starved this small businessman. It was not but 2 months after that this corporation raised the price of milk 50 percent over the previous price. They got their money back in a hurry, but the consumers of that area lost a producer, and lost a small businessman who was really oriented in their direction.

I think that is applicable here as we look about the producers of our Nation, and their relation to the consumers.

I want to give you another example about the total agricultural orientation of my State. I know that most of you if not all of you were approached by members of the Farm Bureau from the various States who came down here a week ago telling us all to vote against this bill. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the Farm Bureau from my State came down and asked me to support this bill. Why? Because they passed a resolution at their State convention that supported the wheat certificate concept, and we have that in this bill. This was in contradiction to the National Farm Bureau's position, but I think really so because that is the total agricultural orientation of our State and its people. It was even understood by those who belonged to the Farm Bureau.

I just want to say one final thing as I close these remarks, and that is it is emotional, I think, but it is true in my view, there is no finer place to live in the whole world than on the farm. No finer place to raise a family. I do not know what there is about a farmer, a small farmer, that grubs all he can out of that soil, but there is something about his projection and in his relationship to his fellow man and his neighbor that is just a little more humane.

You and I did not start farm programs and farm subsidies, but if we want to look at them in the total personal concept as they apply to our life today I think we have got to know and realize that if we can do something to supplement nonfarm income as well as farm income for the small families who want to live on that farm and raise their families, then we have performed a service because we then are not forcing them into the county seats, into the capital cities, and into the urban communities where they will ultimately end up on welfare.

I think that is the very basic provision and concept that is hooked up with this farm bill that we are considering now, and so I can only say that this is not Utopian. I know that it is a "whipping boy" piece of legislation for many, they say "Boy, when the farm bill comes

up just wait until I get a whack at that baby. I am going to take care of that. That is where I want to do my legislative work for the year."

But there is something very personal for anybody involved in this legislation that I hope you, my colleagues, will consider. It is minimum, but it is very vital to the agriculture in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FARM BILL: FUSE FOR A NATIONAL DEPRESSION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER).

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, to use an old phrase in a little different context, depression is "just around the corner" for this country if we do not have positive action very soon to halt the current recession and slow the high rate of business failures.

Both in agriculture and farm-related business circles, any sharp drop in the economy or prolonged deterioration, even at a small rate, will result in a slide that will snowball into a rural depression. And all of our most serious depressions have started that way—in the rural areas with farm foreclosures, low agricultural prices, and business failures among those close to the farmers on the land.

We have before us a farm bill containing the seeds of a farm depression that could rock this Nation. It will lower farm prices. It will break a lot of farmers. It is no time to be pushing farmers further down; it is a time we should be legislating relief for them to strengthen the whole economy.

With only 16 percent of disposable income in America going for food, and with only 5 percent of our disposable income actually reaching American farmers and ranchers, we must all realize that farm products are selling very cheap, actually below cost of production for most farmers, who have been living off their capital for a number of years.

At the bottom of the agricultural marketing totem pole are prices for grain.

On the farms of America today this is what you find:

Wheat is selling at 13 cents per bushel below 1943 levels.

Corn is selling at 6 cents per bushel less than in 1947.

Soybeans are 13 cents a bushel under their 1951 average.

Barley is a nickel a bushel under 1943 prices.

Oats bring 11 cents under 1943 levels.

Offsetting these prices paid farmers are these things:

Freight rates are at 1970 price levels—the highest in history.

Petroleum, steel, machinery, rubber, taxes, land, interest—every component of farm costs—is either at its highest in history or at a 30- to 40-year high.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what is known as the cost-price squeeze for agriculture. That, my colleagues, is what has forced agriculture into a box that requires, demands, a continuation of an agricultural stability act—a farm bill that keeps agriculture in business.

I have not mentioned prices for livestock. Prices for cattle, pigs and lambs are reasonably good. But beef on the hoof is selling somewhat lower than June of 1969, and 10 percent lower than the 1951 prices. Pigs and lambs are matching 1948 prices, 22 years ago. Because livestock markets have held up better than grain prices it is because of that and only because of that—that we are not now in the midst of a farm depression of a magnitude and depth that would be hard to project.

Unfortunately, hog prices are right now turning down.

It is only because of the relative strength and stability of the livestock markets that there has not already been a massive dislocation of farmers, with many squeezed off of farms hunting jobs in the cities. The trend from farm to city has been at a rapid pace for over 10 years. If it were not for current favorable livestock prices, it would have been an exodus comparable to the dust bowl days of the thirties.

Let those who are not directly involved in agriculture listen to me. I am not speaking of a little, isolated economic downturn that would only affect a few Americans—those 3 million operating the Nation's farms and ranches—I am speaking of an economic downturn that would require no haggling over semantics to determine whether it was correctly called a recession or depression. I am speaking of a "By Gawd depression" where no one would need to quibble over economic barometers or statistical yardsticks or need to read opinions of economists to know their pocketbooks and income were getting slim.

I am, Mr. Chairman, talking about an honest-to-God, go-broke depression that starts on the land, at the farm sales where they auction farmers off their land, and a depression that goes all the way to Wall Street in New York City, cutting down in its swath agribusiness in the rural towns and cities, business throughout the Nation, industrial output, and most important of all, a great many of the people in this country who live and work day by day and month by month doing a job for a paycheck.

The greatest single industry in the country is agriculture. It buys more steel, more petroleum products, more rubber, more trucks, than any other industry. When agriculture goes out of business or stagnates you can be certain that the ship of state is going to be rocked by the waves.

I have stated that but for relatively good and stable prices for livestock, agriculture with greatly increasing costs would already be in a disastrous depression; there is one other factor that has helped prevent this catastrophe. That is a farm program, the 1965 act, that, while not good enough to keep pace with the cost price squeeze for farmers, has done some good to stabilize farm income and prevent a more serious decline in grain markets.

What we have before us now in the administration's proposals for grain farmers is the prospect of much lower grain prices.

In my book, continuing cheap grain prices will mean cheap cattle, cheap pigs, cheap lambs.

You may say "Well, I would like that, I could buy more meat for my family."

Take a look at what really happens when farm prices go down. Price spreads widen. Farm to dinner table margins are at an all time high. A 30-percent drop in farm prices would not give consumers a 10 percent saving at retail. If wheat goes down 50 cent a bushel it would not save people who buy those breakfast foods regardless of how nutritious they are or are not, a penny a box. I can assure you, however, that the producers of those products would have lost their shirts in a vicious market that took off the top end but left them with rising costs that cannot be paid by the price received from the marketing of their product.

And there, Mr. Chairman, we would have the conditions which would plunge this entire Nation into a depression that would stagger our whole economy. We are ourselves confronted with a decision to pass a bill that leads toward the bottom of the pit or to follow, with temperate judgment, a path that leads to price stability for farmers and to the overriding responsibility of making the American economy sound.

This bill as it affects grain farmers leads to the pit—this bill does not approach the income stability of the present farm program. It would, under the guise of giving farmers more flexibility, assure lower grain prices. While all else that is produced, sold, built, bartered or bought has been going up, we would be forcing farmers to product for lower prices. There is not something new and better for grain farmers in this bill. Rather, there is something new and worse in this bill.

It is no wonder that no farm organization supports this bill. It is true the milk people want the milk provision, the wool growers want their program continued, and we all want Public Law 480 extended—but that is the extent of the support. No organizations back the wheat or feed grain titles, or the setaside idea. Even as desperate as grain farmers are, there are none that can say that this legislation would improve their lot.

Mr. Chairman, progress on the farms and ranches of America in the past 40 years has increased production magnificently. But we have never matched that know-how and capability in production with knowledge of marketing and distributing the food so that all in the Nation could enjoy the abundance with which we are blessed.

We have food stamp legislation pending before this House. Extension of Public Law 480, Food for Peace, is one of the titles of this bill. They are programs to take care of hungry people here at home and abroad.

We can improve on distribution costs and I will cite one example: From my home county, coal is shipped over 1,000 miles on the Burlington-Northern Railroad to furnish the fuel to turn on the electric lights in Minnesota. The freight

rate on that coal is $2.74 per ton. Wheat moves the same distance on the same railroad for five or six times that amount per ton. Railroad cars that haul grain cost more than cars to haul coal. But the real difference in the rates lies in the fact that the coal moves by unit trains all year and the grain moves by spurts and is billed in single car lots. There is no reason not to haul grain by unit trains at costs which would greatly reduce current freight rates. The Department of Agriculture, not adverse to progress, the grain trade, and the railroads—all could benefit by solving a problem in distribution costs that farmers big and small cannot solve by themselves.

I offer these three points: Food stamps, food for peace, and progress in distribution costs as three hopes for doing what farmers and humanitarians seek—improving farm prices and ending hunger of people whose nutrition and food supplies are inadequate.

Meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason to pursue folly by weakening the farm program, no reason to court serious depression; no reason to enact the wheat and feed grain sections proposed by Department of Agriculture officials who view the problem of grain farmers as one that can be solved only by lowering their prices. These two sections of the bill more than any other parts in the proposed legislation reflect the callous philosophy of so-called grain experts who have not truly realized the impact of rising costs on grain farmers.

I propose to continue the present level of price support for wheat as a minimum, and I shall offer an amendment to keep the minimum returns for a producer's whole crop at 70 percent of parity; that is, approximately $2 per bushel or the blend price return from 100 percent of parity for domestic wheat and the $1.25 loan on the rest, which is what the farmers get now.

The return should be more—wheat farmers are in trouble financially even at $2 per bushel average return—but this minimum will at least give them stability instead of a big drop.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the President of the United States went out to North Dakota recently and declared that he was for 100 percent of parity for wheat. There is a lot of confusion about whether he meant all wheat, or just a minor fraction of it.

If he is really for 100 percent of parity for wheat—which is what it ought to be—and cannot find anyone in his own party to offer such an amendment to this bill, I will put it in for him. I will be delighted to abandon this 70 percent, which I am proposing only because his Secretary of Agriculture and all the rest of his appointees have fought even that much right down the line.

I here and now challenge all of those who talk about 100 percent of parity for wheat to support just 70 percent as the minimum in the law. Stand up and be counted. Let the President send up another of his letters announcing his support for even that level of support for wheat—more if he wishes to—and I know the wheat producers of America will be grateful in view of what his Secretary of Agriculture is trying to do to them.

I also expect to support a similar amendment affecting feed grains which will be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH), my colleague from the Agriculture Committee, to give feed grains an assured minimum price support, in the law, at current levels.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I will propose an amendment directing the Secretary of Agriculture to arrange for the use of unit trains and rail-to-barge shipment of grains to lower transportation costs and to take the savings into account when calculating county loan rates on grain, so the savings in transportation will be passed back to the producers who desperately need every penny of added value they can obtain.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments to assure a minimum blend return for wheat and feed grains at least at present levels is the very least this body can do: anything less than that, anything as far down the scale as the administration is insisting upon, would be lighting the fuze of a depression.

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

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I understand the gentleman's first amendment correctly about wheat. Will the gentleman explain that again?

Mr. MELCHER. I will offer an amendment to assure the same level of price support for the whole wheat crop that we have right now—a 70-percent-of-parity return for our wheat farmers on their whole crop. This bill provides for parity on domestic food wheat but that is less than half of the crop.

Mr. KLEPPE. Is this a net 70-percent return the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MELCHER. I am talking about 70 percent figured on the whole crop.

Mr. KLEPPE. A blended price?

Mr. MELCHER. A blended price.

Mr. KLEPPE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma not only for yielding to me the 5 minutes but for all the cooperation he has given me in these past weeks in trying to reach some kind of compromise in regard to the payment limitations. Certainly he has been a gentleman. I wish also to thank the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee (Mr. POAGE), with whom I have had occasion to deal many times.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I intend to offer a substitute amendment to the committee amendment—title I of the bill—to limit the production payment to no more than $20,000. I will cosponsor it with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and on behalf of BARBER B. CONABLE, DONALD M. FRASER, EDWARD P. BOLAND, JOSEPH M. MCDADE, ALBERT H. QUIE, JEFFREY COHELAN, JOHN C. CULVER, FRED SCHWENGEL, ROBERT T. STAFFORD, ROBERT N. GIAIMO, ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, and RAY J. MADDEN.

This amendment represents a combination of the best features of amendments which each of us had developed separately. The end result, we believe, is a more effective and reasonable method of reforming our scandalous and inequitable farm subsidy program. I will insert at the close of my remarks a copy of the amendment and a brief explanation of it.

Perhaps the most important feature of our amendment is the strong language it contains to prevent its evasion through such devices as subdivision of farms. It calls upon the Secretary to implement regulations to prevent such evasion.

We also have regulations which we suggest that the Secretary should implement in order to establish a legislative history indicating that these are the kind of farm regulations which the Congress will insist upon. I also include these draft regulations at the close of my remarks.

These regulations are based on regulations which the Department of Agriculture promulgated several years ago to guide its staff in the enforcement of a $5,000 payment limitation in the conservation reserve program. They have been updated to apply to the commodity programs.

I assure my colleagues that if the amendment I am offering today is approved, I shall counsel with Secretary Hardin and his staff to the extent necessary to assure that the limitation is enforced and administered in an equitable and effective manner, thus reducing Government expenditures substantially.

The three enclosures referred to follow:

THE CONTE-FINDLEY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ON H.R. 18546 (TITLE I OF THE BILL)

TITLE I, PAYMENT LIMITATION

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) The total amount of payments which a person shall be entitled to receive under each of the annual programs established by Titles III, IV, V, and VI of this Act for the 1971, 1972 or 1973 crop of the commodity shall not exceed $20,000.

(2) The term "payments" as used in this section includes price-support payments, set-aside payments, diversion payments, public access payments, and marketing certificates, but does not include loans or purchases.

(3) If the Secretary determines that the total amount of payments which will be earned by any person under the program in effect for any crop will be reduced under this section, the set-aside acreage for the farm or farms on which such persons will be sharing in payments earned under such program shall be reduced to such extent in such manner as the Secretary determines will be fair and reasonable in relation to the amount of the payment reduction.

(4) The Secretary shall issue regulations defining the term "person" and prescribing such rules and further limitations as he determines necessary to assure a fair and reasonable application of such limitation and to prevent the circumvention or evasion of such limitation, whether the circumvention or evasion be attempted by means of the subdivision of farms, production allotments or bases thereof through sale or lease, or by other means; Provided, that the provisions of this Act which limit payments to any person

shall be applicable to lands owned and operated by states, political subdivisions, or agencies thereof.

SUMMARY OF THE CONTE-FINDLEY AMENDMENT

This substitute for the Committee amendment (Title I of the bill) differs with the Committee version in two principal respects: it would limit payments to any producer to no more than $20,000 per crop; and it includes language to prevent the evasion of this limitation. The following is an analysis of each subsection of the Conte-Findley substitute:

1. This is identical to the Committee subsection (1) except that the ceiling level is $20,000, and it is made applicable to wool as well as to cotton, wheat and feed grains.

2. This subsection is identical to subsection (2) of the Committee subsection (2), merely defines the term "payments."

3. This subsection is also identical to the Committee subsection (3), and is designed to encourage participation in the programs by producers affected by the limitation by permitting their set-aside obligation to be reduced in proportion to their payment reduction.

4. This subsection differs significantly with the Committee subsection (4) by making clear that the Secretary *shall* issue regulations to prevent circumvention or evasion of the limitation. It also makes clear that states and their political subdivisions or agencies will also be subject to the limitation provisions. The Committee subsection would have exempted them from these provisions. The substitute amendment assures that such agencies will continue to be treated as other producers. There is no justification for extending a privilege to a select number of states and state institutions merely because they are in the business of farming.

REGULATIONS TO PREVENT EVASION OF A $20,000 PER PROGRAM PAYMENT LIMITATION

Introduction

Even though the Department of Agriculture in years past has had considerable experience administering limitations on individual payments, the question of definitions and regulations is very important. Rules must be established which will prevent the circumvention or evasion of the limitation.

The word person is deliberately chosen in the amendment because it has been used widely in administering previous limitations and is well understood in the agricultural industry. Used here, person means an individual, a family, a partnership, or a corporation.

The maximum payments a person can receive under any single commodity program cannot total more than $20,000 a year—whether the program be feed grains, wheat, cotton or wood. To illustrate, if John Jones is proprietor of a farm on which feed grains are produced, is partner in a second such operation and has controlling interest in a corporation owning a third such farm, the aggregate payments he can receive from all sources for feed grains program participation cannot exceed $20,000 a year. Also the maximum each for the partnership or corporation likewise is $20,000. To take another illustration, if John Smith has similar interests except that his interest in the corporation is not controlling, he need not count payments to the corporation in computing his total payments subject to limitation.

The amendment is drafted to give clear instruction and authority to the Secretary to make further prorata reductions in payment limitations where he finds that sale or lease of production allotments or bases, or sale or lease of portions of farms have been made for the purpose of evading or circumventing the payment limitation.

It is also drafted so as to make clear the intent to cover by the limitation payments applicable to lands owned and operated by states, political subdivisions or agencies thereof.

Set forth below are regulations drafted on request by the Library of Congress after consultation with Department of Agriculture legal counsel. The word "producer" as it appears in the draft regulations should be considered the same as the word "person."

A possible exception to Item 4 in the draft regulations would be an Indian tribe, where tribal custom has caused one agent to act for several persons within the tribe. The Secretary shall have the authority to determine fair and reasonable rules in such circumstances.

The draft regulations are printed here as an indication of the regulations expected by the author of the amendment to be employed in administering the limitation.

The regulations

(a) The total of all cotton, feedgrains, or wheat payments under the programs to any producer for any year with respect to all farms in which he has an interest shall not exceed $20,000. All or any part of the payment which otherwise would be due any producer shall be withheld, or required to be refunded, if he had adopted, or participated in adopting, any scheme or device, including the dissolution, reorganization, revival, formation, or use of any corporation, partnership, estate, trust or by any other means designed to evade, or which has the effect of evading the provisions of this section. A family trust created on or after January 1, 1970, will be considered a scheme or device to evade the provisions of this section if it results in the settlor and beneficiaries of the trust receiving in the aggregate payments under the Program in excess of $20,000. For purpose of this provision, members of the family include husband or wife of the settlor, children of the settlor, their husbands and wives, and members of the immediate household of the settlor; and payments to a trustee shall be regarded as payments to the beneficiaries of the trust. For purposes of this section, a family shall include grandchildren of the settlor, step-children of a child of the settlor, and any minor related to the settlor by blood or marriage.

(b) Any sale or lease of land having a cotton or wheat allotment, or a feedgrain acreage base which on January 1, 1970, was a part of a farm or group of farms entitling the producer to payments in excess of $20,000 under provisions of the 1971 programs for these crops, if sold or leased to another producer or producers, shall be subject to the same prorata adjustments in payments and acreage as though it had not been leased or sold, except in cases where a renter gives up a lease from an unrelated landlord.

(c) For purposes of applying the payment limitation prescribed in paragraph (a) and (b) of this section, the rules contained in subparagraph (1) through (6) of this paragraph shall be effective to determine whether certain individuals interested in farming operations as landowners, landlords, tenants or sharecroppers are to be treated as one producer or as separate producers. In cases in which more than one rule would appear to be applicable, the rule which is most restrictive on the number of producers shall apply.

(1) A partnership shall be considered as a producer: Individual members of the partnership may be recognized in another capacity as landowners, landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers, on the same farm or another farm only if (i) the individual members operating in a separate capacity are not identical with the membership of the partnership, and (ii) the individual members also operated as separate producers or in a separate capacity as producers on the farm during 1969.

(2) A corporation or association shall be considered as a producer. A stockholder who owns a majority of the stock of a corporation shall not be considered as a separate producer on the same farm nor recognized in any other capacity on the same farm as a landowner, landlord, tenant, or sharecropper.

(3) An estate or trust shall be considered as a producer unless the estate has only one heir or the trust has only one beneficiary, in which case only the sole heir or the sole beneficiary shall be considered as a producer. Subject to the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, an individual who is not the sole heir of the estate or the sole beneficiary of the trust may be considered as a separate producer or recognized in a different capacity as landlord, landowner, tenant, or sharecropper, on the same farm or on another farm, provided such separate producer status is established to the satisfaction of the county committee.

(4) Two or more individuals operating as a group under an arrangement which, although lacking the legal elements of a partnership or corporation, is in the nature of a joint undertaking shall be considered as a producer. (Clubs, societies, fraternal and religious organizations, as well as informal arrangements between two or more individuals, are examples of such groups.) Individual members of the group shall not be considered as separate producers on the same farm nor recognized on the same farm in any other capacity as landowners, landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers.

(5) Husband and wife shall not be considered as separate producers nor recognized in any other capacity as landowners, landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers, on the same farm or on different farms. Other individuals having any family relationship may be considered as separate producers if they are participating on different farms. Such individuals may be considered as separate producers on the same farm or recognized in different capacities on the same farm as landlords, landowners, tenants, or sharecroppers only if such individuals operated as separate producers or in separate capacities during 1969.

(6) Individuals having a joint or common interest arising out of their interests in the ownership of any part of the farm as joint tenants, tenants by the entirety or tenants in common shall not be considered as separate producers on the same farm nor recognized in any other capacity on the same farm as landlords, landowners, tenants or sharecroppers.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA).

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to state that I intend, at the appropriate time tomorrow, to offer an amendment to this bill which will provide that anyone who desires to receive more than $5,000 in subsidy payments in the aggregate must agree to comply with the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and must certify that he is in compliance with all local State and Federal health and safety regulations.

I want to emphasize three things about this proposed amendment.

I am not changing any of the existing standards. I am not increasing the minimum wage requirements. I am not proposing any new Federal, State, or local health requirements.

I am merely saying that if someone wants to receive more than $5,000 of Federal money he ought to agree to comply with those minimum requirements. The proposition is based very simply on the premise that someone who is feeding his family with his paycheck is just as dependent on the amount of that paycheck and the health and safety conditions un-

der which he is earning it, whether he works in a mine or in a mill or on a farm.

It is based on the further proposition that we try to interfere as little as possible with the truly small farmer. Therefore, anyone who receives less than $5,000 of subsidy payments will not be affected by this proposed amendment.

Obviously a preferable position is that all farm help ought to be covered by such provisions. I repeat again, anyone who feeds his family with his paycheck is dependent on that paycheck and the conditions under which he has earned it, wherever he has worked.

However, I think as an initial proposition of fundamental fairness it is not too much to say to the large farmer that if he wants to enjoy $5,000 or more of these Federal fruits, he ought to be willing to share a little bit by complying with the Federal standards that apply to all other employers and comply with his own State and local health and safety regulations. It is a simple amendment, and I hope the support of the committee will be forthcoming.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the fact that we have a minimum wage law applicable to farm labor.

Mr. MIKVA. To some farm labor. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. To most all farm labor except very small farms.

Mr. MIKVA. May I say to the gentleman that less than 20 percent of all farm labor is presently covered by the minimum wage and hour standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This would add some more employees to that coverage at least as far as wages are concerned.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What the gentleman is really doing, then, is this: the gentleman is attempting to expand the minimum wage law to an area that it does not now cover. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MIKVA. By no means. I am suggesting that if someone wants to get Federal funds, they ought to agree to comply with the standards already in the law.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Which has the effect of extending the minimum wage law.

Mr. MIKVA. That is a semantic argument. The gentleman finds one effect, and I say the effect is that a large corporate farmer who wants to share in some of the billions of dollars we are providing ought to agree to that fundamental minimum.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. O'NEAL).

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, why do we subsidize newspaper, magazine, and book publishers with low postal rates? The answer is easy. It is not because the publisher needs the money, or because we feel sorry for him. It is for the better enlightenment and thus the benefit of the recipients of those publications. We want the public to get reading material as cheaply as possible and thereby be well informed.

Mr. Chairman, why do we subsidize various forms of transportation? The answer is the same. It is for the benefit of the traveler, or shipper, or receiver of the products being hauled.

All of our subsidies are for the benefit of some portion or all of the public.

No one would suggest that the Washington Post or the Reader's Digest or Time and Life publications or any other publisher receive the subsidized rate as a "welfare project." No matter how big the publisher is, if he did not get the subsidy he would have to charge more to the subscriber.

And nobody ever suggests seriously that we put a limitation on these subsidies. Nobody suggests that my weekly papers retain the subsidy but that we deny them to the big dailies. It is manifestly unfair to suggest this and it is contrary to the intent of the program, which is simply to have a well-educated, well-informed, well-read populace in this country.

Likewise, one of the purposes of the farm programs is to have a well-fed public at the least expense to the individual. It is the public that is really subsidized.

Despite the fact that American costs of food production are the highest in the world, despite the fact that American processors, American laborers, American truck drivers, American meat cutters, American food store clerks, American workers in every phase of agri-business get the highest incomes in the world, the American consumer still pays the least percentage of his take-home pay for his food than any person who ever lived on the face of the earth. This is due in part to the hard work and the small return on the farmer's investment, the marvelous discoveries of our agricultural colleges and agricultural research laboratories, but also due to the system—the Government subsidization that eventually gets to the person who buys and eats the groceries.

Some city and suburban Members of Congress do not seem to realize that the American taxpayer is helping his constituents pay the grocery bill. The poor family pays a larger percentage of his income for food than the rich man and thereby benefits the most from the farm subsidy program. When the clerk is calling the roll in this Chamber the loudest vote for the farm bill ought to come from the urban Member of Congress. The merchants and manufacturers of all other products will sell less if this bill fails to pass and the American must then spend more of his take home pay for food.

Mr. Chairman, it would surprise me greatly to find one Member of this body—Republican or Democrat—who would write this bill as it is written or who is completely satisfied with it. Everyone familiar with the legislative process knows that this is the way it has to be with all major complicated legislation.

Certainly it is not a perfect bill, and not one which wholly satisfies anyone. But it is a good bill and it represents concessions and compromise arrived at in more than a year of various subcommittee and full committee sessions and meetings between our committee and Secretary Hardin and other top officials of the Department of Agriculture.

Members of the committee who are most interested in the farmer's welfare have maintained a realistic and practical attitude. We have accepted in a spirit of compromise a bill which is not regarded by all as the best possible solution to the farm problem.

We hope our colleagues in the House will accept this legislation in the same spirit and give it overwhelming approval on final passage. I am convinced that a failure to pass it will trigger a real depression in America.

The importance of favorable action on this bill cannot be overemphasized, not only importance for the American farmer but because of its impact on our Nation's total economy.

In the absence of a new law to replace existing statutes which expire at the end of this year, we will revert to an old and outmoded program which would force the farmer to overproduce in a vain attempt to make a profit and thus destroy himself. The surpluses of the 1950's would seem small when we consider the production capacity of American agriculture today.

In days past there was a common and probably accurate statement that nationwide economic depressions all begin on the farm. Depressions in this country have historically been farm bred, farm led, and farm fed.

If we do away with our system of subsidies, if we stop making these Federal payments through the farmers to the consumers, then one of but two alternative things will happen: One, we will have to import all of our cotton and all of our wheat because not a single American farmer can come anywhere near growing it at a profit because of what he has to pay for equipment and supplies. The cotton farmer, as I understand it, would lose about 10 cents a pound for every pound he raised. Therefore we would destroy all of these farmers and they and their employees and their families would probably move to the cities immediately. Not only that, but we would destroy countless thousands of jobs and industries that sell to the farmers.

I would ask my colleagues to simply add up the industries of this kind that happen to be in their own districts.

The other alternative, Mr. Chairman, is for the farmer to get from the consumers what he now gets from the Government.

Considering the current state of our economy, the failure to pass a farm bill would most assuredly set off a cataclysmic change in the agri-business world and the economy in general. Agriculture is still by far the largest single industry in the United States, and it generates jobs for nearly 40 percent of the employed workers of our Nation, either by providing the implements with which they work or by providing a market for the commodities which they produce.

It seems almost unbelievable that the American public could take for granted such a vital industry as agriculture. Yet, this is exactly what many have done for several years now.

Even with the assistance of this legislation, farmers in the United States will not realize a fair return on their considerable investment in time, labor, and

money. The return on crops lags far behind the costs of input items that go into production. In this decade, farm costs have gone up 31 percent and farm debt has increased 90 percent.

Although the Agricultural Act of 1970 by no means offers the farmer a panacea, it should accomplish the objectives which farm programs for the past several years have achieved. That is an approximate balance between production and consumption.

On the crucial question of limitation of payments, I agree with the views often expressed by our distinguished chairman. He has said, in effect, that while limitations basically are unfair and would impair the efficiency of any farm program, they seem to be inevitable and therefore should be held at a workable level. We believe that level to be $55,000. I sincerely hope the bill with the $55,000 limitation will pass by a solid majority.

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

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. O'NEAL) for his statement and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH).

ZWACH AMENDMENT TO TITLE II

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I support the provisions of the Poage-Belcher bill dealing with dairy products and would like to clarify as best I can the intent of an amendment which I proposed and the committee unanimously accepted concerning the class I base plan.

My amendment appears on page 5, line 22, of H.R. 18546 and it reads as follows:

(v) notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, dairy farmers not delivering milk as producers under the order, upon becoming producers under the order, shall ninety days later, pursuant to the provisions of section 8c(5)(D) of this Act, be provided with respect to milk delivered under the order, allocations based on their past deliveries of milk during the representative period from the production facilities from which they were marketing milk during the representative period on the same basis as other producers under the order on the effective date of order provisions authorized under this clause (f): *Provided*, That bases shall be allocated only to a producer marketing milk from the production facilities from which he marketed milk during the representative period, except that in no event shall such allocation of base exceed the amount of milk actually delivered under such order.

This amendment was carefully worked out after weeks of discussion and as the author of it, I want to make it very clear that this amendment is designed to give all established dairy farmers a realistic opportunity to have competitive access to class I markets throughout the Nation.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 was enacted only after long and careful consideration of the dangers to both producers and consumers of permitting certain groups to gain control of and limit access to specific markets. It was specifically to protect producers and the public against such possible dangers that 8c(5)(D) was introduced and adopted with this provision:

(D) Providing that, in the case of all milk purchased by handlers from any producer who did not regularly sell milk during a period of 30 days next preceding the effective date of such order for consumption in the area covered thereby, payments to such producer, for the period beginning with the first regular delivery by such producer and continuing until the end of two full calendar months following the first day of the next succeeding calendar month, shall be made at the price for the lowest use classification specified in such order, subject to adjustments specified in paragraph (B) of this subsection.

Equally as important was the amendment sponsored by the late August Andresen of my State of Minnesota. It was also found to be a necessary protection to gain adoption of the original act.

The Andresen amendment states:

(G) No marketing agreement or order applicable to milk or its products in any marketing area shall prohibit or in any manner limit, in the case of the products of milk, the marketing in that area of any milk or product thereof produced in any production area in the United States.

These provisions were found necessary as a part of the act, for two reasons: First, to assure the free movement of milk in interstate commerce and prohibit barriers adopted at the request of producers distributing in an area at the time of Federal order promulgation, and second, to prevent the undue exploitation of consumers by preventing the free entry of milk from other producers.

Recently, efforts have been undertaken to upgrade manufacturing grade milk to the point where, in the near future, it seems quite likely that all milk sold in interstate commerce will equal the grade A standards recommended in the code of the U.S. Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has released recommended standards in the past year to upgrade manufacturing milk. The final enactment of such standards has been delayed only to permit further collaboration with USDA, to simplify and correct any unreasonable and unnecessary provisions of the minimum standards.

While price was once the main incentive to get farmers to meet grade A milk standards, in recent years several new factors have entered the picture. As production milk units become larger, new facilities must be provided and many dairy farmers find it reasonable to meet the highest standards at the time of the initial change rather than on a piecemeal basis as standards are gradually upgraded. This tendency is especially strong in the Upper Midwest where 85 percent of the milk production must look to other areas for a market outlet. The better dairy farmers are continuously striving to produce milk that will be acceptable to, and desired by, those consumers who demand the best.

Another factor in the upgrading of all milk is the greater consciousness of consumers that they are not themselves in a position to police the quality of all food products with a result that they demand greater Government supervision for all perishable food products.

Dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest are the most efficient milk producers in the Nation as evidenced by the fact that milk production has held relatively stable in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, even though milk prices there average far below the national average. For example: The 1968 average price received by Wisconsin farmers for milk was $4.59, while the U.S. average was $5.30. Producers supplying grade A milk for the Chicago Regional Milk Order in 1968 received an average of $4.80 at Chicago, while the average price for all Federal order markets was $5.46, while other markets in areas less well adapted to milk production ranging up to $6.95 per hundredweight for 3.5 percent milk.

Minnesota and Wisconsin have long been the reserve supply of milk for the Nation, shipping milk to other markets on an emergency basis when other producers nearer the receiving markets could not supply market needs. When Minnesota and Wisconsin milk is not needed for such shortages, it is kept at home for use in manufactured products. At any rate, they supplied the needs without regular participation in the respective pools and without regular qualification and "producers under terms of the orders in the receiving market."

These producers have provided a real service to the market, receiving class I returns only when their milk was needed. However, in recent years more producers have shipped directly to distant markets as truck routes and equipment were improved and interstate highways were developed. We now have milk from Minnesota and Wisconsin going to St. Louis; Indianapolis, Ind.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Cleveland, Ohio; and other distant markets on a regular daily basis as milk producers in the Midwest make up for the shortages in other areas.

The door must be kept open for such milk to move freely into markets where needed. Class I base programs in orders must not be permitted to assign all class I premium proceeds to a specific group of producers in high production cost areas because they happened to sell milk to such market at a specific time.

Equally important is the fact that the term "producer" does not necessarily mean the same thing in terms of Federal order participation as in ordinary lay language. Outside of the Federal order field, we ordinarily think of a producer as anyone who produces the product under consideration. However, such is far from the case in Federal milk order terminology where the USDA has provided much more specific definitions. For example, the following definition, typical of most Federal milk orders, comes from the Chicago regional order No. 30:

§ 1030.15 Producer. "Producer" means any person, except a producer-handler as defined in any order (including this part) issued pursuant to the Act, who produces milk in compliance with Grade A inspection requirements of a duly constituted health authority, when milk is received as producer milk at a pool plant or diverted pursuant to § 1030.16 from a pool plant to a non-pool plant.

When we consider the term "producer" in relation to Federal marketing order, the key becomes not whether the dairy farmers are producing and marketing milk, but whether the plant to which the farmer's milk is delivered qualifies as a pool plant. Pool plant qualifications generally include required percentages of total milk receipts to be used in class I products—fluid or drinking milk—and that specific minimum percentages be distributed for sale within the prescribed marketing area. Pool plant standards frequently differ depending upon whether the plant packages its own receipts for fluid distribution or acts as a supply plant by reselling its receipts in bulk to another plant which in turn does the bottling. By varying these pool plant specifications, USDA also determines who may participate in a pricing pool as a producer.

When we concern ourselves with market entry of new producers, we are in fact talking about the right of any dairy farmers engaged in the production and marketing of milk, and not just those producers who qualify under terms of present orders. Our concern is that existing dairy farmers who may desire to sell milk to Federal order fluid markets be given equal opportunity to share in the premium or high class I prices as those already qualifying by sale to pool plants. We recognized, of course, that they must meet the quality standards necessary for sale in the market under consideration and that such milk must be available when needed.

This bill which provides for class I base plans specifically assures qualified dairy farmers, irrespective of the area in which they produced milk, an opportunity to share equally with other producers in the proceeds of the market's class I sales.

The specific language of my amendment on H.R. 18546 is designed to avoid any barrier to the free flow of milk and to prevent discrimination against producers.

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

Mr. ZWACH. I yield to the gentleman.

IMPERFECTIONS IN THE BILL

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, those of us from agricultural districts are most acutely aware of the inequities of this bill. To protect farm income at equitable levels, the Congress should provide more protection than this bill contains.

But we know higher agriculture expenditures are politically unattainable in an increasingly urban society with competing demands for the taxpayer's dollar. This legislation, therefore attempts to achieve a compromise with reasonable prospects for passage in the House of Representatives where few Members have significant numbers of constituents in agriculture.

Those of us from the plains know this bill perpetuates inequities in the distribution of the national conserving base—some 100 million acres of cropland diverted from intensive production of supported commodities. Members of my staff and I and many others have worked for months to achieve reform in this area—a more just distribution of the conserving base acreage. We have had no success.

Kansas has 29.9 million cropland acres, with a conserving base totaling 6.4 million acres. Texas has 35.8 million cropland acres, with a conserving base of only 2.9 million acres. Kansas and Texas are directly competitive in the fed-cattle industry and the production of milo for feedlot use. The inequity is obvious, but it has developed over the years under existing regulation and law, and is perpetuated by this act.

URGE SUPPORT BY ALL MEMBERS

Other Members from other regions of the Nation will recognize other imperfections in this bill. It is right to protest these inequities, for the economy of a good many States and farming regions is at stake. However, without passage of compromise legislation at this late hour, chances are we will have no farm bill at all this year.

Farmers want a bill, not a political issue. Without a bill, land values might be reduced drastically in many farming regions. Many honest and diligent family farmers will see their equity in the land destroyed. All farmers will suffer depressed income and be forced to curtail purchases of farm machinery, fertilizers, and petroleum products.

MARKET ECONOMY THE GOAL

Over the long haul, we must return to a market economy in agriculture. This bill is a hopeful first step in that direction, for it assures the United States a competitive position in the export market for wheat and feed grains.

A market economy—and collective bargaining—in production for domestic consumption are rejected in favor of the consumer subsidy, but in export commodities, at least, a giant step is made in the direction of the market economy under this act.

Farmers cannot survive without an export outlet for commodities. Half the hard red winter wheat of Kansas is grown for export. Wheat farmers have lost about one third of their allotment over the past 3 years. They cannot continue to sustain additional acreage reductions without rapid deterioration of production efficiency. The export market is the commercial wheat farmer's only hope, and this bill protects that market.

The entire Nation depends upon the export of commodities no less than agriculture. Our balance-of-payments position in trouble already, would collapse without the continuing cash sale of about $5 billion in commodities overseas each year. This bill protects our balance of payments more than it protects farm income, and every urban Congressman should not forget that fact.

Whether we approve or not, many great industries in America are supported by Federal subsidies in the public interest. Magazine publishers enjoy the second class mailing subsidy. The aircraft industry is heavily subsidized. The railroads are subsidized, and are asking for a billion more per year.

The petroleum industry is subsidized by import quotas, the textile manufacturers are asking for similar subsidies. The Nation cannot permit unlimited numbers of Volkswagens and Saabs and Fiats into our market for obvious reasons. Our national economy is clearly a partnership—a partnership between private industry and the Federal Government's policies. Profits and losses are habitually determined by management's decisions and the decisions in Washington. The one complements the other.

This year is not the year to experiment with the future of America's largest industry—agribusiness—representing about $125 billion of the gross national product.

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

Mr. ZWACH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his dogged determination and persistent efforts to have included in the class I base plan proposal in this bill a provision which would guarantee access to the producers of the great dairy areas of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other places who might have been barred or who might have been delayed for a period of years in getting access to the class I markets of this country.

I think much of the credit for this very fine provision in this bill must go to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Also I want to commend the gentleman for having included in this bill a continuation of the dairy indemnity payments to farmers who lose their products through no fault of their own, based on pesticides and other articles that contaminate milk, which have been approved by the Federal Government.

Third, for the provision which makes available to the Military Establishment and military hospitals dairy products which will be given to them without cost.

I think these are very commendable provisions and I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his efforts which have made them possible.

Mr. ZWACH. May I say to my neighbor, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON) that I bear witness to his untiring efforts as Governor and as attorney general and as a member of the Wisconsin Legislature and as Congressman in his effort to carry out the opening of the milk markets for high grade milk.

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

Mr. ZWACH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH) for his diligence, his patience, and his perseverance in obtaining favorable consideration for his very vital amendment to this bill—starting on page 5 of H.R. 18516.

The Zwach amendment clearly states the principle of competitive access to class I markets, and it goes a long way to making the class I base plan an acceptable provision in the dairy program.

As one who worked with the gentleman from Minnesota in his efforts to obtain equitable treatment for the area of the Nation that produces more milk

than any other region on the face of this globe, I can appreciate the difficulties encountered and the resistance that was offered by those who wished to make this class I program a local milk monopoly for a few favored producers in milk deficit areas.

With the language of the Zwach amendment and the clear intent of the committee spelled out that this program is to be administered in the national dairy interest, not just the local dairy interest, I am confident that dairy farmers in our area of Wisconsin will be fairly treated in the days and years ahead.

Without the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, I could not possess that confidence, however.

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I wish also to pay tribute to the sections of the bill relating to recreation, hunting and fishing.

I wish to speak briefly about the grain provisions of the bill that I feel should definitely be strengthened. I feel it is wrong to eliminate the parity concept, to fix at a designated rate the return in agriculture when freight rates, farm inputs and taxes are continually on an escalator. I will offer an amendment that will retain the parity principle as it is in wheat. I believe also that we ought to have some bottom to the loan figure. I do not believe we ought to give to the Secretary or to any administrative official the exclusive right to peg a loan rate from zero to 90 percent of parity. The amendment I shall offer will also deal in that area.

Third, it will deal in the area of the release prices of CCC commodities. If this legislation is implemented as contemplated, it well may result in a lower release price for stocks held by Commodity Credit.

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

Mr. ZWACH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I have discussed this matter with the gentleman and thoroughly agree with him. I wish to associate myself with his point of view and shall support his amendments.

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been a bit disturbing today, both in the discussion on the rule and in the general debate, to hear the farming industry painted as one that is to have the advantage of a windfall or, as one Member termed it, a "boondoggle." I believe it is no such thing. I believe that the evidence clearly points out that this bill falls far short of our present legislation for our farmer.

I have opposed this legislation principally on one point from its very inception, from the time the Department presented it to us. I refer to the set-aside proposal. I think that in my district, a very conservative estimate has been made that farm income will be reduced by 20 percent.

I have been disturbed as well by some statements that have been made, as well as from other quarters—for instance, a minority view or dissenting view in the committee report—that cotton is receiving a favored position in this legislation.

I certainly choose to differ from that assertion. Incidentally I have both wheat and feed grain producers in my district, as well as cotton. To make this bill equitable in its application to cotton as well as wheat and feed grain farmers, we need to revise the provision in the bill with respect to set aside. Therefore it is my intent to offer an amendment tomorrow to reduce the set aside authorization of the Secretary on the cotton section of the bill from 33⅓ percent down to 20 percent. That is, acreage equal to 20 percent of the farm base acreage allotment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is no better way to sum up the reduced income for the cotton farmer in this bill than was done by the Secretary and his Assistant Secretary, Mr. Palmby, in response to a question which I posed on May 12 at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture. Assistant Secretary Palmby responded to my question about the set aside proposal in this fashion:

> This requirement for diversion or set aside in the cotton program, I point out to you, is a less attractive feature than what is in the present Act for the cotton people.

Mr. Chairman, I might say in conclusion it is my present intention to vote for this legislation on the floor of the House for the reason that I feel the evidence preponderates for this legislation as being better than no legislation, or for this legislation as being better than going back to the 1958 act. But I would say let us equalize, let us equate, let us be fair among the various commodities covered by this program, and let us reduce the set aside authority by the Secretary of Agriculture from 33⅓ percent to 20 percent.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, during the 21 years that it has been my privilege to serve as a Member of this great body, I have seen many farm bills battled and battered on this floor.

I have seen proposals to literally enchain American agriculture, and I have fought those proposals.

I have seen some real fiscal follies designed and developed through the years and seldom have I seen the Committee on Agriculture in substantial agreement on anything.

I have seen many instances where the administration—be it a Republican or a Democratic administration—has been in a hammerlock with the Congress over farm legislation—be it a Republican or a Democratic Congress.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the rhetoric during the past two decades on farm bills was usually shrill, generally emotional, and yes, inevitably partisan.

This year, for a change, we have a different legislative atmosphere as we consider H.R. 18546.

This year we have a bill which has the support of the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), and the ranking minority member of that committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER).

This year the administration and the committee are working together to pass a farm bill.

This year the Committee on Agriculture, with only six dissenting votes—three Republicans and three Democrats—has agreed on a farm bill.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the situation is different this year because the leadership of both parties agrees that it is in the national interest to have a new farm bill to replace the expiring Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

This year there has been more light than heat in the farm bill dialog, so let us continue to use reason, not rancor, and analysis, not emotion, as we continue our deliberations over this important legislation.

Now when I said that this year's farm bill was different, I did not mean it was so different that there is not any controversy about it.

This farm bill is not ready for the Consent Calendar, believe me.

There are some features in it which I personally do not think are sound, and I am sure other Members of the House feel the same way. This is not the farm bill that I would write, nor is it the kind of farm bill the administration would write if it had the power to do so. It is a compromise bill which has the thoughts and writings of many. But, by and large, I am convinced that this bill represents the best bill possible at this time, even it if is not the best possible bill.

When I say this bill is the best bill possible, I mean that it is preferable, both to the farmer and the taxpayer than either a straight continuation of the 1965 act or a reversion to the old laws in effect prior to 1965. Either of these alternatives represent, in my opinion, a reversion to the antique notions of past farm programs which have done so much to hamstring the farmer and deplete the public treasure, programs which I, for one, have consistently opposed.

I think we all have to recognize that while in many ways this bill is similar to the legislation of the past, it at least contains some movement and direction toward the free market. It suspends quotas and controls on wheat and cotton, and it establishes a set-aside system that should help provide farmers with greater flexibility in the management of their own farms.

At the same time, this bill promises that the financial rug will not be pulled from under the American farmer for the next 3 years. It contains a commitment for the administration to continue to expend about the same amount of money on the three big commodity programs as is the case now.

As just one Member of this House I realize that our national prosperity is directly interlinked to our farm prosperity. Without a sound agricultural economy we are not going to have a sound total economy.

I therefore accept the fact that this bill is a form of subsidy to American agriculture.

I have not observed a developed nation in this world which did not subsidize its agriculture one way or another, and our great country is no exception. The assistance we provide in this bill will, in the long run, be repaid many times over to American taxpayers and consumers.

That is why I am supporting H.R. 18546.

I do not intend to try to substitute my judgment for what a good farm bill is for that of the 27 Members of Congress who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and who brought this bill to the floor after 38 days of public hearings, 92 executive sessions, 27 night meetings, and a year and a half of negotiating nearly every sentence and word of this 57-page bill.

This bill is supported by the Secretary of Agriculture, by the administration, and by the Democratic leadership of the House and by me as the Republican leader.

I support it, and I urge all Members of the House to do likewise.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, this farm bill concerns me as much as any bill before the Congress. The mechanics have been and will be dissected pro and con in the ensuing debate.

My concern regarding the technicalities runs deep. I have some reservations about this bill, but my primary concern regards the innuendo surrounding the farm programs. Despite arguments to the contrary, Mr. Speaker, this is a consumer's bill. Everybody in America eats, and what we do today will seriously affect the price everybody pays for food.

American agriculture is the strongest in the world; yet, ironically, our farm program is the most maligned in the world. I find it difficult to sit by while some would foster the false image of the "big, fat farmer who gets rich for not planting." This is simply not true, and I would admonish the big city boys for pushing this imagery. To do this, I must point out that one hardworking man on the farm feeds 44 of his people in the city. And, while prices are at an alltime high, the housewives of this Nation spend but 16½ percent of their husband's disposable income in groceries. Nowhere in the entire world can this record be matched—either in price or in quality.

Yet, the farmer is caught in one of the most severe cost-price squeezes to face any industry. Even with food prices, as high as they are, these prices come nowhere near paying the production costs.

The farmer does not enjoy the profit margin of his city cousins who are industrialists. And, yet the farm product has not risen in cost, nor suffered in quality, as have the majority of other consumer items.

The income margin has been repeatedly shaved closer to the farmer's pocketbook. Increasingly, the farmer has been left to his initiative, his capacity for hard work, and his technological expertise in order to grow more and more food for more and more people—and realize less and less. We are at the point of no return. If things get any tighter, we will see a mass exodus from the farm to the "greener" pastures inside the city limits. If today's farmer fails, naturally his son will not try to make a go of farming.

Mr. Chairman, the headline hunters have filled the Nation's media with hot charges that the fat, corporate farmer sits back and gets fatter while his crops are not planted. Again, I say this is a false image.

It is true that there are giant farmers in the Nation, but the real recipients from a diverted acreage program is the small farmer. By keeping some of the big boys in the program, we are encouraging the small, the individual farmer to keep his plow in the ground.

I am certainly no economist, Mr. Chairman, but I think I can make a sensible prediction. I predict that we would have even larger problems were we to, in one fell swoop, wipe out this particular program. Imagine, if you will, that perhaps less than 100 giant farms could feed this Nation. Given our technological advances, this is within the realm of the possible. But, should this happen, do not you imagine this Government would become a full-time policeman checking and rechecking the potential for price fixing, corruption, and related antitrust matters.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this Government will spend billions to subsidize the schools, transportation, water and sewer, social programs, housing and hundreds of other Government-supported endeavors—yet where is the hue and cry when abuses are shown in these areas, where is the indignant big city voice when corruption is shown within programs aimed at the poverty-line people who can ill afford such abuse.

Then, on top of this, try to explain to a farmer why this Nation can spend $1 billion on free food stamps, yet cannot spend $3½ billion on a program that will feed everyone, including the poor who receive the food stamps.

Mr. Chairman, only 3½ cents of the Federal dollar goes into a farm program. Three and one-half cents out of every Federal dollar—and we feed this Nation and others, to boot. I wonder if there is any other industry in this land which can do so much with so little.

We must continue to preserve the rights of the farmer—and, by doing so, we will preserve the rights of the American consumer. But, the farmer has the right to receive a fair return for his labor; the right to receive a fair return for the sale of his crop; the right to expect fair treatment from his Government; and every right to object to the distorted statements of the uninformed who would malign the man who works side by side with the sun.

Mr. Chairman, we must put a face on the farmer. It is folly to look only at national statistics. Let me quickly tell you of one farm family which exemplifies the farmer who loves his land and works it hard.

On July 4, while most of the Nation paused, I was driving in central Texas. The heat was unbearable. It came riding in on 102-degree beams of sunlight.

Just off the highway, a sun-burned arm raised from the wheel of a tractor in friendly greeting. The cloud of dust behind the tractor died down and we stopped to visit. As the conversation got underway, another tractor cleared the horizon—it was the man's 15-year-old son who was cutting the cane into the windrows.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the real farmers. They are full-time farmers; they are legendary in that the head of the clan began farming in Travis County some 75 years ago. Most of his children—and their children—are farmers. And they all want to remain as farmers.

I was amazed at their keen perception of the farm bill, which was then still in embryonic stages. They asked about the possible outcome, about set-aside as opposed to diverted acreage—and the youngsters asked if there was any future for them in farming.

These are 100-percent farmers, Mr. Chairman. No moonlighters here. And they are concerned about their livelihood.

It looks like now I will have to tell these good friends that there has been a shift in this Government's farm program. This new 1970 model we are rolling out differs from the old bill in these major provisions:

An acreage set aside program will be set up;

Although parity is retained as a concept, the working papers on this include only wheat; and

Wheat, feed grain and cotton payments could be limited to $55,000 per crop year to individual farms.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the farmers in my district will take this news. How successful will the arguments be that this is the best compromise bill which could be forged out of an urban Congress.

Most important of all, however, is that the Congress must enact the best farm bill possible. It may well be that this bill is the best consensus opinion the House can muster and agree upon. Thus, it is vital that we move this or a similar bill to the other Chamber. Some programs have already lapsed. We are faced with this bill or falling back on an older farm program. Already, the farmer's sun has begun to set: we must hurry to help his program before economic darkness sets in.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 18546, the Agriculture Act of 1970.

I know there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding this legislation and I would only like to point out to my colleagues that the agricultural economy

of this Nation is a very diverse one. Perhaps it is almost impossible to combine the entire and diverse faction of agriculture under one roof. But I know the Agriculture Committee has labored long and hard to bring to the floor this bill which I think represents a delicate blending of all these interests. I would like to commend the committee and particularly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) for his untiring efforts in behalf of the agricultural community of this Nation.

I think the passage of this legislation is essential to a viable farm economy and that such an economy is essential to the betterment and welfare of all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks specifically to the class I base provisions of title II of this act. The Puget Sound region of Washington State has the only operation class I base plan presently in operation. I represent the majority of the producers furnishing milk for this marketing order area. I was involved in the drafting of the original class I base legislation which can be found in the Agriculture Act of 1965. Subsequently, I drafted and on two separate occasions helped pass through the House of Representatives legislation similar to that we are considering today. Unfortunately, on the first occasion of the passage of this type of legislation, these provisions were deleted in a Senate-House conference committee and on the second occasion of the passage of this type of legislation through the House of Representatives, the Senate, having insufficient time at the end of the 90th Congress, failed to pass it before adjournment.

Mr. Chairman, the class I base provisions of this legislation are not everything that I would like. Similarly, they do not contain all the provisions that some other persons interested in the dairy industry would like. Rather, they represent a blending of the interests of all dairymen and I think constitute a reasonably satisfactory compromise of the conflicting and divergent interests even of the dairy industry of America. With proper administration, it is my feeling that these class I base provisions can become guidelines for more orderly and satisfactory milk marketing procedures for the entire United States.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I think it would be a good idea to explain briefly a class I base plan. I do not intend to belabor the subject, but class I base plans are relatively complex. For the benefit of my colleagues who have not dealt in depth with this subject, using my limited knowledge, I would like to use a rather elementary illustration to shed some light on this subject.

If my colleagues would envision a pie which represents the fluid milk requirements of a given area, I think it would be helpful for the purposes of illustration. The fluid milk requirements are the requirements for milk which people consume in fluid form. That is to say, the milk you receive at your doorstep or purchase in the supermarket.

Under a class I base plan, the pie is divided among dairy farmers delivering milk for that area. These dairy farmers, or producers, are given a piece of the pie, based upon a history of deliveries during a past representative period. In this way, they have reasonably accurate knowledge of how much milk they will be able to deliver and how much they will receive for it.

And now, if my colleagues would envision a larger pie encompassing the smaller, I will designate the larger pie the manufacturing milk used to produce butter, cheese, and other dairy products. A lower price is received for the manufacturing milk. Under a class I base plan, all milk delivered by a dairyman over his share of the fluid milk requirements go into the manufacturing milk portion of the pie, and he receives for it a lower price.

The important thing to observe is that each producer knows the amount of milk for which he will receive the higher, or fluid milk price, and that he will receive the lower manufactured price for the balance. If his production costs are high, he will tend to regulate his production closely to his share of the fluid milk market. In this way, uneconomic production and resulting surpluses are discouraged, particularly in areas of the country where the cost of production is high.

Prior to the implementation of the class I base plan in the Puget Sound milk marketing area, a system of "blend-pricing" was utilized. Under this system, a share of the fluid milk requirements of each producer was based upon a "base making period." The base price was in no way related to the fluid milk requirements of the market. Each producer knew the base making period in advance. As a consequence, he tended to increase his production so as to achieve a higher base for the following year, even though the inevitable result was a reduction in the base price for all dairymen. This resulted in what became known, in our area, as the "base race."

The only way for a producer to maintain his share of the market was to compete against other dairymen in attempting to obtain a larger base each year. You see, the individual producer was actually producing, not for the requirements of the market, but to achieve a larger and larger share of the market.

Experience with the class I base plan under the order in the Puget Sound area demonstrated that the theory of the legislation is sound. But it became apparent that modifications were necessary if the plan was to operate under current conditions effecting the marketing of milk not only in that area, but throughout the United States.

You may well ask why other areas have not adopted the class I base plan if it appears to be sound. The fact is, dairymen supplying a number of other areas in the United States, including Georgia, Mississippi, Florida, Texas, and others are desirous of adopting class I base plans, but they wish to do so after the modifications which we are today suggesting, become law. The areas under consideration, it should be noted, are not areas of surplus milk production. The class I base plan is desired, however, because it will contribute to market stability, and for more fairness among dairymen supplying the market.

Mr. Chairman, there are in the legislation before the Committee today, two major modifications which should lead to the adoption of class I base plans in other areas and to the more orderly marketing of milk. These modifications are as follows:

First. Authorization for "new producers" to earn a class I base.

Second. Authorization for established producers, or base holders, to share in increased sales of fluid milk.

The 1965 amendment provided:

> Any increase in Class I base resulting in enlarging or increasing consumption, and any producer Class I base forfeited or surrendered, shall first be made available to new producers and to the alleviation of hardship or inequity among producers.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this was interpreted to mean that "new producers" could achieve a class I base only from enlarged or increased fluid milk consumption, or from forfeiture or surrender of bases by other dairymen. It was interpreted to prevent new producers from building a base which could be depended upon, regardless of fluctuations in the market.

If my colleagues again would envision the illustration of the pie I used earlier and envision further that while a new producer could share in increase in fluid milk requirements beyond the perimeter of the pie, a new producer could never be assured a permanent piece of the pie.

In a continually expanding market, with more sales growth than deliveries by new producers, this may not present substantial problems because all of the new sales went to new producers. But in a contracting market, one can see that a new producer would be in a tenuous position at best, because as the market contracts, the new producer would lose his share of the fluid milk sales. Also, an influx of new producers could dilute the benefits of market growth to meaningless proportions.

Under the new proposal, new producers are provided methods of earning bases upon which they can depend, in the same manner as other producers.

The second major problem alleviated by the adoption of the new class I base legislation is assuring established producers of sharing in the new sales. The language which I quoted earlier as preventing new producers from acquiring a base was also interpreted to prevent established producers from sharing the benefits of any increased fluid sales in the market.

This is corrected in the proposed legislation by providing that bases may be adjusted to reflect utilization of all producers "during a representative period of 1 to 3 years, which will be automatically updated each year." With this language, class I bases of new and established producers can be adjusted periodically to reflect increases in their delivery to the market.

It is my feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary should be very judicious in the utilization of the "rolling base period" provided by this language. I would certainly hope that representative

periods reflect more than 1 year, lest we fall back into what we witnessed in the Puget Sound milk marketing order area prior to the adoption of the class I base plan, and which I alluded to earlier as the "base race."

There are other provisions in this legislation to specifically authorize use of yearly established seasonal base plans if dairymen supplying an area should so desire: the so-called Louisville plan for making seasonal adjustments in prices paid farmers, and so forth, but the major changes are those which I have discussed in some detail; namely, assurance that new producers could establish class I bases and that established producers could share the benefits of increased fluid milk sales.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be helpful to the Members to discuss very briefly how a class I base plan would be adopted by the producers in a given area. In our area, a class I base plan committee was established, composed of producers, marketers, and other experts in the area to be affected. After consultation and committee meetings with the dairymen and marketers, a class I base plan was drawn up and submitted to the Department of Agriculture. Public hearings were then held under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture.

After hearing, a recommended decision is rendered by the Department of Agriculture. Following exceptions, the Secretary of Agriculture may make changes, and the plan is then submitted to the dairymen supplying the area for their approval. This legislation specifically requires that any such plan be approved by two-thirds of the producers supplying the area before it can become effective.

The legislation also requires that every producer supplying the area vote as an individual on the class I base plan.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that passage of this legislation and with proper administration of class I base plan promulgated thereunder, the areas affected would be assured of a supply of fluid milk at reasonable prices. Further, it assures dairymen supplying the area of a share of the market which will be relatively stable. And, finally, it provides impetus for dairymen to coordinate production to the demands of the market, rather than to artificially encourage production for base acquisitions which bear no relationship to the demands of that market. Thus, it tends to key production of fluid milk to the demands of the fluid milk market and production of manufacturing milk to the demands of the manufacturing market, rather than to pit dairyman against dairyman in a futile effort to maintain shares of the fluid-milk market.

The inevitable consequence of this legislation is to stabilize milk marketing conditions in the interests of both dairy farmers and consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment, because I am particularly interested in the dairy section, title II, to address some questions to the chairman of the committee (Mr. POAGE).

The committee report states that the class I base plan is designed to reduce dairy surpluses in areas of excess production. It was my understanding that the authority was intended for use in any marketing area where producers desired it, and that many of these areas were, in fact, not characterized by excess production. Does my understanding vary from that of the committee?

Mr. POAGE. It was the committee's intent not to restrict the use of class I base plans in any areas.

Mr. MEEDS. Further, it seems to me that the committee report dealing with producer-handlers is stated very succinctly in the first pargaraph, and that the following paragraphs all contradict the meaning of this first paragraph, which is explicit and which is in complete harmony with the 1965 amendment and which is restated in the legislation at hand.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. Without question, it is intended by this amendment, as by the 1965 amendment, that the class I base authority in no way changes the legal status of so-called producer-handlers under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

Stated very briefly, the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 authorizes the regulation of handlers, including handlers who produce their own milk. This is, in no way, changed by this legislation.

Mr. MEEDS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina Mr. MCMILLAN).

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not try to reiterate the statements already made by my colleague in support of the pending farm legislation.

I want to congratulate our committee chairman, subcommittee chairmen, and minority members for the months and months of their valuable time they have given to this proposed legislation.

I know that this bill is not perfect and it leaves a great deal to be desired; however, we cannot afford to permit the one price cotton act to expire and we need the other sections of the bill even though they are not perfect.

I also want to congratulate the Secretary of Agriculture on his untiring efforts in assisting us in preparing this legislation. He has met with us more times on this proposed legislation than any other previous Secretary has ever met with the Agriculture Committee, I am certain.

Again I want to state my strong support of this bill and express my appreciation to Mr. PRICE and Mr. POAGE of Texas for giving us in detail the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS).

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss H.R. 18546, legislation that directly affects the man who is the backbone of America and the man who helps provide the highest standard of living of any nation in the history of the world. That man, of course, is the American farmer.

In considering this legislation, I think we have an urgent need to try to provide answers to a most serious and pressing dilemma—the same dilemma farmers have faced many times in our Nation's history, but never before with such complexity and change.

The farmer today has been and will be asked to produce enough food for a hungry world and yet he is the victim of economic and political factors which deny him a fair price for his labors. This problem is compounded in that it comes at a time when our society is caught up in a whirlpool of change. The problem is so serious that such issues as world starvation and world peace might well hang in the balance.

Unless we can find a remedy for farm price discrimination, the agricultural segment of our economy is courting disaster, and a traditional way of life will hasten its now slow departure from the American scene. How can the farmer survive if everything he sells goes down in price and everything he must buy has gone up and keeps climbing? The answer is simple: he cannot.

Today, the farmer looks to Washington for some sign of optimism, a sign that dawn will break to brighten the bleak cost-price picture. With this legislation, we need to take a commonsense look at the plight of the man whose job it is to feed America and to help feed a troubled and explosive world.

Prior to considering this most important legislation, I think it is important to realize what a tremendous role agriculture plays in our economy. Although there are only 3 million farmers in the United States, agriculture is still by far the largest single industry in our Nation.

Agriculture generates jobs for nearly 40 percent of our employed workers, either by providing the raw material on which they work, or by providing the market for the products or commodities that they produce. Agriculture employs more people than the steel, auto, utilities, and transportation industries combined. Obviously, then, this legislation should be considered as directly affecting our Nation's work force and as a means by which we can provide jobs and employment.

It is also important to consider agriculture's total impact on our national economy. Farmers annually spend more than $36 billion for goods and services just to produce their crops and livestock. Each year, the farmer buys products containing 320 million pounds of rubber, enough to put tires on nearly 7 million automobiles. The farmer uses more electricity than is consumed in the cities of Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, D.C. combined. Every year he uses 5 million tons of steel in the form of machinery, trucks, cars, fencing, and building materials. Farm use of steel accounts for 40,000 jobs in the steel industry. Obviously then, H.R. 18546 is legislation that will benefit industry and the blue collar worker.

From an investment standpoint, agriculture's total assets of $298 billion equal two-thirds of the value of current assets

of all U.S. corporations or about one-half the market value of all corporations' stocks traded on the New York Stock Exchange. Obviously then, H.R. 18546 directly affects our national investment picture.

Exports of U.S. farm products totaled $5.7 billion in fiscal year 1969. This includes $4.7 billion in commercial sales and $1 billion in food aid, a significant contribution toward our goal of a favorable balance of payments so important in maintaining a stable economy. Obviously then, H.R. 18546 is legislation that directly affects our world trade picture and our balance of payments problem.

In short, agriculture is the backbone of American business. There is twice as much investment per capita behind each agricultural worker—$50,000—as there is behind each industrial worker—$25,000.

The point I am trying to make is that as we consider H.R. 18546, we are not only considering a farm bill, but the very future of our national economy. This bill not only concerns farmers, it concerns jobs, industry, investment, world trade, and our national standard of living.

I also think it is important to put the worth of the current farm program and the proposed farm program in proper perspective. I know the spotlight of public concern and attention is focused on the very real plight of our cities and the problems of urban America. Seven out of 10 Americans live in urban areas and we must implement massive assistance to rescue our cities.

We really find ourselves in a paradox. Farmers who find they cannot make it stream to the cities. On the other hand, city dwellers, crowded together in huge urban complexes with problems that almost defy Government, desperately seek the solace of the countryside and the traditional way of life of the American farmer.

The point is that our urban and rural problems are really inseparable and I would hope we can discuss this legislation in a framework of mutual concern. This is not a farm bill as such but a bill to seek answers to the pressing problems of rural America which in turn directly affect the problems of urban America.

In this light, I think it is important to reconsider this legislation from the standpoint of the consumer. My urban colleagues and their constituents and consumers all across this Nation have been repeatedly told the farmer is paid huge sums of money for growing nothing. And the American consumer has also justifiably rebelled against the high cost of living, and in particular, against the high cost of food. A major thrust of this protest has been directed at support payments, or subsidies, for farmers.

Everyone agrees we need to seek new direction for agriculture program policy. However, I think we need to take another look at this so-called subsidy.

A better term to use would be "consumer subsidy" for, in fact, the farmer has subsidized the American economy and the consumer. The American consumer spends more disposable income for nonfood items, 83.5 percent in 1969, than any consumers in any other country in the world. Agricultural efficiency has enabled the American farmer to provide food and fiber for himself and the needs of 44 other persons, thus freeing a tremendous national labor supply.

In return, the farmer must have income stability to permit him to adapt with confidence to the latest technological developments in his profession and to make a decent living.

Actually, today the housewife spends only 16.5 percent of her disposable income after taxes for food as opposed to 21 percent in 1957. This reduction in percentage of income spent on food has saved the American consumer a total of $20.6 billion in food expenditures in 1969, allowing this income to be spent on nonfood items and boosting economic growth in nonfood industries. This is quite an investment compared to an annual outlay of over $2.4 billion in crop subsidies in a program that tries to maintain stability and minimum costs in food production.

The 16.5 percent food cost figure compares with 25 percent for Great Britain, 28 percent for West Germany, 37 percent for Japan, 50 percent for Russia, and as much as 75 to 80 percent in many countries in the Far East.

This comparison has even greater impact when the diet of the American consumer is considered. Agriculture's technological revolution has enabled the American housewife to buy preference food—beef, pork, poultry, and dairy products—and higher quality convenience foods. Again, the American housewife buys more food with a smaller percentage of her disposable income than the housewife in any part of the world and at any time in history.

It is also important to keep food costs in perspective. Between 1957 and 1969, the price of food purchased for use at home increased 25.8 percent. This compares to a price rise of 26.4 percent for transportation, 48.3 percent for all services, and 58.1 percent for medical care. The overall cost of living in December 1969 had risen 31.3 percent over the same period.

Although payment provisions to farmers in farm legislation are in actuality subsidies, perhaps in light of the information just discussed, they should be called "consumer guarantees" in that they do make sure the American consumer gets the best quality food at the lowest cost in the world.

These same payment provisions have created considerable misunderstanding and controversy regarding this legislation. Almost every segment of the economy has received either direct or indirect subsidies and usually for good reason—railroads, shipping, airlines, tariffs and quotas protecting American industry and manufacturing, magazines, et cetera. In fact, agriculture, in spite of being the largest U.S. industry, has received only $5 in the past 50 years for every $1,000 Americans spend for subsidies.

In this respect, may I point out the price of food, clothing, and shelter is going to be paid either by those who use them directly or through taxes, or by the land from which they come. The people of India and China throughout the centuries demanded food and fiber below the cost of production. The cost was paid by the land from which it came. As a result, the land is worn out. Yet, we ask our wheat producers to market wheat for around $1.20 a bushel, whereas the cost of producing a bushel of wheat is around $1.70.

Were we to immediately remove all Government from agriculture without new farm legislation, farm production at the present rate could not be maintained. Without favorable farm legislation proposed in H.R. 18546, farmers could not buy and operate the equipment and supplies essential to the production of adequate food and fiber for the American people.

Simply stated, our future supply of food and fiber is dependent on enactment of this proposed farm bill. The only other way of maintaining this needed production would be by raising the price in the market place. Certainly many farmers would like this, but the consumer revolt would be something to behold.

We must also remember that the farmer only receives about one-third of what the housewife spends in the grocery store, and that share is constantly decreasing. Therefore, if the farmer now receives $3 billion in subsidies, it is likely this expenditure is reducing consumer costs by something like $9 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the need to enact this legislation is most urgent. Improving farm income is an immediate goal. There has been a 30-percent loss in farm population in the last 9 years. As the farm population disappears, our rural communities also lose business establishments and population. In my First Congressional District of western Kansas, we lost 36,000 people in the 1960's.

This outmigration has resulted in spite of the fact most people prefer to live in the countryside. According to a recent Gallup poll, over 50 percent of our population would prefer to live in rural and small-town America if they could earn an adequate living.

Passing this legislation is a necessary first step in our efforts to revitalize rural and small-town America and to reverse our population migration. It also seems to me this is the most obvious and direct solution to problems relating to urban congestion, crime, welfare, housing, hunger and malnutrition in our Nation's cities. We must create in rural America a new environment of jobs, education, and favorable living conditions. We need to stem the migration to our cities and then reverse it. Americans of tomorrow should have a real choice of where they want to live.

I am of the opinion H.R. 18546 is the best bill we can obtain in the House of Representatives. I believe it does represent a new approach to our farm program policy. In this regard, I would like to discuss several key aspects of this legislation that I feel are most important to the Nation's leading wheat producing district.

H.R. 18546 is made up of eight titles containing provisions for payment limitations, dairy, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, Public Law 480, and miscellaneous items. The key provisions I would like to discuss involve wheat, feed grains, dairy, and the overlooked but nevertheless most important provisions for cropland conversion and long-term land retirement.

In brief, the wheat section of the bill:

First. Suspends both the marketing quota program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

Second. Provides domestic marketing certificates to farmers participating in the set-aside program in an amount equal to U.S. food consumption—about 530 million bushels annually.

Third. Sets the face value of these domestic certificates at the difference between the wheat parity price—current $2.82 per bushel—and the average price received by farmers during the first 5 months of the wheat marketing year, which starts on July 1.

Fourth. Provides for a preliminary payment to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. This payment would be the amount estimated by the Secretary to be 75 percent of the value of the domestic certificate. The balance of the payment—if any—would be paid in December. If the Secretary's estimate were too high, no refunds by farmers would be required.

Fifth. Continues the cost of certificates to wheat processors at 75 cents per bushel.

Sixth. Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans to participating farmers from zero to 100 percent of the parity price for wheat.

Seventh. Establishes a set-aside program under which wheat farmers, in order to be eligible for loans, certificates, and payments under the program, must set aside or divert from the production of wheat and other crops an acreage determined by the Secretary.

Eighth. Authorizes payments to participating farmers for any additional set-aside acreage and for permitting public recreational access.

Ninth. Authorizes Secretary to permit wheat and feed grains substitution—Sebelius amendment.

Tenth. Continues wheat certificate payments based on projected yield—Sebelius amendment.

The feed grains section of the bill:

First. Establishes a voluntary feed grain—that is: corn, grain sorghum, and barley—program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

Second. Provides that price support payments to participating farmers on one-half of their feed grain base will be the difference between not less than $1.35 per bushel—for corn—and the average market price for the first 5 months of the marketing year—which starts on October 1 on corn and grain sorghum and July 1 on barley.

Third. Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans at zero to 90 percent of feed grain parity prices.

Fourth. Authorizes additional set-aside and public recreational access payments.

Fifth. Establishes a "set-aside" program under which participating farmers would be required to set aside or divert feed grain or other cropland in order to become eligible for feed grain loans and payments.

Sixth. Provides for a "preliminary" payment of 32 cents per bushel on corn to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. If the difference between the average market price and $1.35 were more than 32 cents during the first 5 months of the marketing year, an additional payment would be made. In no event would refunds by farmers be required.

Seventh. Authorizes Secretary to permit feed grains and wheat substitution.

The dairy section of the bill:

First. Extends and amends the authority for the dairymen's class I base plan in Federal milk market order areas. It specifically guarantees competitive access to class I base plan markets by established producers outside the market order area. Appeal procedures under present law remain unchanged.

Second. Suspends the operation of the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm-separated cream and permits the Secretary to set lower support prices on butter.

Third. Extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by CCC to the armed services and veterans' hospitals.

Fourth. Extends the Secretary's authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who through no fault of their own have their milk contaminated by and condemned because of the presence of pesticides and residues.

The wheat section of the farm bill assures the farmer 100 percent of parity—presently $2.82—on his domestic production, approximately 50 percent of his total crop. It seems only reasonable that the farmer who must buy retail and sell wholesale for this production should receive parity with the rest of society on the domestically consumed portion of his production. The market price is approximately 40 percent of parity. To expect farmers to survive at these prices while paying the American cost of production is beyond conception and would destroy the family farmer and agriculture as we know it today.

In return for this production incentive payment—the wheat certificate—the farm cooperator will set aside a given acreage and conserve land and water resources to guarantee adequate food and fiber for future generations. The farmer will have the option of saving additional land and water resources for additional diversion payments. Producers may elect to plant and graze on the set-aside acreage sweet sorghum and to plant and harvest several other soil-building crops.

To add freedom and flexibility to farm management decisions, the substitution provision authorizing the substitution of wheat and feed grains production to preserve allotment history is extended to include all allotment acreage. This will allow maximum farm response to changes in supply and demand and guarantee increased production efficiency. Also, farmers may voluntarily idle land, not planting their allotment, without the threat of reducing their allotment history if price support or diversion payments are not accepted.

An important provision to maintain future certificate payments on the basis of projected yield is included in the farm bill. This provision to guarantee equity in the distribution of farm payments is vital if we plan to keep our most efficient farmers in agriculture and provide adequate incentive for young efficient producers to enter farming. The Secretary shall make adjustments if an exceptionally low yield is shown to be the result of drought or other natural disaster during the year used as the base period.

The Secretary will continue the present wheat loan program for participants. Wheat certificate payments will be based on the difference between parity and the average market price received by farmers in the first 5 months of the marketing year. Since the market price is lowest during this period, this provision will have minimal effect on the value of wheat certificates.

Since the proposed legislation extends the same discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture regarding the loan level as the 1965 act I have urged Secretary Hardin to use his authority to establish the wheat and feed grains loan at the highest possible level. It is imperative that the wheat loan level remain approximately at its present level to not only maintain but improve farm income throughout the duration of this bill.

The Secretary is also authorized to make payments to reimburse participating farmers who permit land use for public recreational access. This proposal has considerable merit and is exemplary of the kind of planning we need to provide recreation land use for future generations.

The feed grains section establishes a voluntary feed grain program for 1971, 1972 and 1973. It provides production incentive payments to participating farmers on one-half of their feed grain base. The payments would be no less than 32 cents per bushel for corn—with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley—and the total of the payment plus the loan would be no less than $1.35 on half of the base for corn.

The substitution of feed grain and wheat production to protect allotment history is included. Also, the provisions dealing with set-aside acreage, additional diversion, public recreational access, and voluntary producton reduction are similar to the wheat section of the proposed legislation.

H.R. 18546 recommends a simple extension of Public Law 480 without amendment. In moving our agricultural abundance abroad, Public Law 480 has served many purposes. It has promoted agricultural trade with friendly underdeveloped nations and has facilitated the development of these nations while achieving greater commercial trading partner status with them. It has furthered the foreign policy of the United States in the process of providing a large volume of food to hungry people throughout the world.

This provision and the other sections

of this legislation will allow us to accelerate our efforts to beat our swords into plowshares and to accomplish our objectives to achieve world peace and reduce world hunger and malnutrition.

This bill does not contain all of the provisions my staff and I worked on or as many dollars for the farmer as I had hoped to guarantee. I have several major concerns in addition to the need for the present loan rate on wheat to be continued.

While the Cropland Conversion and Greenspan proposals for long-term land retirement are extended by H.R. 18546, I am concerned that the appropriations level of $10 million annually for each program is inadequate. These are not enough funds to determine the impact of long-term land retirement programs on our economy and to provide proper safeguards for an adequate food and fiber supply in the future through effective water and land resource conservation. In addition to the need for accelerated conservation efforts, these programs should be greatly expanded to protect the quality of our environment and to provide more opportunity for open spaces, clear water, clean air, and outdoor recreation. I plan to introduce legislation including the retirement of poor land for conservation purposes in the next session of Congress.

Another concern is the production base concept originally conceived to accompany the set-aside approach. It was labeled a new and more positive approach to supply management. However, the proposals to implement this concept indicated that in fact it only created new sets of inequities without providing relief to areas such as my district in western Kansas with a disproportionate share of the conserving base requirement. I urged the USDA to modify its proposals to remove the present conserving base inequities and avoid new inequities. After considerable effort, the Department of Agriculture failed to rectify this situation, the concept was abandoned and the set-aside will be allowed to operate as originally proposed. We still have, however, an urgent need to adjust inequitable conserving base allotments.

While this bill does not contain all of the provisions my staff and I worked on or as many dollars for the farmer as I had hoped to guarantee, I think this bill will sustain American agriculture. I think the set-aside approach is a gradual step toward a more producer-oriented agriculture. Hopefully, new market outlets for agricultural production, such as a grain alcohol substitute for lead in gas mixtures and similar proposals for other commodities will be developed and expanded during the duration of the program so the farmer may obtain parity at the marketplace—the goal of both farmers and consumers.

This omnibus farm bill must be passed to guarantee future economic growth and prosperity in the domestic economy, to guarantee an adequate food and fiber supply for future generations, to reduce hunger and malnutrition, both domestically and abroad, to accelerate our efforts to attain world peace, to protect the quality of our environment in the countryside and the cities, and to expand and improve recreational opportunities. Early enactment of this legislation is vital not only to agriculture, but is necessary to insure hope in America's future.

THE LATE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Mr. Chairman, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the able and beloved MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, affectionately known to all as MIKE.

MIKE was born in Plains near Wilkes-Barre, Pa., December 2, 1886, and was reared in humble surroundings in the coal mine region.

MIKE KIRWAN was truly a man of many facets. As a boy he worked in the coal fields and as a youth he traveled throughout the United States. He lived his life in the tradition of the American boy in search of himself. He worked his way across the wild west as a trainman here, as a cowboy there, then in oil fields, wheat fields, and even a lumber camp.

During World War I, he served as an artillery sergeant in France.

He served two terms as a member of the Youngstown City Council representing the fourth ward. MIKE was first elected to Congress in 1936, and served his constituency faithfully until his death.

From his humble beginnings, he forged ahead as one of the main bastions of power in the Democratic Party as the chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee since 1947 and in the Congress as chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, and later as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. He served as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee from 1937 until 1943. He was a national vice president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Long before the nationwide concern it has today, MIKE took a positive interest in the preservation of our national environment. The impact of his far-reaching proposals can be seen throughout the Nation. The great system of power dams, reservoirs, and waterways in the United States are in a great measure a result of his leadership. MIKE's deep concern was the welfare of the people of the entire Nation.

MIKE was a very unusual person. From his humble surroundings and lack of formal education, to have carved out such an extremely successful career in the service of his fellow man, was indeed a remarkable achievement. He had unswerving belief in his Creator and boundless confidence in his fellow man. He was kind and considerate and yet firm in his convictions and truly dedicated to every cause which he felt was right. MIKE's word was his bond. He felt a deep responsibility to help those with whom he lived and for his constituents for whom he worked untiringly.

I was privileged to be MIKE's friend and colleague for almost 30 years, during 8 of which MIKE was dean of the Ohio congressional delegation. Indeed, he was a man who never lost his simplicity. He always had compassion for his fellow men, perhaps because he understood them so well.

MIKE acquired numerous honorary degrees and was even a member of the Cowboy Hall of Fame and had been appointed a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution as well as the recipient of many awards for his efforts in conservation.

The Nation has lost a distinguished legislator. My family and I extend our sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rises, I will ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their own remarks and include extraneous material, and in my own remarks I will include a telegram of condolence from President Nixon:

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIF.

Mrs. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Washington, D.C.:

Your husband's death brings sorrow to the hearts of those he served so tirelessly and so effectively, and it deprives the nation of an articulate public servant. Mrs. Nixon and I send you and your family our deepest sympathy, as well as the hope that the achievements that distinguished your husband's career may now be a source of strength and comfort to you. May God bless you always.

RICHARD NIXON.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, no one was dearer or closer to me than MIKE KIRWAN. So I can say:

He is not dead, as we that are left shall die;

Age shall not weary him, nor the years condemn.

At the going down of the sun, and in the morning,

We will remember him.

MIKE KIRWAN has departed this earth at the end of a life of determination, dedication and hard work.

The outstanding funeral tribute in Youngstown, Ohio, last Thursday, when many of his congressional colleagues attended was an indication of the high place that MIKE KIRWAN held with his constituents, his fellow public servants and all those who knew him.

His passing was a bit more sorrowful for me, Mr. Chairman, since Congressman MIKE KIRWAN was more than a colleague. He was a dear friend, a trusted companion, and a man whose friendship I beheld.

When I first came to Congress in 1945, MIKE KIRWAN took me by the hand and led me through this building and through the mysteries of this House. I was always very proud of my association with him,

since Congressman MIKE KIRWAN, like myself, was a native of the northeastern Pennsylvania coal fields, born in the town of Plains, only a few miles from my home in Wilkes-Barre. He worked in those mines with my family, my neighbors, my relatives and my friends.

MIKE KIRWAN's life was rugged in every sense of the word, always filled with the determination to pursue the right and the proper.

His career began at the tender age of 7 as a slate-picker in the Heidelberg Coal Shaft near Wilkes-Barre. He used to kid us at the University Club, when we would ask each other, "From what university did you come, and what year?" We would say, "Yale, 1926," or "Harvard, 1924." MIKE, without batting an eye, would say, "Heidelberg, 1904." Most people did not know what that meant, but some of us did. It was the colliery at which he worked.

The same awful working conditions that permitted child labor abuses which young MICHAEL KIRWAN suffered were later put to an end. Some 40 years later he began a brilliant career in the U.S. House of Representatives where he always voted to improve the lot of the laboring man, and the betterment of working conditions.

MIKE KIRWAN came to Washington with the beginning of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's second term, and in the years to follow gave leadership and fight to all of the social and economic battles fought in these Halls.

I will have many fond, cherished memories of this great American whose death marks the termination of a life of service for all. The House of Representatives will be lesser, with another distinguished colleague gone to the final rollcall.

MIKE KIRWAN had the persuasiveness of Mr. Sam, the conviction of John F. Kennedy, the righteous pursuit of Harry S. Truman—and like all of these great Americans whom he knew and served with, he most of all loved the United States. He cared for the preservation of our democratic system of government, and held sacred the preservation and expansion of its natural resources.

There are many ways in which we can remember MIKE KIRWAN, Mr. Chairman, but I prefer to recall his magnetic presence as being that of a proud man.

He was proud of his country, and never reluctant to accuse those whom he believed did not hold its best interest at heart.

He was proud of the House in which he served, with the admiration of all his colleagues.

He was proud of his esteemed chairmanship on the Public Works Appropriations Committee, where I was pleased to serve with him for over 20 years.

He was proud of his district in Ohio whose economy and way of life were so often affected by the role the Federal Government played, thanks to MIKE KIRWAN, in making life there a little better for all residents.

He was proud of the Democratic Party, and the prominent role he held in spearheading its congressional campaign committee.

He was proud of his Irish-American ancestry, and like so many other great Americans in this tradition, he chose a life in government and politics.

There are many ways, Mr. Chairman, in which I could bring down the curtain on the life of MIKE KIRWAN, but I think Shakespeare may have said it best in the fifth act of Hamlet:

Now cracks a noble heart.
Good night, sweet prince, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest...

Mrs. Flood joins with me in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to our old friend and neighbor, Mrs. Kirwan, to his brother, John, and Mrs. Zorzi, still our neighbors in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Mr. Chairman, I include the attached editorial from the Times Leader Evening News, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., for July 27, 1970, in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks:

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, 1886–1970

The death of Representative Michael (Mike) Kirwan, famed Ohio Democrat and one of the most powerful figures in Congress, recalls a colorful career. He was a native of Plains and a resident of Youngstown, where he represented the 19th congressional district for 34 years.

As a member of the appropriations committee, chairman of its sub-committee on public works and chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee, among other things, Representative Kirwan was the Dan Flood of his adopted city, both in popularity and activity. He belonged to an earlier generation than his local counterpart. However, they were close personal friends as well as political allies.

Representative Kirwan came by his eminence the hard way. In boyhood, he worked at the Heidelberg breaker and when notables at a Washington dinner, on one occasion, were asked to reveal their alma maters, he rose and stated proudly, "Heidelberg, '07." The other guests were impressed at the mention of the famed German university until they learned later that he was referring to the anthracite mine where he was employed.

His career included tours of duty as a veteran, trolley conductor, laundryman and railroader before he entered politics and was elected to the city council of Youngstown. Such was the esteem in which he was held in his district, he ran ahead of Franklin Roosevelt in one election.

One of the best informed men in the capital despite his lack of a formal education, he always had the courage of his convictions as well as a rare sense of humor. An indication of his stature was his annual St. Patrick's Day party which attracted everyone of importance from the President down.

He never forgot Wyoming Valley, which he left in 1907, returning frequently for dinners and personal visits. He was easily one of our most distinguished sons as well as an outstanding public servant.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the very able and distinguished Speaker.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, each and every one of us who served with MIKE KIRWAN and knew MIKE KIRWAN had our lives enriched by the fact that our journey in life crossed each other's path.

MIKE KIRWAN's life was one of the most unusual of any person in the entire history of the United States. His life was one of ambition, of determination, of courage, and dedication and love to God and country. His life is an inspiration for all others to follow, particularly for the youth of America. Overcoming great difficulties as he did, taking advantage of our institutions of government, he was elected by the people of his district to serve in this great body, starting with the 75th Congress and continuing in this body until his death a short while ago in the 91st Congress.

During his service he made contributions that placed him among the truly great legislators of our Nation's history. There is no one whose love of America was stronger or more clearly evidenced than the love that MIKE KIRWAN had during his lifetime. He was not only one of the outstanding legislators of our Nation's history but was also one of the great Americans of the entire history of our country.

He was a man of firmness in the performance of his duties, but in his relationship to his fellow human beings he was a man who had an overabundance of kindness and of understanding. Each and everyone of us could tell many pleasant incidents we had with MIKE KIRWAN during his service in this body, but to me the most important thing was his love of his country, his love of the House of Representatives, and his dedication to the service of the people of his district, his State, and our country.

In the passing of MIKE KIRWAN the House of Representatives has lost one of its greatest Members. His contributions will always occupy the foremost pages in the legislative history of our great country.

His love of Mrs. Kirwan was always evidenced, as well as his love for his family—gentle, direct, kind. All of us will miss MIKE KIRWAN very, very much. He will leave a vacuum that is going to be difficult to fill. While no one is indispensable in life, I think we can fairly say that MIKE KIRWAN represented about the best that is humanly possible in his service to his people, his State, and to our country and in his love of this body and in his dedication to the service of the United States not only on the domestic level but also on the foreign level. MIKE KIRWAN had developed to the point of being an institution in his district and in this body, an institution based upon respect and based upon affection.

In his passing I have lost a very dear and valued friend whose memory I shall always treasure.

The House of Representatives has lost one of its finest, noblest, and most effective Members.

I know I express the sentiments of all my colleagues when I extend to Mrs. Kirwan and her loved ones our deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the distinguished Speaker. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, all of us who had the privilege and the honor of knowing MIKE KIRWAN are deeply grieved by his passing. Of course, during his extended illness it was a matter of deep concern to us that he was not with us and was suffering.

MIKE, by any standard, was a most, most unusual man. He was, in the finest

American tradition, a self-made man and this is one of the highest tributes I can pay any man.

His life, as I saw it, exemplified the typical American success story, and this is certainly a success story unmatched in my time in the political arena.

MIKE was a colorful individual in a wonderfully unique way. When they made MIKE they broke the mold and threw it away. There was nobody else like him, during my association with literally hundreds of Members of the House, and I doubt that in the future there will ever be one like him.

We all knew MIKE as a really great guy and also as an outstanding legislator. MIKE knew what the rules were and he played the game in a fine style and in a fair way. He wanted to win if he thought he was right, and he usually did, but he did it in a fine, upstanding, typically American way.

I can say without hesitation or qualification that I will miss MIKE KIRWAN a great deal. I was privileged to know him especially well because of my previous service on the Committee on Appropriations, where MIKE served so long and so exceptionally well.

I can say from the bottom of my heart that MIKE KIRWAN was one of the great giants in this House during the time in which I have served here.

He was a dear friend, and one whom I shall miss very greatly in the months and years ahead. It is with the most heartfelt feelings I extend my condolences to MIKE's family and his friends. We shall all remember him most fondly.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

I yield to the very distinguished majority leader (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN stood out in this Chamber as one of the most remarkable men of our generation. He stood on the horizon like a tall tree, and to paraphrase Edwin Markham, when he fell he went down like a kingly cedar, and left a lonesome place against the sky.

MIKE KIRWAN, as the distinguished gentleman in the well has said, was a man of many facets. To me he typified, in an individual way, the great American dream. He came from the coal mines of his native Pennsylvania up to the Capitol of his Nation in his long struggle against great odds. In his determination, he succeeded not only in his life's work but also in becoming an outstanding human being among his fellows.

MIKE was a pillar of the House and of the Democratic Party. He was the second ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee, chairman of its great Public Works Subcommittee, and chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee.

No man is more responsible than he for our country's expanded water resource development, including flood control, pollution control, water supply, power generation, navigation, irrigation, and recreation. No man worked harder to protect and develop our priceless and irreplaceable national resources. He was the staunch guardian of our national forests, our fish and wildlife, and our great public lands.

MIKE KIRWAN believed deeply in investing in the development of human beings. He was the devoted friend and advocate of the student, the poor, and the American Indian. He spent his lifetime paving the way that others might have a better life and better opportunities.

I agree with the distinguished minority leader that when MIKE was made by the good Lord he broke the mold, because while he was in a sense a typical although outstanding Horatio Alger story personified, at the same time he was one of the most unique individuals I have ever known. Like Napoleon, he had no model and no successor. He was the one and only MIKE.

MIKE KIRWAN was a friend of man; he was my friend; he was a great colleague. I shall miss him as long as I live.

Mr. Chairman, I join all my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Kirwan, to their family, their children and grandchildren and friends my deepest sympathy.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the very distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to what has been said by our distinguished Speaker, by our distinguished minority leader, by our distinguished majority leader, and the others who come here today to pay a tribute to MIKE KIRWAN. It is certainly not a last tribute, because anyone who spent 30 years with him, as I did, could never contemplate this being a last tribute. His mark is left on all of those who knew him or were associated with him.

MIKE KIRWAN was a man's man, yet he was beloved by woman; he was a dedicated man, yet an understanding man; he was a man who loved his constituency, and yet he had the breadth and the knowledge to understand that it was only a part of a great continental nation.

MIKE was a builder above all. His monuments are everywhere.

There were so many qualities that MIKE KIRWAN had that one fails to find adequate words to describe them: His sense of deep loyalty to his family, his church, his country, his party, and his friends; his knowledge; his keen understanding of the American political scene; and his awareness of the ancient admonition that he who does not understand the connection between morality and politics does not understand either one.

So we just bid MIKE farewell. Every man who served with him shares a part of MIKE. In the immortal words of John Donne, "Do not send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

In a sense all of us are lesser men because of MIKE KIRWAN's having left us.

The people of Ohio—and, indeed, the people of the United States—lost an able and devoted leader with the passing of MIKE KIRWAN.

When I first came to Congress, in 1940, MIKE KIRWAN was already known as an able and hard-working Member of this body. He had been elected to Congress for two terms, and had already earned the respect, the esteem, and the affection of all of us who were privileged to serve with him.

MIKE KIRWAN leaves us with a priceless legacy: a lasting example of what a Congressman can and should be. Each of us should aspire to the mark set by this able and dedicated public servant, this unselfish and compassionate human being.

Mrs. Boggs and I have lost a dear friend, and this Congress has lost an able and beloved Member. Together, we express our deepest sympathies to the family of MIKE KIRWAN.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to join others in tribute to the life, service, and character of our late and beloved friend, MIKE KIRWAN.

America has lost a great and good man.

I have lost a good and always helpful friend. MIKE was a loyal man. Countless and unnumbered are the times when he helped me in my work as chairman.

I had the privilege of serving with him throughout his nearly 28 years on the Committee on Appropriations. While he served on a number of subcommittees over the years: Interior, Public Works, War, Labor-Federal Security, Legislative-Judiciary, and Deficiencies, plus numerous special subcommittees, perhaps his most distinguished—certainly his longest and best-known—efforts were in the fields of our obligations to the American Indian and in the preservation and development of our precious and priceless natural resources.

His good deeds in behalf of the American people—including, I would add, coming generations—are shiningly inscribed across the pages of American history.

MIKE KIRWAN was the legislative champion of conservation.

He stood tall in his love of America; his love of country burned with the fierceness of a streak of lightning.

He stood tall in the esteem of the people of his Ohio constituency. They sent him here 17 successive times and when his work was done, he ranked seventh in seniority in the service of the House.

But he ranked first in the hearts of his constituency and high in the esteem of his colleagues.

The work of his hands will stand with time.

Though a man of humble beginnings, he rose to a position of great public trust.

MIKE KIRWAN's tireless efforts and lasting accomplishments recall President Kennedy's observation that any man can change the world and every man should try.

That is one of his great legacies to posterity.

May God bless his memory and give comfort to Mrs. Kirwan and all of his loved ones.

Mr. Chairman, as a further tribute to this distinguished American, I include at this point the set of resolutions adopted by the Committee on Appropriations on the day of MIKE KIRWAN's passing.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE LATE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN OF OHIO

Whereas, on July 27, 1970, the Honorable Michael J. Kirwan, full of years and full of honors and in his 34th consecutive year as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, answered the last roll call and joined the Congress of the Hereafter; and

Whereas, Mr. Kirwan was one of the most devoted, respected, and beloved Members ever to serve in the Halls of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas, Mr. Kirwan, through his nearly 28 years as a Member of the Committee on Appropriations, recognizing the serious neglect of the precious and priceless natural resources of our Nation, became America's legislative champion of conservation with an unexcelled dedication to the protection, preservation, and development of these resources, thereby lifting up a standard for others to follow; and

Whereas, throughout his 27 years of service on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies, including 13 years as its Chairman, Mr. Kirwan vigorously and successfully supported more adequate provision for the education, welfare, health, and resource development of the American Indian, for the preservation and development of our national park system, our national forests, our fish and wildlife and mineral resources, and management of the great public lands of the West; and

Whereas, during his 15 years as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works for Water, Pollution Control and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission, including the last 6 years as its Chairman, Mr. Kirwan provided outstanding leadership in expanding the essential water resource development of the country, including flood control, pollution control, water supply, power generation, navigation, irrigation, and recreation; and

Whereas, the thousands of completed public projects and facilities, yielding innumerable benefits to this and coming generations, are living testimony to the foresight, perseverance, and persuasion of Mr. Kirwan; and

Whereas, Mr. Kirwan, a deeply religious man, prideful of his humble beginnings and epitomizing what Emerson had in mind when he said that America was but another name for opportunity, was possessed of those qualities of honesty, simplicity, candor, and genuine goodness of character which gained him the respect and love of his colleagues and a national circle of friends; and

Whereas, Mr. Kirwan, over his long years of ceaseless effort and dedication, contributed mightily and lastingly to the building of a better America; and

Whereas, surely time will surround the work of his hands with a lasting veneration; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Members of the Committee on Appropriations, sharing the universal feeling of grief at the loss of this truly great American and legislative champion who has crossed the river to rest in the shade, extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and others of the family, to his relatives, and others of that wide circle of admiration and universal respect; and, be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be entered in the journal of the Committee, a copy sent to Mrs. Kirwan, and that arrangements be made to include a copy in the appropriate ceremonial proceedings of the House of Representatives.

Adopted July 27, 1970.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the very distinguished ranking member of the minority on the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of those words of Longfellow:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

MIKE KIRWAN has left his footprints on the sands of time, not only in this country, but throughout the world.

I am particularly reminded of the great effort MIKE KIRWAN made on behalf of the people of Samoa. That island territory was, in a sense, the poorhouse of the Pacific. But, because of the great work there that MIKE KIRWAN was responsible for during his tenure as chairman of the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, it is now a pearl in the Pacific. Through his efforts the children of Samoa now receive education, roads have been built, and industries have been developed. This is just one of the many places in the world that will always be a better place to live, because it is indelibly marked with the footprints of MIKE KIRWAN.

But most of all, Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of his efforts on behalf of his own district. Because of MIKE KIRWAN, dams and reservoirs have been built, and industries kept there. It is my great fortune that, in a redistricting not long ago, part of his district was assigned to me, including a good bit of his home county, Mahoning County. In the work that I have done in that county in the past I have never ceased to admire and respect the great affection the people of his home town and county had for him.

Last week we attended the funeral rites for MIKE KIRWAN. A feeling of great sadness was evident all over the city. The flags were flying at half mast and all the city buildings were draped in mourning. They remember him; they will not forget him.

Mr. Chairman, there is much that can be said about MIKE KIRWAN as a legislator, and as a statesman, but to me the great strength of MIKE KIRWAN was his capacity to be a friend. Regardless of which side of the aisle one was on, MIKE KIRWAN was a friend, a devoted friend, and one that all could turn to.

So, Mr. Chairman, I shall miss him, but I cannot feel that he will be gone from this Chamber because his accomplishments will always be remembered. Many of us will hope to continue what MIKE KIRWAN did here for his country, and for the people we all represent.

To Mrs. Kirwan and the children I extend my condolences—but he has lived long and well, and God was good to him. I am certain there must be a feeling in that family of joy at having shared life with him, and gratitude that God made him the man he really was and kept him with them for so many years. He was a magnificent man and we shall all miss him so very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the death of MIKE KIRWAN is a tragedy. It has come at the wrong time in the critical era through which we are passing but death never takes a holiday. Death knows no season. The poet has said:

The leaves have their time to fall, the rose to wither at the north winds breath, but thou hast all seasons for thine own, Oh, Death.

Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN was a poor man's Congressman. MIKE KIRWAN was the idol of those who labor. He was an authority on poverty because he endured poverty in his early days. He used to reminisce about the days when he "rode the rods." He spoke of the days when he was a hobo. He spoke of the days of labor's fight for survival during the early days of the labor movement—of which he was a part. MIKE KIRWAN's formal education was limited, but his knowledge was great. He knew America as few men do—North, East, South, and West and every section loved him. In the House of Representatives he had no enemies. He was unanimous. He had the affection of men of all areas and all political convictions. He defended the institutions of the House and he was contemptuous of those who tried to tear these monuments down. Mr. Speaker, MIKE KIRWAN was the epitome of Markham's tribute to Lincoln when he said:

He held his place—Held the long purpose like a growing tree—Held on through blame and faltered not at praise. And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down as when a lordly cedar, green with boughs, goes down with a great shout upon the hills, and leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

In these hallowed halls, the void MIKE leaves will never be filled.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I cannot very well say any more than what has been said about MIKE KIRWAN.

But I would like to supplement what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) said about Samoa and the educational system in Samoa.

MIKE pioneered in this field. You should know that this country now has a contract with the Indian Government to orbit television and will broadcast into 2,000 Indian villages where they have no schools and bring education to them.

This is going to be one of the great things in the space effort because it can be applied all over the world, and those of us who loved MIKE KIRWAN can say that he pioneered in this field.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio. "MIKE" KIRWAN was more than a colleague to me, he was a longtime dear friend with whom I traveled over a good part of the world and a man I greatly

admired, and will greatly miss. I had the good fortune to know MIKE ever since I came to the House of Representatives in 1944 and to serve with him for 25 years on the House Committee on Appropriations. MIKE was a true "pro" and I can remember fondly the help he was to so many of us when we were newly come to this body. MIKE was a candid man and spoke his mind and the reaches of his mind were vast. He was interested in the environment back in the days when it was not an "in" thing to be so. He was a conservationist who was greatly responsible for saving many of our natural resources. He devoted much of his time to Indian affairs and was deeply concerned about his fellow man. He had a certain crispness about him that comes from making it on your own. He had about 3 years of formal education and sweated as a young boy in the coal mines, worked as a railroad brakeman, lumberjack, oil field roustabout and a farm hand before entering politics. But this work did not embitter him, rather it broadened him and gave him a warmth and love for life that he communicated to all around him. We shall miss a true friend, a giant of a man. To his lovely wife Alice, his sons and daughter and all his family I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers in this trying time.

Mr. Chairman, last Thursday, along with many of our colleagues I attended the funeral services for MIKE in Youngstown, Ohio, in his parish church, St. Brendan's. The pastor of St. Brendan's, the Right Reverend Monsignor William P. Maxwell, V.F., delivered a moving eulogy which I shall now share with my colleagues. Monsignor Maxwell's remarks which compose a true picture of MIKE, follow:

MY DEAR, MRS. KIRWAN, members of your family, and your relatives: the sincere sympathy of all here assembled, that of the people of this whole area and in many distant places, is yours to-day. We pray our loving Saviour to ease the burden of sorrow and to lift the weight of sadness that the death of Mr. Kirwan has brought. We trust the tribute of this gathering and the innumerable words of praise spoken during these days will give some degree of pleasure and a rightful pride to lighten the darkness brought by his passing to eternity.

Reverend members of the clergy, revered religious, distinguished associates in government, honorable civil officials, grateful constituents and loyal friends of "Mike" Kirwan: your presence here on this sad occasion, together with that of so many who would like to be here, constitutes a strong, earnest and enduring tribute.

It is unnecessary to recount for you the many achievements of Mr. Kirwan. There is universal agreement that his life has been highly successful. His difficulties and his triumphs should give inspiration and example to those whose way of life is hard. His sturdy qualities of truthfulness, honesty, human concern, and foresight, encourage and confirm the natural benefits of these qualities to all of us. And, Oh! how we could do with a massive emulation of his love of country and pride in this great nation of ours!

His speech was always candid; sometimes as one writer commented "without rhetoric or polished grammar"—but always understandable. On one occasion he stated that the secret of success in politics is nothing more nor less than "telling the truth."

"The American people are not dumb. They may be confused about a lot of things; but they are not dumb." D'ya see the point I mean?"

Mr. Kirwan challenged his audiences, when campaigning, to watch his honesty. "Watch me like a hawk," he would say. "If you catch me taking a short cut, you're fools if you don't vote me out of office." Perhaps we might say his scorn for the glamor side of government and his disdain for a "phony" anywhere spring from his deep sense of honesty.

The list of his accomplishments is a long and varied one. For his own district, adjoining areas, in distant parts of the country, even in the Pacific islands. Many of these measures received prompt backing because their need or usefulness was readily seen. Others, the importance of which he perceived clearly, were seen but slowly by his colleagues. Patience, sometimes impatience, and determined perseverence finally won his goals in most cases. While I am deeply impressed by his constructive efforts to secure educational opportunities for American Indians and children in the far reaches of the Pacific, there is another instance of his concern that is amazing. Interested somewhat by chance in the need to wipe out a certain beetle that was destroying a vast timber area in the West, he secured the money from Congress and saved a great amount of timber, sufficient in quantity to build more than a million five-room homes! But it is not the magnitude of the results that amaze me; rather it is his readiness to help in a worthwhile undertaking.

Despite his contacts with people of note and distinction and his participation in events of tremendous importance he never lost the common touch. He enjoyed these contacts and his part in great affairs; he even showed a justifiable pride: yet he was essentially a simple and humble man. To one and all he was glad to answer to the friendly name of "Mike". And he judged a man not by who he was but by what he was, with a special warmth for the man he called "Joe Doakes".

It has been said that he was a devout man because he made frequent use of a rosary. I was delighted to learn that his attachment to this old fashioned devotion was so well known. I understand how—as his fingers moved over the worn beads and he murmured through habit his Paters and Aves—he beheld vividly in his mind a review of some of the outstanding events in the life of Christ, from His birth to His death and resurrection. And along the way he watched the gracious concern of Jesus for His mother. Through this meditation he renewed his allegiance to his Lord, drew inspiration and courage, found strength to meet his own problems and to continue his work for the good of mankind.

I would not say he was devout because he said his rosary, but rather he said his rosary because he was devout. He did not wear his religion on his sleeve, as the saying is. He lived it. It was part of him; not something to be considered separately from himself. His concern for others, his idealism, his charity: these things were not some special features of the man; they were part of him, an external expression of his spirituality. Yes, I would say he was a devout man.

Because he was a devout and humble man it was his wish to have his last earthly function in his parish church; in his church of St. Brendan in which he has worshipped God for more than half of his long life. Here with his family, in the midst of his neighbors, with his friends from near and far gathered round, he wanted to lay down his earthly labors and enter into the joy of the Lord. In seeking this simplicity I feel he was expressing the desire to emphasize the spiritual on this occasion. He had a great balance in the importance of worldly and spiritual things. He echoed the scriptural question: "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?"

He was a good parishioner. While regular in his attendance at church he was in no way ostentatious. He received the Sacraments and participated to the extent he could in the activities of the parish. He was not one to interfere, to be critical or demanding; and yet, on occasion, he made kindly, interested and helpful suggestions. In the twenty five years I have known him he never refused a request made of him for the parish, whether it was of his time, his presence, or his purse.

His name and achievements will be long remembered. He goes now to receive his reward for a life of service to his family and to his fellow men, and for a life of faithful love of his Creator. In the light of Glory, in the very presence of God, he will experience what "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, the things God has prepared for those that love Him." Into that glorious realm our thoughts and our prayers go with him. And before the throne of the Most High God he will continue to represent us—to put in a prayerful word for each of us. May he rest in peace. Amen.

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have lost a wonderful friend. Ohio has lost a champion—as has Oklahoma—and the Nation has lost a patriot and statesman.

The death of MIKE KIRWAN leaves a great hollow in the hearts of all his friends and a great void in the leadership of the Congress.

In their beautiful resolution of tribute to MIKE, his colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations referred to him as "one of the most devoted, respected, and beloved Members ever to serve in the Halls of the House of Representatives." In no respect did they overstate the case.

Here was a man who truly knew what it means to be an American—what it means to live in a land of freedom and opportunity—if ever any man did. For he rose from the humblest of beginnings, faced tremendous hardships, went to work while still a small boy and learned at an early age the meaning—and the value—of hard but honest toil.

But he overcame all the obstacles—the early death of his father from "miner's asthma," the lack of formal education, the years in the mines, the grueling physical labor, the war, the depression—and made a monumental success of his life and an enviable contribution to the improvement of life in his Nation: this free Nation which had given him life's greatest gift—opportunity. What a tremendous message this life brings to those today who have eyes to see and ears to hear.

MIKE KIRWAN had great compassion. But he knew the difference between compassion and the sentimental "do-goodery" which so often passes for compassion in today's world. MIKE knew how to cry and he knew how to fight. He knew how to laugh—as perhaps only the Irish

do—and he knew how to win an argument. And he had one special gift for the role he played in Congress—he knew how to give without being taken.

For several years now, MIKE KIRWAN has been my neighbor down the hall in the Rayburn Office Building. His was a friendly, jovial office—the nearer it got to St. Patricks Day the more friendly and jovial it got—and it was a hard-working office. You learn a lot about a neighbor. MIKE's office bore his distinctive mark—and he was a good neighbor.

But perhaps the greatest thing about MIKE KIRWAN was the way he loved this country. Public works projects all around the land are an enduring and working monument to this magnificent conservationist. And no one owes him a deeper debt of gratitude than the people of Oklahoma and the people of my first congressional district, where very soon the Arkansas River will be navigable to the port of Catoosa, just outside Tulsa, and the heartland of America will become a veritable garden spot and a new center of commerce because of the foresight and support of Ohio's MIKE KIRWAN.

I salute him. I shall deeply miss him. And I join with my colleagues and with Mrs. Belcher in extending my deepest sympathy to his dear wife and to his family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, today we pay tribute to the memory of a great American, a great Ohioan, and a great Congressman, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Representative from Ohio.

His work in this body over 34 years adds to the great legend of the House of Representatives.

The times of MIKE KIRWAN were not ordinary—and MIKE was not an ordinary man or an ordinary Member of the Congress.

MIKE KIRWAN came to Washington after an early life of hardship and poverty. He came from a large family, he worked in the mines as a breaker boy, he worked in the lumber mills, he worked in the steel mills. In his times, he did the work of two men. He labored a normal man's span of hard work before he came to Congress in 1936. His work in Washington began a second labor. The first 50 years of his life were spent in working for the support of his family. The next 34 years were spent in working for his fellow man.

MIKE KIRWAN represented Youngstown—"Steel City, U.S.A." As a man, he was as tough as the steel which was produced in his district. It was a sorry and wiser man who tested either his strength or his determination. Anyone who lost a fight against MIKE KIRWAN—remained the loser. In his conflicts with others, he won both the battle and the war.

And yet there was a tenderness about the man which surfaced time and time again. In his own life experience, he could outline the tragic sequence of the misery of man and the efforts of the law to make things better. His heroes were the doers of these times—President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Kennedy, and President Johnson. The New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, and the Great Society were the milestones in his life—the markers of progress in making our society respond to its times.

MIKE KIRWAN worked at the crucible and at the forge which made these legislative programs a firm and permanent part of what is the law of the land. In all of the laws which have increased the opportunity of the American people and the security and the dignity of every American citizen, MIKE had his part.

The gentleman from Youngstown, Ohio, has helped make the laws of the land as strong, as serviceable, as useful to man—as the steel produced in his home community. They will endure. They are his monument. They are lasting testimony of his dedicated service to his fellow man.

This man was dean of our delegation. He was my friend. My profound sympathy extends to his wife and his family. This man did not live unto himself—this man lived and worked indeed for his neighbor and for his times.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I shall never forget the first visit that I remember MIKE KIRWAN making to Oklahoma with his lovely wife, and the impact that he made upon the people of Oklahoma that he visited there. MIKE KIRWAN could have been elected Governor, Senator, or President, as far as the people of Oklahoma were concerned. He was an adopted son of Oklahoma, and he will be deeply missed for all time.

I would like to include in the RECORD, as part of this tribute today, the wonderful tribute that appears in Senator Kerr's book "Land, Wood and Water," and also the words of Joe McCaffrey, one of the finest newsmen of the Nation's Capitol, in his tribute to MIKE, along with a partial list of the many honors, awards, and degrees that were conferred upon this great American.

It would take many pages to list all of the honors and tributes which were extended to MIKE KIRWAN in his lifetime.

A memorable picture of MIKE KIRWAN appeared several years ago in the book, "Land, Wood, and Water" by Senator Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma:

A government station wagon skidded around a sharp turn and stopped on the edge of a steep cliff. Below was a sight that never fails to stir the souls of men, a swiftly running river. A strange figure for this primitive wilderness hopped agilely out of the car. Beside his guide's tanned, leathery face, he looked pale. He wore a Homburg hat jauntily, and an overcoat. He said in a voice slightly touched by an Irish brogue, "So this is it!"

"Yes, Congressman," replied the driver, "this is Clearwater River, and down there is Bruce's Eddy."

The Representative peered down into the deep canyon and remarked in a tone of awe, "'Tis beauty and power both, if you see what I mean."

This was Congressman Michael J. Kirwan, onetime coal miner, railroad laborer, and knockabout. There is much of the spirit of Wesley Powell, George Maxwell, and George Norris in him, and he had made many of their dreams come true. Though representing the steaming industrial district of the Youngstown, Ohio area, Mike Kirwan has made deserts bloom, brought cheap electric power to remote farms, and saved hundreds of river towns from the gasping catastrophe of flood.

The picture is broadened by some additional excerpts from the Senator's book:

The story is told of Congressman Mike Kirwan, a great modern champion of water development, being asked in Boise, Idaho, "Why is it, Congressman, that you, a Representative from Ohio, are so interested in water development of the West?"

The Congressman stood a moment without answering. His eyes followed the path of cars back and forth on the busy street. Then he said in a voice faintly colored by the brogue of his ancestral Ireland, "Water development and irrigation bring prosperity. Prosperity means people will buy cars. And every car going up this street has some steel in it made in my home town of Youngstown, Ohio."

Congressman Kirwan is Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee that passes on funds for reclamation, irrigation, water conservation, and hydroelectric power. Without his shrewd bargaining skill, his timeless patience, his stubborn will and immense dedication to conservation, many dreams would have been broken in the complex wilderness of Congressional appropriations. When the chips are down and the committee doors closed, it is this sentimental Irishman, hard-headed scrapper and dreamer, who has come through with the money.

Day after day, in his small committee room deep in the bowels of the Capitol, Mike Kirwan pores over papers and questions witnesses with the enthusiasm of a young priest winning his first convert. Then he packs his bag and goes out to look over the lay of the land.

This particular trip to Clearwater Lake began hundreds of miles away, following the course of a great river all the way to a proposed dam site and reservoir in the mountains of Idaho.

He told his guide, "Let's go down and have a look."

The station wagon crept down a steep hill. Along the river's edge, Kirwan got out and eagerly walked along a beaten path used by fishermen. With each step his enthusiasm grew. "For sure," he said, "this is a good site. I can see how easy it will be to dam and impound the river and irrigate the land. We'll get it through."

The guide, a little uneasy in the presence of this powerful figure, grinned happily. Mike Kirwan's words meant that another dream would come true.

Many of his colleagues have wondered why this grandfather who had toiled in the black depths of a Pennsylvania mine as a boy and had later worked as a railroad trainman, would be so interested in water and the arid lands.

"What does he get out of it?" some ask.

The answer is simple. Mike Kirwan believes in the best of all possible worlds, and wants to hasten the day of its reality. As a youth, he traveled about the West, hitching rides on freights, working in the wheat fields, lumber camps, and ranches. He saw all the terrifying waste of land and resources that drove Powell, Maxwell, and Norris to their evangelism. While Kirwan rarely speaks in the House, once in awhile his feelings boil over and he talks from a full heart.

A few years ago when the cry of "economy" was clumsily cutting conservation budgets, the graying Kirwan, still as tough a fighter as in his youth, rose in the great well of the House of Representatives and said:

"I was raised in the foothills of the Pocono Mountains, and I remember the warnings in

the early nineties against the waste of our resources. 'It is wrong. You will live to regret it,' they said. We were going into the forest and burning trees that it took God two hundred years to grow. What was the result? Today, we have to go to Canada for lumber and wood products and pay three times the price. We have wasted land and water just because we are afraid to spend a dime."

The restless rustling in the House died down. The Speaker sat stiffly on his dais and looked affectionately at this stocky figure. "We are wasting our resources, and the payoff when it comes will be terrific; all because we have not had the courage to spend money to save our resources. From Maine to California, there is waste and destruction of our natural resources, yet every time we try to appropriate some money to correct it, the cry is that we must economize."

He looked earnestly at the members and went on, "If you will spend a few million dollars correcting the evils that went on for two hundred years, you can do something for posterity. Don't listen to those who will tell you, 'Those are the sins of our fathers.' I say we are committing sins today against our land, and if we do not hurry up and make a fair confession, God help this country for the next hundred years. Take a look at Lake Erie," he demanded. "A part of that area is in my district, where the original marker was placed just a hundred short years ago to divide Ohio from Pennsylvania. The marker today is back three miles from where they placed it. Can you imagine the highways, the buildings, the land that dropped into the lake? Erosion did it. Oh no, you cannot evade your responsibility and still have a $200 billion income."

There is a great deal of George Norris in Mike Kirwan. When he sees a river running swiftly down its narrow course, he envisions the huge gleaming dam and the power converted into low-cost electricity, lighting homes far across the lonely land. This has placed him in the frontline of an angry, ceaseless battle fought in the corridors, the cloakrooms, and on the floor of Congress.

His is the spirit that moves mountains and wins minds. In every corner of the land, in city councils, state legislatures, and Congress, there are men like Mike Kirwan bringing ever closer the great hope that our rivers can be transformed into benefactors of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with every word Senator Kerr wrote about MIKE KIRWAN. He was a close and dear friend, and one of the greatest Americans of our century. It was a privilege to have served with him for nearly 18 years in this House.

Another fine picture of our colleague was painted in the tribute of Joe McCaffrey on July 27 to MIKE KIRWAN:

Mike Kirwan lived at the University Club when Congress was in session, but he never saw the inside of a college or university as a student, hadn't for that matter, gotten as far as high school. One evening at a dinner at the Club the guests had to rise and give their school and year. When it came Mike's turn he rose and said, "Heidelberg, 1910". And as he told the story later, he would add, "Let them track that down".

Before he was a teenager Mike had set out to make his living. He worked in the oil fields, he worked on the railroads, he crisscrossed the country until he went into service in World War One.

When he came to Congress in the big Democratic sweep of 1936 he knew as much about the 48 states as any University man, and his love for his country was as great or even greater. As a member of the Appropriations Committee Mike served for some time as chairman of its Interior subcommittee, charged with funding the Interior department and its reclamation projects around the country.

One of the best speeches ever made in the House was one the tough, old Irishman from Youngstown gave without a note presenting the Interior budget. For almost an hour, Kirwan recited the needs of the country with the conservation fervor of Teddy Roosevelt, he ticked off project after project which was included in the bill, and pointed out what a great investment every dollar would be because it was doing something positive for the country. When he finished he was given a standing ovation.

He later took over the Public Works Committee of Appropriations and because of his work there and on the Interior Committee he was better known in many parts of the west than in his home state of Ohio.

Mike was an individual, one of the few to survive the antiseptic even sterile politics of the last few years. There aren't many more because Television, unfortunately, has developed a new kind of politician. But there are few who will contribute as much to their country as Mike Kirwan contributed over the last thirty years.

Mike Kirwan was a man who was "for" thinks, a positive man, not a negative, "aginer".

Mr. Chairman, I agree with Joe McCaffrey in every word of his tribute.

A partial list of the honors, awards, and degrees conferred upon Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Doctor of Humanities honorary degree—awarded for his contribution to the welfare of the American Indian and for his endeavors in pushing through for completion the greatest program of Conservation and Reclamation ever known to man. Presented March 25, 1960.

VINCENNES UNIVERSITY
Vincennes, Indiana

Doctor of Laws Degree *honoris causa*. Presented June 6, 1960.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
Fayettesville, Arkansas

Doctor of Laws Degree *honoris causa*. Presented for Congress Kirwan's support of the multi-purpose development of the Arkansas River Valley. Presented January 28, 1961.

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Toledo, Ohio

Doctor of Laws Degree *honoris causa*. Presented June 7, 1961.

YOUNGSTOWN UNIVERSITY
Youngstown, Ohio

Doctor of Conservation—awarded for outstanding efforts in the field of Conservation. Presented May 28, 1963.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
Fort Collins, Colorado

Honorary Doctor of Civil Laws Degree. Presented August 9, 1963.

CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSITY
Wilberforce, Ohio

Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree. Presented August 6, 1967.

COWBOY HALL OF FAME
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Charter Life Membership—presented March 25, 1960. Membership includes the late Will Rogers, the great humorist, and others who did so much in the development of the West, also, Charles Creighton, who was born in Ohio in 1820 and died in 1890. Though he did not go beyond the sixth grade in school, he built the first telegraph line from St. Louis to San Francisco, doing his own surveying. He founded the City of Omaha, Nebraska and Creighton University.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PIONEERS

Honorary Member—in recognition of vision and devotion in advocating and supporting the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the creation of the Eighth Sea. Presented June 29, 1961.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Appointed by Speaker John W. McCormack on January 15, 1962 as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Appointed by Speaker John W. McCormack on January 15, 1962, as a member of the Joint Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution.

NATIONAL FISHERIES AND AQUARIUM BOARD

Appointed by Speaker John W. McCormack on January 26, 1963.

NATIONAL FISHERIES INSTITUTE

An award recognizing efforts in establishment of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. Presented April 29, 1963, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

UNITED VETERANS COUNCIL

Life Membership was presented for outstanding leadership to promote the welfare of Veterans of the Armed Services of the United States. Presented January 18, 1954.

UNITED LABOR CONGRESS
AF of L. Youngstown, Ohio

Humanitarian Award presented for staunch support of organized labor—being an outstanding humanitarian and a great American. April 15, 1958.

MAHONING VALLEY FEDERATION OF SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS

Award for his efforts in behalf of Conservation in the Mahoning Valley. Presented February 20, 1961.

ASSOCIATED MOTOR CARRIERS OF OKLAHOMA, INC.

Certificate of Merit conferred for having shown outstanding leadership and service to the people of Oklahoma through statesmanship and sympathetic understanding of their problems. Presented July 30, 1959.

NORMAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NORMAN, OKLA.

Honorary Lifetime Membership in recognition of his many years of outstanding service to our country in the Congress of the United States.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF OHIO

Medallion—presented for Distinguished Service to the Mahoning Valley Industrial Region. Presented March 9, 1961.

ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, INC.

Certificate of Life Membership awarded in sincere appreciation for outstanding leadership through the years and for unwavering support and dedicated service to the program of water resource development. Presented March 13, 1964.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Elected a Congressional Founding Member and a participant in its program to encourage a better understanding of American History through the spread of information on the founding, growth, and significance of the United States Capitol, as a symbol of free representative government.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Award of Merit presented in recognition of outstanding accomplishments while serving as a Member of Congress for twenty-eight years; for his efforts while serving as Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior and Related Agencies; Chairman of the Democratic Congres-

sional Committee for re-electing Members of Congress; and in recognition of outstanding contributions toward the advancement of the State of California and to Los Angeles County. Presented May 14, 1964.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Award presented in recognition of his long years of dedicated service in behalf of America's war disabled veterans. Presented April 23, 1964.

DUCKS UNLIMITED CONSERVATION SERVICE AWARD, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Award for outstanding contributions to the cause of Migratory Waterfowl Conservation and the preservation of North America's Waterfowl heritage for generations to come. Presented October 5, 1967.

NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Award in recognition of his service to the Reclamation Program of America, of his significant contribution and devotion to water resources development, and of his support for creative water management. Presented November 16, 1967.

THE NEW FRONTIER ORGANIZATION OF TRUMBULL COUNTY, TRUMBULL COUNTY, OHIO

Award in recognition of his 31st year as a distinguished member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States; With appreciation of his long and outstanding record of public service to his own district and to the Nation at large; Acknowledgement with gratitude his great and successful efforts in bringing to fruition an impressive number of public projects which have materially improved and enhanced the general welfare; With sincerest felicitations on his Birthday with the hope that he may continue to serve his constituents, his party, and the Nation in his distinguished manner for many years to come. Presented January 4, 1968

COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD—EASTERN ORTHODOX MEN'S SOCIETY OF MAHONING VALLEY, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO

Award for outstanding service and significant contribution to the Youngstown Area Community. Presented February 10, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, today's tribute to MIKE KIRWAN is only a small token of the great esteem and affection which Members of this House held in life for this great American. I know that every House Member and every Member's family join today in mourning the loss of this beloved colleague, and join also in sending love and deep sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and all of the Kirwan family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. O'Neill joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to the family of MICHAEL KIRWAN. We are deeply grieved over their loss.

The death of MIKE KIRWAN seems to end an era not only in Congress, but also in America. He was one of the last of a kind. As a poverty-stricken child in a mining town in Pennsylvania, MIKE was only able to remain in school through the third grade. However, this did not make MIKE embittered or unconcerned. MIKE lived life to the fullest, taking part in such diverse activities as a migrant worker, streetcar conductor, wanderer, coal miner, and steelworker, invaluable experiences which later made him truly sympathetic to the common man and dedicated toward progressive legislation. He believed in the American dream because he felt he had lived it, and he was going to help others live it also.

As a legislator, he constantly kept his humble origins in mind and as one of the most singularly powerful men in Congress, MIKE made sure that the laborer's rights were always protected. His main concern was to improve the lot of the worker and allow everyone to partake of the good life that MIKE believed America had to offer.

As a friend, MIKE was sincere and loyal. There was never a time when I needed his help that it was not readily given. One never met MIKE when he did not have an amusing story to tell. The times are countless when MIKE would entertain us with his quick wit and Irish charm.

People meant a lot to MIKE, not just the wealthy and powerful, but good people. These are the people to whom his life was dedicated.

MIKE's leadership, warmth, and sparkle will be sorely missed in the halls of Congress and I will miss his warm friendship.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL).

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN's passing leaves an empty place that cannot be filled for any of us who came to know and love him and cherish his friendship. Out of humble origin in the Pennsylvania coalfields he rose to a position of positive leadership for good in the U.S. House of Representatives. America and her public domain is better preserved for the ages—the Indians have received better treatment because MIKE gave a life of unselfish, dedicated service to the land he loved. He was always grateful for his opportunity to do his share and more. One of his remarks when we last visited was, "My country has been good to me." And I must say, he has not only been good to it, but also good for it. He was among those who did his best to keep America more than a symbol of hope for all her people—he wanted his country to be as it was for him, a land of opportunity and fulfillment for all. My deepest sympathy is extended to his family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the privilege of joining in the tribute to the great statesman and our cherished friend, the late Honorable MICHAEL KIRWAN.

Mr. Chairman, today I gazed upon the face of a friend for the last time, still in death. The human within me experienced the natural anguish one endures when he sees in death one who "a short time ago lived, loved, felt dawn, and sunset glow." Yet, to the faith we long cherished that the soul is immortal and only the body passes through the normal cycle of life, we now have the comfort of the scientific principle that matter is never destroyed and even invisible energy is but another form of visible mass.

So we know that only the body of MIKE KIRWAN is now in the course of nature's mysterious transformation and renewal of life. Not only is his soul immortal but his life will live on into the infinite future in the numerous friendships, rare in quality, which he made; in the echoes of his innumerable generosities; in the strains of his laughter and his cheerful ways which will ever live in the world he so nobly inhabited; in the face of America which he so magnificently altered and improved, in utilitarian service and in satisfying beauty.

MIKE KIRWAN is an American success story as well as a human epic. From poor boy working in the mines for a few cents a day he rose to be one of the mighty of America, respected, loved and, if the victim of an enemy's assault, feared.

In his party's councils he was strong, dedicated, and bold. So in the councils of his country and his colleagues. Let the eye scan all of America and you will hardly find a place which does not bear the noble imprint of MIKE KIRWAN in the decades that he served his country in this House. And scan the Congress and most parts of America and you will find hands which shall never forget clasping the hand of MIKE KIRWAN, and ears which shall never lose the sound of his warm voice, and hearts in which his generous and brave spirit shall remain.

So MIKE KIRWAN, although he is dead, still lives and will long live. I join my colleagues in tribute to him. I humbly pay him the homage he so richly deserves. I shall ever cherish his friendship.

My wife joins me in tender sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY).

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, this is a sad day for all of us, for the people so ably represented in this House by our long time friend, MIKE KIRWAN, for the State of Ohio, and for our country.

Although MIKE's passing was not entirely unexpected, it, nevertheless, came as a shock to us all.

MIKE KIRWAN's service over a long span of life—83 years—was unmatched by few men. He was a builder and a conservationist. Through his powerful influence, vigorous effort, and persuasiveness, numerous projects of service to mankind have been constructed over our Nation.

As chairman of the Subcommittees on the Interior and Public Works, MIKE always gave everyone a hearing. If the program or project before him bore the margin of benefit to the public, MIKE put his great weight and influence behind it. If it was without merit, he courteously passed it by.

Although a dedicated and loyal Democrat, MIKE KIRWAN was not partisan in his service. Republicans, as well as Democrats, always felt free to seek his wise counsel and assistance, and if their position had merit, they got what they sought.

Mr. Chairman, I have been blessed with many friends. And life would be so dull without them. MIKE was my friend—my personal friend—one of my warmest and dearest friends. Morning after morning I had breakfast with him in the Long-

worth Cafeteria. Time after time I visited with him in his office. And on so many, many occasions we enjoyed an evening together at a social function, a sporting event, a dinner, or just a gathering of friends. He visited my State on several occasions. On two occasions he came at my request for the purpose of personally inspecting local public works projects. We were privileged to honor him with a dinner on his 80th birthday in Biloxi, Miss. I particularly recall, Mr. Chairman, that the dining room was packed. MIKE charmed them with his humor, his knowledge of government, his simplicity, and his cordial manner.

We are going to miss MIKE KIRWAN. The Nation will miss him. But, Mr. Speaker, we will always remember him for the good he brought to this world and to our country, for his service to us all, for the admiration and love he had for his wife and family, for the joy and happiness he brought to so many, and for his love of God and country. He was a dedicated, devout Christian man.

I wish I could say more, Mr. Chairman. I really do not know how. As Mike would say, "do you get the point I mean?"

I thank our Creator for the life of MIKE KIRWAN. And I extend the warmest sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the name of the delegation of the State of Illinois I express our sincere sympathy to the family of our great friend and colleague MICHAEL KIRWAN.

Mr. Chairman, this tribute to MIKE KIRWAN does not convey adequately my deep feelings for him. These words cannot capture my emotions to their fullest depth in honoring MIKE. He was the kind of man that once you met him you knew you would never forget him. I knew him for 33 years and the first time I met him I felt as though I had known him for a lifetime. MIKE was simply a great human being who lived life and enjoyed his fellow man.

MIKE KIRWAN was also a visionary. He had a vision of a great America whose resources would be developed to their fullest potential and whose riches would be fully protected. Mike was an environmentalist long before the word became popular and long before concern over the ecological crisis became such a widespread issue. Who can forget his plea for support of the public works and the Interior appropriation bills each year and his description of these as the "all-American" bills.

MIKE was a pragmatist. He coupled his vision with the practical knowledge of political life. His message was simple and one worth repeating: "To accomplish something you needed power. You do not have to tear down the system to build it up. You work within and change the system by gaining power."

In simple but forceful terms MIKE KIRWAN was what is right with America. He demonstrated how a young man who had to work in the mines as a youngster could become a national political leader, skilled in legislative and party politics. MIKE proved that with determination and industriousness a man could achieve what he wanted.

I deeply mourn MIKE KIRWAN's passing. His absence from this Chamber will diminish its luster. But I am comforted by the warm memory of 33 years of friendship with one of the greatest men with whom I have had the pleasure of serving in the Congress.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with the other Members of the House in expressing sympathy to the family of MIKE KIRWAN.

MICHAEL KIRWAN was indeed a strength to this House of Representatives so long as he was a Member. He was first of all an American who understood and appreciated the fact that America was founded upon the good hard work of individuals who wanted to do what was right and step in the right direction.

It was my happy privilege through the time I have been a Member to come to know him well and to love the great MIKE KIRWAN.

As the gentleman from Mississippi and others did, I also had breakfast with MIKE almost every morning, and we had as a result of this an understanding and a knowledge of what was right and what was wrong.

We will miss MIKE in the future. America has lost a great citizen. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife and family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN).

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, when I first came to the Congress 23 years ago, I remember very vividly meeting MIKE KIRWAN. He stood out, along with the late Sam Rayburn and Joe Martin, as a guiding light to those of us who were new to the Congress.

MIKE KIRWAN was a Congressman's Congressman. He enjoyed helping his colleagues, not only with legislation, but with problems in their respective districts. I do not believe in the history of the Congress there was ever one who did more to develop the natural resources and waterways of our land than did MIKE KIRWAN. There is hardly a river or a harbor in this Nation that does not bear the stamp of his guiding hand in its development.

Although a great Democrat, loyal and devoted to the Democratic Party, MIKE KIRWAN never failed to put his country before political considerations. Indeed, he was a statesman of the highest rank, one who stood tall in the esteem and admiration of all his colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, our beloved colleague not only served his Nation through his magnificent service in the House of Representatives, but he also served his country in time of war. And always he upheld the ideals and principles which made this Nation great. He was a great believer in the free enterprise system, and the story of MIKE KIRWAN, who went from a penniless Irish boy to become one of the leaders of the Congress is an inspiration to men everywhere.

MIKE KIRWAN was also a devoted family man, with fine and wonderful children and grandchildren. It is to these members of his family, and to his devoted wife, Alice, that I express my most heartfelt sympathy, and that of Mrs. Dorn and my family, in the passing of our friend.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, when historians come to write the true story of how this generation filled its stewartship for conserving our Nation's natural resources, the name of the late Congressman MIKE KIRWAN will stand foremost among those who did the most to keep this great land strong, clean, and good.

His championship of all those things during his many years in the Congress will become a beautiful American legend. His mark today stands in every section of America in the projects built through his leadership. Projects protecting our lands, conserving our waters and retaining our great public areas and forests bear his signature.

No State was better served because of this man's determined devotion to keeping and building America's resources than did Oklahoma. My fellow Oklahomans knew and loved this great leader. They will cherish his memory as our Indian friends say: "so long as the grass grows and the rivers flow."

There is no Indian tribe in the country, and especially none in Oklahoma, that did not benefit from his knowledge and interest in them as Indians and as people.

My earliest memory of being a fellow congressman with MIKE KIRWAN had to do with the help he gave me for Indians of Oklahoma.

His leadership will be missed but his good works will continue on through the years. I know his wife and his family will find consolation in the high regard with which he was and is held by the citizens of this Nation, and especially by those of us who served with him. I extend my deepest sympathy to them.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join with those of my colleagues in an expression of personally-felt loss that came over me when I learned of the death of Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN. When I first came to the House in 1955, MIKE KIRWAN was, of course, a legend in his own time. His position as chairman of the House Democratic Congressional Committee insured that new Members, as well as veteran Representatives, had abundant exposure to the qualities that rendered him so singularly effective for the many roles he was able to fulfill here.

I, for one shall never forget the kindnesses he offered during the early years, when they were particularly welcome, his practical, pungent wisdom about the ways of the House and congressional politics, nor his Irish wit and gregariousness I found MIKE KIRWAN's manner and personality particularly congenial. With MIKE KIRWAN there was usually no problem of getting acquainted.

His wit could bite, and I am sure some Members may have occasionally felt the sting of it, or when the chips were down MIKE KIRWAN had no match in the busi-

ness of practical politics. I need not give testimony here to that fact that MIKE KIRWAN in opposition could be a formidable foe. But if a Member had him as an ally, problems often seemed to have a way of disappearing, and either way, the fight was always fair.

I would like to make a personal comment about one of Congressman KIRWAN'S more famous extracurricular activities. No Member who ever attended one of his memorable series of St. Patrick's Day parties would ever forget it. These celebrations, which became an annual affair, were obviously a source of great satisfaction to him. Despite the fact that, through the years, his hospitality resulted in the largest St. Patrick's Day parties in town, they never became large enough to be impersonal. MIKE'S personality provided the cement that could hold hundreds of friends together in a spirit of the warmest friendship.

MICHAEL KIRWAN became what he was as a Member of the House of Representatives through the force of his own abilities. He earned his many friendships the hard way, with sincere and genuine efforts to be a friend, with all the responsibilities that can entail—including the strongest kind of personal integrity. There is not much any of us here today can add to his reputation and esteem. We can, in some small way, celebrate our own good fortune in having been privileged to know him. In my own way, I shall always honor both the memories and the man.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in honoring MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. MIKE as he was known to virtually every senior Member of the House and Senate, became something akin to a congressional institution during his 34 years in Washington. He was known for hard work, for plain talk, for skilled and disciplined leadership. His record of accomplishment—public works projects that brought water to the country's farmlands, that produced energy for its homes and factories, that shielded millions against floods—is monument enough to his work here.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee's Public Works Subcommittee for more than two decades and its chairman for the past 5 years, MIKE fought for pollution control and environmental protection long before such causes became fashionable. Other efforts now modish—conservation of fish and wildlife, for example, or opening up opportunities for the American Indian—were among MIKE'S most cherished personal goals during his years on the Interior Subcommittee.

MIKE'S contribution to his country—and this, I want to emphasize, is not an exaggeration—have not often been paralleled in the Congress. I am proud to have known him as a close personal friend and colleague.

MIKE was born poor. Working in Ohio's grimy coal mines and railroad yards as a young man, he learned respect for honest labor. He never forgot what it is like to be a working man. His ardent support for social legislation—legislation ranging from labor rights to medicare—never flagged during his years in Washington. He travelled widely before entering public life, earning his way as a roustabout in oil fields out west and as a lumberjack in timber camps. During World War I he was decorated while serving with combat artillery units in France. His background gave him an insight into the diversity of American life, and American people—and, still more significantly, an insight into the common bond that links us all as countrymen.

First elected to Congress in 1936, MIKE served Ohio's 19th Congressional District for nearly 34 years.

He served well, Mr. Chairman.

He never shunned a legislative battle for a cause he felt just. He never shrank from an issue merely because it was controversial. He never broke his word to a man or broke faith with the people he represented.

He will be missed here.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Alice, his children and grandchildren.

Mr. Chairman, I insert in the RECORD a fine editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator of July 28, 1970:

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

Congressman Michael J. Kirwan, known the country over as simply "Mike," the one-time coal mine breaker boy, was an indomitable fighter, from his days down in the holes in eastern Pennsylvania's mine section to his era on Capitol Hill. Just as he fought against injustices to the workingman with which he wrestled as a labor union member, he battled valiantly and courageously against the illness which ended a long, unbroken and highly productive career in Congress marked by countless contributions to the welfare and progress of his home district and the nation.

The Youngstown congressman, stricken in his 17th term, was an elementary school dropout, yet by all applicable standards he was an educated man and one of Congress' most influential. Mr. Kirwan attained his education in the "bootstrap" manner. In his later years and as a result of his enduring interest in the humanities, conservation and reclamation, he received honorary degrees from numerous colleges and universities. It was noted by a colleague when, in 1961, he was honored by Oklahoma City University, that "In a sense it is the House of Representatives and the American way of life which are honored by the award to Congressman Kirwan."

* * *

Mr. Kirwan's formal education was, indeed, limited, but formal education is only one way of arriving at truth. Innumerable contacts and personal relationships with people from virtually all around the world gave him a deep, mature perspective and thorough knowledge of human affairs.

Mr. Kirwan represented 19th District citizens for nearly 34 years. Among the principal reasons for the congressman's continuity of service are the district's bountiful water supply and accompanying flood control program established because of Mr. Kirwan's influence in Congress. He was chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and second ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. He also had spent many vigorous and fruitful years as head of the Democratic congressional campaign committee.

Seniority alone would not have given him the influence he wielded in such groups, his national reputation as a conservation authority or his exalted position in national politics as chairman of the party's campaign committee. It was his strength of character and his outstanding ability which impressed not only his colleagues but those back home who, election after election, chose to send him back to Washington as their spokesman.

As it was in the old adage about the prophet in his own country, some in the 19th District may not have realized the stature which Mr. Kirwan had attained not only in national politics but also national policies. He probably was even better known throughout the West than he was in his own state because of his work in behalf of reclamation. In 1960 a book by Sen. Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma, then one of the country's foremost authorities on land and water management, gave considerable space to Mr. Kirwan who was compared with the late Sen. George Norris of Nebraska for his outstanding efforts for conservation.

Mr. Kirwan's decisions, indicating his comprehensive grasp of public needs and the manner in which they should be met, earned him the respect of fellow congressmen. The Mahoning Valley, of course, will never forget how much it owes to him for his efforts in behalf of additional water resources and flood control facilities and, naturally, the years of hard work that he put in as he fought for a low-cost method of helping the district's economy, the Lake Erie-Ohio River waterway. It was hard for him to accept the fact that people of his own state, including public officials and industrial figures who would have benefited by the proposed canal, never gave him the cooperation that would have helped make the waterway a reality. This undoubtedly was one of the greatest disappointments of his public life.

Mr. Kirwan was a strong supporter of an adequate national defense even though, with some members of Congress, this policy was never popular. For many years he sought relief for Youngstown in the form of the Crab Creek flood control project upon which work has already been begun. It is unfortunate that he will not be able to see this important operation completed.

It can be said, we believe, that Mr. Kirwan was staunchly and enthusiastically Democratic, yet he never allowed political expediency to alter his personal philosophy as it concerned district or national policies. He may have been the only man who told his President, face to face, to "go to hell!" President Truman had appointed an Ohioan to an important government post without consulting the congressman who told Mr. Truman he was upset. Truman replied that as President he didn't have to consult with anyone and this provoked Mr. Kirwan's politically historic observation.

We don't mean to imply that Mr. Kirwan was perfect. In fact, most of his strength came from his humanness, his imperfection. His anger, when aroused, was deep and lasting. Yet this fact, too, probably contributed to his influence in the House; it was a wrath to be feared.

Mr. Kirwan leaves much to the district and the nation he served so long so well. He had a vital part in what some analysts have called the greatest program of conservation and reclamation ever known to man, and always with the national concept in mind.

It is recalled that in 1961 district industrial leaders honored Mr. Kirwan for his service to the district and the nation. A. S. Glossbrenner, then president of Youngstown Sheet and Tube, offered a citation which hailed Mr. Kirwan as a "self-made man who is recognized among men for his great capacity for understanding and accomplishment. Coming from a humble, austere beginning, he fought his way to the top by sheer force of his own character and determination.

His life is a symbol of success and light of hope to the people of the world . . . the American success story!"

The Mahoning Valley never has had a representative who accomplished so much, not only for his own district but for the nation as well. He built dams and reservoirs, he helped protect the nation's forests, he fought for water conservation and, above all, his was the dream of a beautiful America, cherishing its resoures, which he preached without end.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it is a sad day in this House of Representatives as well as in the Nation as we pause to pay final respect to our late colleague from Ohio, Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN. Congresswan KIRWAN had a long and distinguished service in this body. His straightforward manner and his reputation for integrity and sincerity helped to earn the respect and affection of Members on both sides of the political aisle.

As a new Member of the House of Representatives in 1963, I had the experience of a brief exchange with Congressman KIRWAN in connection with a public works appropriation bill. While Congressman KIRWAN appeared to deal sharply with me on that occasion, he later called me to the committee desk and expressed in his frank and open manner a warmth and friendship which persisted from that hour to his final days in this body.

It is not difficult to understand MIKE KIRWAN's rise in prestige and influence in Democratic Party circles. He made fast friends and he held the friendships which he once established. It seems fair to add also that MIKE KIRWAN did not forget his friends. Likewise, MIKE KIRWAN's friends will not forget him.

Mr. Chairman, I will not recount Congressman KIRWAN's record of service and experience in the course of his long and colorful career. Instead, I will observe simply that MICHAEL KIRWAN was a man of honor and great humanity who rose to a position of importance and leadership in his party and in the Nation—and in this body that he loved so well. In addition to this expression for my esteemed friend, I wish also to communicate on behalf of Mrs. McClory and myself our affection and deep sympathy to his widow, Alice, and to other members of Congressman KIRWAN's family.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the passing of MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN takes from our midst a distinguished public servant whose heritage is embodied throughout the Nation in parks, dams, reservoirs, and water conservation projects. Long before ecology and environmental concerns became popular issues, he championed the cause of future generations. His contribution to the irrigation and power development of the West remains as his most impressive monument, the achievement of a farsighted statesman to whom politics had become a means to an end—the advancement of the common good.

MIKE KIRWAN was a truly representative American, respected by his colleagues in this House and trusted by the people he served so faithfully and well through the years. At the time of his passing he was the second oldest living Member of this body and the seventh-ranking Member in seniority. He was a lifelong and loyal party man, who believed in the inherent vitality of the American two-party system. As chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, he not only toured the land in behalf of the party he loved, but also assisted various of his colleagues who were concerned about their reelection. I was one of those who was the beneficiary of his assistance, for which I am eternally grateful.

His interests were varied and colorful. At once modest of manner and vigorously determined, he gave effective leadership in many areas. Among his concerns were American Indians and the American territories abroad. He was an honorary member of many tribes, and took pride in the fact. In the Virgin Islands and Guam, he was responsible for vitally needed school and health facilities, established out of his deep concern for human welfare.

His background was wide ranging, and kept him in touch with the aspirations of millions of Americans. A lifelong union member, he was never afraid of hard work nor unfaithful to the legitimate interests of labor. The son of an immigrant coal miner, he worked at times as a breaker boy, a railroad brakeman, an oilfield hand, a lumberjack, and a harvest hand. Later he served on the city council in Youngstown, Ohio.

His was the American story of the poor boy who made good.

In this House, his service on the Public Works Subcommittee was outstanding, yet he found time to serve on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and on the National Fisheries and Aquarium Advisory Board. His ardent advocacy of a national aquarium has become a legend. His concerns for veterans reflected his experience in World War I with the AEF.

To his widow, Alice; to his sons, John and Michael, Jr.; to his daughter, Mrs. Robert Vaughn; and to all his family and friends; I extend my sincere condolence in their loss, a loss shared by the Congress and by the whole Nation. Surely they are comforted at this time by the memory of his life and achievements, which have deserved the words spoken of old, "Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter into the joy of thy Lord."

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am very saddened at the passing of my good friend MIKE KIRWAN, a man I have known and admired since I first came to Washington in 1959. His death, coming after a long and painful struggle, creates a void in this body which can not easily be filled.

In addition to capably serving as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, he found time to diligently serve his party for 23 years as head of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. For his inspirational work as head of this committee and for his tireless efforts to promote the ideals of the Democratic Party, he shall always be known to me, and I am sure, to many of my colleagues, as "Mr. Democrat."

MIKE was a stouthearted Irish politician whose anecdotes were legend. As a story teller, he was unexcelled and we could listen for hours to the tales of this charming man.

Politics was his life and he lived it to the fullest. Those of us that were fortunate enough to have been close to MIKE can never forget his sparkling wit and the special meaning that he gave to St. Patrick's Day. I am sure that "you get the point I mean." MIKE we will miss you.

On behalf of Mrs. Rostenkowski and myself, I would like to extend my sincere condolences to Mrs. Kirwan and to the entire Kirwan family.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the death of our beloved colleague, MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN, marked the passing of not only a great public servant but a great American. He possessed the spirit and the energy similar to all the pioneers who make this great Nation the greatest in the world.

MIKE was one of the few pioneers left who, as a boy, was compelled to forgo school in the early grade period and work to support himself and his widowed mother and family. His education was received the hard way. During his youthful working days, he read and studied in order to improve his mental capabilities and better his economic situation. He rose, step by step, to be one of the most influential Members of the Congress of the United States.

Congressman KIRWAN was respected, revered, and honored by all who made his acquaintance. He was called upon to consult with Presidents, Senators, Congressmen, heads of industry, and the leading businessmen of the Nation on matters of legislation and public development.

He was a conservationist, a developer, an advocate and sponsor of dozens of the major public works projects which the citizens of our Nation enjoy today. His life's accomplishments and his success are a glowing example to our present-day American youth of what hard work, honesty, sincerity, and religious devotion can accomplish in this great free land of America. He will be missed by thousands of his friends and admirers not only in his congressional district and State but throughout our country. I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, in the relatively brief period in which I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives, I did not have the good fortune to become intimately acquainted with my distinguished Ohio colleague, MICHAEL KIRWAN.

I will always regret that I did not have the opportunity to become better acquainted with MIKE.

As an Ohio neighbor, long before I ever came to Washington, I knew well the tremendous reputation that Congressman KIRWAN had earned as a remarkably influential, respected Member of the House.

So it was that when I arrived here in Washington I looked upon him with considerable awe. He had already become somewhat of a legend.

And so it is, I view his death as a great loss to all of us in the House, to the people of the State of Ohio, and to the American people as a whole. We will miss him greatly.

Mrs. Mosher and all my congressional staff join me in expressing our sympathy to the Kirwan family.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our friend and colleague MIKE KIRWAN, who has so ably represented the 19th Congressional District of Ohio for the past 34 years.

MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN was born in my own State of Pennsylvania, December 2, 1886. He served with distinction in the 64th Artillery, U.S. Army, during World War I. He became a resident of Youngstown, Ohio, and was active there in politics even before he was first elected to the 75th Congress and for a time was a member of the Youngstown City Council.

In the House of Representatives MIKE KIRWAN soon became recognized for his outstanding ability as a legislator and for his friendliness and personal modesty as well. He was always the true friend of the laboring man and ever in the forefront among those seeking progressive labor legislation. As chairman of the influential Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee he built up a most impressive record of substantial achievements. His accomplishments as a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures have benefited all taxpayers and helped promote efficiency in Government operations.

It is a mark of the esteem and friendship in which he was held by his colleagues in the House that MIKE was made chairman in 1947 of the Democratic National Congressional Committee and retained that post of honor until his untimely passing.

I regarded MIKE KIRWAN as a dear personal friend as well as fellow legislator, and I believe that all who have had the privilege and pleasure of knowing him share that feeling. MIKE KIRWAN will long be missed in the House of Representatives and by his host of friends throughout the country. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in their tribute here to MIKE KIRWAN. I served many years on the Appropriations Committee and for the last few years on his Subcommittee on Public Works.

During all these years we were close friends and never had a difference for MIKE was fair though firm. There was no sectionalism about MIKE. Where he stood you knew and when he talked, you knew what he meant. As the priest who conducted the last services in Youngstown, Ohio, so aptly said, MIKE would close, "You see the point I mean!" We always knew.

He leaves thousands of monuments in a material way, but more than that he made life a little better for so many, and his friends he leaves are limited only by those who knew him.

Our committee, as pointed out by the chairman, adopted a resolution on MIKE's untimely death which expresses better than I could hope to here, our feelings at his loss.

To his beloved wife and family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, "man's genius," said the Greek philosopher, Heraclitus, some 2,500 years ago, "is a deity." In the case of MIKE KIRWAN, his deity was a passionate belief in the American dream. And he worshipped that deity with unabated zeal throughout a long life devoted to public service. His genius lay in his realization that America was a synonym for opportunity unlimited, a land where success beckoned alluringly to the individual who had the insight and the energy to follow her.

A writer more recent than Heraclitus said:

> Genius, that power which dazzles mortal eyes,
> Is oft but perseverance in disguise.

Congressman KIRWAN's career is chronicled variously and at length in the news media. But not in the Congressional Directory, where he might be charged with authorship. There his biography consists of a single sentence, taking up barely one line of printed type. It is probably an all-time record for brevity. He believed in deeds, not words.

From the news media we gather that his was a colorful character, colorful because of its straightforwardness, its vigor, its devotion to the cause of his constituents. His people could trust him. We, his colleagues in the House, could trust him. We knew without advance notice on which side of public issues he would be found. It would be on the side of the aspirations and hopes of the people who sent him to Congress, as the Constitution intended a Congressman to be.

His record, as we pick it up from personal knowledge and from what we hear and read, is one uninterrupted story of accomplishment. Starting with little, he amassed around him much in the way of practical achievement, in prestige, and in honor.

It is unnecessary to repeat here what has been so often and so well told elsewhere. The important point is that MIKE KIRWAN was a true exponent of the American spirit which built on this continent a great, rich, and benevolent nation. He did not expect success to be handed to him as a birthright. He lived to carve it out for himself in the heat and sweat of effort. He looked with contempt on that modern tendency which can see no future for active involvement in the competition of mind and muscle for glory and material success. This is a wonderful country, he believed. He did his best to help make it so, and he assumed all good Americans would do the same.

It is fitting then that we pause today to contemplate the virtues of a comrade who was so true to the ideals of his native land, and who labored so persistently and so successfully to perpetuate those ideals. While we mourn his passing, and offer our sincere condolences to his family and close friends, we assert once more our high respect for his accomplishments as a superb legislator. May his career be an inspiration to all of us to work without ceasing for the good of our countrymen!

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of MICHAEL KIRWAN, a late and much loved Member of this body. To look at an analysis of "MIKE'S" record in the Congress, is to look at a long and powerful list of accomplishments. His achievements as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works and as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Committee are a matter of public record; however, his work behind the scenes in Congress show how great his affect really was.

During most of my tenure in Congress, Mr. KIRWAN has been ill, and relatively inactive. However, as most of you are aware, he enjoyed a long and close friendship with my predecessor, the late John E. Fogarty. Both men resided at the University Club and frequently walked to their offices in the morning. Often these walks were planning sessions on bill strategy, and the record shows how well these plans worked.

Both men were known for their great humanitarian concept. Both men were from simple beginnings and their hearts were filled with the needs of the people they represented. Both men had known poverty and sought through the power they had attained to do all they could to eradicate its debilitating effects. Their accomplishments are staggering.

The 19th District of Ohio was well represented by Mr. KIRWAN and he will be missed by his "people" as he will be missed by this body.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the death of my dear friend and colleague, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, is a source of profound sorrow to me. His loss to the House of Representatives, to his native Ohio, and to the Nation is immense—an irreplaceable public servant.

No one had more friends and was more respected than MIKE KIRWAN. For all of my years on the Appropriations Committee, MIKE was a fellow committee member. It is difficult for me to conceive of the committee without him.

MIKE was not only one of the great Members of this body, in which he served for 34 years, he was surely one of the most effective members ever to sit on the Appropriations Committee.

He served on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 27 years, and he chaired that subcommittee for 13 years.

During those years, MIKE worked tirelessly and effectively for the development of our great national parks and for the preservation of our national forests and wildlife. Conservationists knew MIKE KIRWAN as a friend and a fearless advocate of an unspoiled America.

The American Indian also knew MIKE as a friend and one who exercised his powerful influence for the betterment of those who were the first Americans.

MIKE also served on the Subcommittee

on Appropriations for Public Works for 15 years, including 6 as its chairman. There are probably few in this body who are not indebted to MIKE KIRWAN for his leadership in water resource development.

Many of this Nation's great river systems today have been harnessed for water, power, irrigation, navigation, and recreation—all because MIKE KIRWAN had the vision and provided the leadership in getting appropriations for these projects through Congress.

Yet, I shall remember MIKE KIRWAN for more than his special ability and determination to get the job done. I shall remember an honest and simple man, not affected by the well-deserved praise for his many accomplishments or by the seniority that he amassed for his many years of service in Congress.

I shall remember a genuinely good man, a deeply religious man, and a good-natured and proud Irishman who earned for himself only admiration and respect from congressional colleagues, constituents, and friends throughout this country and abroad.

MIKE KIRWAN is gone, leaving a vacuum which can never really be filled, but the memory of this great friend will remain, as will the great parklands, river systems, and wildlife preserves of America—all monuments to the memory of Congressman MIKE KIRWAN.

Mrs. Andrews joins me in extending our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and other members of the Kirwan family at this time of their great sorrow.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from remarking upon the sadness of a day which sees the passing of our colleague, MICHAEL KIRWAN, commemorated by the Members of the House of Representatives.

When I came to the House in 1949, MIKE KIRWAN was already an institution, much beloved by everyone who knew him. He took the time to seek out the new Members, and he took an interest in their problems. His friendship was easily given, and his loyalty was as a chain of steel.

MIKE KIRWAN had four great loves—his country, his Ohio district, his friends, and the House of Representatives. But essentially, these were all the same. He knew he could not be false to one of them without being false to all, and he never was.

He had a great view of the Nation, and of the Nation's resources. And he was always the great conservationist, always on the side of development for the common good.

I, like many another Member of this House, could always count on MIKE for sympathetic support of and understanding of the need for various public works projects involving our stream resources. Those of us who come from the Appalachian region of the country found in him a vigorous ally in this field, for he knew the great extent to which development of the region's economy depended upon development of our water resources.

From his position as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, MIKE KIRWAN worked to make reality of the dreams of development of Appalachia, and many other areas of this country. His view was that when one region was made stronger, the entire Nation was stronger—and that he regarded as the highest calling in the public service, the strengthening of the Nation.

The people of my area of eastern Kentucky knew MIKE KIRWAN as a friend, and I know they are saddened by his loss.

Mr. Chairman, not only has the Congress lost one of the great practitioners of the art of government, but we have all lost a personal friend. For me, that loss is keenly felt.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is with a saddened spirit that I rise today to pay tribute to an old and dear friend and colleague, MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN. I was deeply grieved to learn of his untimely death.

MIKE KIRWAN was very kind and very good to me when I first came to Congress as a junior Member, as he was to so many in this House and on both sides of the aisle.

His entire life was a model of service and untiring efforts to improve the lives of those he served, and all humanity as well.

The plight of the American Indian became one of MIKE KIRWAN's many special concerns. He actively supported better educational facilities on Indian reservations and on Samoa, and housing projects on St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands.

As chairman of the House Public Works Subcommittee, he truly proved his worth. His accomplishments in the environmental field—long before the issue became popular—will rank highest in his monument. National parks, dams, reservoirs, and water conservation projects are in existence today because of his proficiency.

MIKE KIRWAN has served Congress with distinction. We shall miss him as a colleague, as a great public servant, and as a devoted American.

Needless to say, the name MIKE KIRWAN will rank as one of the greatest men in the history of this Nation.

May God bless him and keep him—Mrs. Burke joins me in extending our sympathy to his loved ones during this time of great sorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the entire House is saddened by the loss of our colleague and my deep warm personal friend, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, the distinguished representative of the 19th District of Ohio for 33 years.

MIKE KIRWAN will be remembered in this body for many things—his chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, through which funneled billions for construction purposes; his leadership in progressive legislation; his fearlessness regardless of the opposition.

But I prefer to remember MIKE KIRWAN for his leadership in conservation. A couple of dozen years ago, when "ecology" was almost an unknown word and long before many of the present proponents of ecology were even known, MIKE KIRWAN was leading the fight to preserve and enhance our national heritage for the future.

And we all know that MIKE was not just a talker; he was a doer. Under his guidance hundreds, if not thousands, of conservationist projects saw reality; a fact for which present and future generations should well remember MIKE KIRWAN.

Now, at 83, and after a year of severe suffering, MIKE has left us. I know we all extend our heartfelt condolences to his wife, Alice, and the children, John, Michael, and Mary Alice. We deeply sympathize with them in their great loss. It is my earnest prayer the good Lord will reward MIKE and let the perpetual light shine upon him for his many acts of charity and good deeds. May his soul rest in peace.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, for 33 years, the 19th District of Ohio has been represented by a dedicated and able servant.

From a humble and meager background, came MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN to the Halls of Congress. Through his devotion to his job and hard work, he became known to every public sector of the country during his long years of service as the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Committee. Although his education had been limited, he possessed the rare ability to "cut through" involved and detailed problems and programs to present them in the layman's language that all could understand.

Of his Irish ancestry, he was proud and wanted all to share in the festivities of the celebration of St. Patrick's Day. On those occasions, he was the gracious host to literally thousands.

His record in the partisan annals of the House are legend in the success of his campaign efforts.

The projects which were funded during his Public Works Subcommittee leadership stretch from one end of this land to the other. They are a constant reminder of the diligence of a man who believed in what he was doing.

Yes, everyone, both in and out of the House, who felt the contact with MICHAEL KIRWAN will long remember his skill and know-how in getting the job done. He will be sorely missed. To his widow and family goes my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow at the untimely passing of our esteemed colleague, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio.

It was a privilege to serve with him these many years in the House of Representatives. He was a man who served his district and the Nation with ability and distinction. He was an industrious public servant in the House of Representatives. One of his finest attributes was his ability to make friends and more so—to keep them. It was my sincere pleasure to know that he included me among the multitude of his friends. He gave of himself willingly and sincerely. The welfare of his constituents, the security of our country, the progress of our Nation were always uppermost in his mind.

Over the more than 20 years that it

was my privilege to serve in Congress with him I benefited by his fatherly and scholarly advice. His commonsense approach to difficult controversial issues and problems for which I sought his counsel have left an indelible impression upon me and I am certain upon those who sought his advice. All of us are deeply indebted to him for his assistance. I shall never forget his wise counsel at the time the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation was under consideration in Congress.

Throughout his long service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations he was influential in pollution control. He fought for the preservation of forests, national parks and fish and wildlife. MIKE KIRWAN was a man of integrity, a tireless and dedicated citizen. His loss will be felt by all who were privileged to know him and serve with him. His death also inflicts a heavy loss on his family and his many friends in Ohio and throughout the United States.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his beloved wife, his children and grandchildren. May they derive some small consolation from the knowledge that their loss is shared by his many friends and in the thought that the good Lord has chosen him to be among His very own.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues in paying tribute today to MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, whose death a few days ago has saddened us all.

MIKE KIRWAN was one of the most conscientious, diligent, and hard-working Members of the House. He gave unstintingly of his time and efforts in the 34 years he spent in the Congress, and they were years of distinguished service not only to his congressional district but to the entire Nation.

Recognizing the devastating effects of pollution long before it became a problem of national concern, MIKE KIRWAN fought for the preservation of our national forests, parks, fish, and wildlife. Through his good sense and devotion to the national interest, essential dams and reservoirs were built in the right places throughout the country. Millions of Americans today and generations yet to come are indebted to him. Completed flood control programs, power generating plants, irrigation projects all over the land are a lasting monument to his persistent and purposeful efforts.

MIKE KIRWAN championed another cause during his years in the House. He gave much of himself to the needs of American Indians, constantly prodding for legislation which would better their economic conditions and educational opportunities.

He distinguished himself in yet another way—by giving vigorous leadership to the Democratic Party Campaign Committee. With his death, the party has lost a stalwart member.

I shall always have a special, personal feeling for MIKE KIRWAN. As a Los Angeles city councilman when I first met MIKE, the thought of trying for a congressional seat had not passed my mind. In our first conversation he suggested that I should make the attempt. A couple of years later I took his advice and was fortunate to win my seat. I will always cherish this memento.

Mrs. Corman and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and other members of the family. I am sure they will find solace in the knowledge that MIKE KIRWAN leaves behind him a legacy of public service that commands the respect and admiration of all who knew him.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow over the passing of our good friend, MIKE KIRWAN. MIKE was a unique personality, one of the old school, in many respects like our former colleague from Chicago, Tom O'Brien. They were fast friends. Both had been schooled in the college of hard knocks, both had experienced hard times in their earlier years, both had succeeded in becoming Members of the Congress. Both were proud to be considered practical politicians.

MIKE was an individualist, a pragmatist, a patriot who loved his country and his party. He was a courageous advocate always for the rights of the people and he strode the floor of Congress in a manner that will not be forgotten.

It was my good fortune to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations. When his bill came before the committee, there was always an air of expectation in the committee room, for MIKE's speeches were gems. Drawing upon his vast experience, both political and personal, he explained his bill in salty, graphic and witty language that always won approval. "This is the all-American bill," he would say. "We're trying with the funds appropriated here to heal in some measure the damage done to our country over the years."

He walked with Presidents, but he never forgot where he was rooted. He was at home wherever he found himself because he was of the people.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation is a better place because MIKE KIRWAN served in the Congress. He will never be forgotten by those who served with him.

Mrs. Yates joins me in expressing our profound sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and members of the family.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, on July 26 one of our country's most able public servants passed from our midst. MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN faithfully served his country in the House of Representatives for 33 years, a career distinguished by his concern for his fellow Americans. His record of achievement will live on in the Nation's landscape in the form of parks, dams, reservoirs, and water conservation projects. His contribution to the development of irrigation and power resources in the West remains as one of his most impressive monuments. Future generations will remember him as a man who championed the causes of ecological and environmental preservation long before they became popular issues.

MIKE KIRWAN was truly a man of the American people. The son of an immigrant coal miner, he was born in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in 1886. His early years were spent in such physically demanding occupations as braker boy, railroad brakeman, oilfield hand, lumberjack, and harvest hand. He never forgot the lesson he learned during these formative years. He was proud of his lifelong union membership, and he remained faithful to the legitimate interests of labor.

His deep and abiding concern for human welfare made him the champion of many causes. Over the years, he was instrumental in improving the conditions of life for many American Indians. They, in turn, expressed their gratitude by making him an honorary member of many tribes, a distinction he accepted proudly. His concern and interest also extended to the American territories. He was responsible for vitally needed school and health facilities in both the Virgin Islands and Guam.

Throughout his career, starting with election to the Youngstown, Ohio, city counil in 1932, MIKE KIRWAN remained a man close to the people. After serving with the AEF in World War I, he maintained a lifelong interest in the needs and aspirations of our veterans. He was an active member of both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A fervent believer in the inherent vitality of the American two-party system, MIKE KIRWAN helped lead the party of his choice as Chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. In this House, his outstanding service on the Public Works Subcommittee earned him the respect of his colleagues. He also served on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. As a member of the National Fisheries and Aquarium Advisory Board, his ardent advocacy of a national aquarium became legendary.

To the members of his family Mrs. Kluczynski and I extend our sincere condolence on their loss, a loss shared by the Congress, and, indeed, by the whole Nation. They must surely be sustained by the memory of his lifetime and achievement and by the respect in which his memory is held by those fortunate enough to have known him.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in lamenting the passing of MIKE KIRWAN, even though the end has not come unexpectedly. For anyone representing a district past which flows the mighty Missouri, and through which flows many troublesome tributaries of that great watercourse, MIKE KIRWAN was an extremely important factor in this body.

I desire to recognize here today the debt I owe to the late Congressman KIRWAN for his willingness to support flood control and navigation projects in the Sixth Iowa District that represent capital improvements in the topography of America. MIKE KIRWAN never apologized for spending money to preserve our natural resources. I think we all owe a significant amount to him for being so willing to invest in our country's future.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a sense of sadness that I join with my colleagues in Congress in paying tribute to the late Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN of Ohio.

MIKE KIRWAN will long be remembered both as an able Member of the House

and a loyal Democrat. As representative of the 19th Congressional District of Ohio for the past 33 years, MIKE KIRWAN served his people and the Nation well. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee it was an honor for me to have served with MIKE KIRWAN. He chaired the important Public Works Subcommittee, and his accomplishments can be seen in the many public works projects across the Nation for which he is responsible.

As a Democrat, there are few in the long history of the Democratic party that have served with the loyalty of MIKE KIRWAN. As chairman of the House Democratic Campaign Committee for the past 23 years, MIKE KIRWAN led our party to win the majority of the House for all but one term during the years he served as campaign chairman. His leadership and loyalty will long leave its mark on the successes of the Democratic Party.

I wish to extend my sincere condolences to Mrs. Kirwan, his three children, and members of his family for the great loss that they, together with the people of Ohio and the Nation, has sustained in his passing.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, the news of the passing of our colleague from Ohio, Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, has saddened every Member of this Chamber and everyone connected with public service. MIKE KIRWAN was a giant among legislators and a champion of conservation and environmental planning.

It was my privilege to serve as a Member of the House Appropriations Committee with MIKE KIRWAN and to experience the legislative accomplishments of this dedicated Representative. For 34 years he served the people of his congressional district in Ohio and for 34 years he served all the people of this Nation. His achievements and proposals for the preservation of our natural resources began at a time when few saw the dangers threatening our environment and continued in this most recent period when concern about environmental protection became fashionable.

Another example of his early recognition of an inequitable situation in his efforts to improve the plight of the American Indian. This was a cause which MIKE fought for in his 13 years as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies and 27 years as a Member of that subcommittee. He called for better education, improved health care, and programs to provide for the welfare and development of resources of the American Indian long before the deplorable conditions facing the Indians became widely known.

MIKE KIRWAN was truly a man of vision but beyond that he was a man who could get things done. Parks, dams, reservoirs, and water conservation projects became realities rather than ideas because of his leadership in the House of Representatives. Flood control, pollution control, power generation, navigation, irrigation and recreation were more than words to this master of the legislative process. The list of accomplishments which he compiled will take up many pages when historians record the highlights of his career. Future generations will enjoy the fruits of his work and realize the full value of his dedication and devotion to conservation.

The respect and admiration which we felt for MIKE is well known and the void which we now feel will not be filled. This was to be MIKE'S last term in the House and a sad chamber now salutes him. I join in extending my personal sympathies to his wife, Alice, his two sons John J. and Michael Jr., and his daughter, Mrs. Robert Vaughn.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep sadness today that I add my respects to the memory of MIKE KIRWAN, our esteemed colleague in the House of Representatives for many long years. Our good friend, MIKE, will be missed by the Congress and all America.

MIKE was a good American, a good Democrat, and a good legislator.

I want to express my condolences and the condolences of my State of Nevada to not only his family and many close friends, but also to the congressional district MIKE represented in Ohio.

I want to make a special note of MIKE'S conscientious devotion to congressional activity and work in behalf of the Western States. This fact particularly cannot be overlooked.

MIKE, while being an easterner, made the effort to travel in the West and learn about the conditions and problems facing the Western States. His position on the Appropriations Committee was of vital importance to the West. MIKE was a top-notch leader in securing needed reclamation programs for the fast-growing Western United States.

MIKE was an honest and just man. He gave of himself completely when he worked on an appropriation bill and the Members of Congress of both sides of the political aisle held him in true respect. My colleagues and I knew of his dedicated work and knew that his word was his bond. A Member of the House always knew that when MIKE KIRWAN said that his appropriation bill had been screened with a fine tooth comb, and that it was a good bill for the American public, that that word was exact.

I personally knew MIKE for 22 years in the House and it was an honor to call him "friend."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to pay tribute to our departed colleague and friend, MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio. When I arrived here as a freshman member of the House in 1962, MIKE had already been a Member of this body for 24 years. Even though I was not a member of his political party, he went out of his way to assist me in my early days in the House. This brought to mind statements which my father had made, praising MIKE KIRWAN for his vigorous defense of the interests of the working man, and his ability to work effectively with those of all persuasions.

In the years that I have served with MIKE, I have found in him those qualities which my father had mentioned. Though we did not always agree on matters, and though we were of opposing political parties, our relationship was nevertheless a most friendly one.

MIKE had announced his decision not to seek reelection to the House at the conclusion of this term. What a pity that he was not able to complete his 34th and last year in this body which he respected and loved.

All of us, but especially we of the Ohio delegation, will miss him, but we are proud of his service to the State and to his district for these many years.

To his wife Alice, and to his three children, I express my sincere condolences.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN was a great man and a personal friend.

His death was mourned by all Members of the House. I do not remember of anyone who was held in higher esteem by his colleagues and who earned such a place in the hearts of his countrymen. I am proud to have served with him on the Appropriations Committee and the Campaign Committee.

He promoted conservation and the development of our natural resources for many years and used his great power for that purpose. As chairman of committees dealing with such subject matters, he was not bashful in promoting these purposes long before America in general caught up with the need for such activities.

Back when some people were calling his bills "pork barrel," he proclaimed them as "all-American" bills. The Nation has finally recognized what he recognized many years ago.

He was a great man for America, a great loss to everyone, and his passing a sorrowful event for America. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a little over a week ago we lost a valued friend and colleague. MIKE KIRWAN'S loss to the Congress will be felt for many years, not only by the loss of his services and long experience to the House which he loved so well, but to those of us who served with him and knew him well.

He had a public reputation for being gruff. Yet those of us who worked with him in the House knew him as a decent, patient man with whom we could work. The art of politics lies in deliberations, negotiations, and where necessary, compromise. But even in compromise, MIKE recognized that he could continue the fight for what was necessary, for what was good for the Nation. He never gave up.

As chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, MIKE KIRWAN held a progressive view of the national public works program. the rest of us, the need for protection of our natural resources. What he for many years called conservation, was in fact what is now referred to as "ecology" and protection of the "total environment." His was the liberal view in the sense that he saw the need for conserving and protecting the great reservoirs of America's real wealth. Long before the rest of us, MIKE pleaded with us to protect our environment. He said:

> We had better wake up, and do what is necessary to preserve, protect, and develop America.

Largely because of MIKE KIRWAN, America has awakened to the crisis facing our resources. Largely because of

MIKE KIRWAN we will "do what is necessary to preserve, protect, and develop" this great Nation.

On behalf of Mrs. Daniels and myself, I extend our sincere sympathy to MIKE's wife Alice and his three children.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this body lost a truly outstanding and distinguished Member in MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. I know he will be greatly missed in this Chamber, and I know the people of Ohio's 19th District, whom he served with such distinction for so many years, feel the same way.

MIKE KIRWAN was born almost 84 years ago. He devoted the bulk of his life to public service—to the problems of his community and to the problems of our Nation.

During the great war—World War I—he served as an artillery sergeant in France. He subsequently served two terms as a member of the Youngstown City Council, representing the fourth ward in which he resided until his death.

Representative KIRWAN was in his 34th consecutive year in this body having first been elected to the 75th Congress in 1937. He spent 28 of these 34 years on the Committee on Appropriations. I have had the personal pleasure of working with him on this committee. In this capacity, I have witnessed first-hand his work as the distinguished Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee.

The Committee on Appropriations recently adopted a resolution on the late Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN that sets forth very well the distinguished record of our former colleague. It notes that Mr. KIRWAN "became America's legislative champion of conservation with an unexcelled dedication to the protection, preservation, and development of these resources."

It also notes, among other things, that Mr. KIRWAN "provided outstanding leadership in expanding the essential water resource development of the country, including flood control, pollution control, water supply, power generation, navigation, irrigation, and recreation."

MIKE's great service and contributions to the 19th District of Ohio, to this body, and to the Nation will long be remembered. That is as it should be.

I join with all my colleagues in the feeling of grief at the loss of this truly great American.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, he rose from the earth.

He lived with the love of God in his heart.

These words are from the scriptural text read at the memorial mass celebrated in St. Peter's Church on Capitol Hill in honor of our late beloved colleague, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio. They are fitting, indeed, to depict the guiding spirit of the great and good life led by MICHAEL KIRWAN. Truly he rose from the very depths of the earth to the highest place in the esteem of his fellow man.

All of us who were fortunate enough to hear Mr. KIRWAN tell of his boyhood days saw in his life the personification of the American dream. He was a "breaker boy" in the mines around Wilkes-Barre, Pa., long before the advent of child labor laws, compulsory schooling or safety regulations or minimum wage—or anything other than the exploitation of the working man. From miner to track walker, to railroadman to Youngstown and to the Congress of the United States, MICHAEL KIRWAN learned to love the law of God and nourished it in his heart during the harsh, hard days of the Molly Maguires. He roamed this country from end to end and determined that his life would have meaning for his country and his fellow man. We are so fortunate that he succeeded in his determination.

He loved his party—the Democratic Party—because he felt and believed deeply in the ideals of that party. With his great sense of politics and people he led in the building of our great country because he saw in that building the work of creation—again, with the love of God in his heart.

The monuments to MICHAEL KIRWAN truly are all over the United States of America—the great parks, the wilderness, the massive public works which give us water, power and recreation are all part of MICHAEL KIRWAN's construction of a great country.

MICHAEL KIRWAN'S life is not just a chronicle of a man. It is, in fact, an important part of the history of our country, and he truly was an historian. We must never forget the lessons of history he was so fond of reciting. His familiar expressions "ain't that what I am trying to tell you now" and "see the point I mean" interlaced personal accounts of witness that MICHAEL KIRWAN gave to the great events and the men who made them happen during his lifetime.

He gave life in graphic detail to the times of McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Hoover, and the depression, Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. It was through MICHAEL KIRWAN'S personal intercession that John F. Kennedy was enabled to gain the support of the mine workers in the tense and precarious days before he won the Presidency of the United States. It was with President Kennedy and President Johnson that MICHAEL KIRWAN towered to his greatest heights and helped those men build the country that would fulfill MICHAEL KIRWAN'S dreams as a breaker boy from Wilkes-Barre.

It would be remiss, indeed, if one were to mention that MICHAEL KIRWAN was a favorite of us all and that while he never played favorites there were some who were tied to him with bonds closer than brotherhood. One of these, our late colleague, John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, was Mr. KIRWAN'S constant companion and perhaps his dearest friend. He left us on January 10, 1967. He, too, lived with the love of God in his heart.

MICHAEL KIRWAN and John Fogarty never let us forget the heritage of Ireland which gave them their humor, courage, love of the earth and sensitivity to the needs of the poor, the ill, the homeless, and the handicapped. These, most of all, will miss the likes of MICHAEL KIRWAN.

In justice to his memory, we who knew him can best honor him by remembering what he tried to tell us and all strive to see the point he meant. We can do that by working together to help build this country the way MICHAEL KIRWAN tried to build it from the mines to the mountain tops—speaking plainly, working hard, and doing everything he could to help the least among us so that when he went to his reward we could stand together and truly say "he lived his life with the love of God in his heart."

To the Kirwan family, Mrs. Carey and I and our children extend our condolences at his passing and our sure conviction that he has won his place in Heaven.

To those who worked with Mr. KIRWAN, his district staff, and the staff of his committee and the Congressional Campaign Committee also our sincere sympathy extends and is tempered by the knowledge that his work so well begun will not be ended as long as we remember him as we shall.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, on July 27, Congress lost a distinguished colleague, and the Nation lost a fine public servant. I join in paying tribute to the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, whose legacy to the Congress began in 1936 when he was first elected to serve the people of Ohio's 19th District.

Since 1947, Congressman KIRWAN served as the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. While I was serving in the capacity of State chairman of the California Democratic Party in 1950, I became well acquainted with "MIKE" when he was helping several California Congressmen in their election campaigns. I consider myself fortunate to have known and admired Congressman KIRWAN over the years.

MIKE not only served the district he represented, but he served our entire Nation. First serving as a member of the Public Works Committee, in 1943, he was elected to the Committee on Appropriations. For 27 years, he was a member of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, 13 years as chairman. In addition, he was on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee for 15 years, and served as chairman during the last 6 years.

Long before Rachel Carson penned, "The Silent Spring," MIKE was a champion of conservation. Long before there was an Earth Day or a mass interest in the environment and ecology, Congressman KIRWAN was at the forefront in saving America's natural resources and our environment.

Congressman KIRWAN received numerous honorary degrees, many of which were in recognition of his active role in preserving and developing natural resources. For instance, Oklahoma City University in 1960, awarded him a doctor of humanities honorary degree, for his part in the completion of the greatest program of conservation and reclamation ever known to man. Other degrees and honors for his service for the betterment of mankind were awarded to him by the University of Arkansas, Youngstown University, the St. Lawrence Seaway Pioneers, National Fisheries Institute, Mahoning Valley Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Arkansas Basin Development Association, Inc., Ducks Unlimited Conservation Service Award, and the National Reclamation Association.

Congressman KIRWAN was a man of

foresight and dedication who served our Nation as a fine public servant for over three and a half decades. All of us can truly say that here was a man who made the United States a better place for all, both for the present and for future generations.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep sorrow and a sense of personal grief that I call to the attention of the House the passing of our good friend and colleague, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of the 19th District of Ohio.

MICHAEL KIRWAN was many things in his lifetime. At the age of 9, he earned 35 cents for a 10-hour day as a breaker-boy, picking slate out of newly-mined coal. At 12, he was getting a dollar a day driving a mule in the coal mines. Working his way around the country, he worked in steel mills, on railroads, in lumber camps, and in oil and harvest fields.

The wealth of experience he earned in his travels around our land left a lasting impression. He was once quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as saying that the State of Pennsylvania—where he was born, raised, and worked—had more to offer the American observer than all of Europe put together, including the scenery of Switzerland.

MICHAEL KIRWAN was a stanch advocate of American principles. He used his political abilities solely to further the American way of life and preserve democracy for all people. He commanded the admiration and respect of associates, colleagues and passing acquaintances alike. Congressman KIRWAN was a man of high attainments, extraordinary moral fibre, and the greatest practical abilities. He clearly stood out from the crowd.

I had the personal pleasure of working with Congressman KIRWAN in his capacity as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Raystown Dam project in my Pennsylvania district. MIKE KIRWAN was, above all else, always a gentleman.

Mrs. Whalley and I extend our deepest condolences to Mrs. Kirwan and their family. He will be sadly missed by all, but the spirit of his life and philosophy will remain with us forever.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, with a full heart I join my colleagues today in an expression of respect and honor for a friend who has left us and condolence to those he left behind. For those of us who knew MIKE KIRWAN, I think we all share the desire to say something special about this very special man. We will, in the end, be quite inadequate in what we say, for MIKE KIRWAN was one of those whose life can neither be added to nor subtracted from by words.

I first came to know MIKE KIRWAN soon after I came to the Congress and over the years that acquaintance grew into a warm friendship. The memory of that friendship will now be treasured by me for the rest of my life.

It was not just a personal relationship of which I speak. The legislative process put the two of us in a particularly close working relationship. As chairman of an authorizing committee, my counterpart on the great House Appropriations Committee was the man I seek to honor at this time. On the many, many occasions when I appeared before the subcommittee that was chaired by this man, I did so with complete confidence that MIKE KIRWAN, with his thorough understanding of the legislative process, would consider whatever funding requests were placed before him with understanding and honesty. MIKE KIRWAN was from Ohio, but I think I can say that the States of the reclamation West had few friends who were as sympathetic to their needs. MIKE was a man of wisdom and kindness who dedicated his life to public service and that service will be his monument. Perhaps his biography in the Congressional Directory, now famous for its brevity, says it all:

> Michael Joseph Kirwan, Democrat of Youngstown, Ohio; elected to the 75th and each succeeding Congress.

I join with my colleagues and the innumerable friends of MICHAEL KIRWAN in sending to his charming widow and their two sons and their families, my heartfelt sympathy over their loss; my prayers that they may be comforted and sustained by Almighty God; and, my gratitude that I was personally honored to be able to walk and work with MIKE KIRWAN as he worked among us as the giant he was among his fellowmen.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it was with a profound feeling of great personal sadness that I learned of the death of my good and longtime friend from Ohio, the most Honorable MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN. It was my great privilege to serve with MIKE KIRWAN in this House for almost 34 years, and I confess to a feeling of inadequacy in attempting to express my sense of loss with the death of this devoted and able public servant, great Democrat, and true friend.

As second ranking majority member of the vital Appropriations Committee, MIKE had a miraculously comprehensive and detailed knowledge of every part of our Federal Government. He was always a source of wise and expert counsel for all his colleagues. Through his extremely meaningful service as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Public Works, MIKE was directly responsible for the proper and orderly growth and development of every section of our Nation. Improvements throughout the Nation during his service stand as a tribute to his effectiveness as a leader and a concerned American.

As chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee, MIKE served his party with true dedication and honor. In his passing, the Nation has lost a great public official, the Congress has lost one of its best loved, admired, and distinguished Members, and the Democratic Party has lost a tireless worker. His finest tribute probably came from the citizens who knew him best, those friends in the 19th District of Ohio who so honored him by selecting him to represent them in Washington 17 consecutive times.

MIKE KIRWAN had a meaningful and productive life, and I know that a benevolent God has reserved a special place with Him in the hereafter for his good and faithful servant. My thoughts and prayers are with MIKE'S family. I share in their bereavement.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, it was with a profound sense of sorrow that I learned of the death of our beloved colleague, MIKE KIRWAN. With his passing, some of the greatness of America died.

His life reflected the great opportunities this Nation has always offered its stouthearted citizens, who are able and willing to work to achieve noble goals.

He was a coal miner's son, and dropped out of school after the third grade to help support the family. He worked in the coal mines, on the railroads, in lumber camps, and in oil fields. During World War I, MIKE served as a sergeant in a machinegun company overseas. Following the war, he was engaged in the mercantile business in Youngstown, Ohio, and was a member of its city council for 4 years immediately prior to his election to the 75th Congress in 1936.

During his 33 years of congressional service, he devoted his great abilities to the betterment of his constituency, his State, and his Nation. He rose to be the able chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Here he dedicated his life to improving the environment and conserving the Nation's resources. In this, he was many, many years ahead of his time.

Through his committee work, and by vigorous and farsighted leadership, MIKE KIRWAN became a major force in controlling America's rampaging waters. Because of him, these awesome natural resources were controlled and channeled so that they better served the farmer, the sportsman, and the citizen seeking recreation by a gently flowing stream. The dams, reservoirs, and many national park projects throughout the country will serve as an enduring tribute to his memory.

Having come up the hard way himself, MIKE was always interested in helping the less fortunate. He was particularly concerned about the plight of the American Indians, and applied himself with great diligence to improving their condition.

As chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Campaign Committee, he worked hard for the election and reelection of fellow Democrats. The fact that we are the majority party in this body today is to a great extent due to the dedicated efforts of MIKE KIRWAN.

Many of us of Irish ancestry, as well as a great number of others with a different heritage, fondly and vividly recall the traditional St. Patrick's Day celebrations which were hosted for so long by our dear and congenial friend. He was a man of charm, wit, and wisdom. MIKE had a natural ability for holding an audience, and could tell interesting and amusing stories one after the other, almost without end.

MIKE and I lived for a number of years at the University Club where I was privileged to enjoy his company almost daily. He was a warm and gentle man, and a thoroughly delightful companion. His passing is a great personal loss not only to me, but to his many friends at the club.

Mrs. Delaney joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife, Alice,

and to his children, and the other members of his family.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of a skillful and effective legislator and loyal friend, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Representative of the 19th District of Ohio.

MIKE KIRWAN'S death is a double tragedy. It is first of all a great loss to his wife, his three children, and 21 grandchildren, and I offer my deepest sympathy to them in their sorrow.

His death is also a loss to our country. The Congress will sorely miss the services of a man who since 1937 has been one of its ablest and most dependable Members.

MIKE KIRWAN, who became "Mr. Public Works" to the House, fought for conservation projects long before conservation and pollution reached the present degree of public acceptance. He became an early champion of water resource development. As Democratic National Chairman, Lawrence F. O'Brien expressed it, Congressman KIRWAN'S environmental accomplishments will be his monument. Numerous national parks, reservoirs, and conservation projects exist today because of his consistent work in this essential field. Among his many accomplishments, perhaps MIKE KIRWAN should and will be remembered for his environmental efforts more than for anything else.

As second-ranking Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee and chairman of its Public Works Subcommittee, MIKE held more power than most men in the House. He used this power most effectively. His leadership and commitment for progress through internal improvements has helped all areas of the country. Among other problems the plight of the American Indian received his special attention as he worked for improved educational facilities on reservations.

As a Democrat, I have come to respect MIKE KIRWAN in yet another way. For 23 years he successfully headed the House Democratic Campaign Committee. During that period Democrats lost majority control of the House only once. I am personally appreciative of the help which the Campaign Committee gave to me in my campaigns over the years. A loyal party member, MIKE served his party and his country with enthusiasm and skill.

I have another very personal reason for feeling MIKE'S loss more deeply than most. For 6 years I lived in the University Club where MIKE resided and I had frequent occasion there to meet him to talk with him and to share his great fund of humor and experience. As a result I felt a particular closeness to him.

Mr. Chairman, I think everyone will agree, Republican and Democrat alike, that the Congress has suffered a severe loss in the death of MIKE KIRWAN. We all mourn the death of this able legislator and citizen.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is with great sadness that I rise to pay final respects to a great legislator, a great American, and a great friend, MIKE KIRWAN.

We in California loved and admired MIKE KIRWAN for what he was. He was many things—a far-sighted conservationist who was concerned about the conservation and wise utilization of our God-given natural resources long before it was a popular subject. A humanist with deep concern for the less fortunate among us, including the American Indians. A dedicated fighter for the rights of the working man from whose ranks he came.

MIKE KIRWAN was a self-educated man. Forced to leave school after the third grade, he went as a small boy to work in the coal mines of Pennsylvania.

Later, MIKE traveled the Nation working in many jobs, in the lumber camps, on the farms and ranches, and on the railroad. For nearly 30 years I, too, worked for the railroad, and some of my favorite moments since coming to Washington nearly 12 years ago were those spent swapping railroad tales with MIKE. As any good Irishman, he was a wonderful spinner of yarns.

But MIKE was more than that. He was truly a great legislator.

First elected to Congress in 1936, he came back each new term with ever-increasing majorities as the people of the Youngstown area of Ohio realized what a jewel they had in their Representative in Congress.

The people of the 19th Congressional District of Ohio admired his sincerity, his honesty, his industry, and his dedicated devotion to the task of representing them in the Halls of Congress. He may have been blunt and forthright, but was never one to dodge an issue regardless of its popularity or lack of it.

That is a kind of man this Nation needs for its outstanding legislators, and the people of Ohio knew it. His service to the Nation soon was realized to the four corners of the United States, and especially the West, as his work on the old Rivers and Harbors Committee first became appreciated. Later he served on the Appropriations Committee, where he was a fighter for adequate development of our parks and other recreation resources, for a better break for the American Indian, for timely development of our water resources, putting to beneficial use the water which once wasted into the oceans.

California today is a better place to live—has a more adequate supply of water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural uses, has a more stable supply of electrical energy, has more recreation areas, and has fewer devastating floods because MIKE KIRWAN served in Congress.

We in California appreciate this and always considered him a great friend. We in California are going to miss him deeply, but the projects which he supported will stand for generations to come as working monuments of his leadership, his dedication to the cause of conservation of our natural resources.

My family and his many California friends join me in expressing our deepest sympathies to the family of this warm, human friend, this outstanding American.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, my heart was filled with sadness over the passing of that great American, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. We, in Ohio, are very proud of the wonderful record of legislative achievements of our senior Member. These achievements will live on as a perpetual memorial.

No man has displayed a greater love for his Nation and his fellow man. He displayed that love in service to all men regardless of their color, creed or station of life.

Early in his life, he served in France as an artillery sergeant in World War I. He devoted many of his energies to aiding his fellow veterans.

It was my privilege to know MIKE KIRWAN before my entry into the House of Representatives so that when I was elected to that body almost 20 years ago, I turned to him for advice and despite the fact that I was of the opposite political faith, he graciously gave me the benefit of his already long service.

I cherished his friendship throughout these 20 years and shall long mourn his passing.

Mrs. Ayres and I express our sympathy not only to his wonderful family but also to his constituency and his loyal secretary of 34 years, Mrs. Roberta Messerly.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I was deeply saddened when I heard of the passing of our distinguished and beloved colleague from Ohio, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN.

This year was to have been his last in this great body, where he had served with credit for slightly more than a third of a century. Only six of the present Members have been here longer than that.

Much has happened in our Nation since MIKE KIRWAN and a large number of other freshmen took the oath of office on January 3, 1937. The years since then have been exciting ones, as the great depression slowly ended, to be followed by turbulent years of war, uneasy peace, and domestic upheaval.

Through them all, our now departed friend served his district, his State, and his country with distinction. He tried, to the best of his ability, to find workable answers to the many challenging problems that came to this Chamber for solution. A man to whom America had given much, he was determined to repay the debt in full measure.

While MIKE KIRWAN was a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat and as such was devoted to his party and its success, he always put the Nation first. He backed the President wholeheartedly during all periods of crisis, regardless of whether the Chief Executive was a Republican or a Democrat.

In these troubled days, when so many want to forsake the strenuous life in exchange for one of effortless security, a man who came up the hard way and graduated from the school of hard knocks somehow seems anachronistic. Be that as it may, I salute the memory of our absent colleague. That he may rest in peace is my fervent prayer.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the truest test of a great man is simplicity, or humility. MIKE KIRWAN had them both, despite a monumental list of achievements that would inspire

even the most indifferent observer. Like many other Congressmen, my debt of gratitude to him is greater than I can express; but I tried to do so during his life, even as I visited him in the hospital and through the years before. This House has lost one of its alltime giants, and one of the most beloved Members in history. We all wish for his bereaved family every sympathy and extend to them, too, our heartfelt gratitude for all he did for his country.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise with sorrow to pay my respects to a beloved friend and esteemed colleague. MIKE KIRWAN, a member of this House for over 30 years, will no longer be with us, but his memory will surely continue to inspire all who were honored by his friendship. We will always cherish the great heritage he leaves—loyalty, integrity, and honesty.

MIKE represented the American dream. From a youth spent traveling around the country working in wheat fields and oil fields, on ranches and in lumber camps, he rose to become one of the most respected Members of this Chamber. He served the Nation in the crucial position of second ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. His leadership and legislative skill insured that the taxpayer received value for his dollar. His chairmanship of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission served as an example for all committee chairmen.

My sympathies go to MIKE'S wife, Alice, to his sons, daughter, and grandchildren who have lost a devoted family man. But even more than with the bereaved family my sympathies are with the people of MIKE'S 19th District of Ohio who have suffered an irreplaceable loss. They have not only lost a wonderful and devoted friend but a truly outstanding representative, and it will be near impossible for them to find another to match MIKE KIRWAN.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, anyone can take a copy of the Congressional Directory and look up the 19th District for Ohio. In it, he will find the following:

Michael Joseph Kirwan, Democrat, of Youngstown, Ohio; elected to the 75th and each succeeding Congress.

And that is all. To an outsider, this scant commentary would appear puzzling; but to those who knew MIKE KIRWAN, it is testimony, in itself, to the fact that MIKE was as humble as a saint. Indeed, he probably is talking to St. Patrick right now.

One indication of his humility is that he never forgot his beginnings. It would not be hard to believe that Horatio Alger modeled his story, "Only An Irish Boy," after MIKE KIRWAN. He had to quit school while still a child and as far as I know, he never received an academic degree, which he didn't need anyway. Anybody can obtain an academic degree, which requires normal intelligence and effort. But MIKE went far beyond that in his dedicated service to the Nation. And this is amply expressed by the number of honorary degrees conferred upon him. There are enough there to make any professor blush with envy.

MIKE was always cheerful, pleasant, friendly and kind to everyone. He could be found working both early and late, but always working. He served the America he loved, as a true leader would. He had the unique gift of personality to be elected and reelected to Congress so many times.

He was a religious man with a profound awareness of his duties to both men and God. MIKE would not bow before the poll takers to find out what to do; instead, he would look at the needs of the people and pray to his God for guidance. He was rigorous in his attendance at church and one time when sheer physical distance was too great, he called upon one of the newest of inventions, a helicopter, to take him from the midst of a forest to one of the oldest of services, the Mass. May God give us more public servants like this.

I considered it one of the continuing highlights of my career that I was able to work with MIKE KIRWAN as a fellow subcommittee chairman on the public works program. Many Americans in future generations will not know whom to thank for the benefits they will receive from reclamation, flood control, waterways, and harbor improvement. I am here to tell you that MIKE KIRWAN worked long and hard to insure that we would bequeath to future generations a conserved America and not a squandered one. When MIKE submitted a bill, you could be sure that it was well thought out.

I recall it was 2 years ago when Congress paid a warm and spontaneous tribute to MIKE KIRWAN on his then approaching 81st birthday. We heard frank and sincere tributes paid to this humble man that filled up over 30 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You could page through the RECORD for a good 50 years before you could even begin to find the likes of it. And you would have to go a good ways back before you could find another man like MIKE KIRWAN.

Among the many photos that MIKE used to have in his office, there were two that seemed to typify his life and life's work—one was a picture taken in 1900 of some young children looking ragged as they carried their lunch pails on the way to the mine in the days before the child labor laws. There was another picture taken in 1950 and this time, the young children had bright faces, were wearing decent clothes and were on their way to school.

MIKE KIRWAN was, in large part, responsible for that transition. It was through his untiring efforts and fair play that the doors of opportunity were opened wider to greater numbers of Americans, both poor and affluent, that greater numbers of people were allowed to share in the good things of this life—education, material progress, and general well-being. MIKE KIRWAN sowed that others might reap.

Let us all take special note that MIKE KIRWAN grew wise with age, but did not grow old. Hopefully, this is an example that all of us will follow.

We, in Congress, shall miss him and the country shall feel his loss. Our prayers and sympathy go to his family.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, although Members of the House were well aware of the prolonged illness of our friend, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, none were quite prepared for his death. I had raised hope upon hope, and I am sure others had done likewise, that somehow or other he would recover and return to be among us.

MIKE KIRWAN was truly a self-made man. Without a formal education, he literally lifted himself by his own bootstraps to become one of the real stalwarts of the U.S. Congress.

MIKE was a tough fighter but a fair one. I know because I opposed him on occasion through the years. Never will I forget our fight in the House over a project which he personally sponsored—a national aquarium to be erected on the Potomac River in Washington, D.C. Needless to say MIKE won, and, although it was a lively encounter on the House floor, we emerged warmer friends than ever.

MIKE KIRWAN was a great American and his contributions to this Nation will ever be remembered. I am glad to have had the opportunity to know this good man, and to the members of his family I extend heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, just 1 week ago my very dear friend and colleague, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, passed away. Our Nation and this House lost a great and capable legislator.

To his lovely wife, Alice, and his children and their families, I extend my heartfelt sympathies and humbly pray the Lord gives them the strength to understand His ways.

Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN was more than just a colleague of mine. He was a loyal and devoted friend, not only to me but to many Members of the House. He served in this House for a third of a century, and those who knew him loved him. He was unfaltering in his loyalty to what he thought was right and unswerving in his resistance to what he considered wrong. He was a tower of strength to a good cause and a bulwark of opposition to a bad one. His service has added to the luster of this House. I join my colleagues in heartfelt tribute to MIKE KIRWAN and will ever cherish his memory and his friendship.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I join with many others of this body in expressing a real sense of personal loss in the passing of our long-time friend and colleague, MIKE KIRWAN.

That sense of loss is the keener by virtue of my service, these past 6 years, on the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which was chaired, as we all know, by Mr. KIRWAN. Throughout those years, our friendship—and our regard for one another—deepened. "Gruff," and "shrewd," and "practical politician," Mr. KIRWAN may have been—and he has been called all such things and many more besides, some of which were not always complimentary. But a gentleman, he was—a man of his word, at all times—and certainly a builder, in the most constructive sense of that word, who saw himself as a force for progress in America, and who was determined to do whatever was necessary to, in his own words, "preserve, protect and develop America."

One could sometimes disagree with "MIKE'S" priorities—as occasionally I did, one notable example being with respect to what became known as "MIKE'S big ditch"—but, in doing so, one could never fail to be impressed with the driving energy in the man, and his sense of dedication to a bigger and better America, toward his dream of which he first began building with his hands and, then eventually, with his canny mind, but always with his heart. And that heart of his was as big as "all outdoors."

By virtue of his early years, spent in the Susquehanna River Valley in Pennsylvania and, then the jobs he held that took him up along the Susquehanna into New York, he shared my own enthusiasm—and dream—for the proper development of the Susquehanna River Basin area, and has been of steady help to me in that regard. Such an interest on his part was not unique, for his later travels had made him familiar with nearly every portion of our land, and desirous of helping others similarly with their local water and land-resource problems in a manner that should not be degraded by references, now, to "pork-barrel politics." Instead, "MIKE" KIRWAN had a vision of the kind of land these United States could—and should—be; and he worked endlessly and selflessly in stubborn pursuit of that vision, enobling himself in the process far beyond the bounds one might have expected would have hobbled a man coming from his humble beginnings and with his lack of a formal education.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, "MIKE" was a man—a big man; feared, perhaps, by a few—respected by all who knew him well enough to see beyond his public image—but, most of all, loved by those to whom he gave of his friendship. And while those, his friends, have lost much, I think it needs be said that his beloved America has suffered a grievous loss, too.

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Robison joins me in expressing our sincere regrets to Mrs. Kirwan, and to her daughter, Mary Alice, and two sons, John and Michael.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, The Lord in his wisdom, has called one of our most distinguished colleagues, Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio, to his eternal rest.

Like Horatio Alger's hero in "Only an Irish Boy," MIKE KIRWAN started at the most humble level and worked and fought his way through the ranks until he reached one of the highest stations in national political life and one of the loftiest pinnacles in the respect, esteem, and affection of his colleagues in the Congress and of the people of the district he served so well.

It was on December 2, 1886, that this great man whom we eulogize today was born in Plains of the Keystone State of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As a young boy he worked in the coal mines and later as a youth he worked for a number of different railroads. He truly earned his bread by hard labor and the sweat of his brow.

Here, in MIKE KIRWAN'S life story we see the story of America itself and the American dream come true. He was an inspiration to all who knew him. As a young man, he traveled extensively, particularly throughout the Western States, working in the wheat and oil fields, on cattle ranches and in lumber camps. Thus, he saw, observed, learned, and stored in his keen mind valuable ideas which he later used on behalf of our great country, particularly here in the Congress of the United States. His first legislative experience was obtained as a member of the Youngstown City Council when he served for two terms.

The 19th District of Ohio, which includes the city of Youngstown—the citadel of the Mahoning Valley Steel District—elected MIKE KIRWAN to Congress in 1937. For 17 consecutive terms, the Nation had the benefit of his dedicated Godgiven talents. He served as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and in 1943 he was appointed as a member of the powerful Committee on Appropriations. For many years he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and later became chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations.

He was a courageous and outspoken advocate of some of the most important programs enacted by the Congress, such as development of our resources, conservation, improvement of our rivers and our harbors for navigation, irrigation, and reclamation, and many other vital programs.

The late "MIKE" as he was affectionately known by us, served his State, his Nation, and the people well. His race is run, his course is finished, but his work goes on. We all miss him and will ever cherish his memory for the record he made, and his achievements speak far more eloquently than anything we can say here. Our country has lost a great Statesman and I have lost a devoted friend.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family at this sad time.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, it was indeed a shock to me to hear of the death of our beloved colleague, effective legislator, and loyal friend MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Representative of the 19th District of Ohio.

The story of MICHAEL KIRWAN is one which reflects the opportunities of this Nation, to those who are willing and able to work to achieve noble goals.

MIKE as he was affectionately known to us, was born on December 2, 1886. He was a coal miner's son and dropped out of school after the third grade to help support the family. He worked in the coal mines, a trainman on the railroads, in lumber camps, and in oilfields.

MIKE had the fortitude and perseverance to carve out an extremely successful career in the service of his fellow man, first as a member of the Youngstown City Council in which he served two terms, then as a Member of Congress to which he was elected for 17 consecutive terms.

My first contact with MIKE KIRWAN came soon after I came to Congress and I have found him to be a warm friend whose friendship I valued very highly. I also value his sage advice and the solicitude he had for the younger Members of this honorable body. This will always stay with me.

Several months ago MIKE announced his decision not to seek reelection to the House at the conclusion of his present term. It is a great pity that he was not able to complete his 34th year as a Member of Congress. MIKE has answered his last "rollcall" when, on July 27, 1970, the Almighty chose to take him from this earth of trouble and turmoil to his heavenly reward.

The two lines in the Congressional Directory are known for their brevity, but saying it with:

Michael Joseph Kirwan, Democrat, of Youngstown, Ohio; elected to the 75th and each succeeding Congress.

does not express the achievements of a courageous and outspoken advocate of some of the most important programs enacted by Congress.

He espoused the development of our resources, improvement of our rivers and harbors for navigation, our conservation programs, irrigation and reclamation, and many other vital programs.

MIKE KIRWAN is not with us any more, but his spirit will surely continue to inspire all who were honored by his friendship. We will always cherish the heritage he leaves—loyalty, integrity, and honesty.

I wish to extend my sincere condolences to Mrs. Kirwan, his three children, and the members of his family in the great loss that they sustained in his passing to the great beyond.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, by any standard, my friend and colleague MIKE KIRWAN was a great man, a most unusual man. His life was one of dedication to his God, his country, and his family. In a sense, we are all lesser men because MIKE has left us, yet his mark is left on all of us who were lucky enough to know him. Last week, I and many of my colleagues attended the funeral rites for MIKE KIRWAN—the one-time coal mine breaker boy who rose to true greatness as a distinguished and respected Member of the House of Representatives for nearly 34 years. I will miss him, we all will miss him. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story from Roll Call on the death of my dear friend, MIKE KIRWAN:

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE KIRWAN—WAS A HOUSE POWER

Rep. Mike Kirwan, one of the last of the colorful longtime powers in the House, died Monday at Bethesda Naval Hospital. Brusque, sentimental, possessed of a natural political instinct and an expert in the use of power, Kirwan was loved and respected by his colleagues and the myriad persons he dealt with as Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of House Appropriations and as Chairman of the Democratic Congressional Committee.

Rep. Kirwan, 83, had been hospitalized since June 1969, when he fell in his University Club apartment and broke a vertebra in his back. He suffered from diabetes and, unaccustomed to taking orders from anyone, disregarded doctors who advised against drinking ("They gave me six months, years ago, I outlived them all").

One of the most personally potent members of the House, Rep. Kirwan never, in his third of a century of service, became Chair-

man of a full committee. Rep. George Mahon (D-Texas) came to Congress two years prior to his arrival, and succeeded to the chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee in 1964 upon the death of Chairman Clarence Cannon.

The Ohio Democrat served as Chairman of the House Democratic Congressional Committee for 23 years. Republicans gained control of the House only once during that time, even though Kirwan's committee staff rarely numbered more than five.

Rep. Kirwan's biggest day each year was St. Patrick's Day. On March 17 he threw the biggest St. Patrick's Day party in town, a favorate of such Irishmen as the late John Kennedy and the late Speaker Rayburn. Whiskey flowed freely, green hats and badges were distributed to all, and above all, there was singing. Congressmen join with staffers, agency bigwigs and professionals like Phil Reagan and Carmel Quinn in harmonizing the Irish repertoire. Rep. Kirwan rarely joined in the vocalizing, but derived patent enjoyment from the musical cameraderie.

Rep. Kirwan was first elected to the 75th Congress in 1937. In this decade he announced several times at victory celebrations "this will be my last term." He made the same announcement in 1968, and this time he meant it.

Rep. Joe Evins (D-Tenn.) is next in line for the chairmanship of the Public Works Subcommittee. Since Rep. Kirwan's hospitalization, Reps. Thomas "Tip" O'Neill (D-Mass.) and Ed Edmondson (D-Okla.) have been acting co-chairmen of the Democratic Congressional Committee.

Rep. Kirwan was the second-oldest member of the House, and ranked seventh in seniority. When the oldest member, Rep. William Dawson (D-Ill.), retires this session, Rep. Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.), 82, will be the oldest member as well as the member with the most seniority.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I join with my other colleagues here today to pay tribute to a man who although never in the public limelight, was nevertheless a beacon in many ways to the Members of this body.

Elected in the midst of this country's most difficult period, the depression, his courage and spirit of resolve were solidly formed in those early years. As the war passed and this Nation grew in power and strength, so too did the venerable MIKE KIRWAN. Under his tutelage and ever watchful eye the Democratic congressional committee which he headed was instrumental in maintaining the leadership of this body for all but one Congress during the last 23 years.

His physical stamina, his political acumen, his understanding spirit must have been forged and honed at the steel mills that abound in his eastern Ohio district.

I am certain that his passing will represent an irreplaceable loss to his loyal constituency in Ohio and his country. I, too, feel a personal loss. As a freshman in this body it was comforting to know a man like MIKE KIRWAN was around to guide you. My most heartfelt sympathies are extended to his family and friends whose sorrow at this time is shared by so many of their fellow Americans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN was the epitomization of the American story that a man can go as far in this country as he has the courage and determination to go.

His life story well could have been the plot for an Horatio Alger novel. Born to poverty, he was truly a self-made man. What he lacked in formal education he made up in commonsense. Hard work and determination were the tools of his success. He did not wait for opportunity to be brought to him on a silver tray. He went out and worked for his goals.

MIKE KIRWAN was a dedicated public servant who regarded public office as a public trust. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word. He was a devoted husband and father. He was a true friend.

MIKE was, in every way, a truly remarkable person. He was a delightful and colorful colleague, and a real giant in the political arena.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I join with all my colleagues who have spoken in tribute to the late MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio. It was my pleasure to serve with this unusual and remarkable man for more than 9 years. Of him it can truly be said that America is a different and far better place, because of his vision and his congressional service. He saw clearly the need to build our country and to invest in the development of its resources.

MIKE was a refreshingly candid—and even blunt—public servant. He never left any doubt of his position on any issue. Ohio and America were well served by this good man. We will miss him.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I was deeply saddened by the passing of Congressman KIRWAN. MIKE was a man whose ideals provided me with a great source of inspiration over the years and I shall always remember his counsel and advice. He will certainly live on in the hearts of many.

He was a true friend not only of his colleagues, but of all the people of Ohio; for he was a great servant of the people with sensitivity and deep compassion for their problems. I join with my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to MIKE's family.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, when I came to the House of Representatives for the first time in 1963, MICHAEL KIRWAN was beginning his 14th term in Congress. Seldom has any legislative body had such long and distinguished service from a Member.

MIKE KIRWAN was a good man, a thoughtful man, an extraordinarily kind man, rich in years and in accomplishments. He had an amazing memory of details of past happenings and it was a delight to listen to him. I had the good fortune on many occasions just to sit with him in the rear seats of the House and to strike up a conversation with him. I profited as a student.

Long before it became fashionable, MIKE KIRWAN expressed his concern for protecting the natural beauty of our land and water. Long before it became the thing to do, MIKE KIRWAN fought for the betterment of the American Indian.

His basic philosophy, at least from the viewpoint of those, like me, who knew him, was one that has withstood centuries of assault—he treated others as he wished others to treat him. Busy as he was, as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee, he was always generous with his time and never refused to meet with constituents of mine who sought through me to discuss with him problems with which they were deeply concerned. For this I shall remain forever grateful to his memory.

Ohio's 19th District has lost an outstanding representative. The Congress has lost a skilled and dedicated legislator. The country has lost a patriotic, caring American. And we who knew MIKE KIRWAN have lost a true friend indeed.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, last week our Nation lost a man of courage and vision, a man who rose from the humblest of origins to a position of great responsibility in this body, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, Congressman KIRWAN was a vital force behind Federal efforts to improve our environment long before such a stance was in fashion. His great legacy includes the numerous national parks, dams, and water conservation projects which resulted from his tireless efforts.

MIKE KIRWAN was deeply admired and respected by both his colleagues and his constituents, who returned him to office 17 times. To be sure, MIKE could be tough, as anyone who clashed with him on an issue can attest. But within this confident exterior of a man risen from the mines, oil fields, forests, and farms, was a sentimental and compassionate heart of an Irishman.

MIKE KIRWAN truly embodied Emerson's belief that:

America is but another name for opportunity.

Always aware of opportunities that he had been given, MIKE KIRWAN eagerly promoted the cause of the common man.

Mr. Chairman, in life MIKE KIRWAN provided outstanding leadership in Government, and he leaves behind a record of public service from which a grateful country will benefit for years to come.

My wife and I convey our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Kirwan and the entire Kirwan family.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply saddened by the passing of my good friend, Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. Not only was MIKE KIRWAN a good friend, but on the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, under his chairmanship I knew him to be a very wise man who had a very interesting but most effective way of stating problems and coming to answers. He will be greatly missed in the work of our subcommittee, as well as by the House as a whole.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in deep sympathy for the members of his family in their loss of this truly great gentleman, and for his constituents of the 19th District of Ohio whom MICHAEL J. KIRWAN served so long and so well.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, "California has lost a good friend in the death of Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio."

In these few words, the editor of the Sacramento Bee summed up the feelings of my home State concerning the death of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN of Ohio.

As I tried to indicate in my remarks of yesterday, we of the Golden State long

will be indebted to MIKE KIRWAN for his wisdom, leadership, progressiveness, and aggressiveness, in the field of conservation of natural resources.

These comments were echoed in an editorial published in the three papers of the McClatchy system, the Sacramento, Modesto and Fresno Bee newspapers on Thursday, July 30, 1970, and I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that editorial:

KIRWAN: A GOOD FRIEND

California has lost a good friend in the death of Rep. Michael J. Kirwan of Ohio.

Kirwan served for many years as chairman of the public works subcommittee. It is this group which initiated the funding of the Central Valleys Projects constructed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and flood control works built by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Kirwan always was sympathetic and helpful and he had no political ax to grind because his own district had no projects.

He knew California and its needs and learned of them early in life when he was an oil worker in Kern County.

His successor has big shoes to fill.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I join with others today in expressing my deep sense of loss over the death of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. I had served with MIKE on the Appropriations Committee and had come to look upon him as an adviser and mentor. He was both forceful in action and wise in counsel. He was a man of energy and industry who, as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, was dedicated to the progress of America as well as to the protection of her environment. He ably represented the people of Ohio's 19th District and served the Nation with distinction since his election to the 75th Congress.

His commitment to the public interest, his understanding of the needs and aspirations of the average man, his very real personal humility and his dedication to this House and all it stands for, all served as an inspiration and encouragement to those of us who served with him. Again, his personality was such a warm one—quick to smile, ever ready with a cheerful word, and always eager to extend a helping hand. His counsel and his judgment will be sorely missed. To his family, I can only say what they already know—that he was a sincere and dedicated American, an outstanding Congressman, and a fine gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I was deeply saddened by the death of one of the most able and conscientious Members of the House, MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN of Ohio.

MIKE KIRWAN served the people of the 19th District in Ohio with great distinction for nearly a third of a century. Since 1937 when he was first elected, MIKE KIRWAN has made outstanding contributions to his State and the Nation in countless areas. However, he is probably best known as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

As a result of his years of experience on the Appropriations Committee, MIKE KIRWAN possessed an expertise in his field that was unexcelled. His many years of service and his natural political instinct left him respected and honored by friend and foe alike.

His thorough knowledge of all aspects of the vastly complicated subject of public works appropriations and his unstinting efforts to make our public projects system second to none won him the respect and admiration of all.

MIKE KIRWAN was a champion of the development of our resources, improvement of our rivers and harbors for navigation, development of our conservation programs, planning for irrigation and reclamation, and many other vital programs.

Despite his demonstrated ability as a legislator and representative of the citizens of his district, MIKE KIRWAN may be remembered best as a man of integrity, compassion, and loyalty. He could be warm and gentle, qualities which enabled him to often find time to help his fellow man and to be wholeheartedly responsive to the needs of the people he served. He was often straightforwardly candid, even blunt, but in a manner that left little doubt of his position on a particular issue, and at the same time, asserted his confidence and trust. These qualities made him one of the most popular and genial Members of the House.

Although MIKE had already announced his intention not to seek reelection, it is regrettable that he was unable to fulfill his 34th year in Congress. Throughout the years he did serve, he carved out an enviable career.

With the passing of MIKE KIRWAN, I have lost a very dear friend and colleague. We shall all miss his judgment and counsel. I offer my most heartfelt condolences to his wife and family. MIKE KIRWAN was a dedicated and trusted American, an outstanding Congressman, and a fine gentleman.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, on July 27, the citizens of the 19th District of Ohio, and the Congress of the United States lost an experienced and effective legislator.

Due to the period of his illness and the relatively brief time that I have been a Member of Congress, I unfortunately did not have the pleasure of becoming a close friend of Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. Nevertheless, I share the respect and high regard which all of those who met MIKE KIRWAN had for him. He was an especially beloved individual, both because of his accomplishments and his gregarious personality.

To his friends and colleagues, MICHAEL KIRWAN personified those qualities of the American character which we all admire. He was a member of that hardy and unusual breed of self-made men who built on this land the great country we have today. MIKE was a resourceful and determined man who developed his talents on his own initiative and took full advantage of the opportunities which this Nation provided him for self-improvement and personal development.

Rising from his early years as a coal miner in Pennsylvania eventually to take a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, MIKE KIRWAN always maintained a strong attachment to the land and the people he represented. As a concerned man of great character and integrity, never did he lose sight of his purpose of service to his constituents.

During the course of my duties when I was a State legislator in Ohio, I had the occasion to make several visits to MIKE KIRWAN'S district. I was always impressed by the devotion with which MIKE was held by his constituents—both Democrats and Republicans—with whom I dealt.

Throughout his colorful career, MICHAEL KIRWAN always kept close to his heart the great love of the land which was engrained in him during his rugged early years as a coal miner and laborer. These early experiences forged in him a genuine concern for the preservation of our natural resources—a concern which he never abandoned. He became a persistent fighter for conservation and environmental quality, long before these issues carried much political weight.

The Congress and the Nation should be grateful that a man of his character and dedication had the opportunity to serve as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee. He does not need an elaborate monument to be erected to his memory, for his works as chairman of this subcommittee will always stand as a tribute to this outstanding legislator.

While we have lost an accomplished legislator and a great public servant, we also have lost a man who was a warm and a compassionate human being. The fire and spirit which MICHAEL KIRWAN brought to his public career sprang from his empathy with the concerns and problems of others and his commitment to help those who were willing to help themselves.

In addition to concerning himself with the problems of this life, MICHAEL KIRWAN had a very sensitive appreciation of the joy of living. He was an exemplary Irishman who was blessed with what we fellow Irishmen consider to be the special wit, charm, and love of life of the Irish spirit. He was truly a "Son of St. Patrick."

It is almost trite to say that he certainly will be missed, but in truth this sentiment is shared by all of MIKE'S colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is an emptiness in Congress today as we of the House of Representatives feel the great loss of MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. To those of us in the Ohio delegation, the loss is especially keen for we knew MIKE KIRWAN as a personal friend as well as a colleague in Congress. MIKE KIRWAN'S story personifies the opportunity for success in America. Born in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., 83 years ago, the son of an immigrant coal miner, MIKE KIRWAN worked in the mines as a child and later as a brakeman and oil field hand. He knew extreme poverty and the impact of the depression years, but with his initiative and fighting spirit, he literally scoffed at the hard times and, instead, took advantage of the opportunity to represent others who had been subjected to the same hardships. MIKE KIRWAN came to Congress in 1937 and for 17 consecutive terms thereafter, he made the concerns of Ohio's 19th District the business of Congress itself. His accomplishments will be his monuments and

his memory will be with us who will forever admire his courage and statesmanship.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is with great sorrow I join my colleagues in paying respect to the late MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN, who represented Ohio's 19th Congressional District from the 75th through the 91st Congress. Mr. KIRWAN was born in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on December 2, 1886, the son of the late John and Mary "Duddy" Kirwan. In 1907 he moved to Youngstown, Ohio, his home until his death. He served in the Youngstown City Council for 4 years prior to his election to Congress in 1936. In addition to his service in the City Council, he was also engaged in the mercantile business. During the First World War, MICHAEL KIRWAN served overseas as a sergeant with the 348th Machine Gun Company of the 64th Artillery, U.S. Army from 1917 to 1919.

At the time of his death, Congressman KIRWAN was the seventh ranking Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. He served as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee. Through his great interest in conservation, he has left a legacy which includes several national parks, dams, and water conservation projects which resulted from his untiring efforts. He was also known for his great concern for the welfare of the American Indian, the people of the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Pacific mandated islands.

Congressman KIRWAN was a confidant of Presidents Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson. Mr. KIRWAN served as chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee from 1947 until his death. During his tenure as chairman, the party lost control of the House of Representatives on only one occasion.

I became a personal friend of MICHAEL KIRWAN many years before I was elected to Congress through our work at the Democratic National Conventions.

The people of the city of Youngstown, the State of Ohio, and the Nation have lost a great public servant.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Alice, and their family.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, this Congress and the entire Nation was saddened by the passing of MIKE KIRWAN. Few men in our time have made a more lasting impression on this body. He was a man of great ability, resourceful, energetic, courageous, and honorable in every respect. Above all, he was a man of principle, whose convictions were well known. He always commanded respect and was rated as one of the more influential Members of the House.

I recall hearing one Member once say: "MIKE always speaks with an affidavit voice." What he meant was that when our departed friend spoke the very tone and manner of his speech carried the touch of sincerity and truthfulness. It was recognized that he never engaged in idle talk just for the sake of having his words recorded. Indeed when he spoke out he did so because he had a message to deliver, and he did so with charm and conviction.

To me the loss of MIKE KIRWAN was the loss of a close personal friend. In the course of time I have spent many hours in his company. He had a philosophy all his own, and he always enjoyed reminiscing about his past experiences, both in and out of Congress. His vivid memory was always present, and he knew the history of his times as few men do.

MIKE KIRWAN will be missed. No longer will our legislative efforts have the benefit of his counsel and advice. The impact of his good works will be felt for generations to come. To the surviving family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, many tributes have been paid to our late colleague, MIKE KIRWAN. Undoubtedly, there are many more that could be made by his countless friends.

Having served with him for nearly 6 years on the Appropriations Committee and on its Subcommittee for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, I had a number of opportunities to be with him in committee hearings. As many of my colleagues know, for years, MIKE chaired this particular subcommittee. His legislative triumphs and achievements through that committee service are legion. There are uncounted beneficiaries of his legislative action on that committee, which today is so ably led by the subcommittee chairman, JULIA HANSEN of Washington.

One of the things that impressed me about MIKE KIRWAN was his sense of history. He was a great admirer of Woodrow Wilson and apparently had not only followed closely the career of Wilson when he was President of the United States, but had studied historical evaluations of Wilson's Presidency.

In committee hearings on a number of occasions, I can recall MIKE bringing to the attention of a witness the contributions of Woodrow Wilson. He apparently admired Wilson both as an educated man and as a great educator. I have heard him stress many times the influence that Wilson had on public education in America. This aspect of Wilson's personality and career must have had a great impact on MIKE KIRWAN, and I think was often reflected in the thrust of legislative programs in which he had an interest.

He was a great advocate of a better educational program for Indian children. He argued strongly for broadening the educational opportunities available to our young children on Indian reservations that he felt were being neglected in an educational sense.

I think one of the great monuments of his legislative career will be the educational television system of American Samoa. This is a bold and innovative step that I think will be characterized as a pioneer effort in the entire field of educational television. The impact that this system has already had on Samoa is dramatic. This system is being observed by educators as a pilot model, not only for use in the underdeveloped areas of the world, but for use as a teaching technique in other educational systems.

It is my hope that in years to come, when people point to a better educational program on our Indian reservations, and the pioneer effort in education on American Samoa, they will remember MIKE KIRWAN.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I join in expressing my deep sorrow on the passing of the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. He was a great American.

All of us in the House of Representatives are familiar with MIKE KIRWAN's outstanding record as a longtime public servant. As second-ranking majority member of the House Committee on Appropriations he played an extremely influential role in shaping our Government's policy in nearly every aspect of our activity. Through his service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, he was directly responsible for the proper and orderly growth and development of every section of our Nation.

As chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee, he served his party with dedication, honor, and immense achievement.

Yet the contribution of MIKE KIRWAN to his country and to his party far exceeds the accomplishments made through his high positions of leadership. More than this, MIKE KIRWAN's genuine affection and respect among the Members of this House were due to his tremendous personal warmth and friendship. He was a true friend whose word was honored and whose esteem was highly valued.

I personally have the highest regard for MIKE KIRWAN's dedication to the well-being of each and every one of us. I know that he sought to assure fair and equitable treatment of every Member regardless of rank or position. He had a tender heart for all of those with whom he came in contact, and always did his best to help in a spirit of true selfless service.

We will sorely miss MIKE KIRWAN's skill, expertise, and integrity. He brought a warmth to this House that will long be remembered, and I know that each of us is grateful for the opportunity to have known him and to have been associated with him.

It is with profound sorrow that we bid him goodbye. I express sincere condolences to Mrs. Kirwan and their family. Indeed, we all feel as though we have lost a family member with the passing of this kindhearted, wonderful gentleman, MIKE KIRWAN.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN, affectionately known to Members as "MIKE," on July 27 at Bethesda Naval Hospital after a long illness. Elected to the House of Representatives in 1936, MIKE won the confidence and support of his constituency and was returned to the House in each succeeding Congress. Originally from Pennsylvania, MIKE moved to Youngstown, Ohio, in 1907, served in the First World War and was later elected to the Youngstown City Council.

As the chairman for many years of the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Public Works, he contributed greatly to the system of dams and res-

ervoirs which were developed nationally over the years. Before beginning public service, he had traveled throughout the United States, working as a trainman, cowboy, and in the oil and wheat fields, experiences which no doubt gave him a great appreciation of the vast natural resources of our country which he was later to oversee as a Member of Congress.

A self-made man with a minimum of formal education, MIKE KIRWAN rose high in the ranks of the Democratic Party, but his devotion to his country overshadowed all and to it he gave first priority. To us on the other side of the aisle, it was implicit in our dealings with MIKE that our national welfare was his foremost guideline as a Member of Congress.

As individual Members, we will miss the warmth and graciousness of his personality in addition to the pioneering spirit which exemplifies our American tradition and history. From the coal fields of Pennsylvania to a revered role in the House of Representatives, MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN personified the personal initiative and dedication to duty which have made this Nation great.

I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and members of his family for whom his full life of service and achievement must serve as a great source of consolation.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I am always saddened at the passing of a friend but particularly so with MIKE KIRWAN. He represented one of the ties that remained with my first days of service in Congress. I learned to know him then and always counted him among my favorite colleagues. He was an honest, forthright, and vigorous legislator. I admired him because of his deep commitment to our two-party system and its contribution to the greatness of our country.

As I look back on my association with him, I shall always cherish the opportunities which it gave to discuss with him a wide range of subjects including his own rich experiences.

I will miss him as a friend just as his family will miss him as a father and husband and as his country will miss him as a faithful public servant.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, in the 4 short years it was my privilege to know our late and beloved colleague, MIKE KIRWAN, I knew him to be a most able legislator and a man of deep conviction. He was truly a man of many facets. He was proud of his country and would take to task those he believed did not hold its best interest at heart. MIKE KIRWAN was a man of firmness in the performance of his duties, but in his relationship to his fellow human beings he was a man who had an overabundance of kindness and understanding.

Like the other Members of the Congress, I will miss MIKE KIRWAN, especially enjoying the breakfast meal with him each morning. But at the same time I feel fortunate to have known him and had the benefit of his wise counsel.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, the death of the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN is a great loss not only to this district and this House but also to our Nation. In his 34 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, MIKE KIRWAN'S successful efforts on behalf of his constituents, his party, and his Nation were marked with an unending strength and determination and an almost unparalleled record of long-lasting and far reaching contributions to the security and dignity of the American people and the preservation and enhancement of their natural resources.

Throughout his life, he served as an example of one of the finest American traditions, a genuinely self-made man. First employed at the early age of 7 years in the Pennsylvania coal fields, he came to be one of the most influential and best informed Members of Congress despite his lack of formal education. By 1947, he became chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee and later assumed the responsibilities of the chairmanship of the Interior and the Public Works Subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Without his years of service, our Nation would have been denied one of its greatest legislators and one of its most persuasive defenders of economic and social well being for the American people. We will long remain indebted to his monumental contributions.

No man has been more responsible than he for our country's expanded water resource development, including flood control, pollution control, water supply, power generation, navigation, irrigation and recreation. The literally thousands of public projects and facilities initiated and completed during his 15 years of service and leadership on the Public Works Subcommittee stand as a living testament to the unusual foresight and perseverance of Congressman KIRWAN.

The Second Congressional District of Iowa is especially grateful for the compassion and understanding evidenced by Chairman KIRWAN. In 1965, our district was struck with Mississippi River flooding of unprecedented severity and declared a major disaster area by the President. Innumerable individual citizens, farms and businesses were inflicted with incalculable damages and losses.

Under the leadership of Mr. KIRWAN, we were able to enact new legislation to provide automatic implementation of disaster relief programs when such tragedies occur in the future and the funding of permanent flood protection, which is now underway in the Iowa cities of Dubuque, Clinton, and Guttenberg, was initiated.

I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a tribute to Mr. KIRWAN, which has been expressed by the city of Dubuque and which is shared by all of the residents of Iowa's Second District:

RESOLUTION OF RESPECT

Whereas, Michael Joseph Kirwan did spend his life in the public service of his community and country; and

Whereas, he was a Member of Congress of the United States, 19th District, Ohio, continuing from the Seventy-fifth Congress in 1937 until his death on 27 July 1970; and

Whereas, he became member and chairman of the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, and in the exercise of office did act to prevent disaster from flooding of the Mississippi River, and with graciousness and continuous work did so serve the people of Dubuque, Iowa.

Be it therefore resolved, that the Mayor and City Council of the City of Dubuque, Iowa, on behalf of the citizens of this city, take note of the death of Michael Joseph Kirwan and, joined with the people of Ohio, do mourn his passing and honor his memory for service to this nation.

Adopted this 3rd day of August, 1970.

DONALD R. MEYERS,
Mayor.

WALTER A. PREGLER,
WAYNE A. MOLDENHAUER,
GAYLORD M. COUCHMAN,
JOSEPH J. BITTER,
Councilmen.

The presence of Congressman KIRWAN will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress and by Americans throughout the country. My wife, Ann, and the residents of the Second District of Iowa join me in expressing our sympathy to the Kirwan family.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I join the many friends of the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN in expressing my deep sorrow on his death.

MIKE KIRWAN'S life should be an inspiration to all Americans. He started from a humble beginning and achieved what many of us strive for as our ultimate goal—he won the love and respect of his fellow man, and he left this world a better place in which to live as a result of his energetic efforts.

MIKE KIRWAN had no secret formula for his success. His experiences as a young man brought him into firsthand contact with the land of this Nation and its people—he dearly loved them both. His varied experiences gave him the vision and foresight to see what America could be. He had one pet project—America, its people, its resources, and its lands.

When a hearing or meeting was about to break up, MIKE KIRWAN had a favorite phrase he would frequently use as he prepared to make his departure. He would say, "Well, I guess I'll put on the rabbit."

Our beloved colleague has "put on the rabbit" for the last time, but for those of us who knew him well and loved him dearly, the memory of the "gentleman from Ohio" will have a special place in our hearts for many years to come.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and the family.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the passing of our colleague MIKE KIRWAN will be felt throughout the entire Nation.

For years he was a knowledgeable, skilled, and forceful Member of the Congress. He served well the citizens who elected him and they recognized his endeavors with award of long tenure.

More than this, however, was his devotion to and service in behalf of all the citizens of this land. MIKE KIRWAN had a deep and abiding interest in the building of a stronger America.

He was able to advance that interest through his service on the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. In this post, he evidenced sincere concern for improvements throughout the United States. He traveled to many parts of the Nation to per-

sonally evaluate projects and proposals for projects.

MIKE KIRWAN'S efforts in initiating many of the great and valuable water resource and waterway projects in this country merit him the lasting gratitude of all citizens who have and who will share in the benefits they provide. This work will be his most enduring remembrance.

Those who knew him throughout the land and understood his great desire to build a stronger Nation, regarded him with deep affection and mourn his passing. We will all miss him.

The esteem in which MIKE KIRWAN was held is indicated by an editorial in the Florence, Ala., Times. To share these thoughts with my colleagues, I include the comments as a part of my remarks at this point:

THE VALLEY LOSES A FRIEND

We were saddened the other day when news came across our desk that Congressman Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio Democrat, a 33-year veteran of the House of Representatives and chairman of the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, died July 27 at Bethesda Naval Hospital in suburban Washington, D.C.

Not only did his subcommittee handle appropriations for all dams and Federal power projects in the Nation, but we were personally well acquainted with Congressman Kirwan and Mrs. Kirwan, and had broken bread with them several times.

We knew him well enough to understand and appreciate his philosophy of life and philosophy of government and recall one memorable evening when we had dinner with the Congressman and Mrs. Kirwan when he expounded these philosophies in considerable detail.

The Ohioan, who had come up the hard way with little formal education, is gone after 83 lusty years of living and 17 terms in the House of Representatives, but monuments to his work are scattered all over the 50 States.

This man from Youngstown occasionally told us that the United States was far behind other civilized societies and developed countries in the world in what it does for its people. He was a great believer in more development of resources and social legislation at home and less warfare abroad.

The Members of Congress and the American people will join us in extending sympathy to those he left behind. It is not likely that the Congress will see many Mike Kirwans in the future.

In our book, he was a truly great American.

Congressman Kirwan, who had been hospitalized for more than a year, was long influential in Democratic Party circles, having served many years as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. He was the second ranking House member in seniority.

On his death, National Democratic Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien paid tribute to Mr. Kirwan's record in the fields of conservation and outdoor recreation:

"His accomplishments in the environmental field—long before the issue became popular—will be his monument. National parks, dams, reservoirs and water conservation projects are in existence today because of his industry."

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly saddened to learn of the passing of Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN at the Bethesda Naval Hospital after a long illness.

For over three decades, MIKE KIRWAN represented the residents of the 19th District of Ohio with honor and distinction. And as long-time chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, he contributed great leadership and wisdom in the vital area of water conservation and control. As a result of his leadership, many once arid areas of this Nation have been turned into fertile breadbaskets.

Mr. Chairman, in a very significant sense, MIKE KIRWAN embodied the great American traditions of individual initiative and individual achievement. He was a self-made man who accomplished his goals with little benefit of formal education. His work experience, however, as a trainman, a cowboy, an oilfield worker, and a farmworker, provided him with a broad and sturdy foundation on which he developed his immutable faith in the fundamental soundness of democracy and the goodness of the American people.

Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN possessed a rare blend of talents and abilities which he used to help the people and the land he loved so well. His person and his activities will long be remembered.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, the passing of our friend and colleague, the late Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio, marks the end of an enviable career of public service.

I first met MIKE KIRWAN when I ran for Congress for the first time in 1958. He was stern and businesslike, but he also was helpful to the *n*th degree.

His cooperation and assistance in that first campaign continued into my service in Congress. He always was most helpful and generous in both information and assistance.

In those early years of mine in Congress, my home city was intensely concerned with the need for Federal assistance to make the Buffalo Harbor usable for St. Lawrence Seaway traffic.

As chairman of the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, MIKE KIRWAN always was most sympathetic to our provincial problems in Buffalo. His was an exceedingly responsible and demanding chore in analyzing the endless requests for public works assistance and deciding the priority and allocation for projects.

There are many public works monuments to MIKE KIRWAN around the country, even though they do not carry his name.

MIKE KIRWAN'S concern was for the public need. His is an outstanding record of achievement over the years. Our Nation is indeed a better one for his having passed our way.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the House, the Congress, the Nation, and very many of us in this body, and throughout the country, sustained a truly irreparable loss in the passing of our dear friend, Congressman MIKE KIRWAN.

First, our hearts go out with prayers and deepest sympathy to his devoted wife and family, and all his dear ones, in their very sorrowful bereavement.

I realize that any remarks we may make today about our dearly beloved friend and colleague, MIKE, would be like carrying coals to Newcastle, since to know him was to respect and love him, and to speak his name reminds us of his warm, loyal friendship, and the many ways in which he lightened our burdens, his brilliant enduring contributions to the work of this House, to this Government and to this country, and the warming inspiration of his loyalty to us and to so many fine causes in the House.

Surely no district could have been more devotedly or effectively served in this Congress than the one in the great State of Ohio, which MIKE represented for so many years in such an outstanding manner.

Speaking of MIKE recalls many happy memories, for he was so unique in his own way, that to describe him, his characteristics, his ramifications, his wide interests, his loyalties, his devotion to his work and to his friends—all the many things that he has done to make America a better place to live, and to improve and strengthen the fiber of this country and its people, really defy description.

He never attended college—he never was highly educated in the formal sense—yet, he was endowed with such a sharp, keen mind, such a broad knowledge of human affairs and understanding of people and business and the economy, and all the manifold things going on in the country and in the world, and had such a keen memory, and quick mastery over subjects with which he was immediately concerned, that there was no lawyer or savant or college graduate or expert—whatever he might be, who could confound him, let alone prevail upon him to take back a single word, or retract one whit from his position.

He brought many measures to the House floor, and under his wise, capable leadership enacted all of them. He knew every phase of all bills and matters coming before his committee, and there was no question anyone could ask him about them that he could not answer.

He might not have answered them always to the satisfaction of his questioner, but one thing is certain; that if they were hostile questions, the questioner never forgot the response.

A wise, experienced leader of the Congress and a dear, valued friend has gone to his eternal reward. He will be greatly missed here in the House, where he has left an indelible impression of vigorous, dedicated public service to the rank and file of the American people and the security and well-being of this Nation.

Yes, the House will greatly miss him, and those of us who knew him so well for years, will especially miss him, and none of us could ever forget this hearty, alert, persevering leader and warm, loyal friend, whose personal color, dynamic leadership and devotion to his work and loyal friendship helped so much to make our service here pleasant, fruitful and memorable.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his gracious beloved wife and family, of whom he was so proud, and I join with them in mourning his irreparable loss. The House will never see his like again, but the peerless service, loyalty, and friendship of MIKE KIRWAN will long endure in this distinguished body and in the hearts and minds of all of us who served with him.

May our dear friend—patriot and champion of so many good causes, MIKE

KIRWAN, find rest and peace in his eternal home.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, we, in the House of Representatives, have suffered the loss of one of our finest and most beloved colleagues in the passing of the Honorable MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN of Ohio.

The fact that he had been seriously ill for many months in no way minimizes the deep sense of loss and grief that permeates the Chamber because since his election to the House of Representatives in the 75th and each succeeding Congress, MIKE KIRWAN played such a vital role in our legislative deliberations and actions.

Since 1955 I have had the great pleasure and the honor of serving with my good friend, MICHAEL JOSEPH KIRWAN, on the Committee on Appropriations in the House. In his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, for a great many years MIKE KIRWAN was known as "Mr. Public Works." This title was indeed well deserved because he was a tireless and great champion of the water resource development and progress of America.

Certainly he exerted every effort as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and especially as the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee to see to it that our land is preserved. Moreover, long before we had pollution legislation, MIKE KIRWAN was making every effort to preserve this country's soil and water and through his untiring efforts our Soil Conservation Service has a much easier task in carrying out its functions.

In addition to his outstanding ability as a legislator, MIKE KIRWAN possessed a delightful sense of humor and his inherent kindness endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. He was a true Irishman in every sense of the word and I am sure there is full agreement that his love for his country and his Government was equally matched by his love for Ireland.

He was always a true friend of the new Members of Congress and sincerely believed that all sections of the United States are important and that under no circumstances should one section be placed in competition against the other.

Saddened though we are, certainly all of us who were privileged to enjoy the friendship of MIKE KIRWAN have many happy memories to sustain us in the loss of his presence on this floor, and likewise, his constant fair-mindedness and objective approach to the most challenging problems left such an impression on us, his colleagues, that this too, will serve as our guideline in the future.

Mr. Speaker, my heartfelt sympathy is with MIKE'S family and it is my prayer that they will be comforted by an abundance of Divine assistance during these sad and difficult days.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of MIKE KIRWAN, we have lost a dear friend, a dedicated and distinguished colleague, a great American.

To list all his accomplishments or to recognize all of his friends would be a task far beyond my capabilities. There are few people in this land of ours who have not been helped in some way by MIKE KIRWAN. There are few major programs passed by Congress in the last 34 years that do not bear his mark.

As a colleague on the Appropriations Committee, MIKE was always knowledgeable, always practical, always fair. As chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee, his help was invaluable year after year.

Above all, however, MIKE KIRWAN was a man of the earth. He toiled in the mines; he drilled for oil; he cut wheat in the fields and trees in the forests. In doing so, he learned to love this land and all of its riches. He learned to deplore the tragic waste of God-given resources. When the time came for him to lead, he did not forget. He led this Nation to new frontiers of conservation and resource development. He was a pioneer. We are all in his debt because of it.

As a colleague and as a friend, I will miss MIKE KIRWAN. It was an honor to know him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, at this point I include several newspaper articles that tell of the fine work and character of our late beloved MICHAEL J. KIRWAN:

[From the Hubbard News, July 29, 1970]

19TH DISTRICT CONGRESSMAN: KIRWAN DIES AT 83, SERVED SINCE 1937

WASHINGTON.—Michael J. Kirwan, a member of Congress since 1937, was defeated for the first time in 34 years Monday when he died at the age of 83 in Bethesda Naval Medical Center.

Kirwan had been in poor health for several years and had been hospitalized since June, 1969 with a broken vertebra in the back suffered in a fall at the University Club where he lived while here.

The second oldest member of Congress, Kirwan was first elected in 1936 in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's landslide victory and was re-elected every two years thereafter. He had announced last year he would not seek re-election in 1970 with Democrat Charles J. Carney and Republican Margaret Dennison determining in November who will fill his post.

Kirwan had long maintained that his proudest accomplishments were his efforts in the fields of conservation and water projects, but his biggest single vote he said was one in favor of extending the draft just three months before Pearl Harbor. (It carried by only one vote.) Kirwan was also a strong supporter of the Fair Labor Standards Act which ended 5 and 10-cent hour labor in some parts of the country, the 40-hour work week law and the GI Bill of Rights.

Never too busy to spend time with residents of his district, Kirwan always remembered his humble beginning as a youth who had to quit school at an early age to help support his family. His political career started as Youngstown's 4th Ward Councilman in the early 1930's and he recalled receiving soup from a city kitchen in 1932.

"I watched strong men wrap frankfurters in their handkerchiefs to take home to their children and that was a sight I'll never forget," Kirwan would tell friends and reporters.

"Mike" didn't lose touch with his home area and his close contact with national leaders as well as his growing power and influence in Congress made him no different to those who knew him in earlier days.

He served as a sergeant in a machine gun company overseas during World War I and his first Youngstown job was with U.S. Steel's Ohio Works.

Kirwan toured the nation aboard Roosevelt's campaign train, crossed the country twice with President Harry Truman, campaigned by air with Democratic candidate Adlai Stevenson in 1956 and made a cross-country trip with President John F. Kennedy.

Three personal audiences with the late Pope Pius and meetings with the Queen of England and the King and Queen of Greece were conversation pieces for Kirwan who believed the average worker needed help from his government the most.

Kirwan cited Berlin, Mosquito and West Branch Reservoirs which he obtained for this area as vital factors in the district's economic well being and regretted throughout his public career that greater support was never available for his long-time dream—a Lake Erie to Ohio River canal.

Serving 11 terms as Chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, Kirwan was termed, "Mr. Democrat", by House Speaker John McCormack. Calling Kirwan, "one of the greatest Democrats of all time," McCormack noted their party was in control of the House for 18 of the 20 years during which Kirwan reigned as campaign chief.

He also was a diabetic and left the hospital infrequently to visit his Capitol Hill office.

Kirwan, born Dec. 2, 1886, was the seventh ranking member in House seniority. Only Rep. William L. Dawson, D-Ill., seven months Kirwan's senior, was older than him.

Kirwan represented Ohio's 19th congressional district, which included Youngstown (Trumbull and Mahoning counties) for 17 consecutive terms and was dean of the Ohio congressional delegation.

As chairman of the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, Kirwan was responsible for approving the expenditure of federal funds for dams, reservoirs, harbors and flood control projects all over the nation. Many of them were considered by some to be necessary mainly to show what a particular member could do for his district.

Thus the "pork barrel" label, which Kirwan deplored.

Kirwan liked to argue that the water projects returned more in benefits than they cost. He called them "investments in America."

Also, as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee in the House, he was the man to see when a member needed campaign funds.

But despite his power, two of his favorite projects were never realized: The Ohio River-lake Erie Canal and a national aquarium in the District of Columbia.

The canal, termed "Mike's Big Ditch" by critics, was a principal reason why he came to Congress shortly after the depression. But, in the intervening years, economics and the declining demand for such a mode of commerce intervened and Congress killed the project in 1967.

He also was a member of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

He is survived by his widow, Alice; two sons; one daughter, and 21 grandchildren.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, July 30, 1970]

SIX HUNDRED FILL CHURCH TO PAY TRIBUTE—PASTOR LAUDS KIRWAN'S PATRIOTISM

(By Pete Sheehan)

"Oh, how we could do with a massive emulation of Mike Kirwan's love of his country and pride in this great nation of ours," the Rt. Rev. Msgr. William P. Maxwell, pastor of St. Brendan Church, said this morning during funeral services for Rep. Michael J. Kirwan.

More than 600 persons filled the church—where the 83-year-old congressman worshiped more than half his life to pay final tribute to Youngstown's great political figure and join his family in prayer for him.

A Washington delegation of representatives and senators formed an honor guard at the church, standing on both sides of the main aisle as the casket, the family and mourners passed through.

The congressional delegation of 50 senators and representatives landed at Youngstown Municipal Airport at 9:15 a.m. aboard Air Force 2, the standby Boeing 707 plane for the President.

Representing President Nixon at the funeral was Richard Cook, a White House aide. Three generals and an admiral were on hand representing their respective branches of service. They are Brig. Gen. F. E. Haynes of the Marine Corps, Maj. Gen. L. B. Taylor of the Army, Lt. Gen. Duward Crow of the Air Force and Rear Adm. W. P. Gaddis of the Navy.

Close to 500 persons stood outside the church waiting for the procession under cloudy, threatening skies.

There were oldtimers who recalled when "Mike" came to Youngstown, there were World War I friends, those who worked with him at the Ohio Works, and on the railroad and there were those who knew him only by his deeds.

There were many children in the crowd which was quiet and respectful.

Neighbors on Glenellen Avenue stood on porches and leaned out of windows to watch.

Some of them remembered Mike quietly going back and forth to church over the years.

SULLIGAN LEADS GROUP

Mayor Jack C. Hunter and his party met the casket at the church door. Mr. Kirwan's grandchildren carried their grandfather to his final service at St. Brendan's.

Next came Jack Sulligan, Mahoning County Democratic chairman, heading a delegation of honorary pallbearers which included elected officials of Mahoning and Trumbull counties and leading citizens who were close to Kirwan.

After the honorary pallbearers entered, the mourners followed.

The congressman's widow, Mrs. Alice Kirwan, was escorted by her son, Michael J. Jr., of McMurray, Pa. and her daughter, Mrs. Mary Alice Vaughan of Washington. They were followed by Mrs. Kirwan Jr. and the son-in-law, Robert E. Vaughan.

Rep. Kirwan's last living brother and sister, John Kirwan and Mrs. Marguerite Zorzi, both of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., came next followed by Mrs. Roberta Messerly, Mr. Kirwan's administrative assistant during most of his career in Washington. She was accompanied by her nephew, William Donlin, also of Washington.

BLESSED CASKET

Msgr. Maxwell blessed the casket and led a procession up the aisle followed by Mrs. Kirwan, her children and their families and relatives and close friends.

The copper casket, made by the Youngstown Casket Co., was flown to Washington Monday night by the Fox Funeral Home. Mr. Kirwan died in Bethesda Naval Hospital early Monday after a long illness.

Members of the honor guard of government officials then took their seats in the church and Msgr. Maxwell, principal celebrant, began the concelebrated Mass. The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew A. Prokop and the Rev. William H. Homan, former assistants at St. Brendan's were concelebrants.

Also in the sanctuary were the Rev. Edward G. Latch, chaplain of the House of Representatives, a Methodist; the Very Rev. Msgr. J. Paul O'Connor, chancellor of the Diocese of Youngstown, and the Very Rev. Msgr. William A. Hughes, episcopal vicar for education in the Youngstown Diocese.

Before giving his homily, Msgr. Maxwell read two telegrams sent by President Richard M. Nixon. The first telegram said that Cook was ordered to represent the President at the funeral.

The second telegram was addressed to Mrs. Kirwan. The President told Mrs. Kirwan that the congressman's death "brings sorrow to those he served so energetically. Mrs. Nixon and I send you and the members of your family our deepest sympathy."

In the telegram, the President also expressed the hope to Mrs. Kirwan that "Kirwan's accomplishments in Congress may be a source of strength and comfort to you and members of your family in the years to come."

In his homily, Msgr. Maxwell said Mr. Kirwan's difficulties and his triumphs should give inspiration and example to those whose way of life is hard.

LAUDS PERSONAL QUALITIES

"His sturdy qualities of truthfulness, honesty, human concern and foresight encourage and confirm the natural benefits of these qualities to all," the monsignor said.

"While Mr. Kirwan never challenged his audiences, when campaigning, to test his adroitness in chicanery, he did challenge them to watch his honesty. 'Watch me like a hawk' he would say. 'If you catch me taking a short cut, you're fools if you don't vote me out of office.'

"Perhaps we might say his scorn for the glamour side of government and his disdain for a 'phony' anywhere sprang from this deep sense of honesty.

"The list of his accomplishments is a long and varied one. For his own district, adjoining areas, in distant parts of the country, even in the Pacific Islands. Many of these measures received prompt backing because their need or usefulness was readily seen. Others, the importance of which he perceived clearly, were seen but slowly by his colleagues. Patience and determined perseverance finally won his goals in most cases.

"While I am deeply impressed by his constructive efforts to secure educational opportunities for American Indians and children in the far reaches of the Pacific, there is another instance of his concern that is amazing. Interested, somewhat by chance, in the need to wipe out a beetle that was destroying a vast timber area, he secured the money from Congress and saved a great amount of timber, sufficient in quantity to build more than a million five-room homes.

KEPT COMMON TOUCH

"Despite his contacts with people of note and distinction and his participation in events of tremendous importance he never lost the common touch. He enjoyed these contacts and his part in great affairs; he even showed a justifiable pride; yet he was essentially a simple and humble man. To one and all he was glad to answer to the friendly name of 'Mike.' And he judged a man by what he was, with a special warmth for the man he called 'Joe Doakes.'

"It has been said that he was a devout man because he made frequent use of the Rosary. I was delighted to learn that his attachment to this old-fashioned devotion was so well known. I understand how—as his fingers moved over the worn beads and he murmured through habit his Paters and Aves—he beheld vividly in his mind a review of some of the outstanding events in the life of Christ, from His birth to His death and resurrection.

"And along the way he watched the gracious concern of Jesus for His mother. Through this meditation he renewed his allegiance to his Lord, drew inspiration and courage, found strength to meet his own problems, and inspiration to continue his work for the good of mankind.

"I would not say he was devout because he said his Rosary, but rather he said his Rosary because he was devout. He did not wear his religion on his sleeve, as the saying is. He lived it. It was part of him; not something to be considered separately from himself. His concern for others, his idealism, his charity: these things were not some special features of the man; they were part of him, an external expression of his spirituality. Yes. I would say he was devout.

"Because he was a devout and humble man it was his wish to have his last earthly function in his parish church; in that church in which he had worshipped God for more than half his long life. Here with his family, in the midst of his neighbors, with his friends from near and far gathered round, he wanted to lay down his earthly labors and enter into the joy of the Lord.

"He was a good parishioner. While regular in his attendance at church, he was in no way ostentatious. He received the Sacraments and participated to the extent he could in the activities of the parish. He was not one to interfere, to be critical or demanding; and yet, on occasion, he made kindly, interested and helpful suggestions. In the 25 years I have known him, he has never refused a request made of him from the parish, whether it was of his time, of his presence, or of his purse.

"His name and achievements will be long remembered. He goes now to receive his reward for a life of service to his family and to his fellowmen and for a life of faithful love of his Creator. In the light of glory, in the very presence of God, he will experience that 'eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor entered into the heart of many, the things God has prepared for those that love Him.'

"Into that glorious realm our thoughts and our prayers go with him. And before the throne of the Most High God he will continue to represent us—to put in a prayerful word for all of us," Msgr. Maxwell concluded.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, July 28, 1970]

HOUSE TO MARK DEATH OF KIRWAN—NIXON, LBJ PAY TRIBUTES

President Nixon, former President Lyndon B. Johnson and the House of Representatives paid tribute Monday to an old friend, Youngstown's Michael J. Kirwan, a member of the House since 1937.

An unusually large list is being assembled of members of both houses of Congress and both political parties who plan to make a special flight here Thursday for the funeral at 10:30 a.m. in St. Brendan Church.

President Nixon, in San Clemente, Calif., said, "The death of Rep. Michael J. Kirwan is a loss to Congress, to the nation and to me personally. I join his many friends in sorrow at his passing, and in respect for his memory and for his long record of service to the nation. Mrs. Nixon joins me in expressing deep sympathy to Mrs. Kirwan and members of the family."

LBJ'S TRIBUTE

Former President Johnson said, "In times that demand the best, he always gave it. The nation has lost a stalwart public servant and the halls of Congress lost an outstanding legislator.

"Mike Kirwan's death brings to a close a long and remarkable record of service in the House of Representatives. His role in our country's affairs has been marked by distinction and by selfless dedication.

"We were classmates in the 75th Congress and I have cherished his friendship in all the years that have since passed. Mrs. Johnson and I mourn his passing and we extend our heartfelt sympathy to his family."

REP. FEIGHAN'S MESSAGE

The duty of informing the House of Representatives officially as it convened yesterday fell to Rep. Michael A. Feighan of Cleveland. With the death of Mr. Kirwan, he becomes the senior member of the Ohio delegation.

Feighan moved a quickly accepted resolution that at the conclusion of the day's business—a complex debate over changes in the organization of Congress—the House recess

in respect to Mr. Kirwan. It set Aug. 4 as the day when all members could express their sorrow.

Rep. Wayne Hays of Flushing later interrupted the debate to inform the House of funeral arrangements.

Meanwhile, the 50 surviving colleagues of Mr. Kirwan on the House Appropriations Committee adopted a memorial resolution honoring the Ohioan's 28 years' service on the committee.

"One of the most devoted, respected and beloved members ever to serve in the House," the tribute said, Mr. Kirwan was one who early recognized "the serious neglect of the precious and priceless natural resources of our nation and became a legislative champion of conservation with an unexcelled dedication of the protection, preservation and development of these resources."

HOUSE COMMITTEE

It said Mr. Kirwan was "a deeply religious man, prideful of his humble beginnings and epitomizing what Emerson had in mind when he said that America was but another name of opportunity."

It also praised his efforts on behalf of adequate treatment of American Indians, the enhancement of the National Park System, wildlife resources and the public lands of the West.

Mr. Kirwan's death deprives the Ohio 19th Congressional District of a vote in the House—in company with three other districts with vacancies—until a successor is chosen.

Mr. Kirwan's office, however, will remain open to handle inquiries from constituents and other matters to provide continuous service for citizens of the Youngstown-Warren area.

RHODES STATEMENT

In Columbus, Gov. James A. Rhodes said, "Ohio will miss Rep. Kirwan's strong voice on the House Appropriations Committee, particularly as chairman of its Subcommittee on Public Works."

Sen. Charles J. Carney, reached at the Ohio Senate in Columbus, where he is minority leader, said "I am deeply saddened by the passing of Congressman Kirwan. He will be sorely missed by his district, state and nation. Mike Kirwan was a man of great common sense and a wonderful capacity for friendship. Last week while in Washington, House speaker John McCormack told me that no man in Congress had more friends than Mike Kirwan. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family." * * *

[From the Warren (Ohio) Tribune Cronicle, July 30, 1970]

SERVICE HELD IN YOUNGSTOWN—LEADERS HONOR KIRWAN

YOUNGSTOWN.—The largest group of congressmen and national and state leaders ever to converge on this area attended last rites here today for 19th District Congressman Michael J. Kirwan, 83, of Youngstown, one of the most powerful and influential members of the U.S. Congress.

Fifty-four members of Congress arrived at Youngstown Air Base at 9:15 a.m. today aboard a Presidential jet, U.S. Air Force 2. They had flown in from Andrews Air Force Base.

Heading the delegation were House Majority Leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma, expected to become speaker next year, and his GOP counterpart, Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Michigan.

Solemn services for Mr. Kirwan, who died early Monday in Bethesda Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Maryland, were held at 10:30 a.m. at St. Brendan's Church.

The Rt. Rev. William P. Maxwell, dean of the Mahoning County Catholic clergy and pastor of St. Brendan's, officiated at the final rites and burial was in the Kirwan family plot in Calvary Cemetery.

Under cloudy skies, hundreds of mourners, ranging from the local laborers to high national officials, paid their last respects to Rep. Kirwan.

Also attending the funeral services were top Democratic party officials, a representative of President Nixon, and many state officials and local dignitaries.

Father Maxwell eulogized Kirwan as being "a simple humble man . . . with the common touch."

He said the late congressman will long be remembered for "his truthfulness, honesty, human concern and foresight."

Mrs. Alice Kirwan, the late congressman's wife, was composed and sober throughout the funeral this morning and was close to her three children: Michael Jr., John and Mary. The 20 Kirwan grandchildren served as honorary pallbearers.

CHURCH CROWDED

The church was crowded far beyond its 600 seating capacity and outside hundreds more stood waiting for a glimpse of the casket.

Representing President Nixon was Richard Cook, special assistant to the president. In a telegram from the California White House, Nixon expressed sincere condolences to the Kirwan family and said the death of the congressman "deprived the nation of one of its most articulate public servants."

Msgr. Maxwell in his eulogy said "There is universal agreement that Kirwan's life had been highly successful and others would do well to follow his example."

He cited Kirwan's love of country and patriotism as one of his greatest attributes which endeared him to the people. Msgr. Maxwell said the two most notable accomplishments of the late congressman were his "constructive effort" to see that educational opportunities were given to all the people, and his fight to save the environment.

CITES KIRWAN'S GREATNESS

He continued to cite Kirwan's greatness as being evidenced by the "large number of distinguished persons attending the service here today."

Referring to Kirwan's "common touch" with the people the monsignor said Kirwan's humbleness was shown by the fact that to "one and all" he was happy to answer to "Mike."

Among the dignitaries attending the funeral were Lawrence O'Brien, national Democrat party chairman; Rep. Carl Albert, leading the congressional delegation; Youngstown Mayor Jack Hunter leading a large contingent of Youngstown dignitaries; State Sen. Charles J. Carney and Mrs. Margaret Dennison, respective Democrat and Republican candidates in the general election to succeed Kirwan in his 19th district congressional seat; Congressman Robert Taft Jr., Howard Metzenbaum, John J. Gilligan, and representatives of each branch of the Armed Services and labor leaders from throughout the Mahoning Valley.

Several thousand persons visited the Fox Funeral Home here yesterday to pay their respects to the family. On Tuesday, more than 450 attended calling hours at the funeral home.

Members of the congressional delegation were invited by William Cafaro, developer of the Eastwood Mall, to have lunch at Cherry's at the Mall before returning to Washington.

Members of the House Appropriations Committee who were scheduled to attend the services were: Jamie L. Whitten, D-Miss., who succeeds Kirwan as ranking Democrat; John J. Rooney, D-N.Y.; Robert L. F. Sikes, D-Fla.; Joe L. Evins, D-Tenn.; Daniel J. Flood, D-Pa.; Tom Steed, D-Okla.; Mrs. Julia Butler Hansen, D-Wash.; Rep. Joseph P. Addabbo, D-N.Y.; Edward P. Boland, D-Mass., and two Ohio Republicans, Frank T. Bow and William E. Minshall.

Besides Mahon, four committee chairmen were to attend: L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., of Armed Services; John McMillian, D-S.C., of the District of Columbia Committee; Thomas E. Morgan, D-Pa., of Foreign Affairs, and George P. Miller, D-Calif., of Science and Astronautics.

Other members of the Ohio delegation are senatorial nominee Robert Taft Jr., Donald D. Clancy, Charles W. Whalen Jr., William M. McCulloch, Delbert L. Latta, William H. Harsha, Clarence J. Brown, Jackson E. Betts, Clarence E. Miller, J. William Stanton, Samuel L. Devine, Charles A. Mosher, William H. Ayres, Chalmers P. Wylie, John W. Ashbrook, and Donald E. Lukens, all Republicans, and Thomas L. Ashley, Wayne L. Hays, Michael A. Feighan, Louis Stokes and Charles A. Vanik, all Democrats.

Others who planned to attend were House Majority Whip Hale Boggs, D-La.; Thomas G. Abernethy, D-Miss.; Ray J. Madden, D-Ind.; Philip J. Philbin, D-Mass.; Melvin Price, D-Ill.; James J. Delaney, D-N.Y.; John C. Kluczynski, D-Ill.; Ed Edmondson, D-Okla.; Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., D-Mass.; John J. Rhode, R-Ariz.; John J. Flynt Jr., D-Ga.; Mrs. Martha W. Griffiths, D-Mich.; John J. McFall, D-Calif.; Tom Casey, D-Texas, and Neal Smith, D-Iowa.

[From the Youngstown Vindicator, July 31, 1970]

BURIAL SERVICES ARE HELD AT CALVARY

(By Pete Sheehan)

U.S. Rep. Michael J. Kirwan who lived most of his life on Youngstown's West Side was laid to rest beneath the shade of beautiful towering trees at Calvary Cemetery Thursday afternoon.

His grave, first in the family plot, is near the S. Belle Vista Avenue entrance in a section opened 15 years ago, about seven blocks from his long-time home on S. Hazelwood Avenue.

Hundreds of persons were waiting at the cemetery when the funeral procession arrived from St. Brendan Church, where hundreds more had attended services for the 83-year-old political great.

Rain threatened during the graveside service but held off until most people were back in their cars, ready to leave.

WILL EULOGIZE KIRWAN

Next Tuesday morning a memorial Mass will be offered in Washington and members of Congress will attend. At 4 p.m. Tuesday members of the House of Representatives will make statements for the Congressional Record eulogizing the veteran of 17 terms.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. William P. Maxwell, Mr. Kirwan's pastor, conducted the brief graveside service. He and the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew A. Prokop and the Rev. William H. Hohman concelebrants of the Mass, blessed the casket. With them was the Rev. Edward G. Latch, Methodist minister and chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington.

Following the services, each member of the Washington delegation of representatives, senators and political leaders expressed his sympathy to Mrs. Alice Kirwan, widow of the congressman, his son, Michael Jr., and his wife of McMurray, Pa., and daughter and her husband Mr. and Mrs. Robert Vaughan of Washington, and Mrs. Roberta Messerly, his administrative assistant of many years.

The 45-member Washington delegation was about 20 members short of expectations because many were unable to attend at the last minute. Former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey also could not make the funeral.

TRIBUTE FROM OLD FRIEND

One of Mrs. Kirwan's oldest friends, James Law of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., paid the congressman a tribute when he said, "Mike never forgot his old friends back home. He looked forward to seeing us and we always waited

for his visits." Mr. Law is retired postmaster at Wilkes-Barre.

Mr. Kirwan received nearly 125 floral tributes at the Fox Funeral Home, filling the area around the casket and other rooms. Among the notables sending flowers were James J. Farley, John J. Gilligan, U.S. Sen. and Mrs. Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy, Speaker of the House and Mrs. John J. McCormack, Lawrence F. O'Brien, Gov. and Mrs. John B. Williams of Mississippi and U.S. District Judge and Mrs. Frank J. Battisti. Gov. Williams attended the service.

Most of the flowers were sent to Assumption Nursing Home.

WILKINS SENDS CONDOLENCES

Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, sent condolences to Mrs. Kirwan. He said, "The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is grieved by the death of your beloved husband. We regarded him as a friend as we struggled to make freedom ring for America's Negro citizens. His civil rights record reflected the genuine concern that he had for all racial minorities. We who will carry on the fight for justice will sorely miss your husband's steady support of our cause. To you and your family go our deepest sympathy."

Mr. Kirwan received an honorary doctorate of law from Central State a few years ago.

Wallace Geuss was in charge of music at the Mass and was soloist. He sang "Panis Angelicus" during Communion.

Area funeral directors furnished their automobiles and drivers to help the Fox Funeral Home take the visiting dignitaries from the airport to the church, the cemetery and back to the airport.

[From the Tribune Chronicle, July 28, 1970]

NIXON, JOHNSON PAY TRIBUTE TO KIRWAN

President Richard M. Nixon and former President Lyndon B. Johnson today paid tribute to 19th District Congressman Michael J. Kirwan, 83, of Youngstown, who died early yesterday at Bethesda Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md.

The body of Congressman Kirwan, who rose from a coal mining job to become one of the most powerful and influential members of the U.S. Congress, was scheduled to be flown back to Youngstown today for funeral services on Thursday.

CITE "GREAT LOSS"

Besides President Nixon and Johnson, hundreds of other governmental leaders and friends issued statements calling the congressman's death a "great loss" to the nation.

Congressman John McCormack, speaker of the House and a close friend of Mr. Kirwan, announced plans to lead a Congressional delegation to the funeral services Thursday at 10:30 a.m. at St. Brendan's Catholic Church, Youngstown. The Fox Funeral Home, Youngstown, is handling arrangements and there will be calling hours tonight from 8 to 9 and Wednesday from 2 to 4 and 7 to 9 p.m. Burial will be in Calvary Cemetery.

BODY FLOWN HERE

Rep. Kirwan's body was scheduled to be taken from Bethesda Hospital and flown by Air Force jet to Youngstown Municipal Airport at noon today. Mrs. Kirwan is accompanying the body.

President Nixon, who plans to send a yet unannounced representative to the funeral, said in San Clemente, Calif.: "This death of Rep. Michael J. Kirwan was a loss to the Congress, to the nation, and to me personally. I join his many other friends in sorrow at his passing, and in respect for his memory and for his long record of service to the nation."

Former President Johnson, a personal friend of Mr. Kirwan, said in Johnson City, Tex., that "the nation lost a stalwart public servant and the halls of Congress lost an outstanding legislator. Mike Kirwan's death brings to a close a long and remarkable record of service in the House of Representatives."

TRUE LEADER

Democratic National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien called Rep. Kirwan a true leader and said, "His accomplishments in the environmental field—long before that issue became popular—will be his monument."

O'Brien added: "National parks, dams, reservoirs and water conservation projects are in existence today as a result of his industry."

Rep. Kirwan was the seventh ranking member of the House and was second ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee. He was chairman of the subcommittee on public works appropriations. He had served the 19th District for 17 consecutive terms. His term expires Jan. 1 and he did not seek re-election this year.

The U.S. Flag over the capitol in Washington, D.C., is being flown at half staff in his honor and flags have been lowered across the 19th District until after the funeral.

MUST SET ELECTION

Gov. James A. Rhodes, who led state officials in issuing his condolences to the Kirwan family, is expected to issue a writ of election within a few weeks setting a special primary and special election to choose someone to serve out Rep. Kirwan's unexpired tem.

The governor is mandated by law to set the elections. He is expected to set the primary for September and the election to run concurrent with the Nov. 3 general election.

The primary must be held at least 15 days before the special election.

Candidates would have until 10 days before the primary to file petitions. Both Margaret Dennison, the Republican candidate for the full two-year Congressional term, and her Democrat opponent Ohio Sen. Charles Carney, have announced plans to seek the unexpired term.

The individual elected to the unexpired term will serve from Nov. 4 to Jan. 1, when the individual (possibly the same person), elected in the regular Congressional contest, will assume the office for the next two years.

FLAGS LOWERED HERE FOR KIRWAN

Trumbull County commissioners late yesterday had the U.S. flags at the County Administration Building and the Court House lowered to half mast in honor of the late 19th District Cong. Michael J. Kirwan, who died yesterday.

Commissioners indicated that a formal resolution paying tribute to Rep. Kirwan's years of service to the people of the district will be adopted at their regular Thursday session.

The flags will be at half staff until Kirwan's funeral on Thursday.

Flags at the City Hall and the Post Office here also are at half staff until after the funeral.

[From the Youngstown Vindicator, July 27, 1970]

MAYOR LAUDS KIRWAN FOR LONG SERVICE

Michael J. Kirwan never forgot his friends and constituents in Youngstown and today he was hailed by Democrats and Republicans, labor and business alike, for his many accomplishments for the Mahoning Valley.

Mayor Jack C. Hunter said, "On behalf of the citizens of Youngstown, and the administration I wish to offer condolences to Mrs. Kirwan, and the Kirwan family. Congressman Kirwan will be missed by all. He has served the 19th District long and well. He was always a model to all who served in public life."

William L. Spencer, president of the Youngstown Area Chamber of Commerce said, "The business community generally regrets the passing of Congressman Kirwan. His contribution to the community and to conservation particularly throughout the nation, have been very much appreciated. As a congressman and as a Youngstown area citizen, he will be greatly missed."

Frank Leseganich, director of District 26, United Steelworkers of America, said "On behalf of District 26, United Steelworkers of America, representing some 60,000 members I express our deepest sympathy on the loss of a sincere and loyal friend of labor. The years of service of Mike Kirwan and the administration of his office will ever be synonymous with the growth and progress of our valley."

John J. Gilligan of Cincinnati, Democratic candidate for governor who served in Congress with Kirwan in 1965 and 1966. "I join the people of Ohio and of the nation today in mourning the death of my good friend Congressman Michael J. Kirwan. Congressman Kirwan served the people of his district and the people of the United States long and well. All of us who were touched by his life and his work are diminished by his passing."

Margaret Dennison, Republican candidate for the 19th District seat, said, "The passing of Congressman Michael J. Kirwan marks the end of an era in the history of the Mahoning Valley."

"As state representative I had the occasion to refer many cases to his congressional office and these were always handled in the best interest of our mutual constituents regardless of political consideration.

"Four great reservoirs stand as a lasting monument to the concern of Mr. Kirwan for the long range prosperity of this region which can be guaranteed only by adequate supplies of water.

"His name should forever be remembered in this valley. I extend my sympathy to the family and staff of Mr. Kirwan."

Former Mayor Anthony B. Flask said "Mr. Kirwan in my humble opinion was the true example of the opportunities of America—from a humble beginning to one of the highest places in our government. He was a great asset to our community and his country. His loss not only to this district, his state and his nation creates a void which shall take years to fill. Mike was the typical American. We sincerely send our sympathy and regrets to his family and his many, many friends in America."

[From the Youngstown Vindicator, July 27, 1970]

COLLEAGUES PRAISE KIRWAN

House leaders of both parties who had known Rep. Michael J. Kirwan during much of his long congressional term joined in paying tribute to his career today.

Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan said "Mike Kirwan will be sorely missed in the Congress. He and I served together on the House Appropriation Committee * * * individual and an outstanding legislator.

END OF SUCCESS STORY

Democratic National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien said one of the great success stories ended today with the death of Mike Kirwan. He was born in poverty, worked in the mines and on the railroads, then went to Congress where the people kept him for 17 consecutive terms.

"In Washington his legislative and political contributions were countless. His accomplishments in the environmental field will be his monument. National parks, dams, reservoirs and water conservation projects are in existence today as a result of his industry.

The plight of the American Indians became Mike Kirwan's special concern."

O'Brien said Kirwan's record as a politician speaks for itself, noting that since he became chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign committee in 1947 the Democrats lost control of the House only once.

"MOST REMARKABLE MAN"

Majority Leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma, conceded to be the next speaker if the Democrats win the November elections, said that in many ways Kirwan was "the most remarkable man I have ever known. Almost literally self-educated, born in poverty and grown in poverty, Kirwan never forgot the American dream." He said that as chairman of the campaign committee "the Ohioan has become almost irreplaceable."

Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, praised Kirwan's efforts on behalf of the nation's largest complex of museums and laboratories since becoming a member of the board of regents in 1962. Besides helping provide the appropriations to finance extensive expansion of the Smithsonian's facilities, he was responsible for having the museum remain open evenings during the tourist season.

LAUDED BY BOW

Rep. Frank T. Bow from the neighboring 16th District, ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, said, "Although we had opposite political views on many subjects, we've been able to work together for the good of our area. He was a great power here in the House and will be missed. I consider Mike Kirwan a great American, a fine legislator and a very devout Christian gentleman."

The committee chairman, Rep. George Mahon of Texas, who was first elected only two years before Kirwan, said "People respected him, they didn't have to guess where he stood.

"He didn't have Shakespearean polish in his language but he had a heart of gold and he got his message over."

WAS STABILIZING FORCE

Mahon described Mr. Kirwan as a stabilizing force on the 51-man committee and a dedicated advocate of the preservation of the environment and development of American resources.

Mahon added that Rep. Kirwan "fought a valiant unbelievable battle against the illnesses which struck him a year ago."

Rep. Kirwan's counterpart as chairman of the Senate Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee, Sen. Allen J. Ellender, D-La., said "Mike Kiran and I shared the concern for protecting and preserving our nation's water resources and I know his loss will be great both to the Congress and the people of his district."

Rep. James Whitten, D-Miss., who replaces Mr. Kirwan as ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, said, "Mike Kirwan was a farsighted man who did more than any 50 men to provide for the future of all of us. Luckily, there are literally thousands of monuments in the form of public works which will stand in his memory."

NEVER FORGOT ORIGIN

Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., D-Mass., number two man on the Democratic congressional campaign committee which Mr. Kirwan headed since 1947, said "Mike never forgot his origin nor the oppression of poverty and he was determined to see that every American could partake of the American dream. He will be sorely missed by his friends and colleagues. We will all miss his leadership and I will miss his warm friendship."

While tributes to Mr. Kirwan have been frequent through the years, just a month ago (June 24) praise for the veteran congressman was entered in the Record by more than a dozen colleagues of the appropriations public works subcommittee, which he served as chairman.

The occasion was the House passage of the $5,242,556,000 public works appropriation measure, the result of his leadership.

Among the tributes then from members of the House of Representatives including those on the committee who carried on Kirwan's responsibilities during his illness were:

Rep. Joe L. Evins of Tennessee: "We miss his great leadership and commitment for progress through internal improvements—the great force of his leadership for growth and development of our nation."

Rep. Edward P. Poland of Massachusetts: "His diamond-rough and unique personality have left their marks into perpetuity on the face of our nation."

Rep. John Rhodes of Arizona: "Certainly the members of this side of the aisle have as much regard for Mike Kirwan as do members on the other side. We thank him for the great services he has rendered to the House of Representatives and to our country in his great career as a member of this body."

Rep. Don H. Clausen of California: "He will always be recognized as a great builder of projects which have certainly been worthwhile."

Mrs. Martha Griffiths of Michigan: "America is the lesser because this man is not here today to help us out."

Byron G. Rogers of Colorado: "He has always been a man one can go to, one who understood the problem, who was sympathetic with the problem, who knew we had to continue to preserve the natural resources of this country."

CITES KIRWAN'S LEADERSHIP

Ed Edmondson of Oklahoma: "We are going to miss Mike Kirwan in the 92nd Congress and in the Congresses to follow. No one has surpassed him in either leadership or statesmanship in the advancement of this cause."

George Andrews of Alabama: "This was really Mike's bill, because this is the bill that makes America the beautiful."

Ben Reifel of South Dakota: "America is a far better land because Mike looked out for it."

[From the Youngstown Vindicator, July 27, 1970]

CONGRESSMAN KIRWAN DIES AT 83; SERVED DISTRICT SINCE 1937

Rep. Michael J. Kirwan, 83, of 236 S. Hazelwood Ave., the 19th Congressional District's voice in Washington since 1937 and seventh ranking member of the House of Representatives in seniority, died at 12:45 a.m. today in Bethesda Naval Hospital. He had been in the hospital since May 6, 1969, after falling at the University Club, where he resided, and breaking a vertebra.

Speaker of the House John McCormack was scheduled to officially announce Mr. Kirwan's death at today's brief session of the House, appoint an official delegation to attend the funeral in Youngstown, probably Thursday.

Other delegations from the congressional leadership and Appropriations Committee also will attend as will a representative of President Nixon.

The business of Mr. Kirwan's office in the Rayburn Building will continue until a successor is certified through a special election. Mrs. Robert A. Messerly, his executive assistant for many years, is in charge.

DIED OF COMPLICATIONS

Aides said Mr. Kirwan's death was due to complications from the fall. He had been unable to be in his office regularly but had kept up with current events and the business before Congress. Last March 11 he received a surprise visit in the hospital from President Nixon.

Youngstowners in Washington recently were told he was weakening and his condition was getting worse. His wife, Mrs. Alice Kirwan, a granddaughter, Maria Owens and a few close aides were with him when he died. He had been in a wheel chair earlier Sunday and appeared in good spirits. Relatives were called to the hospital about 11 p.m.

Flags on all government buildings in the nation's capital will be at half staff for three days.

Flags on all city and county buildings in the 19th District also will fly at half staff until the day after his funeral.

Considered one of the top leaders in the Democratic party for a generation, Mr. Kirwan was widely known all across the country as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. He was the second ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Although Mr. Kirwan had had a diabetic condition for several years, he retained relatively good health until he fell. He campaigned here in the fall of 1968 and as the new Congress opened, he was in the Capitol performing his duties. He was re-elected chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Campaign Committee and a trustee of the Smithsonian Institution.

He had been at Bethesda Naval Hospital with an electric pacer on his heart, but seemed to respond well.

In history, Mr. Kirwan will be remembered for the part he played in sustaining the nation's defense stance before the outbreak of World War II; his work for conservation all over the country, including Mosquito, West Branch, Shenango and Berlin reservoirs in the Youngstown district; his aid for education of reservation Indians and for school facilities in American Samoa and Pacific mandated islands.

In the Democratic party, he served as chairman of the National Congressional Campaign Committee longer than any other man, and was the first northerner to hold the office. Mr. Kirwan's party leadership brought him into close contact with Presidents Truman, Kennedy and Johnson.

Mr. Kirwan was born Dec. 2, 1886 in Plains, Pa., a suburb of Wilkes-Barre, a son of John and Mary Duddy Kirwan. His father, a hard-coal miner, died at an early age of "miner's asthma" from the black dust.

Michael was the third in a family of 10 children, and managed only three years of formal education in the Plainsville four-room school. At the age of 7 he began work as a breaker boy.

Joining the mine workers' union as a boy, he was fleet of foot and for a time was a runner or messenger when strike trouble beset the hard coal region, and the operators and union staged almost open war.

Mr. Kirwan met Miss Alice Kane of Wilkes-Barre in 1912 and corresponded with her during World War I, when he served in France as a sergeant in the 348th Machine Gun Company. They were married Sept. 15, 1920—shortly after he located permanently in Youngstown.

Mr. Kirwan leaves his wife; two sons, Michael J. Jr. of McMurray, Pa., and John of Honolulu; a daughter, Mrs. Mary Alice Vaughan of Washington; a brother, John; and a sister, Mrs. Marguerite Zorzi of Wilkes-Barre; and 20 grandchildren.

LEFT MINING AT 16: ROAMED UNITED STATES DOING VARIETY OF JOBS

His early life had been spent roving about the country, working for railroads and employed in many occupations, even wheat harvesting.

Mr. Kirwan left the mines when he was 16,

He took a job at $1.25 a day in a lace mill, but soon left to rove over the country for three years.

He worked for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and in other fields. Working in Duquesne, Pa., he was walking about one Sunday and couldn't see a tree like those in his native Wilkes-Barre, at the foot of the Pocono Mountains, and near the banks of the Susquehanna River. He decided to leave such a barren place, and walked to McKees Rocks, and took a P.&L.E. train to Youngstown, arriving July 4, 1907. He went to work at the Ohio Works, but two years later went roaming, from Chicago to California, where he worked for a time tearing down buildings damaged in the earthquake. Later he worked and boarded in a house in what is now part of Los Angeles metropolitan center.

WORKED IN CALIFORNIA

In Los Angeles, Mr. Kirwan worked on the McHolland Aqueduct, and for short stretches at a power plant in Redlands, Calif., and as a brakeman on the Southern Pacific out of Bakersfield. In an oil field near Bakersfield, he earned $2 an hour in building a pool with sacks to contain the flow of a new 35,000-barrel well.

Before returning to Youngstown in 1911, he worked in lumber camps and cut wheat in Oklahoma and Texas.

Back at the Ohio Works, he was a railroader in 1911 and 1912. Beginning in 1912 he worked the winter months in Youngstown and the summer months for the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Lehigh Valley out of Atlantic City. He returned to Youngstown in 1916, was drafted into the Army in 1917, entering as a replacement in the 64th Artillery of the regular Army, composed of Ohioans.

After training at New Orleans, the unit left for France, four months after the United States entered the war.

Back here after the war, Mr. Kirwan returned to the Ohio Works. During the depression, his interest turned to politics, and he was elected 4th Ward councilman in 1931. Giving virtually full time to the job, he developed a record of public service.

The congressman was fond of recalling the advice of a Vindicator city hall reporter, Irving L. Mansell (now managing editor) when he entered city council, Mansell, he said, told him not to speak in his first term, but to listen. Becoming chairman of the council finance committee, he wielded an important influence in city politics for four years.

BEAT VETERAN REPUBLICAN FOR CONGRESS SEAT IN '36

In 1935 he entered the race for mayor but withdrew. A year later, he won the Democratic nomination for 19th District Congressman against eight rivals. The district then included three counties, Mahoning, Trumbull and Ashtabula. Mr. Kirwan was supported by the Townsend plan group, then regarded as radical.

In November, 1936, Kirwan won over Rep. John G. Cooper, Republican, who had served for 22 years.

In Washington to begin his term, Mr. Kirwan stayed at the Carroll-Arms Hotel, now the Capitol Hill Hotel. Another newcomer to Washington also stayed there—Lyndon Baines Johnson.

LONGTIME FRIEND OF LBJ

Their friendship lasted through the years and once at the LBJ ranch in Johnson City, when Kirwan was in a visiting congressional group the John- * * * chairman of the National Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. Success in electing Democratic congresses in the 1950s during the Eisenhower administration brought him great recognition.

Mr. Kirwan crossed President Franklin D. Roosevelt's wishes in June, 1939 by voting for the Townsend Bill because he believed government could and should do more for elderly people. Nevertheless, Roosevelt came here Oct. 11, 1940, to back up Kirwan's campaign for reelection.

In the 1940 presidential campaign, while backing Roosevelt, Mr. Kirwan braved unfavorable reaction to speak for building the nation's defenses, as war raged in Europe. That fall, he piled up an amazing majority of 46,492 votes.

VOTED FOR GUAM'S DEFENSE, LEND-LEASE TO AID ALLIES

To strengthen defenses, Mr. Kirwan voted for the Guam defense bill and lifting the embargo on arms shipments to future allies. He voted for the lend-lease bill, and after it passed Congress, Mr. Kirwan jubilantly carried it to the White House for presidential signature.

In a speech, Mr. Kirwan predicted war was sure to come. He resisted hundreds of telegrams against the Selective Service Act. He was one of only two Ohio representatives to back it.

WINS TRUMAN'S PRAISE

Mr. Kirwan's legislative skill brought praise from President Truman in 1949. Of his piloting the Interior Department bill through Congress, Mr. Truman remarked, "The Interior Bill was the best we've ever got through the House. Mike Kirwan deserves the major credit. He fought it through the appropriations subcommittee, through the full committee and finally through the House over the protests of the private power lobby. I think the world of Mike. In my opinion he is one of the most outstanding and ablest legislators we have in Congress."

Mr. Kirwan was an admirer of President Woodrow Wilson and had been on trains that shuttled his car. In his years as councilman, Mr. Kirwan studied much about Wilson and other famous Americans including Boies Penrose, famed Pennsylvania Republican boss of the late 19th century.

An array of writing by prominent correspondents as well as authors and columnists testifies to Mr. Kirwan's place in the history of his times. He was particularly happy to be included among the top 1,000 Americans since colonial times, in a publishing venture of the Gale Research Co., in March, 1968.

LISTED WITH TOP MEN

The noted author, Tristram Coffin, carried him among nationally prominent men in a series of articles on prominent men.

In recent years, Mr. Kirwan stayed at the University Club, quite a distance from the Capitol. He walked back and forth until his recent illnesses.

He delighted in telling how he got into the University Club, despite his very limited education. He had worked as a boy at Heidelberg Mine No. 1, and on entering the club, he simply replied "Heidelberg No. 1," when asked what his university affiliation was.

Shortly afterward he received a letter from someone visiting Heidelberg University in Germany which remarked, "It is surprising the number of professors here who remember you." This story is typical of many told about Mr. Kirwan, who relished humorous situations.

WAS A DEVOUT CATHOLIC; SAID ROSARY ON ARISING

But there was a very serious side to him. A devout Catholic and member of St. Brendan Church, Mr. Kirwan always said the Rosary on arising.

Mr. Kirwan took the nation's problems seriously. The U.S. Forestry people attest to that, and Mr. Kirwan is credited with going out of his way in a Denver visit to inspect the destruction wrought by spruce beetles and then getting appropriations which resulted in saving an estimated 12 billion board feet of lumber.

Agriculture and Interior Department secretaries in administration after administration found in Mr. Kirwan a sympathetic listener for their needs.

UDALL LISTS PROJECTS

Said Johnson's Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, "Everywhere you look, you see projects Kirwan supported for America. He has done more for conservation than anyone else in Congress."

Johnson's Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, said, "Kirwan is a professional, a pillar of strength in the Congress." The late U.S. Sen. Robert Kerr of Oklahoma in his book, "Land and Waters," devoted a full chapter to Mr. Kirwan, ranking him with the late President Theodore Roosevelt in accomplishment for conservation.

A few months after Mr. Kirwan took office, a $1 million improvement for Ashtabula and Conneaut harbors passed Congress. This was the beginning of the deluge of public works that flowed into all corners of the district, and through schools, bridges, roads, etc., touching and bettering the lives of virtually every resident.

BACKED TVA PROJECT

Returned for his second term, Mr. Kirwan joined four other Ohio representatives backing the controversial Tennessee Valley Authority, which he regarded as an example of conservation and development of natural resources for the public welfare.

The district in 1939, got $22 million in Works Progress Administration projects alone. In July there was a post office for Campbell and city hall for Lowellville.

Throughout 1940 he backed many water transportation, conservation and pollution programs. He obtained $110,750 in federal aid for Meander Reservoir and pledged his aid to fight for a satisfactory water supply for Warren.

His efforts for his district bore more fruit in January, 1942, when he personally broke ground for the $6-million Berlin Dam project. In July 1943 he took similar action for the $5-million Mosquito Reservoir. It was Mr. Kirwan's last-minute action in having the dam's appropriation inserted in the bill that saved it. Very few in the nation were approved that year, when war pressures virtually stopped public works. Mr. Kirwan argued effectively that the dam would protect the vital steel mills of the Mahoning Valley from drought and flood—and nature proved, a year or so later, that the protection was needed.

WAS PROUD OF STATUE SYMBOLIZING "MR. DEMOCRAT"

A simple man in many respects, Mr. Kirwan for several years treasured a statue of "Mr. Democrat" in his Washington office.

The statue shows an Irish workman with his sleeves rolled up, ready to fight. There were only five made, and Lyndon Johnson, while in Congress, gave his to the Youngstown congressman.

FOUR HAD COPY

Later, as President, LBJ borrowed it back for deposit in the $40-million Johnson Library being constructed in Texas. Another copy, given to FDR, is in the Hyde Park Museum.

It was Mr. Kirwan who made the statue famous and it always will be associated in the minds of Johnson and other Kirwan colleagues at Washington with the Irish-American congressman from Youngstown.

His service in government brought Mr. Kirwan national and even international recognition. Arkansas State University, Toledo Municipal University, and Vincennes University of Indiana, each conferred doctor of laws degrees on the Youngstown legislator.

HONORED BY YU

Oklahoma City University conferred on him a doctor of humanities degree; the University of Colorado, a degree of doctor of civil laws and Youngstown University, a degree of doctor of conservation.

Mr. Kirwan's brief biography in "Who's Who in America," lists membership only in the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. However, he received more than three-score citations and commendations during his career, and was made an honorary member of many organizations, including the Downtown Kiwanis Club and United Labor Congress. He also was admitted to Indian Tribes and given other symbolic memberships.

MET WORLD LEADERS

His travels as congressman brought him into contact with many of the world's leading statesmen, among them the former King of Greece. He also always was in close touch with the Irish ambassador to the United States, especially around St. Patrick's Day.

In his work as an appropriations subcommittee chairman, Mr. Kirwan visited project areas, frequently taking what might be regarded as unattractive congressional junkets to see the needs first-hand. One of these trips took him to American Samoa, and an educational television and radio station there is named after him.

ISLAND HOUSING PROJECTS WERE NAMED IN HIS HONOR

A housing project in Campbell is named for him; so is one on St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, where officials and citizens wanted to recognize the help he gave the islands while on the Interior appropriations subcommittee.

The Youngstown district has known Mr. Kirwan and supported him as a champion for water resource development here and as a congressman aggressive to get full considerations in federal allocations for education and other purposes.

FOUGHT FOR CANAL

Almost single-handed at times, Mr. Kirwan battled for the Ohio River-Lake Erie Waterway, and through his work a favorable recommendation was made on it. Opposition of Pennsylvania and lack of Ohio support have thus far frustrated accomplishment of "Kirwan's ditch," as some opponents dubbed it.

Despite frustration about the waterway, 1969 brought to a successful climax one of Mr. Kirwan's most cherished projects, an aquarium for the nation's capitol. Ground is to be broken when the federal new building freeze is lifted for the $10 million project, expected to become a top tourist attraction.

Citations and awards line the walls of Mr. Kirwan's congressional offices in Washington. Among them, perhaps, should be mentioned Time Magazine's calling him a "nation builder" in October, 1966; "Vision Future" Washington Memorial award of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress given in June, 1965; Ohio Valley Improvement Association honor in October, 1965; 55-year membership pin of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, June, 1968.

ESCORTED FDR HERE

Mr. Kirwan's association with presidents and others of the nation's great was extensive. He rode with the late President Roosevelt as he came to inspect plants here prior to the outbreak of World War II.

He campaigned with the late Adlai E. Stevenson in his Democratic presidential campaigns of 1952 and 1956. He made plane trips with JFK to the Far West, to Arkansas, to the funeral of House Speaker Sam Rayburn in Texas, and to view East Coast storm damage. In the 1968 campaign, he introduced Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey on the steps of Stambaugh Auditorium as he brought his presidential campaign to Youngstown.

GOT TRUMAN AS SPEAKER

Mr. Kirwan arranged the visit of former President Truman to Youngstown in 1962, and was responsible for a succession of distinguished Democrats speaking at Democratic dinners here. Once he even went out of his way to procure a distinguished Republican speaker for the Mahoning Valley McKinley Club's annual dinner.

Always at work for some project in the district, Mr. Kirwan was given much credit for getting a branch office of the federal district court here, and getting the appointment as U.S. district judge for Frank Battisti, who was elevated from the Mahoning County Common Pleas bench. He also helped to establish the Mahoning Valley Vocational School at the airport.

WAS CLOSE TO RAYBURN

Among Mr. Kirwan's intimates at Washington were the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn of Texas and the present speaker, John McCormack of Massachusetts.

Speaker McCormack has likened Mr. Kirwan's career to that of one of the Horatio Alger's heroes. Such public figures as Chief Justice Earl Warren and Presidents Johnson, Truman and Kennedy heaped praise on Mr. Kirwan for diligent work in Congress and in the field of conservation.

The late newspaper columnist, Raymond Clapper, once asserted that Mr. Kirwan got more federal money for his district than any other legislator. News columnists frequently commented on Mr. Kirwan's work, among them Drew Pearson, who sometimes got into Kirwan's hair over what he termed "pork-barrel" conservation projects. Mr. Kirwan always was quick to respond.

WON ELECTIONS EASILY

While Mr. Kirwan won elections to Congress in the 1936 FDR landslide by a comparatively small majority, he had wider margins in most elections therafter. Often nothing more than what might be termed "token opposition," appeared.

In 1938 he had perhaps his narrowest fight, winning over the late Atty. William P. Barnum, who had been a common pleas judge and county Republican chairman. In recent elections, Mr. Kirwan often received 65 to 70 per cent of the vote cast, and the 19th Ohio district came to be regarded as a safe Democratic district.

As a campaigner, even after many years of service, Mr. Kirwan was a man-to-man operator, often traveling around the district day after day, seeing people. In some recent campaigns, however, he became so deeply involved in the national effort that he had little time to spend here. His friends carried on for him, and in quick visits he managed to cover much territory.

SENT FLAGS TO SCHOOLS

Mr. Kirwan sent scores of American flags to schools, veterans posts, Scout troops and other organizations after they had flown over the Capitol. Few knew that each involved considerable expense to him.

Mr. Kirwan was a special guest and speaker at hundreds of dedications over the nation, among them the Honolulu Harbor modernization project dedicated in 1959.

His wide interests showed up at every turn in his career. For instance, he was instrumental in obtaining the designation of William Holmes McGuffey's boyhood home in Coitsville Township as an historic site. He also was credited with getting the royal Spanish portraits for the Arms Museum in Youngstown.

Volunteers of America named him to their National Advisory Board in 1964, and he took a keen interest in their work.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, once again one of the favorite whipping boys of the Congress has come before the House of Representatives for consideration today and tomorrow. I refer to the Agricultural Act.

There will be those in this Chamber who will be voting against this bill for economy, because this happens to be an agricultural act. I certainly cannot disagree with economizing in Government, but I wonder where some of them are when some of the other bills come up. It is rather strange to take a head count and to see that we have some economy-minded Members when only agricultural bills are involved, but when some of their urban bills come before this House they never think about economy.

I believe it is time to economize across the board. The people who want to economize here are looking and judging two areas, first they say that we can save money here, and second, they say we can go back to an older program, and that this bill is not needed.

I believe they are ignoring the true purpose of an agricultural act; that is, to retire unneeded land. We are blessed in this Nation with the gift of being able to produce more food and fiber than we can consume. Thank goodness we have that blessing.

The purpose of our agricultural program is not to guarantee an annual income to the farmers, and it is not to preserve any one farmer on the farm. If it were, a limitation on payments would, of course, work and be advisable. But the very purpose and intent of the farm program is to restrict and to hold production in line with consumption.

With this in mind the Committee on Agriculture, in a bipartisan effort, working with the administration, has come forth with the only agricultural bill that will be coming before this Congress this year.

Here again we are being advised, "Just defeat that bill before the House of Representatives and we will come back with a better bill." This ignores the fact that the Committee on Agriculture has been working for the last year and a half constantly toward developing a new farm program, a program that will let farmers realize a greater income, a greater share of our great national wealth.

Those people who are proposing that we defeat this bill tomorrow are ignoring the fact that we are reaching the end of this session of the Congress and that the existing programs will end with the harvesting of the crops this year. There just will not be enough time for us to come back this year with any other farm bill.

Agriculture is a basic industry. It is one of the two basic industries we have in the country today. The economists here well know that the basic industries, of course, are mining and farming.

Agriculture is basic because nobody else touches the product before the farmer produces it. It is basic also be-

cause, as has been said this afternoon, if the farmer does not make money no one else is going to make money. Our Nation's economy is dependent upon a healthy and prosperous farm economy.

We all must admit that our economy is somewhat delicate today. Perhaps just the slightest bit of lack of confidence shown by the Government, by the Members here, to indicate that we want to change that economy, might be the straw that breaks the camel's back. I do not believe anyone here wants to take that chance.

Sure we want to save money. But is it really saving money for the American consumers? Every one of us is a consumer. We are eating today cheaper in percentage of spendable dollars than ever before in the history of the Nation, and we are eating cheaper than any other civilized nation in the world. We must continue to provide the foodstuffs on the shelves of our stores of this Nation.

Yes, too many of us take for granted, when we go down to the grocery store, that the products will be there. We do not realize where it comes from, why it got there or how it got there.

It is because the farmer has stayed technically ahead of all other industries, doing a more efficient job. The farmer has been able to do the job which was discussed this afternoon, of meeting the cost squeeze. There is a price, wage and cost squeeze that the farmer has met and has still been able to stay in business. He has done it by efficiency and some help from Federal farm programs.

All of us are consumers. This bill is a consumers bill. What will happen if this bill is defeated? Agriculture will, of course, survive, but many of the people who are now calling themselves farmers in this country, will not be around. What will be the actual result to the consumers? The taxpayers of this Nation are going to pay a lot more through increased food prices. The railroads have been mentioned here. We have seen where railroads have been consolidated today. We do not have nearly as many competitive railroads today. Look at the dilemma they are in. Competition is healthy. If we have to help competition by making sure that we keep the little farmer out on the farm, the way to do it is to enact the legislation before us today.

A farm program is needed to keep our agriculture economy healthy, to maintain a stable national economy.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of H.R. 18546, the Agricultural Act of 1970. I hope the membership will support this bill and the one committee amendment. Tomorrow a substitute amendment will be offered and I rise in opposition to the amendment to put the limitation on subsidy payments at a most unrealistic level of $20,000. Such action will only serve to wreck the agricultural industry which we are so valiantly trying to preserve with the bill under debate. If this amendment were passed it might well result in defeat for the Agricultural Act of 1970. I feel sure my colleagues who are so determined to limit subsidy payments would not want this to happen. If they had taken the time to study the agricultural situation, they would know that without a new farm bill we will revert back to the legislation in effect in 1958. This would prove disastrous to agriculture within 3 years and would prove to be much more costly to the Government than allowing a total of $55,000 in subsidy payments as provided for in H.R. 18546.

Let us consider some other industries. Manufacturers readily regulate production to prevent price disasters. Because of their large numbers, farmers historically have not been able to do this without a farm program to serve as a guide. The farm bill we have under consideration with a realistic maximum payment level of $55,000 permits them to do this.

The farm program has worked the past few years and will continue to work in the future only if we set the guidelines for farmers to cooperate in diverting acreage from surplus crop production into soil-conserving uses. Many do this at a financial sacrifice because they know balanced supplies are in the best interest of all.

It should also be noted that the large farmers at whom this amendment is pointed realize that without a farm bill they would unwillingly drive small farmers out of business because of their less efficient operations. I would remind my urban colleagues who are supporting this amendment that when the small farmer leaves the country he heads straight for the big city which results in increased pressure on the urban areas.

All who cooperate earn, and are entitled to, reasonable compensation for acreage diversion. Nowhere have I heard of a limitation on payments when a city takes real estate for urban renewal, or when a State takes land for a highway. Would my colleagues be willing to set a limit on how much could be paid under eminent domain proceedings for the Interstate Highway System, no matter how much land was in question. I know I wouldn't and I don't think they would.

The farmer who is asked or required to divert 100 acres from surplus production expects to be paid more than his next door neighbor with comparable land for 50 acres of diversion. And why not? His investment is twice as great, his taxes twice as great, and his risk is twice as great.

The farm bill is not a welfare program. To be effective in balancing production it must fit into the free enterprise concept that a man is rewarded in terms of the value of his contributions. Program payments reimburse farmers for income they forego and expenses they incur when they divert land from crop production to carry out our farm policy. Farm incomes have not attained a parity with nor the stability of incomes in most of our economy. Unreasonable limits on payments and the accompanying disruption in the farm workforce and in our rural communities will add further to urban congestion as noted previously.

And to those who assume that money will be saved by limiting payments, I say that is simply not true if the same result of supply management is to be achieved. If one large farmer who has been foregoing production on 1,000 acres does not cooperate in these programs because of an unreasonable limitation on payments, that means 100 small farmers will have to forego production on 10 more acres each to maintain supply and demand stability. I believe you can readily see that this would cost more, not only in Federal funds, but in further curtailment of opportunity for smaller farmers.

The farm program as proposed is designed to adjust production and supply, to avoid burdensome surpluses and to strengthen the national economy. Reasonable payments are an integral part of the farm program. To impose oppressive limitations, is to undermine if not destroy this important program.

While limitations are aimed at the larger farmers, to impose an unreasonable limitation will strike hardest at the smaller farmers. With extremely low limitations the larger farmers will be forced out of the program, bringing about its collapse and thereby denying the benefits to the small farmers as well. Without a farm program large farmers may survive, but the small ones could not.

I strongly urge the Members of the House to reject any attempts to reduce the limitation on payments below the $55,000 level.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, as the time grows nigh for the conclusion of general debate on this pending legislation I would like to add my remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the deliberations on this bill have taken some 17 months, I cannot in the very few minutes that have been allotted to me today express my feelings, my anxieties, my hopes, and my desires with regard to this legislation brought before us today.

However, for the serious student of the subject of American agriculture, in addition to the debate and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will be available for study I commend to that student the complete works of the Committee on Agriculture, a compilation of which would reflect the history, the true spirit, the objectives and intent of this legislative effort.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, while H.R. 18546, the Poage-Belcher bill, does not measure up in a number of respects to what I believe we should have in a farm bill, it is the result of a good-faith effort by members of the House Committee on Agriculture to reach a satisfactory compromise. I am therefore supporting it as representing what I believe to be the bare minimum essential for maintaining a stable economy for both the producer and consumer of agricultural products. I also believe it is the best bill which can be passed under existing circumstances, and that the alternative to it is probably no bill at all at this session. In view of the great amount of time and effort taken

to get H.R. 18546 to the floor, it seems clear that if the House should reject this bill there simply will not be time enough to get another bill on the track and passed first by the House and then by the other body. This means the law, which has authorized our farm price-support programs since 1965, will expire as scheduled at the end of this year and we will revert to permanent agricultural legislation. In the absence of new legislation to replace the expiring statutes, the 1949 price-support law will automatically go into effect with a return to depressed farm prices and excessive Government-owned stockpiles of grain. It is clear that such conditions will benefit neither the consumer nor the farmer.

According to most historians, the agricultural revolution began several decades after the industrial revolution, but, once started, the farmer has been rapidly catching up in productive techniques. In the last decade industrial productivity per man-hour increased at an annual rate of 3 percent. The productivity of the average farmer, on the other hand, increased at the rate of 6 percent per year. One hour of farm labor now produces seven times as much food as it did in 1920. One farmer today produces enough food and fiber for himself and 44 others. Only 10 years ago this figure was 24 and in 1949 it was just 14.

Last year each of us consumed 182 pounds of red meat, 260 pounds of vegetables and 563 pounds of dairy products. Never before in the history of the world has the housewife had the opportunity to choose from such a wide variety of foods at such reasonable prices. The average American family is currently spending only 16.5 percent of its income after taxes for food. One year ago this figure was 17.2 percent. Twenty years ago it was 22.2 percent. By way of comparison, the average family in Western Europe allocates 25 percent of its disposable income for food, while the figures in the Soviet Union and Asia are 50 percent and 75 percent respectively.

This cornucopia of superabundance, however, has been a mixed blessing. Low farm prices have forced thousands, even millions, of farm families from the land into the complex urban environment for which all too often many were ill-prepared. At the same time the hourly earnings of manufacturing workers have increased since 1950 by 131 percent and corporate dividends by 235 percent. But the farmers' average return in 1967–69 was 3 percent below the comparable 3-year base of 1947–49. The prices received for the three major farm crops—corn, wheat and soybeans—were actually considerably lower than those received a score of years ago. For example, the average price received for corn last year was $1.12 compared to $1.68 20 years ago.

Since 1948 the U.S. population has increased by 36 percent while the farm population has decreased by 50 percent. In this same span of time, the number of farms has dropped from 5.7 million to 2.9 million, and the migration to the cities continues.

An additional 100 million people will inhabit the United States by the year 2000. This will present an ever greater challenge to the American farmer who up until now has always been able to furnish the American housewife with an abundant supply of nutritious, wholesome food when and where she wants it. But the continued ability of the farmer to feed and clothe our Nation's growing population in the future will be contingent upon his receiving a much more adequate return for his labor and invested capital than he is receiving at the present time. And it is in the consumer's own best interest to see to it that the farmer receives it, for an adequate supply of consumer goods simply cannot be forthcoming in the absence of a prosperous and thriving agriculture. This must be made clear to the 95 percent of our population not residing on farms if we are to have a workable agricultural policy. Whether we represent rural or urban districts, it is our duty as Congressmen to bring consumers a better understanding of the problems of the farmers who produce their food and clothing.

For farming is big business. Agriculture is the Nation's largest industry employing 4.6 million workers—more than the combined employment in the transportation, public utilities, steel and automotive industries combined. The 4.6 total steel requirement for machines and building materials was 6.5 million tons, ⅓ as much as was required by Detroit. As you can clearly see, gentlemen, a strong agricultural economy is absolutely essential to the economic welfare of the Nation.

The farmer has also more than shouldered his share of the burden of maintaining a favorable balance of international payments, thereby halting the outflow of gold from our country. Agriculture is the one sector of our economy which has continually had a favorable balance of trade.

Last year, farm products valued at $5.7 billion were shipped abroad. More than $1.1 billion went to Japan alone. Since 1945 agricultural exports have exceeded $100 billion, making us the world's leading exporter of farm products.

Another source of confusion arises from the fact that agricultural appropriations bills include many items which public opinion charge exclusively to farmers, when they in fact inure to the benefit of the general public.

A large share of agricultural appropriations bills customarily directly or indirectly benefit a broad segment of the U.S. population. Nonfarmers actually participate in a larger share of the Agriculture Department's expenditures than farmers themselves. For example, approximately 55 percent of the items included in the 1970 budget for the USDA were for services of primary benefit to the general public, and less than 45 percent were for programs of direct benefit to farmers.

It should be evident to any reasonable observer that the American farmer has not received his fair share of the Nation's prosperity for many years. He works long and hard and incurs great financial risk, yet farm income has gone up only 18 percent in the last 20 years while national income in general has gone up 255 percent. The housewife unfairly blames the farmer for the cost of food, when as a matter of fact he receives only 39 cents of the consumer's food dollar, only 2.4 cents from the sale of a 31-cent box of corn flakes.

H.R. 18546, the Poage-Belcher bill, will afford the American farmer a chance to receive at least some measure of economic justice while meeting the challenge of increased needs for food and clothing from our growing population. It is the product of the best bipartisan effort of which the Agriculture Committee was capable under the leadership of its Democratic Chairman BOB POAGE and its ranking Republican member PAGE BELCHER. It is a fair compromise representing a total victory for no individual or group and in all likelihood the only farm bill on which this House will have an opportunity to vote this year. When one considers the alternative which is no bill at all and revision to permanent legislation, the Poage-Belcher bill should be much more acceptable both to urban and rural interests.

I have purposely reserved comment on the various proposals for payment limitations until the time when the bill is being read for amendments. Whatever the decision as to limitations, I respectfully urge all Members to vote for the Poage-Belcher bill on final passage.

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

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the Agricultural Act of 1970, H.R. 18546, as reported out of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

> Cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens. They are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous. . . . But our citizens will find employment till their numbers—and, of course, their productions—become too great for the demand, both internal and foreign.

That statement made in 1785 in a letter to John Jay, the U.S. Supreme Court's first Chief Justice, still holds true today.

Farming is still the Nation's largest single industry, with almost $85 billion worth of business transacted every year. Forty percent of this Nation's jobs are farm related, with produce manufacturing and marketing, the farm equipment industry, and other related industries involved in the business of keeping this Nation supplied with food—the essence of life itself.

This fact, Mr. Chairman, is one that my colleagues and I must certainly bear in mind as we consider the merits and shortcomings of this legislation.

While this is a farm bill that represents many compromises, I am convinced that this legislation is vital to the continued success of our agricultural production and essential to the stability of this Nation's entire economy.

There are four basic points of this bill that necessitate the measure's passage.

First, the bill allows farmers more freedom to manage his farm by removing some of the more stringent restrictions put into effect in earlier legislation.

Second, it allows the farmer to go back to the marketplace for a determination of his prices for most goods.

Third, it will protect the income of our farming population during the transition from heavy dependence on the Federal Government to increasingly less dependence on the Government.

Fourth, it provides for limitations on payments to farmers participating in the cotton, feed grain, and wheat programs.

I am prepared to support that limitation, Mr. Chairman, because I am convinced that such a limitation is a giant step in the right direction, a step toward phasing out all subsidies and sending the farmer back to the marketplace to find a fair price for his goods.

If it is this body's decision to limit those payments to $55,000 per crop, I will hail it as a momentous action, since such a decision would represent a reduction in payments of as much as $2,945,000 as compared with presently acceptable levels. I have long held that these unlimited payments have tended to favor the large and wealthy farmers while greatly discriminating against the small and middle-size farm operation. But if it is the will of this Congress to establish lower limitations of payments, I will still support the bill, because we simply cannot jerk the rug from under the American farmer all at once. These are the Americans hit worst by inflation, with the increased cost of labor and equipment and a decrease in farm prices. This is not the time to desert him.

Let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, that if this legislation is not passed—if the current farm legislation is allowed to expire—then we must be prepared to face a major economic crisis.

The Agricultural Act of 1958, which would again become our farm policy if this legislation fails to pass, includes one of the most unfair and short-sighted provisions ever passed by the U.S. Congress. The old two-price cotton system would be reinstated, placing our textile industries at a further disadvantage than they have already experienced, and allowing foreign industry to purchase cotton at a lower price than our domestic textile industries.

Foreign markets grow increasingly richer while domestic industries struggle under great tax burdens. This is a deplorable situation, Mr. Chairman, and I am strongly opposed to any action—or inaction—of this Congress, which would further upset an already unfavorable balance.

This measure which we consider today also specifically guarantees competitive success to class I base plan dairy markets by established producers outside the market order areas, suspends the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm-separated cream, and permits the Secretary of Agriculture to use discretion in setting the support price on butter together with other milk products. The measure also extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by Commodity Credit Corporation to the armed services and veterans hospitals, and continues his authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers.

In addition, feed grain producers who participate in Government programs will be eligible for payments on a portion of their feed grain production. Corn growers will be assured of a return of not less than $1.35 per bushel through a combination of marketprice and direct payments on about one-half of their normal corn production.

The Secretary of Agriculture and his associates have had more than 24 evening meetings in an effort to work out the differences of opinion on the bill and to put together a complete and effective farm package.

Let us never forget, Mr. Chairman, that even with the cost of farm programs, the American consumer spends less of his income for food than anyone in any other nation in the world.

As Jefferson said, we owe the stability of our entire economy to the American farmer. Let us not desert him in this time of crisis.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the comparatively few members of the Committee on Agriculture who is opposed to this bill. I do not consider subsidies to be immoral or always unwise, but these farm programs in my view simply have not worked. I represent a large agricultural district in California and fortunately for me it is one which is not involved in these programs. It is an area where the agricultural producers have done better over the years than those in areas relying on subsidies and controls.

Certainly we have our ups and downs, but I am thoroughly convinced that these programs have not been successful.

I will cite you some figures to bear out that point. In 1950 the price of corn per bushel was $1.44. Today it is $1.24, down, of course.

Wheat in 1950 was $1.99 per bushel. Today it is $1.23 per bushel.

Oats in 1950 were 76 cents per bushel. Today they are 58 cents per bushel.

Cotton in 1950 was 39 cents per pound. Today it is 22½ cents per pound.

Soybeans, $2.93 per bushel in 1950, and today they are $2.72 per bushel.

Cottonseed was $52 per ton in 1950, and today it is around $48 to $50.

Beef cattle, not in the program, not supported, in 1950 were $24.40 per hundredweight. Today they are $27.90 per hundredweight.

Hogs, in 1950, were $20.90 per hundredweight. Today they are $23.90 per hundredweight.

The same thing could be said with accuracy and with justification for fruits and vegetables. Fruit and vegetable prices are considerably better today than they were in 1950 and that, in my opinion, is because we rely on a free market rather than a program of subsidies and controls.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I know of no one for whom I have a higher regard, but the approach which the gentleman is making I have had made to me many, many times—by those who said, "we are not under the farm program."

Having served for many years as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture, I would like to say this—in the perishable food area, they are under the best farm program there is.

Section 32 of the Agriciultural Adjustment Act provides 30 percent of import duties which is used to buy up surpluses of these commodities. When you buy up these surpluses, you do not need any other program. If you bought up the surpluses in the commodities covered in this bill you would need no other program.

Mr. Chairman, I have had beef producers say, "We do not have any support prices and we do not want any. We do not want any farm program." If they took away the support price on feed, every cattleman I know would go broke in 30 days and so I have told them.

So I say to my friend, the gentleman from California, he can go to the Department and have them buy up the surplus dates, and surplus vegetables, and surplus raisins, surplus oranges, and grapefruit, and surplus this, that, and the other. The best program that we have is that which we have for perishable commodities where by buying surplus we match supply with demand.

It is true, your area does not come under this program, but you do come under other provisions of the farm program. In my opinion that is the reason we have so much trouble with any agricultural legislation; so many folks have Section 32 funds, they do not have any interest in the rest of it.

Would the gentleman answer that?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. That portion of this food program to which you referred, the dollar volume is $3 or $4 billion.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now you are getting to talk about the matter of money and you are getting away from the principle, but you are out from under this program but you are under the other.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Perhaps the gentleman did not understand my opening statement. I am not opposed to subsidies as a matter of morality standards.

I think in this case they have not worked and have not been successful.

I would like to discuss a possible motion to recommit.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will take only a few seconds of the gentleman's time.

May I say to the gentleman that I have never believed in the payment approach. I thought it would be misunderstood by some and misused by others. Time has proved I have been right about that, but when I say that we live in an economy where the minimum wage is fixed by law and where the average wage is $2.94 because of the laws that we pass for collective bargaining and the producer, the agricultural producer, has to buy everything he uses in a market where labor costs are protected by law I say that anything you pay—and some folks call it a subsidy—is nothing in the world but enabling the agricultural producer except the producers of perishables, who have their section 32, to live in a society where

all other elements are protected and he has to pay the money for this protection every time he buys anything with which to produce. He cannot do it without going down, and history shows if farming goes down the rest of the economy is pulled down with it.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. They are down instead of up, and those other areas of agriculture which are not under subsidy are doing better.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the motion to recommit, it has not been determined whether I will be making the motion to recommit. But if I do, I think it is only fair to state to my colleagues, it may be—and I say "may"—I am not making any promise—it may be a motion to instruct to strike all of the titles except the dairy, wool and Public Law 480 sections of the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the new farm bill now before the House is a compromise of many views. I think it is fair to say that generally speaking the pending bill is not enthusiastically supported by rank and file farmers and farm organizations. A major problem is that the current farm law expires at the end of this year and Congress and the administration are under heavy responsibility to come forward with farm legislation.

The committee has faced a very difficult situation and has worked long and faithfully to produce a satisfactory measure.

We are indeed confronted in the field of agriculture with very serious problems. I regret to say that I am fearful that we have seen the best farm programs that we will ever see. But, I would hope that we have not come to the end of farm programs which with all their faults and shortcomings, have been helpful in enabling the producers to do an outstanding job for the consumers.

I know that there are those who will speak, and there are those who have spoken today in favor of drastic payment limitation amendments. Mr. Chairman I want to reassert my unalterable opposition to payment limitations on farm programs. One of the reasons why the programs of the past, with all their faults, have been workable has been that they have operated with the objective of fairness to producers in all parts of the nation and to the big and the little producer alike.

Mr. Chairman, the RECORD of the proceedings of today may be very important in the history of American agriculture. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings of tomorrow may become a historic document.

I speak of the fact that this RECORD contains the speech of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and other distinguished members of the committee.

I would like to make reference to another document which I hold in my hand. It is the report on the agricultural appropriation bill for the current fiscal year which was issued by the Committee on Appropriations on June 3. This was issued by the full Committee on Appropriations. But the subcommittee which handled the hearings and brought this bill to the full committee and the House was headed by the distinguished friend of agriculture, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

I would like to help round out this debate by quoting from sections of the report prepared by the House Committee on Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee. Our discussion today of the significance of agriculture would be incomplete without a review of some of the key points developed in that excellent report.

The committee stated:

Some, but not enough, people know that the few on the farm free the rest of us to provide the machines and gadgets of modern-day living. Many people do not stop to realize that those who have left the farm have been replaced by machines and expensive materials; and that the man on the farm has to have sufficient income to buy the machines, equipment, chemicals and other materials; otherwise many people now in our cities, who make the machines, would have to go back to the farm as we saw in the depression of the late 20's and 30's.

The Department of Agriculture, identified with 5.1 percent of our people on the farm, in reality represents that 94.9 percent of the nonfarmers more closely than does any other department, for it represents the source of food, clothing and shelter for all Americans, and further, represents the largest individual market for labor and industry.

Mr. Chairman, to understand these programs we must understand the significance of farming as a market for the products this Nation produces. The Appropriation's Committee report stated as follows:

The producers of agricultural products spend nearly $30 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock; another $12 billion a year is spent for the same products that urban residents purchase—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances, and other products and services. Each year the farmers' purchases include $3.4 billion in new farm vehicles, machinery, and equipment. It takes 120,000 nonfarm employees to produce this farm equipment alone.

His annual purchases also include $3.4 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance of machinery and motor vehicles. Farm production uses more petroleum than any other single industry. Each year the farmer buys products containing 320 million pounds of rubber—about 9 percent of the total used in the United States, or enough to put tires on nearly 6 million automobiles. He consumes 28 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Every year he uses 5 million tons of steel in the form of machinery, trucks, cars, fencing, and building materials. Farm use of steel accounts for 40,000 jobs in the steel industry.

In addition to describing the importance of the agriculture markets, the committee report on the appropriation bill also described why our rural farmland is being abandoned in favor of congested urban areas. The appropriations report included the following observations on this point.

The number of agricultural producers providing food and fiber for our rapidly expanding population continues to decline and is now down to about 5 percent of the people in this country. Trained and experienced farm labor is in increasingly short supply.

Long hours of hard work, more rigorous living conditions, hazards of weather, threats from insects and diseases, increasing financial risks, and decreasing financial returns are causing farming to become less and less attractive to each succeeding generation of young people. Fewer and fewer farm children are turning to farming as a career. More and more of their parents are moving to "greener pastures" in town as the monetary return for their labor, investment, and managerial skills decrease on the farm.

As a business venture, farming is becoming less attractive as the necessary farm investment increases and the net return on the investment decreases. Figures from the Department of Agriculture show that average farm investment has increased nearly fourteenfold in the past 25 years, from $6,158 in 1940 to $85,402 in 1969. They also indicate that the average return on farm equities has dropped more than 50 percent during this period, from 7.1 percent in 1945–9 to 3.1 percent in 1968.

It is entirely understandable, therefore, why fewer and fewer people are remaining on the Nation's farms, and why some 5 percent of our population on the farms is now feeding the other 95 percent in addition to themselves. This undesirable imbalance can be expected to be further aggravated as movement away from agriculture continues.

The report also treated of the efficiency of American agriculture as follows:

The efficiency of American agriculture has been a blessing to the consumers of the world. It has provided a plentiful supply of wholesome and nutritious foods which U.S. consumers have come to accept and take for granted. It has produced quantities in excess of domestic needs which have become a significant factor in our international programs of aid and assistance to the less fortunate peoples in other nations of the world.

Because of the remarkable achievements of American agriculture, the people of the United States for years have enjoyed a standard of living never before attained anywhere in the world.

Mr. Chairman, as we consider this farm legislation today it must be remembered that agriculture is absolutely basic to our further progress as a nation. I quote further from the June report of the Appropriations Committee on the agriculture appropriation bill:

In the opinion of the Committee, the growing tendency to consider agriculture as a less essential part of our national economy, and to reduce funds needed for its continued support, threatens our Nation at home and abroad. It could have a serious effect on the future food supply of this country and could weaken our ability to meet our future responsibilities as a leader of the nations of the world.

History teaches us that the food-deficit countries of the world started on their decline by failing to give adequate attention to the protection and development of their basic natural resources. They failed to provide necessary protection and development through research, control of insects and diseases, conservation and other programs needed to assure the preservation of their capacity to meet the needs of their people for food, clothing, and shelter. This is true of nearly every country we aid today. We must not make the same mistake.

One of our major problems today is that, though agriculture is our best market for industry and labor and the most economical supplier of the consumer, so few people are engaged in agriculture that its voice is weak in the legislative halls of a majority of the States and of the Nation. No longer does agriculture figure prominently in the planning

of those who would appeal to the majority. This leaves a major task for those who recognize that the national welfare depends on a sound and healthy agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, it is most important, most vitally important, especially to the poor, the consumers, and the people in the urban areas that we have a satisfactory farm program. I hope that the information which has been supplied in this debate and which is included in my statement will help set this whole picture in better perspective.

There must be conditions when agriculture and the people in agriculture can continue to do a magnificent job for the people of the Nation and for the people of the world who, in one way or the other, rely heavily upon the economy, the prosperity and the stability of American agriculture.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY).

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late. The attendance is light. I shall be brief.

Mr. Chairman, I am concluding 26 years on this committee, 28 years in the House. I have seen a lot of bills go through the Committee on Agriculture. I have seen bills come out with wide differences between the members. Strangely enough, as controversial as this measure appears to be, there is now more unanimity among the members than there has ever been on any major piece of farm legislation.

This bill was reported by a vote of 27 to 6. It has bipartisan support. It is supported by the Department of Agriculture. It is supported by the President of the United States, and it is supported by a vast majority of the farmers of this Nation, as well as the committee.

The bill has been almost 18 months in preparation. We began the discussion and consideration of a general farm bill way back in February of last year. After all of these long months that which is before you is the product of our effort.

I know that there are some few little points in the bill that some of us disagree with. I know some amendments will be offered. I can appreciate the fact that some of the Members feel so strongly about their views that they feel it incumbent upon them to offer amendments. Frankly, I would like to offer some amendments, but I know that a piece of legislation of this kind is the result of people sitting down, working together, adjusting their views and coming to compromise. A piece of legislation such as this, so large, so broad, affecting so many thousands of people throughout this land from coast to coast, cannot be assembled in any other manner. Refusal to compromise would have meant no bill at all.

I command the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for his sensible and sound remarks. There are a few things, as he says, about this bill that he does not like; but he said he was going to support it because he knows it is the best we can get. And after all, it being the best we can get, it is not bad.

There is a great deal of good in this bill and there are literally thousands of farmers throughout these United States who are waiting for the bell to ring tomorrow night telling them that this bill has been passed. I can tell the Members now there are millions of consumers who feel the same way—and they should, or else the price of the food that goes on their tables in the months and years ahead might be at such a level that they cannot afford to pay for it. This is just as much a consumer bill as it is a farm bill.

We compromised on the subject of acreage set aside—a favorite administration provision—we compromised on the subject of limitation of payments. We compromised on so-called parity. The Members know I like parity. I am like many other Members of this Congress. I ran on a ticket for 100 percent of parity, just as many others did. I got here and found out I did not have a chance to get it, so I took what I could get. I am not so much interested in parity as I am in cold cash. I am interested in a dollar-and-cents return. This bill provides a specific dollar-and-cents return to my farmers, irrespective of whether or not there is a reference to parity. For some commodities a level of return at a percentage of parity is provided for in the bill. For them, parity is made the income return yardstick, and for some others it is not. So we compromised on this issue. In the end all will come out about the same.

We compromised on marketing quotas, on acreage allotments, and on open-end planting. I did not like open-end planting. I still do not like it, but that is a part of the compromise. It is in the bill and I am going to support it.

I see my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), over here, I did not intend to make reference to it, but he does not like limitation of payment—that is, below a certain level. The gentleman probably has more farmers in his district than any member of this committee, but he picked out a limitation-of-payments level that would take care of his farmers and leave them untouched. He has only 21 farmers in his district who will be affected by his amendment, and even then only slightly. He is not against payments. He is for payments. He is for payments that will reach the pockets of every one of the farmers in his district 100 percent—except 21 of them, and he is willing to give them $20,000 each. He endorses the principle of payments to farmers. He recognizes the necessity for such for his farmers. And he makes sure that each and all of them, 27,540 in all, are fully taken care of, that is, all but 21 and even them to the tune of $20,000 each.

I am sure my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), who used to be a member of our committee, sat up many nights to determine just exactly where he could draw this line so he could take care of all his farmers. Now, if the gentleman did not do that he can tell us about it tomorrow.

I know there are some farm organizations that say they are not for this bill. But they do not say they are opposing it. There is one that says it is against it. I do not know if this organization has ever been for any general farm bill that came on this floor in the last 15 or 20 years.

It has been against every single bill that has come to this floor from this committee—and sometimes I have found myself with them—and never for anything. Actually, at the national level it is not representing the farmers of the United States or even its own members, and the people of this Chamber know it.

The other farm organizations, which call themselves the coalition, are not fighting this bill. They have not sent messages around to defeat it. They know that if this bill is killed they will in all probability be without a farm program, and they will be in a heck of a shape if they do not have one.

Mr. Chairman, we have a choice to make tomorrow. The choice is, Do we have a program or do we not?

It is going to be very easy to find some little "ifs" and "buts" here and there that one does not like. Let me tell the Members now it is not a question of having another farm bill out of the Committee on Agriculture on the floor of the House this year. This is the bill. This is it. There will be no other. It is this or else. When the Members go home, if we do not see fit to pass this bill, they can tell their farmers that they threw away the only opportunity they had to take care of them.

Now some concluding remarks about limitation on payments.

Our farmers have been through some rough times lately, and it is not just the big farmer, or the small farmer, it is all farmers. A payment limitation of $20,000 will be the straw that broke the camel's back for many of them.

I have heard a lot of talk lately from urban Congressmen about how their constituents are calling for an end to farm payments. But I ask our city neighbors if they would like to have their entire life savings, and even their entire life, wrapped up in a business such as farming. The price of farm labor is up 63 percent, the price of farm motor vehicles is up 35 percent, and taxes have increased 129 percent in the last decade. But the price of cotton and wheat is less than it was even 20 years ago. The net income of farmers from crop production—including Government payments—has declined sharply in the period from 1966 to 1969.

Even so, farmers are not sitting around waiting for doomsday. They are trying their best to overcome these obstacles through innovation, invention, and the sweat of their brow.

From 1966 to 1969, the output per man-hour of labor in crop production rose 9.1 percent, while the output of nonfarm labor rose only 5.4 percent. Rising productivity not only moderated the impact of lower returns and higher costs on farm income, but it gave our country one great example of how inflation should be fought. If all Americans were increasing their efficiency as much as farmers, we could have inflation under control.

What attitude will the U.S. Congress adopt toward the people who grow our

farm crops? It is the height of irony that some of my colleagues are singling out this very great record of productivity for special attack. They advocate a plan of payment of limitations which would have the effect of killing off the most efficient farmers and who have been the very spearhead of rising productivity.

No one can deny that the larger farmers are the leaders in adopting efficient methods, which are quickly passed on to their smaller neighbors. Obviously the large operators are best equipped with both the means and the attitudes to experiment with the new techniques which bring higher productivity. It has been clearly demonstrated that the larger growers are the leaders in group efforts of farmers to finance the research and education which are more and more essential to continued agricultural progress.

The chance to grow in size is a goal which stimulates producers in every field to work and strive toward more efficiency. Stifle that chance through governmental discrimination, and you will stifle the whole thrust of rising farm productivity. I favor special provisions to take care of small farmers and I support such. But I do not favor the destruction of our larger farms and farmers.

The farmers in my own State of Mississippi are banding together in pockets here and there to fight the boll weevil together through a boll weevil diapause control program. By doing so they are reducing the cost of growing cotton. They are buying eight and 12 row equipment to reduce the requirement for labor. They are combining operations so that one pass across the fields will do more than one job. They are only asking for time to get their cost of production below the selling price of their product. They are making progress, considerable progress, but they need more time.

The limitations idea is promoted with the false claim that the larger farmers do not need government to survive. Payments are likened to some sort of welfare program. The truth is that high and rising costs affect producers at every size of scale.

The large producers know they cannot survive if they must go it alone in competition with small farmers who are subsidized by Government payments on all of their production. Their only recourse will be to move into other crops where their production and efficiency will not be penalized. Already the large farmers, out of the fear that limitations will be imposed, are putting their land on the market, only to find there is no market. If such a policy is adopted, there will be a wholesale breaking up of farms into small units, and the leadership of this Nation's progress in efficient crop production will be lost.

As you vote tomorrow I urge you to bear these thoughts in mind.

I strongly urge you to support our bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what a payment limitation would hit cotton hardest and would hit feed grains, my type of area, the least. But this is true for one simple reason, and that is that cotton is where almost all the big payments go and feed grains where payments are least. So naturally any limitation is going to hit Mr. ABERNETHY'S district more severely than mine.

I have offered limitations of $10,000, of $15,000, and of $20,000. I am trying to find a level and a time that will succeed. I believe this week is the time and $20,000 is the level.

A little bit earlier today my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) placed in the RECORD the text of the limitation amendment on which he and I are in complete agreement, which we are jointly sponsoring. He also placed in the RECORD the language of the regulations which we recommend should this amendment become a part of the act and should it become law. We believe it is very important that the Congress give direction to the Department of Agriculture as to just what rules should be applied.

We believe in a strict application of the limitation in order to pare down to the bare minimum any possible slippage.

This is being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today instead of tomorrow, to give Members the opportunity to look at this language tomorrow morning, to read it thoroughly, to examine it at firsthand, to see that regulations would be effective.

I should like to turn now to the set-aside concept which in its purity when it was presented to the Committee on Agriculture by the Department of Agriculture leadership was very appealing. The idea was to determine a certain acreage on a farm which would be set aside—that is, set out of production—and then permit the farmer maximum freedom to plant the remaining acres of his farm. That would be a step toward freedom in planting in American agriculture, and truly a fine goal.

Well, I read the bill. I wonder if everyone here today has read the text of this bill. I believe it would be interesting, really, to find out how many Members have read it. I will not call for a show of hands, but I did read every page and every word.

I am searching for the right word to describe the set-aside concept as it emerges from the Committee on Agriculture—not as it was presented in its purity by Mr. Hardin and his colleagues but as it emerges in the form of this bill.

Let me illustrate what I mean. Turn to pages 12 and 13 of the bill and read the language beginning at line 21 at the bottom of page 12 and continuing through line 8 on page 13. "The Secretary shall permit producers to plant and graze on the set-aside acres." Then it lists all kinds of crops. Now, is that setting acres aside from production, I ask you? It is not that the Secretary "may" but that the Secretary "shall." He does not have the option to refuse the planting or to permit the planting and grazing, but he "shall." There is a hole kicked in the set-aside concept big enough to drive the biggest John Deere tractor through.

On page 13 is the beauty of them all. Read this line. "The payment," that is, the payment for the set-aside or the payment to the farmer for being a cooperator, "shall be the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage," that is, set-aside acreage, "were devoted to conserving uses." In other words, there is no penalty whatever imposed upon the farmer who plants and harvests from set-aside acres.

Now turn to page 29, the feed grain section. "The Secretary shall permit producers." Then we list a whole bunch of other crops that may be planted on set-aside acres. Here again the payment shall be the rate which would be otherwise applicable if such acreage were devoted to conserving uses.

Now look at page 46. At the top of that page here is the beauty to end them all. The sentence there reads, "The Secretary may permit cotton"—these are cotton set-aside acres—"The Secretary may permit cotton or other commodities to be planted on the set-aside acres to such an extent and under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

There is another great big hole kicked in this set-aside concept.

Then I learned about an arrangement that was worked out, which does not appear in the committee print or the bill but was a deal worked out in the late stages of negotiation on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FINDLEY. Under this deal—here is another beauty—a farmer in the arid parts of Texas and elsewhere who has been practicing skip row planting in order to get maximum production, that is, he skips a couple of rows and plants a couple of rows and then skips a couple of rows and does that as a good practice as a farmer—under this deal, which is not written out in the committee report or in the bill, can count those skip rows as meeting his set-aside obligation under this program. Another great big hole kicked in the set-aside concept.

I am inclined to think that the set-aside concept is not only an outrage and a sham, but I call it a conspiracy against the taxpayers.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee which studied this bill for almost 18 months, I would briefly like to cover the major provisions of this important legislation in an effort to provide my colleagues with a helpful thumbnail sketch. The biggest problem we face now is knowing exactly what is contained in this bill and what it is intended to do.

The bill contains eight titles dealing with: Payment limitations, dairy, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, Public Law 480, and a general and miscellaneous title which includes a Cropland Conversion and a Greenspan program.

Title 1 of the bill sets limits that any individual farmer may receive from

the cotton, feed grain, and wheat programs. Under this provision a producer would be limited to $55,000 from each commodity program.

This limit applies to payments for price support, set-aside, diversion, public access, and marketing certificates, but it does not include loans or purchases.

Payment limitations do not apply to lands owned by States, political subdivisions, or agencies thereof, as long as the land is farmed primarily in the direct furtherance of a public function.

The dairy title extends and amends authority for the class I base plan in the Federal milk market areas. It specifically guarantees competitive access to class I base plan markets by established producers outside the market order area.

Under this title the mandatory butterfat price-support program for farm-separated cream is suspended, and the Secretary is permitted to set lower support prices on butter. But, milk would continue to be supported at a level between 75 and 90 percent of parity.

This title of dairy also continues the Secretary's authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers, and it extends his authority to donate dairy products owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the armed services and to veterans' hospitals.

The wool title extends the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, through December 31, 1973. It continues the present incentive price of 72 cents per pound for shorn wool and 80.2 per pound for mohair for each year of the extension.

There are several key points to the act which are common to feed grains, wheat, and cotton. First, each commodity program would become effective with the 1971 crop and run for a 3-year period.

To be eligible for program benefits a producer would be required to set aside a percentage of his cropland to approved conserving uses, in addition to maintaining his normal conserving acres.

The amount of set-aside would be determined by the Secretary. For cotton it could not exceed one-third of the farm base acreage allotment. After meeting the set-aside requirement a producer would then be free to plant anything on his remaining cropland—except for peanuts, rice, tobacco and sugar. Another exception is that the Secretary would have authority to limit wheat and feed grain plantings during the transition period in 1971 and 1972.

The set-aside concept is one major area where decisionmaking would be returned to the farmer. Acreage allotments and bases have helped to reduce surplus production, but in some cases they have held back our farmers' efficiency. This has hurt our sales in export markets—and has probably reduced our farmers' net incomes.

For instance, because of acreage allotments, some farmers are forced to grow wheat in the Corn Belt, corn in Texas, and soybeans in Kansas. Farm income may suffer in those cases because of high production costs for those particular crops in those areas.

Under the set-aside plan, we would expect to see more of our corn production centered in the Corn Belt—more of our wheat acres in the Great Plains and the Pacific Northwest—the Southeast would produce more soybeans.

The most efficient cottongrowers could compete for the world market without penalty.

Feed grains would compete more effectively for world markets, and this would encourage livestock feeding industries around the world.

A quick look at the functions of allotments and bases will further illustrate the increased flexibility farmers would have under set-aside. Under the present program, allotments and bases are used to determine acreages for specific crops on individual farms, as well as for payment and diversion purposes.

Under set-aside, allotments and bases would be used to determine a producer's payment and his diversion requirements, but they would not restrict him in planting individual crops.

For instance, a producer in the Corn Belt who has both a feed grain base and a wheat allotment could meet his set-aside and normal conserving requirements, and then plant all of his remaining cropland to corn. He would be eligible for a price support loan on all of his corn production. In addition, he would receive the feed grain payment on half of his feed grain base, and wheat certificates on his domestic wheat allotment.

It is possible that the producer we have just mentioned would lose wheat history under another provision of the act which is common to feed grain, wheat, and cotton. That specifies that there would be a loss of history under certain conditions. We will spell this out later as we discuss the provisions for each commodity.

As has been the case in the past, the programs will be financed through the Commodity Credit Corporation, with annual reimbursement through the appropriations process for each commodity.

Participating producers would receive a preliminary payment as soon as possible after July 1 of the year the crop is harvested. The amount for each commodity varies, and will be explained as we cover each of the commodity programs.

Payments in the form of domestic marketing certificates would be available to guarantee cooperators 100 percent of parity on that part of the crop used for domestic food.

The certificate value would be based on the difference between a farmer's average market price—during the first 5 months of the marketing year—and parity.

The Secretary would be authorized to pay for additional set-aside acreage and for public recreational access to set-aside acres. Authority is also provided for growing specified crops on set-aside acres.

A preliminary payment of 75 percent of the estimated certificate value would be made as soon after July 1 as possible. The final payment would then bring total support up to parity. If the estimate should be too high a farmer would not be required to make a refund of the initial payment.

Processing certificates, for domestic food use, would continue to be 75 cents per bushel.

A minimum price of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned wheat for resale would be 115 percent of the national average loan rate, plus reasonable carrying charges.

The wheat program would have a loss of history clause. There would be a loss of history—not to exceed 20 percent of the domestic allotment the following year—if at least 90 percent of the domestic allotment is not planted. And the allotment would be removed if there were no plantings for 3 consecutive years. But, there would be no domestic allotment reduction if a producer elected to not receive payments for the unplanted wheat acres.

The Secretary may authorize plantings of feed grains or soybeans as substitutes for wheat to retain wheat history.

Farmers who were prevented from planting due to natural disasters would not lose allotment.

There are two additional, significant points in the wheat program worth noting. There would be new domestic State, county and farm allotments established rather than using the old allotment.

And, farm projected yields would still be used for computing program benefits.

For feed grains—loans for corn would be up to 90 percent of parity—with rates for grain sorghum and barley loans proportionate to their feed value in relation to corn. The loan level would set to encourage exports and prevent excessive stocks.

The feed grain payment—to be made on one-half of the base—would equal the difference between the actual average market price—during the first 5 months of the marketing year—and current support—but total support would be not less than $1.35 per bushel for corn. Yields for computing program payments would be based on the feed grain yields determined for the preceding crop, with adjustments.

A fixed preliminary payment of 32 cents per bushel, on corn, would be made to participants as soon after July 1 as possible. That 32 cents per bushel for corn would be the minimum, but the payment could increase if the market price declines below $1.03 per bushel.

Unlike prior years, a producer would no longer be required to plant half his base to feed grains for payment purposes. But, as we will explain later, he would have to plant a specified percentage of the base to feed grains or an authorized substitute to avoid a loss of history.

The Secretary could authorize payment for additional set-aside and for public access and he could authorize specified crops on set-aside acres.

Commodity Credit Corporation sales policy for unrestricted use would be a minimum of 115 percent of the national average loan rates, plus reasonable carrying charges.

For feed grains a producer would have to plant at least 45 percent of his base

acres or he could lose up to 20 percent of the base the following year.

If no plantings were made for 3 consecutive years, the base would be removed.

However, the Secretary may authorize planting of wheat or soybeans as substitutes for feed grains to retain history.

Farmers who were prevented from planting due to natural disaster would not lose their base.

The Secretary would be authorized to adjust farm bases from a pool made up of acreage released by farmers no longer producing feed grains.

For upland cotton there would be no quotas, but there would be a national cotton production goal which would be the offtake plus 5 percent, and the carryover goal would be at not less than 50 percent of the offtake.

The national allotment would be established at the expected domestic consumption rate, plus up to 25 percent additional. But, in 1971 the allotment would be set at 11.5 million acres. Allotments would be apportioned to the States on the basis of their preceding 5-year history.

The loan rate for upland cotton would be set at 90 percent of the estimated average world price—based on middling 1-inch upland cotton. Support for cottonseed would be optional.

The payment rate, plus the average market price at the designated spot markets during the first 5 months of the marketing year must equal 35 cents per pound, but the payment rate may not be less than 15 cents per pound.

The payment would be made on an acreage planted within the farm allotment. If 90 percent or more of the allotment is planted, the entire allotment would be considered planted for payment purposes. Payments would be based on the average yield of the acreage planted to upland cotton during the 3 preceding years, adjusted for any abnormal yield caused by drought, flood, or other natural disaster.

There would be a preliminary payment of 15 cents per pound to be made as soon as possible after July 1.

The Secretary is also authorized to pay for public recreational access. And he could permit cotton or other commodities to be planted on set-aside acres.

Sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation for unrestricted use would be not less than 110 percent of the loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges.

Like the wheat and feed grain programs there would be a loss of history clause under the cotton program—but release and reapportionment would still be in effect.

The history loss would be not more than 20 percent of the allotment the following year, if less than 90 percent of the allotment was planted. The allotment would be lost if there was no cotton planted for 3 consecutive years. But, the Secretary would be required to allow soybeans, feed grains, or wheat to be used as a substitution for cotton for history purposes, if substitution is allowed for feed grains and wheat.

Like the other programs, there would be a provision to protect the acreage not planted due to natural disaster.

Also provided for in the cotton program would be the sale, lease, or owner transfer of allotments. Out-of-county transfers by sale or lease within a State would be subject to the approval of the ASC County Committee, based on findings that a demand for the allotment no longer exist in the county. And transfer of allotments because of natural disaster would be authorized.

Title 7 of the bill would extend, without change, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. This is commonly known as Public Law 480.

In title 8—the general and miscellaneous title—there are provisions for continuing the cropland conversion program at a level of $10 million per year. This is a program that helps producers shift their cropland to other income producing purposes on a contract basis.

The Greenspan program, which assists local governments in acquiring farmland for such purposes as parks, recreational areas and the like will be continued. The bill authorizes a $10 million program for Greenspan.

Also contained in title 8 are these miscellaneous provisions: The current exemption from marketing quotas for boiled peanuts would be continued.

Farmers or other landowners who do not desire to hold an allotment on any crop under a Government program may voluntarily relinquish it. This would be a permanent provision.

And there would be an indemnity program to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticide residues.

To summarize, there are eight titles in the Agricultural Act of 1970. They are: Payment limitations, dairy, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, Public Law 480, and general and miscellaneous provisions.

That briefly is a summary of the major provisions included in the bill.

I would hope my colleagues are fully aware of all the aspects of the bill before they are asked to make a final decision.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL).

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated so many times today, this bill was worked on probably longer than any agricultural bill in recent history.

I happen to have the high privilege and, so far as I am concerned, the honor of being the chairman of the subcommittee that deals with the wheat and feed grain section in this bill.

I want to compliment in every way I know how the members I am privileged to work with on that committee, members on both sides of the aisle, who worked diligently and worked long hours.

They have made compromises, with the true interests of the farmers and consumers of this country at heart, and I compliment each one of them. Particularly, I want to compliment, as has been stated before today, the effective work of the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma, PAGE BELCHER, particularly on this bill along with our distinguished chairman (Mr. POAGE), because this has been a unique experience in seeing a bill after many months of work and many hard decisions being made, to find a bill coming out of the Committee on Agriculture supported with 27 votes for it and six votes against it.

Mr. Chairman, to be as truthful as possible, this is not the farm bill I would have chosen, nor I am convinced, is it the farm bill that most members of the Committee on Agriculture would have chosen, had they been given a choice. However, it is the best bill the administration announced it was willing to support, and after over 1 year of committee deliberations, despite attempts to substitute more proven theories for maintaining a strong agriculture, this is what we have to offer and I support it.

I support it now, despite the fact that I would have been far happier had the amendments offered to the wheat and feed grains section of the bill to bring it closer in line to past policies been adopted. But the majority of the committee disagreed, and it is vitally desperate that we enact a workable program as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, despite my past criticisms of this bill, I do believe, if it is administered carefully by the Secretary of Agriculture, that the bill before us envisions a workable farm program. I am personally pleased that we have been able to retain the parity concept for wheat, and guarantees that the Secretary will expend approximately the same amount during the 3 years of the life of the program as was expended during 1969–70.

If we can pass this bill, I personally pledge my full support toward holding the Secretary to his word. He and his entire staff are all honorable men, and the only reason I would support the bill would be because I am assured, in my own mind, that they would not knowingly destroy the livelihood of the Nation's small agricultural producers.

In many ways, a case can be made that this is a worthwhile program, and I am particularly impressed with the flexibility it should give a producer to manage his own crops, and plant as he chooses.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware that this is not a perfect bill but it is an honest attempt after a great effort to reach some sort of compromise between strongly diverging views. As such, it is worthwhile and deserving of the support of each of us; accordingly, I recommend its passage.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this time. I know it is growing late. I shall not repeat much of what has been said before, including today under the rule. I have asked permission to revise and extend my remarks, and include charts and tables for Members' study before tomorrow's 5-minute rule.

I also call attention to the fact that for the last two Congresses—in fact, since 1967—I have appeared before this very distinguished committee, Committee on Agriculture, and have testified about a plan and an idea that has been growing and has been constantly perfected through the years as a farm plan.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. Whether my suggested perfections are incorporated or not, I shall vote for this bill, not only because of my respect for the people who are in favor of it, and their almost unanimity in bringing it out, but because I am thoroughly convinced that the entire economy, if indeed not the husbandry of our natural resources, depends on a bill of this type at this time and place in our Nation's history.

I also appeared before the Committee on Rules. I have great respect for what has been said, particularly here today, about the need for continuing some kind of subsidy in order to provide the services and sincerely assure the consumer of the quality and nutritious foods and fiber stuff that we are going to need throughout the rest of our lives and as our population explosion goes ahead.

I would like to compliment the House Committee on Agriculture for reporting a bill to amend and extend the farm program.

While not violently disagreeing with the Agriculture Committee's hard and diligent work, I strongly believe that my cropland and water restoration program, that I introduced in the 91st Congress last September, is a sounder approach. The consumer must be the most interested and realize the end product of the farmer's production is human bodies.

Basically this bill would:

First. Provide for establishing a cropland and water restoration program under 1- to 5-year contracts—up to 10 years for tree cover—beginning during the 3-year period 1972 through 1974.

Second. Provide for establishing an annual cropland restoration program to be offered during the years 1972 through 1974.

Third. Repeal authority for acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and marketing certificates on wheat and acreage allotments on corn, and specify the levels of price support on wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum, effective with specified crop years.

Fourth. Prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from making any sales—except sales offset by equivalent purchases—of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, or flaxseed, effective July 1, 1970—this is subject to amendment—at less than 125 percent of the current support price for any such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges.

Now, Mr. Chairman the backbone of my proposed legislation is soil and water restoration, and the incentive to accomplish both, with a realistic profit margin for the farmer. This concept has been conclusively proven by master farmer-conservationist, Gene Poirot, of Golden City, Mo. He has proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that submarginal land can be restored and that a profitable farming operation can result. Three years ago Chairman POAGE along with Congressman BELCHER and a majority of the House Agriculture Committee, visited and toured the Poirot farm. They saw a scientific approach to farming and they can verify that it works. Due to the success of this farming operation and based upon the sound principles Mr. Poirot sets forth in his book, "The Margin of Life," we were able to develop and draft a farm bill that would insure the farmer adequate income, stabilize consumer prices, restore the basic soil and water resources, and not bleed the American taxpayers to death.

The essential feature of my bill (H.R. 13717) is the second market concept.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in actual operation the second market would:

First. Buy tons of a suitable crop which by its growth and yield would:

Give the farmer the choice of selling to the Government or of otherwise disposing of the crop on the market without Government payment,

In any amount of tons the farmer wants to sell,

At a fair price announced each year, but above an approved standard such as a minimum wage, parity, or share of his cropland,

Grown on any part or on all of his cropland,

Improve the degree of soil restoration and water conservation accomplished, and paid for by the farmer.

For example, the second market would offer to sweetclover—or its equivalent—growing alone for 1 year and plowed under, an established amount of $25 per dry weight ton. If the farm had a pond approved by the SCS for irrigation and flood control or other practices of special value, the suitable crop would be worth an established amount plus a bonus of $5 perhaps, or $30 per ton. The weight and rent per acre would be figured on the spot by the farmer's own county ASCS agent for the farmer to accept or reject the offer.

This program would offer a fair additional money reward for good farming. Not a stingy amount of relief for "idling land" as in the soil bank. Not large sums of money for surplus control to those on rich land where there is no problem, and one-third as much per acre to those on poor land, needing fertility, water, and the money to buy them. It would keep the Nation's soil immediately ready for an emergency call by the Government.

The second market would buy only proved results, regardless of the political power a group might have, or the richness of the soil. It does not pay for storing large amounts of surplus products, or for large sums for giving it away later.

The program pays at a minimum wage, or parity level, for the services it buys from the farmer. Any product he grows which yields less net income per acre is at once a surplus, so he shifts farming efforts and the troublesome land to the second market provided by the Government for developing its soil and water resources to a higher level of more economic production.

Since yield per acre, market price, transportation, local costs, and so forth are all factors in net profit, a change in any one of them can cause acres to be shifted into or out of production under the second market program. This is far more flexible than any directive delivered from Washington, D.C., could ever be, because the individual farmer makes the decision on his farm.

Another result will be a permanent system for agricultural production with little or no competition from the off-the-farm people who either already own rich land or can restore soil and water resources to make it so, and thereby gain income tax relief. If the land should become rich, beyond our food and fiber needs, industry can find use for the products it will grow or produce at a low cost to make them into products people will need.

Other uses for any extra land and/or credits could well be environment controls to hold insects and diseases in check; restoration of wildlife habitat; ponds for farm and community water supplies where nitrate poisoning in wells becomes a health hazard; the preservation of virgin stands of grasses and timber; and beautification in general, to name a few.

One final advantage to the second market, Mr. Chairman, is that the administration costs will be less. There would only be one crop to measure. Participation would be checked only on those farms selling to the second market. There would be no surplus to measure and give away. There would be no cost-sharing for fertilizer, lime, terraces and many other activities now requiring many more people, than were needed a few years ago.

What I have offered is a prescription, mixed and compounded by men of the soil. A prescription that might not be a complete cure for the situation, but one that could act as a "shot" to help get the patient back on his feet, so that he could do some of his own doctoring, and perhaps even heal his own wounds, thus alleviating the necessity of "round the clock" nursing, from his "big brother" in Washington.

Mr. Chairman I shall have the mimeographs and explanatory memos available tomorrow along with these large viewgraphs to explain the applicability and easy feasibility of this plan in the form of an amendment for titles III through VI of the committee bill. It leaves the rest of the bill and the committee's intent, completely intact. It would generally substitute cropland and water restoration and a voluntary alternate market for subsidies to idle acres. I commend it to your consideration:

SOLVING THE FARM PROBLEM THROUGH AN ANNUAL CROPLAND RESTORATION PROGRAM

Who benefits? Farmers—Rural Communities—American Housewife—and Consumers.

How? By Farmers using an "alternate market" provided by the Government in buying—Soil and Water Restoration.

A farmer in *Serious Economic Trouble* using the alternate market would: Increase his net profit—control surplus—increase the productiveness of his soil—*without* increasing the market price to the consumer and without asking the consumer to decrease the price for what he sells to the farmer.

Example: Yield x Selling Price less Cost = Net Profit. Any kind of crop or livestock can be used. Corn is selected because of its present low price of $1.00 per bushel and its high production costs. Sweet clover, requiring soil

restoration at the farmers expense, is selected as the suitable crop. Sweet clover yielding 2400# per acre, costing $25 per acre to produce and selling for $30 per acre are not changed during the five years covered by this example.

Purpose: Showing under these adverse conditions farmers can correct their problems if given the alternate-market chance to do so.

UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS OF PRICE COST SQUEEZE

Acres	1	2	3	4	5	Net profit	Percent increase	Total yield	Bushels reduced	Percent reduced
Yield	$50	$55	$55	$55	$55			270	0	0
Cost	50	50	50	50	50					
Net profit	0	5	5	5	5	$20	0			

EFFECTS OF THE ALTERNATE MARKET

1st year:										
Yield	$30	$55	$55	$55	$55			220	50	18.5
Cost	25	50	50	50	50					
Net	5	5	5	5	5	$25	25			
2d year:										
Yield	60	30	55	55	55			225	45	16.6
Cost	50	25	50	50	50					
Net	10	5	5	5	5	30	50			
3d year:										
Yield	60	60	30	55	55			230	40	14.8
Cost	50	50	25	50	50					
Net	10	10	5	5	5	35	75			
4th year:										
Yield	60	60	60	30	55			235	35	12.9
Cost	50	50	50	25	50					
Net	10	10	10	5	5	40	100			
5th year:										
Yield	60	60	60	60	30			240	30	11.1
Cost	50	50	50	50	25					
Net	10	10	10	10	5	45	125			
Average each year							75			14.8

A study of this five acre, five year performance table of a farmer in serious economic trouble reveals the following:

1. The surplus is controlled. It is that number of bushels (50) in one acre that are produced at a break even point that doesn't result in any net profit to the farmer. This fifty bushels going to the market will depress the price of corn produced on the other four acres which represents a small profit. The fifty bushels also depress the price for other farmers who have richer land still producing at a net profit. It is in their interest to have it removed from the market.

After five years in the program this man could reduce the surplus by 40 percent taking out two acres of his cropland and still make 100 percent more net profit than he made to begin with. See 4th year in chart.

If the producer needed it, he could also increase production by 11 percent, make a net profit of 150 percent without increasing the price to the consumers or asking the producer to take less for his products.

2. The net profit for the farmer is greatly increased, he could now better stand a depressed market price than five years before.

3. His land is much richer than this conservative table indicates which means that adverse weather conditions will have less effects on his yields.

4. He has learned more about the science of agricultural production and also where to go to get the information.

5. The rural community in which he farms has not experienced a serious reduction in his demand for supplies. He has had net profit to spend in increasing amounts each year. When he leaves his farm, the land can produce more effectively than it could five years before, thus increasing community wealth.

6. The consumers of the farm products have not been asked to pay more or take less and they are assured of a steady supply of farm products for their children when the present farmer leaves the land.

Soil and water restoration and conservation are the vital part of successful farming anywhere in the world. This is nature's demand, not that of man. Farming in most cases destroys these resources. An alternate market offering to buy their restoration is most important.

Why have a market buying tons of a suitable crop at a fixed price occupying land for one year or more on any number of acres?

An "alternate market" competing with a first market for land use can prevent prices in the first market from going too high or too low and still have the free working of supply and demand for the consumer. Participation in the alternate market will be very sensitive to consumer demands in amount and kind of product. For example, substitute any set of figures for those in the chart based on yield, selling price and costs and any one of three choices will at once be evident:

1. The farmer who has no problem is not interested in the alternate market.

2. The farmer who has a problem can make more money producing for the alternate market on his poorer acres.

3. The farmer who does not have any soil productive enough to supply either the first or second market and return a profit at the price offered in either market must quit farming. The good economics and science of agriculture will tell him so.

"Tons" of a suitable crop are bought to measure degree of fertility and the kind of fertility provided by the farmer. Also to encourage the farmer to get the necessary scientific information so as to grow the largest amount of tons which by their weight reveal the degree of restoration he has done.

"Suitable crop" offers a scientific means for determining what kind of *land use* is most desirable. The best land use may be pasture and flood control, timber and wildlife habitat restoration, agricultural production plus wildlife with some special crops for insect control and high income vegetable and fruit crops. In some cases the preservation of wilderness, virgin prairies and their native creatures may be desirable, and add beauty to the landscape and serve as sources of recreation.

"Fixed price" is important so that a floor for agricultural production may be established for earning net profit below which farmers need not produce agricultural products. It also needs to be fixed so that above it an increase may be offered to encourage soil and water restoration to meet the need for our increasing population. The fixed price should begin at a place which will encourage farmers to return as much plant food to national cropland as is used in annual production and to hold the soil in place and provide water from rain fall to irrigate it for the highest economical production.

"One year" or more in the suitable crop is for the purpose of allowing a biological adjustment (if any) to take place after large amounts of plant foods have been applied and to allow the farmer to control surplus production.

"On any number of acres" will allow a quick adjustment to supplies, up or down, by the land best equipped to do so. It will also give farmers a chance to shift to some other kind of farming if economic conditions suggest it.

"Community and social betterment" by encouraging industry to locate in the area to provide additional employment and utilize local resources.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER), for really an excellent job on this bill. I used to serve on the committee and I know it is no easy task to put together a farm bill which is acceptable and which we can enact. I am going to make my own judgment on amendments and see if there will be some I would support or not, but I will give my commitment now that I am going to support this bill. I think it is necessary.

First, I would like to address myself to the Members of Congress who feel they have only consumers in their districts and feel they might not want to support this bill. I ask them only to look at what will happen in the event this bill is not passed and we go back to the permanent law, which is now being called the 1958 law.

Some years ago we had the battle over the bread tax and we were able to knock out the additional requirement for the processors to pay the additional tax on wheat. Under the 1965 act it has been limited to 5 cents. If this bill is defeated and we go back to the permanent law, the processors will pay $1.35, and every consumer will be paying through the

nose for the bread that is bought, to pay for the payment to the farmer.

Some of the members of the Agriculture Committee might say that is good, but we will have great difficulty with the consumers if that is done, and I ask every Member to think of that. If this bill is defeated and we go back home we will find the price of bread will go up, and the consumers will have to pay the added price of the certificate, and the blame will be upon us.

No matter how we feel that this bill does not do as well for the farmer as we would like, it is far superior to the permanent law, the one the Democrats and the Republicans all were against in the 1958 act. We wrote one in 1965 and there was not agreement with everyone. Some people were opposed to it. This is an attempt to free it up a little more for the farmer, to try to pull up their income over the 3-year period. It is hoped we can write improved legislation at the end of that time. But I believe anybody who feels the consumers are going to benefit by the defeat of this bill is going to be entirely mistaken.

Lastly I commend the Members on the excellent provision on dairy and the class I base plan. I have felt for a long time if the class I base plan was used by those in deficit areas in order to freeze out everybody else and drive up the price, it would not work well. This provision encompasses what we envisioned and thought of as the class I base plan. It will eventually reduce the cost of the price support program.

(Mr. RHODES, at the request of Mr. BELCHER, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the subsidization of agriculture is not anything new. It did not come about as a flash from the blue, but only after well considered legislative proposals had been debated and enacted by the Congress and implemented by the Executive.

One of the main ideas behind the farm subsidy is the fact that the farmer is one of the few producers of new wealth. From an economic standpoint, most industries and professions are processors and improvers of materiel and products which are presently available either in raw or unfinished state. However, the farmer, from raw land, brings into being goods, food and fiber which were not previously in existence. This is an economic fact in life which was recognized to have validity many years ago.

Because the farmer produced new wealth, his well-being has always been very basic to the well-being of the entire economy. Take the producers of new wealth out of any economy, and you find that that economy will become sluggish and depressed. This is certainly true of the American economy, as we have discovered in many instances in which farm depressions were followed immediately by economic recessions.

Subsidies were also allowed as a mere matter of fair play. Because the farmer produces crops which are perishable to varying degrees, he is at the mercy of the marketplace. It is easy for persons who are well versed in marketing methods to keep the market low at the time the farmer must harvest and market his crop. This occurred for many years prior to the intervention of the Federal Government. Farm programs have given stability to the farmer and allowed him to market his crops in a more orderly, profitable, and fairer manner.

The third reason for subsidies has been that, without them, there will either be a lack of production of food and fiber, or the price of farm products would advance greatly. In other words, the cost of production and a modest profit is guaranteed the farmer so that he will stay in production, and, even more importantly, the consumer can be supplied with the products of the farms at reasonable prices.

Many of the Members of the House who think it is good politics to vote against this bill or to vote in favor of unrealistically low limitations of payments to individual farmers may find themselves embarrassed. The lack of a program or the imposition of a low limitation will either cause a scarcity of farm products or an increase of prices which will certainly be felt by the housewife when she does her marketing. If the housewife becomes unhappy in the market, she may well extend her unhappiness to the voting booth.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there are parts of this bill which each of us would change. However, in the main, it is a good bill. I congratulate the members of the Agriculture Committee, and especially their chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) on the fine work they have done.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are at the end of the general debate on this bill. We have been debating this bill for about 15 or 16 months. I suppose we will continue to debate it tomorrow.

I believe anyone who has listened to the debate today will find that not a single member of this committee is 100 percent satisfied with the bill. That is the reason why we have been able to get a bill out supported by 27 members of the committee, by the ranking member, by the chairman of the committee, by the Department of Agriculture, by the President of the United States, and the Bureau of the Budget.

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

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

Mr. NELSEN. I have been reading some comments in the press relative to this bill. Some charge it is a Democratic bill and others that it is a Republican bill. As nearly as I can gather from the debate here, this is pretty much a committee bill drafted by the committee. Would the gentleman have any comment on that?

Mr. BELCHER. There was a whole lot of drafting done in the committee.

I might say, this is the first time in 20 years I have been a cosponsor of a general farm bill. In most of those years I have been in opposition to the general farm bill.

This bill I believe cannot be claimed by any single member of the committee, by the Department of Agriculture, by the Bureau of the Budget, by any farm organization or anything else.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BELCHER. The reason why we were able to get this bill together is everybody had to give a little. We got together to discuss it. During all that period of time I believe every member of the committee had to give in on some particular pet theory of his.

There were many times when I did not think there was any possibility at all of getting everyone together. Probably in the final analysis the only reason why we were able to get a bill out is because everybody began to realize we were going to be in a whale of a shape if we did not get out a farm bill.

We also found that no single group, no single organization—whether it was the coalition, the Farm Bureau, the Republican side of the House, the Democratic side of the House, the Department of Agriculture or anybody else—could get a farm bill out all by themselves. We were just pretty much out in the stream altogether, and we all had to get in the same boat or we were going to sink. That is exactly what we did.

There will be amendments offered tomorrow. I have a lot of amendments I should like to offer myself. There are a lot of things about this bill I should like to change. I argued loud and long for them in the committee, as did many other members of the committee. But we all gave ground in order to get a bill.

If we are going to start adopting amendments here tomorrow, we are soon going to find out we will not all be in the same buggy, and if we are not all in the same buggy on tomorrow night or the next day we are probably going to be defeated on a farm bill.

A lot of people say, "Well, I have been wanting to get rid of farm bills for a long time. I have not thought they were any good."

Members have heard the stories about the big payments to the big farmers and so forth, and what a horrible farm program we have had.

Well, I do not represent a farmer who gets, probably, more than $1,000. I doubt if I represent a farmer who gets $5,000, in the whole district.

The reason why I am anxious to get out a farm bill is that I believe without a farm bill we are going to kick off a depression in this country and then everybody is going to get hurt.

I do not care whether you live in New York City or Chicago or what your job is. I do not care whether you are a manufacturer or a broker or an ordinary laborer. Any time the economy of this country goes into a depression every single person in the United States is going to get hurt. My people who live in Tulsa are going to get hurt just as much as the farmers are. That is the reason why I am trying in every way I can to get this bill

out. I have gotten, by argument with the Administration and with the Department of Agriculture and members of the committee and everyone else, the very best bill that we can. If you want it, take it. If you do not want it, you are going to get hurt worse than I will.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as one of those on this committee who were probably most dissatisfied with certain sections of the bill or among those who were, and did not vote affirmatively to report this bill out, I want to say to my colleagues that at the same time I feel it is vitally important the bill be passed.

There are those who feel at this juncture we can afford to put aside this bill and defeat it and count on something coming forward either in an extension of the 1965 act or in some other approach. I am not so sanguine about it. We are in the late months and weeks of this Congress, and I think we undertake an enormous risk if this House does not vote to pass this bill which is presently before us. I had hoped for something better for wheat and feed grain farmers in particular. I exerted every effort in the committee to get something better and worked as closely as I could with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) to that effect, but at this juncture I believe it would be foolhardy for anyone concerned with the welfare of the American farmers to block this legislation or defeat it.

I want to say to my urban colleagues—and I wish more of them were here to hear this—if agriculture suffers I am sure as the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma says—if agriculture suffers a tremendous recessionary impact by having these programs defeated overnight, it will be felt in every manufacturing and urban area in this country. American farmers expend $34 billion annually in the agricultural economy. Three out of every 10 American employees are employed directly or indirectly in agricultural business. Farmers now spend most of the $16 billion that they make in income in the consumption of goods manufactured and produced in this country. The impact of the defeat of this bill on the agricultural economics and immediately in terms of the national welfare and economy would be so startling and grave and effective in bringing about a further recession in our economy that I think it ought to be looked upon with grave concern by every American.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN).

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, As we have both seen and heard during the course of the debate today, it is easy to find fault with the legislation that is before us. This serves to identify the complexities that exist in attempting legislation that will adequately serve agriculture throughout the Nation with all of the varied geographical conditions, as well as the varied types and combinations of operations.

While this may seem to present a difficult, and at times almost an impossible situation, it is more indicative of an agricultural industry that is well established and well equipped to serve the food and fiber needs of this Nation, together with a big part of the rest of the world.

We had ought not to be disillusioned by the fact that there are some problems in attempting to find a legislative combination that will serve both the best interests of agriculture, and the entire Nation and all of its citizens. The history of agriculture throughout the phenomenal growth of this Nation has always contributed greatly to our economic stability, to the industrial growth of the Nation and the health and welfare of generation after generation.

For these reasons it becomes pertinent that if we are to expect to continue to have economic and industrial growth, to maintain the envied reputation of being the best fed Nation in the world, and to remain an international power, we need to legislate in such a manner that agriculture's future is assured of a rightful and well-earned place in both our economic and social structures.

There are endless statistics which offer ample and undisputable proof that statements I have just made are true and correct. I shall not attempt to reiterate many of them here today because the committee members have already placed them before you both emphatically and eloquently. In addition, they have prepared within the committee a compilation of information relating to agriculture entitled "Food Costs and Farm Prices" which are most convincing.

But let me just refer to a couple of statistics that will serve to identify for each of us the importance of our decisions during today and tomorrow. I have already made reference to agriculture's great contribution to the industrial and economic growth of this Nation. There is one very simple statistic that emphasizes this more emphatically than any combination of words can do. It is a fact as stated by the chairman of the committee that the cost of food to the American populace amounts to only 16½ cents out of the net income dollar. The significance of this is that it also reveals that there is left out of that income dollar 83½ cents with which to purchase other commodities. It is this money that has provided the great domestic market for manufactured goods of every description, whether it be automobiles, snowcats, housing, or any and all of the rest of the many comforts that we enjoy.

Compare it to other nations, several of which the price of food is more than 50 percent of the income dollar, and one can easily see why their industrial growth is not comparable to ours. Consequently, every citizen owes a great debt to the American farmer, not only because he has been provided with food cheaper than anywhere else in the world when related to income, but also for the many other conveniences he has shared and enjoyed throughout the years. May you also remember that farm programs have been a substantial part of this contribution during the past 35 years or more.

One other statistic that we had not ought to forget: while the Nation has struggled with a continuing inflation over the years, the 1969 prices received by farmers were 4 percent lower than in 1952 which is the last year when farm prices were equivalent to 100 percent of parity. Yet during that time the retail food prices were up 29 percent. Now let us not let it be said that farm prices have been the influencing factor in the increases of retail food prices, for they can be accounted for only when you consider the increased costs of doing business which the farmer has also had to bear. We, of course, could not quote statistics like that were it not for one undisputed fact, for it tells us very clearly of the efficiency of American agriculture. Had it not been for their ability to produce efficiently, our farmers would have gone out of business long ago in view of those facts.

The productivity of the American farmworker increased at the rate of 6 percent a year during the 1960's while the manhour output in nonagricultural industry increased by only 3 percent a year. It has generally been accepted that such accomplishment in our system should also produce like rewards. Here, however, is the identity of an often repeated expression—farm problems exist. For the income to the producer of food and fiber has not anywhere near kept pace with the income of other sectors of our populace and economic structure.

With these facts in mind, it should become obvious that this bill should attempt to correct and improve this economic inequity. Let us not kid ourselves into thinking that it does, however. It will do well if it can even hold farm income at present levels. It is the very minimum that we can, with any degree of reasonableness, offer to the farmers and rural America. It is not surprising, as has been stated before, that there are many farm people, groups and associations, who are completely dissatisfied with this legislation. It becomes obvious the bill does not solve the inequity that I referred to a moment ago. It does not even offer any resemblance of reward that these folks have so diligently earned during all the years of our history, whether at peace or at war.

However, this House is faced with a most difficult, complex, and yet important decision. For it appears that following the length of time in which deliberations have taken place on this legislation, dating way back to last year, the bill before us represents the best that the committee could produce and arrive at an acceptable common agreement. They have worked hard and long and are deserving of compliment. The Department of Agriculture and the Secretary have worked just as diligently in attempting to work with the Committee to find a ground of common acceptance that would at least grant assurance that agriculture is not going to take a further step backward. And, so it seems that the question resolves itself—Shall it be this bill, or none at all? All of you know I am sure that with that alternative, there can be only one choice—this bill.

It would seem that there are still three areas in which this bill could be amended to improve it and yet not change its structure, objective, or cost to such extent that it would become undesirable in any significance. The changes I have in mind are these:

First, there is no good reason whatsoever why the loan rates on either wheat or feed grains should be permitted to range at the Secretary's discretion from 0 to 100, or 0 to 90 percent of parity. Quite obviously any loans at 0, 10, 20, 30, or 40 percent are of no consequence to anyone. The very minimum might well be 50 percent or even higher.

Second, if we have any intention whatsoever to improve the market prices, then the resale price of commodity credit stocks should surely be set at a level higher than is authorized in this bill. It is sheer folly that these stocks should have the effect of reducing prices at such time as the program may have been successful to the degree of having created some improvement in prices.

Third, the parity concept as applied to feed grains should be retained much the same as the bill provides for wheat. Once that parity concept is lost, it will be difficult to regain it and it is the only comparison whereby farm prices are stipulated in a manner that reflects the continuous increased costs of production and the effects of inflation. In these days when these increased costs are serious problems to so much of the rest of the populace, we cannot afford to leave an industry as large and significant as agriculture without acknowledging the problems created for them.

However, I do hope that even as the bill is written, the Secretary and the Department will pay due regard to the factors I have just referred to, and not permit this one sector of agriculture to be shortchanged.

It would be easy for me at this point to talk about legislation that I have introduced which involves an entirely different approach to the problem and is aimed directly at creating improved market prices. However, at this stage, it would seem rather superficial to do so.

I do acknowledge, however, that one of the desirable factors in the bill before us is that it does present a greater leeway for the individual farmer in the planting of crops within the wheat and feed grain programs. This is a recommendation that I have made on many occasions and is also a part of the bill to which I referred earlier. While I find it a difficult and somewhat disappointing decision, it does seem that in view of the present circumstances that confront us legislatively, politically, and practically, I do not have much choice but to support the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same. It would be my desire that we might have done better for the farmer in rural America.

However, in view of the lack of time and other complications, it seems that this becomes the only choice that we have on this day. I would share and recommend the hope if this bill becomes the law of the land that during this next 3-year period, some constructive and diligent study be directed to any and all means and objectives which can be achieved by legislation or produced that will serve to improve the inequities evident here today. Unless we do, this Nation may well face food and economic problems with which none of us desire to be confronted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply for the purpose of emphasizing the point which was made by my friend from Oklahoma that this bill is a workable bill as it stands. It is a bill that has support from a great many sources, none of whom finds it entirely satisfactory but all of whom have agreed that it is the best we are going to get. It is something that we can get. This is an opportunity to give to our farmers an additional $3.5 billion in spending power, which is important not only to our farmers but to our whole economy. It is vital to our whole economy, in my judgment.

But the bill will not achieve those results if it is butchered up on the floor tomorrow. The important thing is that this bill is now in a form which has general support. It has what I believe is the maximum support that we can get for it. If we begin, each one of us, trying to put our own brand on it—and I have just as many reservations as anybody has—we are going to kill the bill. I am not going to offer any amendments and I do not propose to support any except the committee amendment. I hope the members of the committee and I hope the Members of Congress will go along with us in not supporting other amendments. I know there will be some very meritorious amendments offered, but we have a balance now which can pass. If we destroy that balance we are going to lose our entire chance, and I do not believe we should take that chance. I think we had better pass the bill as it is.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, talking about how much difference of opinion there is, I know a lot of people must think that when you try to write a farm bill people just cannot get together. Well, when you try to write a labor bill all the labor people are in the same boat. When you start writing a farm bill you have about 265 different commodities that are produced in this country, and you have all kinds of geographical conditions.

I remember one time when I started out on one of the hearings that we had across the country, that cattle were very cheap, and so many of the people in Oklahoma were raising cain about the fact that cattle were so low. And then I was up in Nebraska, and I was telling some of those fellows up there, I said:

You know, it just beats the dickens how low cattle are.

Well, they said:

What do you mean "low"? Why, you doggone Oklahomans are getting twice what the cattle are worth. Now, how do you think we can pay that price down in Oklahoma and feed them corn up here in Nebraska and sell them on the market in Chicago?

So I found out.

And then we were up in the vegetable area of New Jersey, and they said:

Well, now, one thing that we do not do is ask anything off of the government, but we just do not want you subsidizing our opposition. We do not want you to let these acreages that come out of the cotton acreage be planted with vegetables.

And so regardless of what kind of a farm bill you try to write, you have got all kinds of different interests.

On this bill right here, when I was trying to get it balanced, I would go down and get the administration to agree for a little benefit for wheat, and then the cotton people would say, "Now, listen, if you are going to do that for wheat, then you have got to do it for cotton."

And then the feed grain people would come along and say, "If you are going to do it for wheat, then you have got to do it for us." And then we would get everybody satisfied, and then in a little bit we would have the cotton people——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Then you would have the cotton people getting a few extra acres, and then the gentleman sitting right here would say, "Well, now, listen. If you are going to do that for cotton, why do you not do it as well for feed grains?" So that is exactly what you are up against every single time you try to write a farm bill. And in this particular farm bill everybody has had to have their feet stepped on just enough times that we have got kind of a balance now. If you ever upset that balance at all, if we adopt one amendment that helps feed grains tomorrow, the cotton people will vote against the bill.

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

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

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to explain this much about the mechanics tomorrow on the bill. Of course there will be a committee amendment which we consider as a part of the bill; it relates to this limitation on payments, and it will be the first thing that will be offered. And of course I want to make it clear that the committee offers that as a committee amendment rather than as a part of the bill, in order that those who feel that they must vote for a limitation on payments will have an opportunity to do so by a separate vote on an issue which they can support affirmatively. This provides the opportunity for everyone who believes that he must vote for a limitation of payments to have an affirmative vote. That is the reason it is offered as a separate amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 18546. It is legislation that is ill conceived and ill advised. It continues American agriculture in an unfortunate direction, and is not good for the type of farms and farmers we have in my home State of Pennsylvania.

This bill is nothing more than an extension of the ineffective and outrageously expensive Food and Agricultural Act of 1965. Instead of providing an or-

derly transition away from the programs which have made farmers dependent on payments from the Federal Treasury, H.R. 18546 would actually expand and extend payments for another 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, to continue our present course is ludicrous. The 1965 act has not done what its proponents promised. It has not improved the farmers' parity position. It has, in fact, raised costs to taxpayers, failed to increase farm exports, and failed to expand farmers' domestic markets. Moreover, the 1965 act has failed to reduce—or even to stabilize—the cost of food to consumers.

Instead of extending the 1965 act, with the minor changes included in this bill, it would be the better choice to pass no new legislation, and thereby permit programs authorized by basic law to be put into operation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to change direction in U.S. farm policy, and support the concept embodied in H.R. 11070—the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1969.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1970".

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment. Page 1, line 5, insert:

TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATION

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) The total amount of payments which a person shall be entitled to receive under each of the annual programs established by titles IV, V, and VI of this Act for the 1971, 1972, or 1973 crop of the commodity shall not exceed $55,000.

(2) The term "payments" as used in this section includes price-support payments, set-aside payments, diversion payments, public access payments, and marketing certificates, but does not include loans or purchases.

(3) If the Secretary determines that the total amount of payments which will be earned by any person under the program in effect for any crop will be reduced under this section, the set-aside acreage for the farm or farms on which such person will be sharing in payments earned under such program shall be reduced to such extent and in such manner as the Secretary determines will be fair and reasonable in relation to the amount of the payment reduction.

(4) The Secretary shall issue regulations defining the term "person" and prescribing such rules as he determines necessary to assure a fair and reasonable application of such limitation: *Provided,* That the provisions of this Act which limit payments to any person shall not be applicable to lands owned by States, political subdivisions, or agencies thereof, so long as such lands are farmed primarily in the direct furtherance of a public function, as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18456) to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous material at that point in the RECORD during the tributes made in Committee of the Whole to the late Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke in tribute to the late Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN be privileged to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17548) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 7, 30, 39, and 55.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON THE BANKRUPTCY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 91–354, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. WIGGINS.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1062, 91st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures the following Members of the House:

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, chairman; Mr. SMITH of Iowa; Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee; Mr. DEVINE; and Mr. KYL.

PAYMENT LIMITATION AMENDMENT TO FARM BILL

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the first item of legislative business to be considered when the House convenes tomorrow will be title I of the farm bill, the payment limitation title. The next of the title which is in the form of a committee amendment has been read by the Clerk, which makes it the pending business of the House.

As I understand the parliamentary situation, an amendment to the committee amendment or a substitute to the committee amendment would then be in order. I would like to give notice to my colleagues in the Chamber that at that time I will be on my feet seeking recognition for the purposes of offering a substitute to the committee amendment. It is my conviction that the committee amendment establishes at much too high a level the limitation on payments.

I am aware that this $55,000 per crop limit as provided in the committee amendment does represent an advance. For 6 years I have been seeking at every opportunity to establish in our farm programs a limitation on the total amount that any individual farmer can receive. The House on several occasions has by record vote established in its version of an appropriation bill or a legislative bill a $20,000 level, but unfortunately the opposition of the other body has caused this to be deleted before that particular bill became law.

This year the situation is different. It is much improved. The other body has finally, at long last, accepted the $20,000 limit. This was done when my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the junior Senator (Mr. SMITH) offered an amendment to the agriculture appropriation bill. This provided a limitation of $20,000 per person, and it was accepted by the Senate by a surprising margin on a record vote. It surprised many of us on the House side and delighted those of us who like myself have been trying for many years to establish a limitation at a responsible level.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now more than 3 weeks since the reorganization bill was first considered on the floor and we have yet to complete consideration of the first title of the bill.

This is without question, one of the most important bills to be considered by this House in several years, and the progress that it has made up to this point is a disgrace.

The Congress is badly in need of reform, and this bill as introduced, was a step in the right direction though an inadequate step. Those amendments which have been successful, have made the bill more acceptable. Much of importance has already been omitted. Some of the leadership has used the scare tactic of warning that a "loaded down" bill would not pass, in spite of clear spirit on the part of a majority of the Members on the side of sweeping comprehensive reform. As a matter of fact, I am of the opinion that many of the amendments which have been adopted, as well as some which have been rejected, would serve to "lighten the load" with respect to passing this bill.

The kind of rearguard action in which some have been engaged has served not only to delay the proceedings, but also to damage severely the bill's chances of final passage and approval by both Houses.

A bill as important as this one should certainly be given top priority during the period that it is under consideration, but the leadership on both sides of the aisle has seen fit to relegate this bill to the late hours of the sessions, leaving inadequate time each day for full consideration, and then refusing to stay late in order to complete action on the bill. This bill should be given top priority every day until final action is taken.

I would expect the American people to lose a great deal of confidence in the Congress if they realized the manner in which their leaders have acted when faced with significant attempts at reorganization and reform of the Congress. Honestly, this lack of confidence is one of the main reasons for the bill in the first place. Let us not lose what we are trying to regain. I call upon the rank and file Members of this body to persuade the leadership to complete consideration of this bill before we recess next week, a mere 2 or 3 weeks after we should have acted, in order that the Senate have a chance to consider it. Otherwise, final passage will be late at best, and the bill could easily die in limbo between the two bodies.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ADDABBO ON H.R. 2076, WITHHOLDING CITY INCOME TAXES

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

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the consideration of H.R. 2076, my colleague and friend from New York, Mr. ADDABBO, a key supporter of this measure asked me for time to speak. Learning that time was not available, he asked me to submit his remarks. In the rush of business, I neglected to do so. Today, I submit his remarks and thank him for his keen interest and strong support of this measure:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ADDABBO, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2076

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2076, a bill to authorize withholding of city income taxes from the compensation of Federal employees. I am a co-sponsor of this legislation and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this measure, which would provide assistance to thousands of federal employees who are subject to city income taxes.

In New York City alone there are thousands of postal workers, customs employees and persons employed by other federal agencies who do not have the protection of withholding on income of New York City income tax. This can produce hardship and financial difficulties at the end of the year when a huge tax burden is suddenly imposed in one lump sum on the employees.

H.R. 2076 is designed to bring relief to federal employees without creating any undue workload on the federal government acting in its capacity as employer. I urge your support of this bill.

THE NEED FOR A BALANCED AND EFFECTIVE PROGRAM TO COPE WITH NARCOTIC ADDICTION

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, national attention has been drawn to the wildly surging rate of narcotics addiction, and we have been continually cautioned about the tragic implications of this situation. As a Nation, however, response to these warnings has been slow, and our efforts puny and ineffective. Now, to our national shame, the situation has burst into epidemic proportions. Narcotics addiction has driven crime rates to staggering new highs, gripped many of our young people in a horrible demeaning sickness, and caused a social disorder that threatens the very fabric of our society.

I do not think I need dwell on the enormity of the problem. Certainly there is none among us who is unaware of the dangers inherent in drug use and abuse.

That such an outrageous situation was allowed to develop is largely the product of ineffective legislation in this area. The Federal program that was established under the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 has proven itself incapable of coping with the problem. In 1968, out of some several hundred thousand drug addicts at large in this country, less than 300 were civilly committed for treatment under this program, and in 1969 only 822 addicts were so committed for treatment. At the same time, it is equally shocking to note that more than 700 known addicts were refused admittance to the program on the grounds that their condition was so severe that they were incapable of rehabilitation. When one considers that the typical hard-core heroin addict currently needs approximately $50,000 annually to support his habit, it is unconscionable to send the most hardened addicts back into the streets where they are liable to commit further crime. They should be detained and put under medical supervision and control.

Our responsibility is clear. We in Congress must act quickly to develop a vigorous program to meet the narcotics epidemic squarely and effectively. Congressman PETER RODINO, of New Jersey, has proposed—and I am cosponsoring—a bill which I think will be a decisive step in the right direction.

The 1966 act laid the methodological framework for treating and controlling narcotics addiction, but our experience with it has revealed glaring deficiencies—it must be strengthened and better funded to become a viable bulwark against the further proliferation of drug addiction. Presently, the law allows only the addict or one of his family to initiate a proceeding for a civil commitment to a medical facility; it neither allows nor recommends the authorization of public health or law enforcement officials to initiate such proceedings even if the person is a known addict and has committed a crime.

Under the Rodino proposal, public health officials will be authorized to apply to a Federal district court for a mandatory commitment of the addict to a facility where he will be medically treated, supervised, and controlled. Addicts whose addiction can be effectively supervised and controlled on an outpatient basis will not be kept in confinement, but will be required to report regularly to a treatment center.

Moreover, this proposal will permit the U.S. attorneys to initiate the medical commitment of addicts who are arrested and charged with a crime. Such persons will be held, treated, supervised, and controlled, pending the outcome of their trial. Their treatment will not operate to suspend or reduce any charges against them; and, if acquitted, they will be required to continue treatment in the facility until the addiction is brought under control.

It is my opinion that both these legal measures are necessary weapons to effectively attack this problem. Yet laws alone are useless without adequate means of implementation. To provide these measures, the proposal authorizes the President to assign to the narcotics program any facility of the Federal Government that he may consider necessary to implement and expedite its objectives. This, of course, involves giving the President considerable latitude in this area, but it is felt that the severity of the narcotics problem warrants this unusual measure.

I hope that we can work together toward a balanced and effective program which will strike at the source of the epidemic and which will strive to abate the personal tragedy of drug dependence and the public problem it creates.

WE CONTINUE TO ABUSE THE ENVIRONMENT AT OUR MORTAL PERIL

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for the better part of last week a belt of poisoned air hung over the east coast from New York to Atlanta—an area inhabited by some 40 million people. Had the winds been less kind, the dose of pollutants a little more deadly, and the rains

less prompt, the damage to human life could have been incalculable.

What on earth will it take to make us understand what we are doing to our world and to ourselves? How many near misses will it take before we rouse ourselves to the perils threatening the environment on which we are all dependent for survival?

Had this threat to the life and health of the American people come from a foreign power, we would have declared a national emergency, mobilized money and manpower, and acted to relieve the crisis before it destroyed us.

Yet, though everyone agrees that a massive national effort is urgently required if we are to avert catastrophe, a dream-like immobilism pervades the response to the problem.

Requests for appropriations for air and water pollution control—even these requests are inadequate—are regularly sliced by the Congress and the Administration.

Our peculiar notion of national priorities permits the development of multi-billion-dollar air polluters and noise producers such as the supersonic transport, while the development of low emission aircraft and auto engines languishes.

Endless billions of dollars are funneled annually into a network of pollution-spawning, neighborhood-destroying urban freeways, while comparatively small mass transit appropriations are held for ransom until the highway lobby extracts its tribute.

Some Federal agencies are among the leading producers of the pollutants other Federal agencies are desperately trying to eliminate—a circumstance in which we might find it cheaper to throw tax money directly down a sewer and eliminate the middle man.

Even in those instances where Congress has legislated against pollution, its intent is often sabotaged by Federal agencies and officials who will not enforce the law no matter how great the provocation. The Federal Aviation Administration's nonadministration of the Aircraft Noise Abatement Act of 1968 provides a sorry case in point, although by no means the only one.

It looks like environment, like the weather, may be destined to become something which everyone talks about but which no one does anything about. As a result, the greatest beneficiaries of the new awareness of the danger to man's natural habitat have been the Nation's advertising agencies. Great corporations vie with each other in expressing concern over the environment—just as they vie with each other in exploiting it. Industrial giants—some of them the worst polluters—spend millions to sing of the day when the lion and the lamb can lie down amidst steel mills and oil refineries to the mutual benefit of all concerned parties. One wonders how many trees have been needlessly fed into the pulp mills to satisfy the vanity of the Nation's leading polluters. Words have become a substitute for acts, and expressions of concern a means of absolution for crimes against the earth.

The most disturbing aspect of this spectacle is that the lives of millions of Americans hang in the balance. Even a partial list of the dangers the future may hold offers ample cause for alarm.

Continued air pollution could make "killer fogs"—such as the one that killed 4,000 persons in London 18 years ago—routine occurrences in large American cities.

The practice of using the Nation's rivers as sewers—into which we dump an estimated one million different chemical waste products—threatens not only the potability of the water supply but the whole balance of life, which is dependent on water.

Mercury pollution alone, if allowed to continue unchecked, may destroy the fresh water fishing industry—depriving the country of an important source of protein.

The use of nondegradable pesticides such as DDT jeopardizes the existence of dozens of species of plants and animals, including the bald eagle, the Nation's symbol.

We are only now beginning to discover—after most of the world's major rivers have been dammed—how profoundly and widely "reclamation" projects can alter the balance of life. The Aswan Dam alone, some 500 miles from the mouth of the Nile River, is causing ecological damage all over the eastern Mediterranean Basin.

Thor Heyerdahl, the great Norwegian explorer who recently crossed the Atlantic in a papyrus boat, reports that the ocean has become so contaminated with oil and other refuse that large stretches of it are unfit to bathe in.

It is an awesome offense to turn an ocean into an open sewer—an offense that poses a direct threat to all life on the planet. The Niagara of oil, long-lived pesticides, and poisonous flotsam and jetsam we annually dump into the oceans are killing the organisms in sea water which release oxygen into the atmosphere. Many scientists believe these organisms are the main reason the air—into which we so casually dump hundreds of millions of tons of pollutants annually—miraculously seems to purify itself. It is thought by some that if these organisms become extinct, or even significantly diminished, there could be major increases in the amounts of carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide in the atmosphere. It would be as though there was a giant parking garage with all the doors and windows shut—and the attendants left the engines of all the cars running.

In view of this, we are especially indebted to our distinguished colleague, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, for drawing attention to the Defense Department's incredible scheme to dump 2,000 tons of surplus nerve gas—stored in corroding drums—into the Atlantic Ocean off the New Jersey coast. That gas remains stored in earth revetments at Rocky Mountain Arsenal, less than 5 miles from the end of the north-south runways of Denver's Stapleton Airport—18th busiest in the world. Portions of it will remain there for at least 2 years, until a program of detoxification is completed. We can only hope that during that time the earthquake fault line—which was lubricated into activity when hundreds of millions of gallons of poisonous refuse from the original manufacture of the gas were pumped down an arsenal disposal well—remains quiescent.

When Col. Frank Borman, the commander of Apollo 8, looked back at this planet from the moon on Christmas Eve, 1968, he called our home "spaceship Earth." The hard fact is that we have not run a taut ship. We now have to face the terrible possibility that before the century ends our children may hear the order "All hands on spaceship Earth abandon ship." But there are no life boats.

There are some signs, however, that the cycle of indifference and greed which seems to defeat all of our efforts may at last be breaking.

One of the most hopeful developments in recent weeks has been a proposal from that remarkably foresighted union, the United Auto Workers, which once more has taken the lead in facing up to urgent national problems. The UAW has joined with six conservation groups to suggest that we adopt air pollution standards so strong that they would probably require an end to the internal combustion engine after 1975. This proposal would require 1975 model cars to have exhausts as clean as those from the steam-powered, Rankine cycle engine.

The source of this suggestion, which would revolutionize the auto industry, is particularly notable: men whose livelihoods and futures are tied to the future of the automobile. Yet they show greater appreciation of their enlightened self-interest as auto men than the dissembling managers of the industry who advocate a policy of environmental tokenism.

The UAW and the conservationists have also suggested that Government agencies purchase only those autos that can operate on reduced octane, lead-free gasoline, and that auto manufacturers guarantee pollution control devices for up to 50,000 miles.

They further propose legislation requiring manufacturers to install pollution control devices on used cars at no cost to the customers, and authorization for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards for emissions of nitrogen oxides by 1973 instead of 1975 as now planned.

These proposals, if passed into law and enforced by properly staffed and funded agencies, would provide a firm basis for an all-out assault on vehicular air pollution. Equally vigorous steps should be taken against other air and water polluters.

Against industrial polluters, for instance, a system might be adopted under which all profits derived from operating plants which do not comply with clean air standards might be attached for use in upgrading them. This technique might be particularly useful in the case of publicly regulated industries, such as airlines which will not convert to clean jet engines and utilities which refuse to install precipitators on smoke stacks of generating plants. Is there and conceivable reason why those industries whose rate of return is assured by public regula-

tory bodies should be permitted to lard their profits by the casual poisoning of their customers?

As long as we insist on rewarding oil producers and transporters—who are among the world's foremost water polluters—with protectionist import quotas and wildly inflated depletion allowances, we should at least condition their eligibility for this largess on their fastidiousness.

Prompt passage of several measures currently pending before the Congress would also be useful in averting ecocatastrophe. I would particularly commend the following bills, which I have joined in sponsoring:

H.R. 14867 would amend the Clean Air Act to permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to shut down plants when weather conditions prevail which make further air pollution an extreme health risk. It would also provide for compensating workers with unemployment allowances, the establishment of new clean air standards, and for injunctive relief for violation of those standards.

H.R. 17199 amends the National Emission Standards Act to provide for the elimination of automotive air pollution. It also broadens the act to provide for regulation of all hazardous emissions from all types of engines, rather than confining itself to certain pollutants from internal combustion engines.

H.R. 17203 would permit the Governor of a State to use part of the State's Federal highway funds to pay any additional costs incurred in purchasing low-emission vehicles.

H.R. 17201 would impose an excise tax on automobiles based on their horsepower and emission of pollutants, and use the revenue to finance research for the development of low-emission vehicles.

H.R. 16520 would establish an Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General.

H.R. 14535 would establish a board to certify low emission motor vehicles, and provide for Government purchase of them if the costs are not more than 25 percent above those vehicles they would replace.

H.R. 13200 would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit supersonic commercial flights over the United States until the problem of sonic boom is solved and its effects controlled.

House Resolution 946 amends the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing Committee on the Environment.

House Joint Resolution 505 urges a constitutional amendment to conserve the natural resources and beauty of the United States.

In addition, we should assure full funding for water pollution control projects. The administration has consistently requested appropriations far lower than authorizations, a slight of hand that does nothing to clean the Nation's waterways and much to poison its politics.

Even these proposals do not constitute an adequate attack on the country's environmental problems. Their very modesty however, makes it all the more disturbing that little or no action has been forthcoming. If the President and the Congress are not willing to take these inadequate first steps now, there is cause for grave concern about how they will respond to the grave crisis recent events show to be so near. Will we be arguing over clean air standards on the day that an atmospheric inversion makes New York City uninhabitable? Will we still be disputing water pollution appropriations when the Great Lakes becomes as devoid of life as the Dead Sea?

Two recent developments give some measure of the magnitude and the urgency of the crisis facing us. First, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's study of critical environmental problems has warned that supersonic transports could change the earth's climate by creating permanent layers of smog in the upper atmosphere. The Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to subsidize the development of the SST, disregarding the potential perils the plane poses to the environment. In view of this new and knowledgeable warning, it is unconscionable not to reopen the whole question of SST development before this session ends. How can we demand an end to automobile air pollution and proceed to subsidize the destruction of the upper atmosphere?

Second, a national organization of State highway officials has recently estimated that meeting the Nation's highway needs for the next 15 years will cost $320 billion, or more than $20 billion a year. That rate of expenditure means that between now and the time the 1975 target date for the pollution-free engine is reached, we will have spent $100 billion for highways, a sum three times greater than the cost of putting Neil Armstrong on the moon, half again as great as the total spent on the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System and nearly 2,000 times as great as the amount the administration proposes to spend on development of the clean auto engine.

American scientists needed less than 4 years to build the atomic bomb. It seems incredible, but current estimates suggest it will take 5 years to produce a nonpolluting automobile—which in the end may be powered by nothing more exotic than a steam engine. The suggestion that $320 billion more could be spent on highway construction is also all too credible in view of past performances.

Is there any rational excuse for not providing that development of the nonpolluting engine receive crash program funding? The administration predicts that the project will cost about $50 million over 5 years. If it receives 10 times that amount in half the time it will still be far less than the cost overrun alone on the C–5A. On the other hand, is there any reason why highway construction should not be cooled off once the Interstate Highway System is complete? That would not mean we stop building roads. It does mean that future highway projects be planned with the understanding that roads and autos are only one part of the Nation's transportation system, a part which for decades has been emphasized at the expense of many others and on which we may well have become overly reliant.

In 1972, the law which sends tax revenues directly into the highway trust fund will expire. The renewal of that statute should be conditioned on the appropriation of some trust fund revenues to alternative transit systems, particularly urban mass transit systems. The Congress would be well advised to authorize a joint study by the appropriate Federal agencies of the country's transit needs for the rest of the century. The participation from the outset of a Department of Environmental Services would be particularly important, if we are to avoid yet another report in which prosperity is measured in parking lots and progress in how much blacktop is spread over the public domain.

There are many other aspects to the environmental crisis. Such questions as nuclear pollution and waste disposal, thermal pollution, land use, and many others are as serious as those that have been mentioned here and also deserve our urgent attention. There is—as Cecil Rhodes remarked—So much to do, so little time. It cannot be emphasized often enough that we are in the 11th hour.

Mr. Speaker, for 150 years enlightened Americans have warned that we cannot continue indefinitely to do violence to the land, the air, and the waterways of this great continent without paying a terrible price. We have ignored those warnings. And during this time, we have ignored other warnings as well—warnings from nature in the form of floods, red tides, atmospheric inversions, and even earth tremors. Those warnings have come more and more frequently in recent years, and still we have ignored them. We continue to do so now at our mortal peril.

COAL MINERS' DISABILITY AND RETIREMENT FUND

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recent wildcat strikes in the coal fields underline the growing anger of the miners, directed at the inequities, inconsistencies, and inadequacies of the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund. I am accordingly drafting legislation to establish a federally controlled coal miners' disability and retirement fund. Such a fund should be financed by $1.25 per ton royalties paid by the coal companies, with the rules and administration completely in the hands of the Federal Government.

Under the privately operated UMW welfare and retirement fund, administered by three trustees, rules have been made and changed in an arbitrary fashion. Many miners and their families have informed me that their pensions or health and medical cards have been summarily cut off without adequate explanation. Some hospital cards have been issued to construction workers, other noncoal miners, and for apparent political purposes.

Huge interest-free deposits have been made by the fund in the UMW-owned National Bank of Washington. This

amounts to a milking of the fund, and diverting millions of dollars into the union coffers. Although the welfare and retirement fund has considerably less now on deposit in the National Bank than a few years ago, the practice should be terminated immediately. At current interest rates, all this money should be bringing in millions of dollars of additional support to benefit the coal miners, their widows and families instead of merely enriching the union treasury. The whole investment policy, plus the haphazard and slipshod accounting and auditing methods alone justify taking the fund out of the hands of private trustees and placing it under Federal administration and control.

If those who haul coal on the railroads can be protected by a Railroad Retirement Board, certainly those who dig the coal are entitled to no less protection. I do not think the problem will be solved simply by making coal miners, their families or widows eligible for medicare or medicaid, or by some special scheme of Federal benefits to coal miners at the expense of the taxpayers. Why should we bail out an unsound and corrupt system with taxpayers' money? The coal companies can and should finance full disability, health and retirement benefits for those who work in the mines, their dependents and survivors.

Through my bill I also hope to remove the inequities between anthracite and bituminous coal miners, and the disability, health and retirement benefits they received. At present, the worker in the anthracite mines is protected even less by an inadequate welfare and retirement fund. My bill will also establish partial benefits for those who work only a short period of time in the coal mines, and enable portability—or transfer of a coal miner's equity in the pension system to another industry if he should leave the coal mines.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration ended its second year of operations, and completed the distribution of more than $260 million in fiscal 1970 funds for improvements in the Nation's criminal justice system. The grants awarded by LEAA are making possible local, regional, State, and national projects which this country has needed for more years than I wish to count. These projects include the planning and construction of new facilities, training of personnel working in the system, the purchase of basic equipment so badly and urgently needed, and the development of new and more modern materials and techniques to enhance the country's fight against crime.

In Virginia, this year, we received $4,150,000 in direct block action grant funds. To this amount, the State and local governments will add approximately $3 million, thus making Virginia's effort for the coming year a program involving over $7 million. Having studied Virginia's plan for the use of these funds, I find our Law Enforcement Planning Agency has designed a program that will improve all the elements of the State's criminal justice system—the police, courts, and corrections.

For example, over $1 million will be used to upgrade the quality of law enforcement within the State. Additional personnel will be recruited and, along with our present force, these new people will receive better training in better facilities.

A majority of these funds, over three quarters of a million dollars, will be used to prevent crime. A large portion of this effort will be directed toward the control and prevention of drug abuse. Over half a million dollars more will be used for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. These two programs alone will have a great impact on crime in Virginia.

The courts, the second element in the criminal justice system, also are receiving major attention and efforts toward improvement. Plans call for revision of the criminal law and procedures provisions of the Virginia Code. We are also undertaking a comprehensive study of court organization and providing increased training for judges and prosecutors. However, to arrest and convict the criminal is not the complete answer to improvements in any criminal justice system. Rehabilitation is the third part. To many, it is the most important aspect of efforts to reduce crime. As the Nation has become aware of overall shortcomings in corrections systems, so has the State of Virginia.

During the coming year, almost a million and a half dollars will be spent to solve the problems of corrections. Virginia is developing regional and community-based programs which will provide not only detention but diagnosis, treatment and training for those who, with such assistance, can return to become productive members of society. One of the most effective ways to reduce crime is to reduce the number of crime repeaters. Studies show that at least half of all offenders now commit new crimes after being released from prisons and jails.

Thus, this three-pronged attack on crime in the State of Virginia is moving forward. But the program I have mentioned are not the total efforts. The State also is increasing its efforts against organized crime, our agencies are developing new skills in prevention and control of civil disorders, and in conjunction with this we are undertaking a special program designed to improve police-community relations. Finally, looking toward the future, we are conducting research and development to insure future programs using innovative, effective techniques.

My State, Virginia, is only one example of the new national crime control program. The other States also are in this effort—and it will be successful. The LEAA program started just 2 years ago. This program will provide in time, for each and every citizen, a safer home, a safer city, and a better and more productive America.

NATION'S SECURITIES EXCHANGES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the presence of institutional traders on the Nation's securities exchanges might greatly alter the structure of these exchanges as we know them today. Because these companies deal with great blocks of shares, many independent traders would be absorbed; they would simply be unable to compete with their larger, more powerful competitors. As a result, excessive economic power would become concentrated in the hands of these institutions, rather than divided, as it is now, among many independent brokers and brokerage firms. Institutional traders accounted for 54 percent of the volume of share orders and 60 percent of the total dollar volume transacted on the New York Stock Exchange in the first half of 1969. Consequently, it is easy to see how these institutions could control trading activity on securities exchanges if they were to be allowed to sit on these exchanges and become brokers for their own account.

It is for these reasons that I introduce legislation to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to require that national securities exchanges amend their rules to provide that no person may be a member of the exchange or a parent of a member unless it is primarily engaged in the transaction of business as a broker or dealer in securities. This bill is drafted so that the Securities and Exchange Commission, in cooperation with the securities exchanges themselves, may implement its provisions by specific definitions, adapted to their specific needs. In order to clarify the purpose of this bill, two points should be considered. First, there are some institutions, primarily mutual funds, which presently have memberships on some of the regional securities exchanges and it is the announced intention of some of the major exchanges to begin to follow this practice. This bill, as introduced, would prohibit this. Second, there are also institutions which are either owned by or affiliated with members of the New York Stock Exchange. This bill would allow for the continuation of these relationships.

JOHN F. STEVENS: STRONGLY SUPPORTED FOR ELECTION TO THE HALL OF FAME FOR GREAT AMERICANS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most constructive organizations of our country is the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. Every 5 years it elects not more than seven Americans for enshrinement there.

The difficult task of selection is accomplished by means of an electoral college composed of distinguished leaders of the United States among university or college executives, historians, and scientists; authors, editors, and artists; men and women of affairs; actual or former high public officials or justices of our courts, both Federal and State.

To sponsor the election to this great honor of the late John F. Stevens (1853–1943) there was formed in 1969 the John F. Stevens Hall of Fame Committee, of which I am proud to have been chosen as one of the honorary chairmen. The offices of this committee are at 345 E. 47th Street, Suite 1800, New York, N.Y. 10017. Its function is to present valid evidence to the electoral college setting forth the qualifications of its candidate, who was one of the greatest civil engineers in history.

The fame of Stevens rests primarily upon four major achievements, namely:

Key roles in the construction of the Great Northern and other railroads.

Discovery of Marias Pass in Montana and Stevens Pass in Washington through which the Great Northern was constructed.

Rehabilitation of Russian, Siberian, and Manchurian railroads, 1917–23.

Designing of the Panama Canal and launching that project on the road to success, 1905–07, for which he was rewarded by President Theodore Roosevelt with appointment as the first official to hold the combined offices of chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

For his tremendous services for the Panama Canal, he is recognized by competent authorities as its basic architect.

A number of prominent organizations throughout the Nation have adopted resolutions supporting the election of John F. Stevens to the Hall of Fame.

As this evidence of such support will be of interest not only to Members of the Congress, but also to many leaders throughout the United States, Panama, and other countries, I quote them as parts of my remarks, as follows:

JOHN FRANK STEVENS: ARCHITECT OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Whereas, the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., is composed of persons in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia who were or are employed in the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, civil protection and military defense of the Panama Canal; and

Whereas, the late John Frank Stevens of West Gardiner, Maine (1853–1943), the great railroad builder, served with great distinction as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission during the planning and organizational period of the Panama Canal (1905–1907); and

Whereas, the history of the project shows that Chief Engineer Stevens made the following contributions:

(1) Rescued the project in 1905 from chaos and defeat;

(2) Supported Colonel William C. Gorgas in the vital work of health and sanitation on the Isthmus;

(3) Planned the railroad transportation system for disposal of excavated earth and rock;

(4) Purchased a major part of the plant for canal construction;

(5) Planned the existing high level lake and lock type canal with Atlantic Locks at Gatun and was mainly responsible for the great decision by President Theodore Roosevelt and the Congress for its adoption;

(6) Organized the engineering forces for the design and construction of the Panama Canal and led the work until success was demonstrated, with full acceptance of both canal plan and organization; and

Whereas, President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907 in recognition of his tremendous contributions to the Canal Zone and Canal appointed Stevens as the first official to hold the combined offices of Chairman and Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission; and

Whereas, Chief Engineer Stevens was recognized by President Roosevelt in his February 19, 1906, message to the Congress as the one "mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat" and has been subsequently acclaimed by authoritative scholars as the "basic architect of the Panama Canal;" and

Whereas, Stevens' contributions at Panama have been memorialized in a mural painting by William Andrew Mackay in the Roosevelt Memorial Hall of the American Museum of Natural History of New York showing Stevens giving the plans for the Panama Canal to President Roosevelt; and

Whereas, in 1962 the United States Government named the principal traffic circle in Balboa as the Stevens Circle and erected thereon a monument with the following inscription that includes a tribute by the successor of Stevens under whom construction was completed and the great waterway launched into the era of operations:

Resolved, that the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., because of the fundamental nature of the contribution of John Frank Stevens in the design of the Panama Canal, the organization of the forces for its construction, and its successful completion and operation, recommends him as eminently worthy for memorialization in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University and respectfully urges that he receive that great distinction.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS, JULY 28, 1969

RECOMMENDS HONOR FOR JOHN FRANK STEVENS

Speaking for all its Member Roads, the Board of Directors of the Association of American Railroads unanimously adopted the following resolution on July 28, 1969:

Whereas, the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University enshrines distinguished citizens whose dedicated lives reflect the highest ideals of our nation's culture in the arts and sciences, scholarship and government; and

Whereas, John Frank Stevens, one of the outstanding transportation engineers of all time, played spectacular and courageous roles in national and international enterprises of major importance; and

Whereas, many of his remarkable permanent engineering feats were in the location and construction of railroads in the United States and Canada and other foreign countries; and

Whereas, Mr. Stevens also contributed immeasurably to American railroad progress and accomplishment in executive and consulting capacities; and

Whereas, his other monumental achievements included service as chief engineer during the designing of the Panama Canal; and

Whereas, none of America's notable railroad leaders who did so much for our nation is in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Association of American Railroads, speaking for all its Member Roads, strongly recommends that John Frank Stevens be accorded this high honor in the 1970 election.

EXPLORERS CLUB, FEBRUARY 14, 1967

The following resolution regarding Mr. John Frank Steven's nomination for N.Y.U.'s Hall of Fame was approved.

Whereas, The Explorers Club is composed of men who have engaged in exploration or added to the geographical knowledge of the world; and

Whereas, the late John Frank Stevens of Maine (1853–1943) was one of the Explorers Club's most distinguished members; and

Whereas, his record includes the following achievements:

(a) Discovery in mid-winter in 1889 of Marias Pass through the Mountains in Montana;

(b) Discovery in the spring of 1890 of Stevens Pass through the Cascade Mountains in the State of Washington;

(c) Major contributions in the location and construction of the Great Northern Railway System; 1889–1903; including a great tunnel bearing his name;

(d) Design of the Panama Canal, organizing the forces for its construction, and bringing the project to the point where its success was a certainty, 1905–1907;

(e) Rehabilitation of Russian and Siberian Railroads, 1917–1923.

Resolved, that because of the outstanding value of the services of John Frank Stevens, it is the judgment of The Explorers Club that he is eminently worthy for memorialization in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University; and the Club respectfully urges his election to that great honor.

Date: August 18, 1967.

FREDERICK T. VOORHEES,
Secretary.

MONTANA HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
Helena, Mont., October 27, 1969.

Mr. ALBERT R. BEATTY,
Vice President, Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEATTY: The Board of Trustees of the Montana Historical Society, at its meeting held in Helena on October 23, unanimously approved a motion instructing me to express the Society's endorsement of the movement to elect John F. Stevens to the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University.

Our Society and Board are keenly aware of Mr. Stevens' contributions to the winning of the West—the Northwest in particular—and we know if it had not been for his energy, knowledge and foresight the history of Montana and the Northwest might have been a great deal different.

Montanans especially know of Mr. Stevens' work in locating the route of what is now the Great Northern Railway. They recall how construction of the railway was halted in the late '80s as the railway builders sought a route through the Northern United States. It was then that Mr. Stevens' great feat of locating Marias Pass—in severe winter weather—made it possible for the railway to achieve a way to the West Coast.

We feel it is also significant that the route, with the pass, eventually helped open up a great National Park—Glacier—for the enjoyment and use of millions of our citizens. Marias Pass, as you know, runs along the Southern Boundary of that park.

Of course, we in Montana also are aware of Mr. Stevens' later achievements that brought him worldwide recognition in his profession.

The Board authorizes this letter, and any additional material we can provide, in this move for recognition of a man who meant a great deal to this region.

Sincerely,

SAM GILLULY,
Director.

THE NIXON ECONOMY AND A WAY TO IMPROVE IT

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if the present administration is living in the same country that I am. This wonder changes to amazement every time I hear members of the administration speak about the current state of the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I can vividly remember the speeches made by the President and other members of the administration when they first took office. They said that we were going to curb inflation; we were going to keep unemployment down; we were going to maintain high corporate profits; we were going to keep the economy booming. All this would be done by scientifically using fiscal and monetary controls. But, somehow the economy faltered and the administration goals have crumbled. The first goal of maintaining the growth of the gross national product has not been reached. Since the third quarter of 1969, when the GNP stood at $730.6 billion, productivity has declined by $6 billion to $724.3 billion. This is the first time the GNP has decreased since 1960, when the last Republican administration was in power.

The next goal the administration abandoned was increasing profits and productivity. Industrial productivity began its spin downward in November 1969, and has continued in that direction since. Business profits are off so significantly that tax revenues from corporate profits will decrease $4 billion in this fiscal year. And the stock market, that perennial indicator of business confidence, has been in virtually uninterrupted descent since the Republicans took over at the Nation's economic helm. In fact, since Nixon took office, stock market losses have totaled $250 billion, more money than the total expenditures in the federal budget.

As the Republicans continued talking and as productivity and profits fell, prices and unemployment began to rise. By January 1970, the Consumer Price Index stood at 131.8 and had risen 5 times faster than it had during the Kennedy and Johnson years. And unemployment stood at 3.9 percent, up .67 percent. Rising prices and rising unemployment were putting the pinch on every American. By means of tight money, high credit rates and low Government spending, the Nixon administration had succeeded in giving the American citizen the worst of both worlds: a decline in growth and an increase in unemployment along with continued price rises.

At this point, the administration decided it would have to change its policies. Fiscal and monetary "adjustments" were quietly made as the Government continued to spew forth its micawberlike confidence. But, still the situation has continued to deteriorate as the following figures lucidly reveal:

	Consumer price index	Unemployment rate
March	133.2	4.4
April	134.0	4.8
May	134.6	5.0

On Tuesday, June 30, the President presented his economic message to the Nation. It was described beforehand as an important policy pronouncement that would concretely deal with our failing economy. But, the speech contained little substance.

For the first half of his speech, the President made excuses, explaining why his policies were not working. There was the excuse of a wartime economy in transition to peace, though only $5 billion out of a GNP of $932.1 billion in 1970 dollars—or $727.5 billion in 1958 dollars—had been redirected from war to peace efforts. There was the excuse of only four policy paths for the Government to follow, although the width and available methods of control within each path was unsubtly and unwisely ignored. Yet, perhaps this part of the speech exhibited some progress. The administration was meekly implying that its economic policies were not working too well.

In the second part of the speech, the President made proposals. I cannot help but feel, Mr. Speaker, that these proposals were flimsy and inadequate; many of them were "more of the same" with only a new top coat of shellac added for "shine." For instance, the President proposed in his speech setting up a Committee on Productivity. This administration seems to regard committees as a substitute for action. The President also called for expanded unemployment and old age benefits in his speech. These programs are meritorious in themselves, but they are insufficient and do not get at the root of the problem. And finally, the President asked for the extension of credit to homeowners and small businessmen because interest rates are too high. Here, Mr. Nixon failed to apply elementary doctrines of economic efficiency for he did not touch those interest rates themselves. In short, Mr. Nixon's policies are inappropriate, inadequate, and inefficient.

I propose an alternative approach to our economic crisis. This approach, I feel, will start our economy growing again, reduce unemployment and stop inflation. I propose:

TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

First. We should expand the money supply at a rate of 7½ percent a year. This is at a rate of 1½ percent higher than the present Federal Reserve rate.

By a classical monetary method, the expansion of our money supply would boost our economy. For months, the administration froze the money supply and this, in large part, caused our economic decline. Realizing its folly, the administration has reversed policy and has given orders to increase the money supply at a rate of 6 percent per year. But, this rate is not high enough. Inflation has been increasing at the same 6 percent annual rate. The money supply should be increased at a greater rate, so that our economic situation will improve, not just remain stagnate.

Second. Expand the Manpower Development Training Act and change it qualitatively.

Presently, the manpower development training program is being run on an economizing basis. When unemployment rises, we hire people to fill the least skilled jobs because it costs less. When unemployment improves, we discontinue the program, leaving the participants no better off than they were when it began. MDTA programs must begin to train people for more skilled, long-lasting jobs, so that once a person has completed such a program, his chances of being unemployed will greatly diminish. This would significantly contribute to making permanent progress in the employment problem.

TO STOP INFLATION

The above measures should give the economy the necessary push to begin to grow once again. But, even if the economy were to prosper again, we would still be suffering from inflation. The following programs will help terminate inflation and at the same time help the economy advance.

END PRICE SUPPORTS

In an act of sheer hypocrisy, the present administration refuses to use price guidelines to keep prices down, but supports all sorts of restrictive guidelines that hold prices up. The most flagrant of these are the oil import quotas, which maintain fuel prices at abnormally high levels, especially in the East. Another example of artificially maintained high prices lies in the defense field, where cost overruns contribute heavily to inflationary pressure. And the huge wasteful system of agricultural price supports is an extremely inefficient, expensive and inflationary way to improve the plight of the farmer. All these inflationary price supports should be ended.

LOWER THE PRIME INTEREST RATE TO 7 PERCENT

This would make money less expensive, and in turn, lower the cost of living index. It would also greatly aid our ailing housing industry, which has been off 40 percent since the present administration took office.

END THE INFLATIONARY PSYCHOLOGY

Mr. Nixon made a great mistake in the fall of 1969 when he assured business leaders the administration would not interfere with their price policy. In effect, he gave them the green light to raise prices to their heart's content; they did not hesitate to do so. This inflationary psychology is still with us. The President must finally make clear that when a specific firm raises prices excessively, the Government will exert pressure on that firm and prevent the price rise.

IMPOSE SPECIFIC PRICE—NOT WAGE—CONTROLS AND GUIDELINES

Too frequently do economists and government officials talk of price guidelines and wage guidelines in the same breath. The two are separable. We can set price guidelines, and then allow management and labor to divide the profits as they see fit. Wage increases, without price increases, are not inflationary. They merely redistribute wages and business profits according to fair bargaining between labor and management. Thus, I recommend that guidelines be set for prices only.

Past history has taught us that one uniform nationwide guideline will not work; specific guidelines must be formu-

lated and enforced, industry by industry. Should a firm raise prices higher than its industry guideline, the Government would indict the company and force the raise to be rescinded.

Mr. Speaker, if the above changes are made, our economy, for the first time in 2 years will be on prosperous, but on stable ground. I am certain the American people would welcome that change.

CONTROLLING THE INTERNATIONAL DRUG TRADE: A PLEA FOR MULTILATERAL ACTION

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that drug abuse is on the increase in this country. We have startling figures to prove how many of our young people are now taking hard drugs. We have statistics that show how crime is related to the use of drugs. The question, of course, remains: How do we cope with this serious problem?

I have long believed that the problem requires a twofold response by this country. It requires a comprehensive program that deals with the treatment and the rehabilitation of individuals who are already taking drugs, and it necessitates a program that will effectively limit the supply of narcotics that enters this country. I have introduced a comprehensive drug program that would deal with both these aspects. Today, however, I would like to discuss the second of the two problems and my solution. I would like to show how it would be possible to control the supply of drugs entering this country.

America is having a difficult time restricting the world trade in opium. The yearly amount traded has increased. Recently, there has been a new move by this country to curtail the growth of the poppy by the use of direct grants by the U.S. Government to various countries to pressure farmers to end their cultivation of opium-producing plants.

This program has taken shape in Turkey—long known to be one of the largest producers and exporters of raw opium. Yet, U.S. initiatives have not achieved their purpose. In the process, they have served to foster a political crisis in Turkey and the growth of anti-Americanism.

In a world that is growing increasingly wary of unilateral American intervention, I believe that we must take initiatives that involve other countries. My proposal to limit the growth of raw opium through the use of the United Nations as a clearing house for the effort provides such an opportunity.

In legislation introduced in May of this year, I called upon the President to press for the establishment of an international consortium under the aegis of the United Nations that would control the world supply of opium. This international body would issue direct grants to farmers growing the poppy. It would pay these farmers, through an incentive program, to produce foodstuffs.

The crucial element in my program is that it would be an international effort. It would be supported by the nations of the world and would be administered by the United Nations. Each nation would be asked to contribute to the costs of the work of the consortium by the use of a formula based on their ability to pay.

If this program were instituted, I believe it would prove itself much more effective than the program presently administered by the United States alone. There would be the pressure of world public opinion behind a nation's compliance. It would not appear to the skeptical as but another attempt at direct American involvement in the internal affairs of another country. As we know, it is this interpretation of American efforts that has fostered the political crisis in Turkey.

It is for all these reasons—the foremost of which still remains the need for an effective program to control the poisonous drugs that are reaching our shores in ever larger quantities—that I ask this Congress to act upon the resolution that I have introduced—calling upon the President to press for the establishment of the international consortium.

RETIRED SERVICEMEN'S FAMILY PROTECTION PLAN—A NEED FOR REFORM

(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, recently my attention has been brought forcefully to a most inequitable situation which is causing severe hardship for many survivors of retired servicemen. A number of letters from widows of retired career military men have detailed the severe difficulties they have had to face after the death of their husbands due to weaknesses in the retired servicemen's family protection plan. All too often these widows find that upon their husband's death they receive no pension at all, except possibly a small social security check if they have children or if they are over 62.

There are at least two basic weaknesses in the RSFPP as it now exists. Perhaps the most notable is that it is inferior to the comparable plan for civil service, in that servicemen have to pay significantly more for coverage than civil servants do. The reason for this is that the RSFPP is operated on strict actuarial principles so as to not cost the Government anything. On the other hand the Government pays part of the cost of the civil service plan. Another weakness of RSFPP is that because of the strict actuarial principles on which it is operated, the election procedures are very strict, much more so than under the civil service plan.

The unfairness of the situation is that after a retired serviceman dies, his family often finds that through no fault of theirs they are virtually penniless. The strictness of the system works hardship on the survivors who suddenly realize that they have little security even though the man of the family spent his whole life in service to his country, often abroad and sometimes in combat, away from his family, perhaps wounded in action, or even a prisoner of war for months or years.

The inequity of the present system, which is in itself disturbing, is pointed up by the way it contrasts to the civil service plan. It is just unfair that career military men receive less protection for their survivors than people in the civil service, since they truly put their lives on the line in the defense of their country, and work under conditions which are harsh for their families.

We are currently considering the establishment of an all-volunteer army, a concept which I favor. In order to do that we are going to have to pay our servicemen better. We all know that. But we are also going to have to correct inequities like this where the survivors of servicemen are less protected than survivors of civil servants.

The letters I have received from servicemen's widows have convinced me that change in the RSFPP is needed, and needed soon. A subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has been holding hearings on proposals to remedy this situation and is, I understand, favorably inclined toward some kind of action this session. I urge that favorable action be taken, as it is merited by the facts.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. Since 1960, the number of immigrants coming to the United States from other countries increased from 265,398 to 454,448 in 1968.

HIGHWAY SAFETY NO. 5—ONE CITY'S SOLUTION

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past month I have been inserting a series of articles from the Christian Science Monitor on the subject of highway safety, specifically the problem of the drunken driver. These articles have clearly made the point that heavy drinkers who also drive are a major cause of the disturbingly high death toll on our highways. Other causes include poorly designed highways, unsafe cars, "muscle" cars, inadequate testing for licenses, judges who are too lenient in dealing with offenders, insufficient numbers of police on our highways, and lax laws. Perhaps the major accomplishment of this series is that it has established drunken drivers as a cause of accidents and fatalities at least equal to the other causes men-

tioned, and one which has been neglected and ignored by too many people too long.

The fifth article in this series by Guy Halverson turns its attention toward a solution, and focuses on one city which has recognized the severity of the problem and is apparently doing something to solve it. Local solutions such as these would go a long way toward saving some of the 28,000 lives which are currently being lost in accidents caused by drunk drivers. Programs like the ones described here are certainly not the complete answer, but they are a very important part of it. They go far toward preventing people from driving after drinking too much, with practical preventive measures. To back this up, it is, of course, necessary for effective, stiff police measures to provide an element of deterrence. In addition, as emphasized in last week's article, it is important for society to treat alcoholics as sick people who are suffering from a disease. All of these measures overlap, and are necessary to a solution to the problem.

This article is important because of its emphasis on what is being done in some leading communities in this field, and for the leadership they can offer other areas as they recognize the problem and begin to act seriously to combat it. The Christian Science Monitor is to be commended for its emphasis in this article on what is being done in several communities, for the encouragement it provides others to be active. Many of us often complain that the emphasis is always on what is wrong. This type of article avoids that by emphasizing constructive approaches to the problem:

ALBUQUERQUE FINDS A BETTER ROAD

(By Guy Halverson)

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M.—Most American cities seem indifferent to the havoc being wrought by the drinking driver. Not Albuquerque, N.M. Under way in this city is a comprehensive, interagency campaign against those who drink and then drive. It could serve as a model for the nation.

What would you do if you suddenly found yourself living in a city of 300,000 people where:

Highway fatalities for 1969 totaled 47 compared with 30 the year before—perhaps 70 percent of which were liquor-related;

Police costs for handling drunkenness are continually spiraling upward;

At least 1 out of every 14 drinkers is believed to be an alcoholic, and many of them own automobiles?

Confronted with this situation, the City of Albuquerque declared war on the drunk driver. The strategy: broad community support, assiduous wooing of federal funds, and an overall program which some safety experts say could become a model of civic responsibility.

According to most safety experts, such a model is sorely needed nationwide. In most of the communities this reporter visited across the United States, he found a towering apathy toward the problem of the drunk driver. Inaction was the rule.

A WELCOME EXCEPTION

The Albuquerque effort, it would appear, is an exception to that rule.

What is happening here, however, is typical of the few model communities recently selected for the Department of Transportation's new program aimed at curbing the drunk driver.

Albuquerque—with a pre-World War II population of 30,000—has mushroomed. Today it is an important space-research center. It sits astride a grid of highways that link such major metropolitan areas as Denver, Los Angeles, and Dallas.

Local planners such as Steve George, chairman of the regional Council of Government, point out that this growth puts tremendous strain on roadway systems. Just in Bernalillo County (Albuquerque) alone, passenger-car resistration jumped from 81,000 in 1958 to 139,000 in 1968. On many major arterials, traffic volume is already at what were projected as 1975 capacity limits.

City planners became acutely aware of the need for long-range roadway planning to counter the rising congrestion and resultant accident patterns.

As a first step, Albuquerque leaders hammered together a joint county, city, and school-district Traffic Safety Commission. It was underwritten in part by a $45,000 Department of Transportation grant.

The commission, operating out of the regional four-countywide Council of Government, was charged with bringing together traffic and road information from different agencies; establishing highway priorities; and channeling local efforts into the statewide program of the New Mexico Traffic Safety Commission.

This paved the way for step No. 2: a $1.4 million grant from the Department of Transportation (DOT) to test out specific countermeasures against drunk driving and part of a nationwide DOT experimental project.

The Albuquerque program, only now getting under way, includes:

A speaker's bureau and an advertising campaign.

Inclusion of questions on alcoholism and alcohol abuse on driver's license tests and renewal tests.

Identification through welfare and other social agency referals of problem drinkers who drive.

Use of cabs and police vehicles to transport drunks home from taverns and parties.

More intensive patrolling in high-liquor, high-fatality areas.

Establishment of a special "drunk patrol."

Experimentation with mechanical devices to identify drunk drivers. Under consideration are such items as portable TV units in patrol cars and exotic devices known as portable "sniffer machines" that can detect alcohol on the breath of a passing motorist.

Development of an extensive alcoholism-treatment program.

What has caught the attention of safety experts is the way the DOT-Albuquerque attack on drunk driving is being hitched to a continuing $740,000 model-city program. The latter is aimed in part at alcoholism and is locally and federally funded. There is some criticism that the model-city program overly stresses rehabilitation of the problem drinker while neglecting controls on the social drinker.

DECISION MADE IN 1966

In 1966, when Albuquerque was planning its participation in the model-city program, a number of organizations—including the police, an area council on alcoholism, and the city government—decided to do something about the drinking problem. They went to the Community Council of Albuquerque, a nongovernmental civic-action agency.

"They asked us to do something about the problem of alcoholism before things got out of control here, as was happening in too many other cities," recollects Dr. Hugh Woodward, past president of the Community Council. The council responded by setting up a planning committee and borrowing a staff person from the Department of Psychiatry at the University of New Mexico.

At the same time, the council asked the city to prepare a report on the cost to local taxpayers of police handling of drunken drivers and persons arrested for public drunkenness. Analysis showed annual costs to be well over $250,000 at that time. A coroner's report, prepared about the same time, also showed most highway fatalities to be liquor-related.

An evaluation of the overall drinking problem found it to be most heavily centered in the low-income, model-city area. The Community Council, at an open meeting at the main branch of the Albuquerque National Bank, presented a comprehensive treatment plan which envisioned a detoxification center and rehabilitation farm for alcoholics.

A special "blue-ribbon" finance committee was appointed. It included the police chief, city manager, a municipal court judge, and several state alcoholism commissioners. They went to work to figure out a way to underwrite what would admittedly be an expensive project.

"SEED MONEY" PUT UP

At a joint meeting in March, 1969, representatives of Bernalillo County and the City of Albuquerque decided to put up $80,000 in "seed money." The idea was to interest the Departments of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to provide the bulk of the needed capital.

"That was the hardest part of the whole planning," laughs Mrs. Margaret Stewart, associate executive secretary of the Community Council.

"It was almost like a nightmare," explains Dr. Woodward. "In our initial planning we had to work out two budgets, one for model cities and one for HEW. HEW said, first the plan, and then the financing. But HUD [model cities] said, first the fiscal, then the program. It took us some close bookkeeping, but we did it."

The $740,000-plus rehabilitation program, as it now exists, involves: a detoxification clinic at the old St. Joseph's Hospital in the downtown area of Albuquerque; a rehabilitation farm for more intensive care; special case workers to deal with the police, courts, and other referral agencies; and a number of specialists for pre- and post-care counseling.

Conflicts may be developing already over the mechanics of the rehabilitation program.

Some officials with whom I talked were insistent that drunken driving must continue to be defined as a crime with clear legal sanctions, even though they would welcome a correlative rehabilitation program.

MANY QUESTIONS POSED

At the same time, other officials were asking questions like: Who is going to identify the problem drinkers—or just the heavy drinkers, for that matter? Who will refer these people to a rehabilitation program at the time of sentencing? Should it be on the mere decision of treatment experts working with local judges? Or should the decision be based on verifiable records—such as an accumulation of convictions for driving under the influence of liquor?

Despite such questions, says City Manager Richard Wilson, "the rehabilitation program is an established concept in this community now and the great paradox is that it is probably much bolder than just about anyone here yet realizes."

Highway-safety experts across the country agree that the drunk-driver problem demands the same kind of coordinated, interagency attack that is being mounted in Albuquerque. Such an attack, they insist, must include both better enforcement and better rehabilitation.

As a Department of Transportation guideline publication states: "Any comprehensive program must include efforts to deal with all aspects of the problem of alcoholism" in a community.

Yet in most communities I visited during the past several months there was no interagency approach. Local leadership—and funding—was almost nonexistent.

Take what I found in Grand Rapids, Mich.: Both the Kent County sheriff's department and the Grand Rapids police were waging imaginative and intensive patrol campaigns against drinking drivers. Yet both departments were saddled by severe budget limitations and manpower woes—even as accident rates continued to rise.

Key community leadership has yet to focus on the problem of the drinking driver. The general public is apathetic. There is no city alcoholism program.

PROBLEM WELL DOCUMENTED

Dr. Winston B. Prothro, Kent County health director, estimates that there are between 7,000 and 10,000 alcoholics in the county. Yet there is no county detoxification clinic, no halfway house. Indeed, the only real local program in the alcoholism treatment area is a counseling program which utilizes one full-time worker.

Ironically, the Indiana University School of Police Administration several years ago undertook an exhaustive study of drinking-driver patterns in the Grand Rapids area. Its findings, which graphically pointed up the problem, were well publicized. Yet little was done.

And Grand Rapids is no exception. Portland, Ore., averages about 2,000 drunk-driver arrests a year. But there is widespread apathy to building a much-needed detoxification center. Gradual elimination of—or at least lessened reliance on—the city's overcrowded drunk tank is not yet an avowed goal there.

Participation by the city in the Department of Transportation's campaign against the drunk driver has even drawn fire. One local newspaper groused editorially that the program was "unimaginative."

There are, of course, a few bright spots across the country. Ann Arbor, Mich.; Charlotte, N.C.; and Greenwich, Conn., are three communities which have the beginnings of a comprehensive campaign against the drinking driver.

In Auburn, Wash., psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers have joined with local traffic courts to treat the drunk driver problem as a family problem rather than just a legal one.

A number of communities are experimenting with special postconviction driver education and alcoholism schools.

Perhaps the best known is the Phoenix Alcohol Research and Reeducation Project, which has received widespread press attention over the past few years. The American Automobile Association Foundation even made a film about it.

POSITIVE BENEFITS NOTED

Under the program, drunk drivers are required to spend four consecutive Wednesday evenings in a special safe driving school, cosponsored by the city, Columbia University, and Arizona State University. The classes, ranging from 30 to 150 students, represent a cross section of Phoenix itself, with prominent businessmen sitting next to housewives or laborers.

"We're particularly pleased with the changes in attitude that we've noticed on the part of many social drinkers after this course," says Judge James M. Smith, one of six city magistrates who participate in the program.

At the lectures, the drinking drivers are given lectures on alcoholism and highway safety, as well as shown actual films of serious highway accidents taken by policing agencies. In addition, the participants are required to prepare a "case history" on their own drinking patterns and what motivated the acts that lead up to their arrest for drunken driving.

Participants in the St. Louis County post-arrest program are carefully selected to ensure a high success rate for the program. Chronic alcoholics are screened out, since it is felt that their need is more clinical than educational.

Programs like these are admittedly fledgling steps. But safety experts insist that if the drunk driver is to be stopped, then there must be a full-scale attack along the lines of the Albuquerque effort—and soon.

SUPPLY OF INDUSTRIAL FUEL OILS GROWS TIGHTER

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern that this winter we may experience a serious shortage in heavy, industrial fuel oils.

This impending shortage is the result of a number of factors, including our declining domestic capacity to make heavy fuel oils because of rising imports and the increasing use of low sulfur content fuels to satisfy local antipollution laws.

The petroleum industry is our Nation's greatest source of low-cost energy, and it is essential that Congress understand the reasons for this shortage and take steps to correct them.

For this reason, I am inserting in the RECORD, an excellent article which appeared in last Friday's Wall Street Journal, and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

SUPPLY OF INDUSTRIAL FUELS GROWS TIGHTER, ADDING TO FEAR OF ENERGY WOES THIS WINTER

A growing shortage of heavy industrial-grade fuel oils east of the Rockies has sent prices soaring to highs and could contribute to the possibility of energy problems in many parts of the nation this winter.

Power companies, factories, office buildings, hospitals, colleges and other users of the boiler fuel are encountering increasing difficulty securing sufficient supplies. In addition, they're paying prices as much as $1.50 a barrel higher than a year ago, or as much as double the year-earlier levels. Many oil companies are turning down prospective customers, and some are even allocating shipments to present customers.

The higher fuel costs in many cases will be passed on to consumers in the form of higher electric bills, under so-called "automatic fuel adjustment clauses" in utility rates, and the form of higher prices for manufactured products. Some factories were forced to close for short periods last winter due to fuel shortages, and the pinch is likely to be more severe this year.

The fuel oil shortage also is contributing to a tightening supply of asphalt, the nation's chief road-building material. Some road projects have been slowed this summer, and the combination of short supplies and rising prices could cut into next summer's state and Federal highway programs.

The causes of the fuel oil shortage are complex and include such diverse factors as new air pollution control laws, a world-wide tanker shortage resulting from events in the Arab world, new Federal coal mine safety rules, and a growing nation wide shortage of natural gas.

IMPACT OF SMOG CONTROLS

A major trigger for the shortage is the fact that many local air pollution control authorities are placing into effect much sooner than anticipated tight restrictions on the sulphur content of fuels. Burning of such fuels produces sulphur dioxide, a gas that when precipitated out on soot and dirt in the air and then breathed in can be damaging to the human bronchial tubes and lungs.

The laws are forcing many burners of coal, the lowest-cost boiler fuel for many parts of the country, to seek fuel oil as a substitute. Most boiler coal is high in sulphur content, and methods of removing it economically are still in the research stage. Pipeline-grade natural gas doesn't contain any sulphur but is nationally in short supply, and several major gas utilities also are rejecting new customers.

About two-thirds of the nation's heavy fuel oils are imported from Venezuela and Caribbean area refineries. At present these fuel oils, too, are high in sulphur, and most of the oil industry's new desulphurization plants in these areas, representing about a $500 million investment, haven't gone into production. What's more, the tanker crisis has as much as tripled oil transportation costs from the Caribbean and has resulted in uncertain delivery schedules at East Coast ports. The tanker shortage results from the prolonged closedown by Syria of a key Middle East oil pipeline and Libya's forced cutbacks in oil production there.

Domestic capacity to make heavy fuel oils has declined steadily because of rising imports and the previously low price of imported fuels in relation to high cost U.S. crude oil—such fuels frequently sold for less than half the cost of the crude from which they're made. This also discouraged the building of desulphurization plants in the U.S. Most new U.S. refineries have been designed without facilities to make heavy fuel oil in order to squeeze more gasoline and other higher-value products from each barrel of crude.

NEEDS GO UNFILLED

There are other factors contributing to the fuel oil shortage. A number of coal mines have been forced to close, at least temporarily, because they're unable to meet new Federal mine safety laws. Several electric power plants have been built to run on heavy fuel oil because of delays in getting approval and equipment for nuclear plants. Industrial plants that use so-called "interruptible" supplies of natural gas as their chief fuel, will need bigger stocks of alternate fuel oil this winter due to the greater likelihood that utilities will have to cut them off during periods of peak homeowner gas use.

Meanwhile the scramble for fuel oil is on. The University of Illinois Medical Center in Chicago is preparing to ask for bids for the fourth time in three months to secure a needed eight-million-gallon heavy fuel oil supply for this winter. The first three tries brought only one qualified bid, which will fill only half the center's fuel requirements.

William Graban, general manager of the municipally owned power plant in Taunton, Mass., says his invitations to 12 oil companies to bid on the plant's 700,000-barrel needs over the next year drew only one bid to supply 250,000 barrels. That bid, from Shell Oil Co., is at $2.90 a barrel for relatively high sulphur (2.5%) oil, compared with a year-earlier price of $1.98 from another supplier. The Taunton plant, about 25 miles south of Boston serves about 18,000 electricity customers, and Mr. Graban says the town could be in a bad fix before long.

A marketing official of one of the largest international suppliers of heavy fuel oils says bluntly, "We are turning down prospective new customers, and from time to time have had to allocate deliveries in some areas to present customers, due to uncertain tanker schedules. We're even trying to buy fuel oil ourselves in the open market."

HEAVY DEMAND FOR LOW SULPHUR

The crunch is even more severe for heavy fuel oil with low sulphur content.

Public Service Electric & Gas Co., New Jersey's biggest utility, has converted about

half of its electric generating capacity from coal to heavy fuel oil with a maximum of 1% sulphur to meet the state's present air pollution control rules. But in October, it must start using oil containing no more than 0.5% sulphur, which it estimates will cost about $1 a barrel more, and it anticipates this will be harder to buy, even though the company is close to two low-sulphur fuel oil terminals. The utility burns about two million barrels of oil a month.

Virginia Electric & Power Co. says such fuel is "exorbitant (in price), and it's just not available." Philadelphia Electric Co., which switched entirely to low-sulphur fuel oil at its power plants last year to meet new air pollution control laws, estimates that the $6 million that the switch added to its first year's fuel bill will be doubled over the next year by recent price increases. Low-sulphur oil costs up to $3.50 a barrel in some markets.

Byron S. Weil, president of Oils, Inc., a Chicago heavy fuel oil distributor, predicts that city's new air pollution control laws on sulphur dioxide will result in a severe fuel oil shortage for large institutions, hospitals and factories.

He asserts that greater access to foreign fuel oil in the Midwest is needed. Up to now about 90% of the nation's heavy fuel oil consumption has been on the East Coast, where there is almost unrestricted access to imported supplies. But imports of heavy fuel oil to the inland areas of the nation have been tightly restricted. Last March, the government granted the first import quota for this area, permitting Commonwealth Edison Co. of Chicago to bring in 4.5 million barrels of low-sulphur, heavy fuel oil. Oils Inc. then asked for a two-million-barrel quota but has been granted only 480,000 barrels.

But one oil marketer says, "Getting quotas may not help inland users much. You just can't find much heavy fuel oil available in the Caribbean right now, and when you can, it's almost impossible to charter a tanker to haul it for you."

MORE CLEAN-UP FACULTIES

Several major new desulphurization plants will be placed in operation in the Caribbean and Venezuela over the next six months, but oil marketers generally don't believe the facilities will solve the shortage.

For example, by the middle of August Standard Oil Co. of California and closely held New England Petroleum Corp. will begin shipments from a 250,000-barrel-a-day facility they share on a 35%–65% basis at Freeport in the Bahama Islands that can make 130,000 barrels of low-sulphur, heavy fuel oil daily. But, a spokesman says, "It's all sold under firm contracts."

In October Creole Petroleum Corp. 95%-owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), the largest supplier of heavy fuel oils to the U.S., will begin production at a facility at Amuay, Venezuela, capable of making 166,000 barrels of low-sulphur, heavy fuel oils daily, and Jersey Standard's wholly owned Lago Oil & Transport Ltd. will start up an 88,000-barrel-a-day unit on the island of Aruba about next Jan. 1. Yet a U.S. marketing official for the company predicts the short supply of heavy fuel oils could last as long as two years.

The Royal Dutch-Shell Group started a 50,000-barrel-a-day desulphurization unit at Cardon, Venezuela, this year, nearly tripling its low-sulphur, heavy fuel oil capacity in the Caribbean. Amerada Hess Corp. has about 86,000 barrels a day of low-sulphur fuel oil capacity at St. Croix in the Virgin Islands. Texaco Inc. has announced plans for a giant desulphurization unit on Trinidad.

The current high prices for heavy fuel oil even have some oil companies pondering a boost in domestic output. "But by the time desulphurization units could be built, the shortage may have ended or prices may have come back down, so it looks like a big gamble," says one oil executive.

DROPPING ASPHALT FOR OIL

An Arab-Israeli armistice also might bring an easing of the conditions causing the worldwide tanker crisis, but oilmen aren't counting on it.

A spokesman for the American Oil Co. division of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) says some refineries are switching some asphalt production into making heavy fuel oil, and this is contributing to a growing shortage of asphalt.

The tanker shortage also is a big factor, since U.S. asphalt plants generally run on Venezuelan crude oil.

Frank O'Donnell, president of Trimount Bituminous Products Co., Everett, Mass., which mixes asphalt with other materials and supplies contractors, says he's been forced to ration deliveries to customers, delaying "completion of all sorts of jobs." The reason, he says, is that his asphalt supplier, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Jersey Standard's chief subsidiary, will sell him only 75% as much as he bought last year. Some of Trimount's truck drivers are working only three days a week due to the shortage, Mr. O'Donnell says.

R. L. Peyton, assistant state highway director for the Kansas Highway Commission, says some projects in that state have been delayed by the need to seek bids on asphalt a second time. He says availability of asphalt has been "touch and go so far this year, and it may be worse next year."

Adolph Zulian, assistant chief engineer of the Colorado Highway Department, says prices of liquid asphalt have risen 20% to 30% from a year ago, and he says that one of the state's major suppliers, Texaco, won't accept any new orders for this year.

Millard Stewart, executive director of the Asphalt Association of Western Pennsylvania, which represents the area's road materials producers, says, "We will probably make it through the year and get most of the jobs done, but it will be tight." He called the supply "critical" and predicted the present $24 a ton price, unchanged from a year ago, may soar to $29 a ton by next spring.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE SITUATION

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include newspaper editorials.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this House has felt great concern for the welfare of the State of Alaska and has devoted much attention to problems related to its economic development and to its extraordinary natural environment. Two articles have recently appeared in the Fairbanks, Alaska, Daily News-Miner which are highly informative and can make a most helpful contribution to our understanding of the trans-Alaska pipeline situation.

One article, printed in the July 20, 1970, issue, is a letter from the Honorable Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, written in reply to an earlier newsstory carried under the byline of William Randolph Hearst, Jr. This letter succinctly presents the Secretary's position with respect to the proposed pipeline and the considerations which have influenced him to withhold any permit for the pipeline and the accessory road.

The other article, printed July 22, 1970, is a report by Joe La Rocca, resources editor for the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, of a talk by Dr. Arlon Tussing before the Anchorage Press Club on that date. Dr. Tussing, an authoritative Alaskan economist and professor at the University of Alaska, points out the fundamental problems involved in the pipeline project which must be solved and the diverse interests which must be satisfied before any agreement can be reached which would physically and legally permit the proposed pipeline to become a reality.

I commend the reading of these two brief articles to my colleagues and to citizens everywhere who wish to add to their understanding of what this trans-Alaska pipeline controversy is all about:

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, July 20, 1970]

HICKEL ANSWERS COLUMN BY HEARST

(NOTE.—Following a visit to Prudhoe Bay, William Randolph Hearst Jr. wrote a column for the Hearst newspapers in which he urged that the way be cleared for the North Slope oil to start moving to market. The News-Miner and other Alaska newspapers reprinted the column which came to the attention of Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel, also an Alaskan. In the following letter, Hickel replies to the statements made by Hearst.)

DEAR MR. HEARST: I write in response to your recent article on the trans Alaska pipeline reprinted in the Anchorage Daily Times. I am disappointed that you did not have the opportunity to discuss the technical problems with professional people in our Department. Had you done so I feel sure that you would not have reached the conclusions that you did.

The overriding concern to which you make no reference is the thermal effect of a hot oil pipeline buried in a permanently frozen medium . . . permafrost. The gradually melting frozen soil creates a continually expanding thaw bulb around the line. This melting undermines the foundation of the pipe and has serious implications for both structural integrity of the pipe and the surrounding terrain and environment.

In March of this year, my Technical Advisory Board, headed by the Geological Survey, submitted an interim report in which the major unresolved geological and related technical problems were delineated. Briefly, these are:

1. differential compaction and subsidence of the surrounding permafrost whose solid foundation is essential for support of the pipeline system.

2. liquification of the melting soils, which may cause large portions of the surrounding permafrost to move down hill in a glacial-like fashion, exposing the higher sections of the pipe to accelerated melting, and burying the bottom sections in acres of mud.

3. seismic dangers resulting from a system designed to withstand not the highest expected earthquake stress (or a magnitude thereof) but rather the average stress, suggesting that one out of every two earth movements would seriously endanger the pipe.

4. soil and rock slippage on adjacent hillsides resulting from the melting of lower lying frozen soils by the hot pipe.

These unresolved problems were addressed to TAPS on March 27, 1970. We have received no answer. You will agree that with concerns of this magnitude pertaining to extensive sections of a system that must be built in a fail-safe manner, it is incumbent upon a responsible government to insist that the answers be found in advance of approving a permit

In May 1969, President Nixon charged me with the establishment of a Federal Task Force that would investigate the ways in which arctic oil could be explored and produced "without destruction and with mini-

mum disturbance." I have given the highest priority to meeting that mandate, dedicated to the view that a pipeline can and should be built, and that it can and must be built safely. The industry, to date, has simply not refined its technology to the degree necessary to assure the public that a pipeline can be safely buried in permafrost soils.

Second, your article completely fails to mention the two injunctions imposed upon the Department by the U.S. District Court, construction of a secondary road adjacent to the pipeline, both have important implications for the pipeline itself. My own view, fully supported by my technical advisors, is that the state of technology is sufficiently advanced to indicate that an environmentally safe road can be constructed in arctic areas. Notwithstanding, no responsible government, State or Federal, would consider violating a court order. To move forward with this vital project, the issue must be met and resolved within, and not in contempt of the legal process.

Your comment that "tundra has no value to anybody except reindeer" expresses an archaic concept acceptable to no one, certainly not to Alaskans who are committed to using the environment with both intelligence and safety. It betrays an attitude that itself is convincing support for your own observation about people from the outside with "good intentions but bad judgment."

I am but one of many Alaskans who have devoted a lifetime to the development of a great territory and a great state. Mineral and economic development is vital to the future of Alaska. Equally so are proper regard and protection for the arctic environment. The two are not conflicting, but rather complementing, values. We will continue to judge them of equal importance, committed to the principle that proper development will occur and that it will occur safely. We are continuing to apply our best energy toward a satisfactory solution to the complex technical and legal problems that temporarily impede progress on the pipeline. I have the utmost confidence that these will be resolved in the near future and that the project will proceed in a fashion that will commend the responsible efforts of both industry and government.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, July 22, 1970]

NO PIPELINE, ROAD FOR 2 YEARS

(By Joe LaRocca)

ANCHORAGE.—Neither a permanent road to the North Slope nor a trans Alaska oil pipeline will be built until the U.S. Congress legislates a settlement of Native Land Claims, and that will take two more years, or longer, an authoritative Alaskan economist told the Anchorage Press Club here today.

In a sobering speech bristling with criticism over the Alaska news media's handling of both controversial issues, Prof. Arlon Tussing charged that the confusion, distress and anxiety that attended them "must be blamed on the failure of the state's political leadership and the state's news media to tell the people of Alaska the kind of situation they really faced . . . particularly upon its three leading daily papers and its two chief business magazines."

Both "By omission and commission," the University of Alaska economist asserted, "the media have consistently misled the people . . . about the real status of the pipeline project."

Said Tussing, there has never been "a shadow of a chance" that pipeline construction could have begun this year, nor anything that the governor or the legislature could have done to get an access road to the North Slope built this season.

"It is hard to believe," he said, "that all of our highest officials, elected officials and all of our editors and publishers completely misunderstood the situation, but to my knowledge none of them has ever tried to tell the people . . . the blunt truth.

"Far from cooling down an atmosphere of hysteria," Tussing added, ". . . our newspapers ran banner headlines . . . they egged on the fruitless charter to Washington . . . the Daily News-Miner cheered the vain pilgrimages to Juneau and boomed a victory party for the North Slope road the very night before TAPS told the state what everyone should already have known—that TAPS would not sign an agreement with the state which required repayment."

But shrugging off the media's alleged misdeeds of the past, Tussing warned that without "some very profound changes, the press is going to allow the state to go through such a charade all over again.

"This time," he said, "the fantasy is that the state can speed things up by building the pipeline itself."

He then launched into a lengthy enumeration of the overwhelming obstacles—political, social, environmental, technical, legal and organizational—which must be successfully met before construction of either a haul road or a pipeline is possible.

Tussing told the Press Club that there are "many obstacles" to pipeline construction, any one of which could delay it for years. "I would give even money," he said, "that the Prudhoe-Valdez route will NEVER be built."

The obstacles, Tussing explained, include the disorganization and political ineptness of some of the oil companies; the engineering problems; the National Environmental Policy act whose full implications nobody really comprehends yet and "the stumbling block which is by far the most intractable: the problem of Native claims," legislative settlement of which is an absolute prerequisite" for construction of the access road, pipeline, or any other major industrial or transportation developments on the federally-owned lands of Alaska.

Tussing said that there are two other "land freezes" beside the Secretary of Interior's land withdrawal which must be resolved by settlement of the claims.

He cites as the most serious one the "freeze" imposed by Congress Alaska Organic Act of 1884 which requires the federal courts to preserve the status quo "wherever a Native claim has a shadow of plausibility."

The state's contention that this does not affect state land selections has already been "totally rejected" by the U.S. Supreme Court as well as the powerful U.S. Senate's Interior and Insular Affairs Commitee, Tussing pointed out.

This doesn't mean, he said, that all the claims are valid; only that the federal government may not dispose of any land on which there is a Native protest until there has been a determination on the merits of the protest.

"It is this situation," he declared, "not the public land withdrawal . . . which is the real land freeze . . . it applies to all situations including state selection and rights-of-way, and can be lifted only by positive action of the Congress."

"One implication of this situation," Tussing noted, "is that the state cannot speed up the pipeline or road construction by selecting the right-of-way, because the state cannot select land subject to a Native protest," at least until it has been tested in court.

Stressing that the Natives' claims and the land freeze are "just one of several sources of obstruction to North Slope transport projects." Tussing said that the litigation brought against them so far by Native and conservation groups "is just the tip of the legal iceberg . . ." If the state tries to build either the road or pipeline with its own funds, you can also anticipate taxpayer suits.

"There are five groups which each has an effective veto power over any further big developments with respect to the North Slope oil and its transportation to market," he pointed out. "They are the oil industry, the state, the federal bureaucracy, the Alaska Natives and the conservation interests."

Any arrangement must be acceptable to all five.

Working out a package which all will accept will take "at least two years," Tussing said.

"A delay of this length . . . four years after the initial Prudhoe Bay discovery, would have been no disaster to Alaska, nor to anyone in the state had the oil industry not been so naive about the legal, political and engineering problems it faced," he said.

Nor would it have been a disaster "if the state government and the state's business community had not been so eager to drum up a boom atmosphere and so eager to turn it into a crisis atmosphere . . .

"The state's private economy and construction activity would have proceeded rapidly upward as they are doing now, but without the alternation of inflationary excess followed by deep despair," Tussing added.

The state's economy presently "is basically in very good shape; the distress and anxiety that have attended the question of the pipeline and the road this year must be blamed on the failure of the state's political leadership and the state's news media to tell the people of Alaska the kind of situation they really faced," Tussing concluded.

BUREAUCRATIC BOONDOGGLING

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the taintedly turned phrase—bureaucratic boondoggling. It is a nemesis applied to Government and those of us who try to serve our constituents and the Nation within the strangling web of redtape.

A prime example of rampant boondoggling is the General Services Administration's highhanded efforts to hand over Federal property to two businessmen so that the Federal Government can tear down the historic Willard Hotel to make room for a so-called National Square. This controversial 6-acre expanse of pavement would not be unlike the Red Square in Moscow.

No one seems to want this square very much, least of all the Congress, which has refused to fund the temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Commission that proposed the square.

But this has not deterred the GSA from pursuing, secretly, when necessary, its crusade to swap at any cost public land for private gain. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the way the GSA has been trying to ramrod through an exchange of surplus Federal land for the Willard property is that some bureaucratic bigwig in the Nixon administration is behind the deal. Bureaucrats, as we are sadly aware, do not move that fast unless they are being shoved.

The GSA, without consulting me about an invaluable piece of property in my own district, first tried to peddle 203-acre Miller Field, a surplus Army field in the New Dorp section of Staten Island, to the owners of the Willard. When I

unearthed this backdoor finagling on May 7, the GSA at first tried a cover-up—denying that it was negotiating any such deal. But time and digging by my staff proved otherwise.

Rezoning of this multimillion dollar residential property in land-poor New York would have made the deal even more attractive to the private developers who envisioned high-rise apartments in an area that desperately needs new hospitals, schools, and parks. Yet, at no time during the preliminary negotiations was I, or, to the best of my knowledge, any other public official representing New York State, New York City or Richmond County, consulted about the proposed exchange. This, despite the fact that for 8 years, I have been trying to save Miller Field for the health, education, and recreational needs of the community.

After I held public hearings on Staten Island and the proposed "land grab" was castigated by both city officials and the public, the GSA suddenly offered the Willard's owners a 17-acre tract in Arlington, Va., near the Pentagon. This land, once the home of the Navy Waves across from the Navy Annex, is currently zoned for "active or passive recreation or for scenic vista." GSA, on behalf of the National Square builders, is therefore urging the Arlington County Planning Commission to rezone it for commercial-office and high rise use.

Mr. Speaker, since when has the GSA become a private real estate brokerage?

Whether land is owned by the Federal, State, or city governments, it is public land. Governments, unless they have secretly changed the rules of the game, belong to the people; that is, the public.

In any event, after doing battle with the totally uncooperative GSA over Miller Field, I introduced legislation to insure that every Member of Congress be notified of the intended disposition of federally owned real property in the district he represents.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation that will prevent a repetition of the Miller Field saga if and when the GSA-inspired Arlington-Willard swap falls on its face.

As I said before, the city of New York is the most land-poor area in the Nation. On Staten Island, we desperately need a general hospital, a vocational high school, and a recreation area. Miller Field is the answer to these needs. Therefore, I am now introducing a bill to allow the Federal Government to turn over the 203-acre field to the city of New York without cost, on condition that the property "be used only for health, education, and recreation purposes." The only cost to the city would be for survey fees.

Miller Field has been declared of no further value to the Government. It can be put to great use for a wide range of public projects. I see no reason why it should be handed over to private interests for private gain.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. RIEGLE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for August 3 and 4, on account of personal affairs.

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. SANDMAN), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. POFF, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER, on August 6, for 30 minutes.

Mr. BUSH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. FEIGHAN, today, for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, on August 10, for 60 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ALEXANDER and to include an editorial.

Mr. FEIGHAN to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend remarks in connection with the proceedings of today in two instances and to include certain extraneous material in each instance.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SANDMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. ROBISON in two instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. EILBERG in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. HICKS in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. FRASER.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in three instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. RIVERS in two instances.

Mr. STEED in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Capt. Melvin A. Kaye;

H.R. 1697. An act for the relief of Jack Brown;

H.R. 1703. An act for the relief of Clayton County Journal and Wilber Harris;

H.R. 1728. An act for the relief of Capt. Norman W. Stanley;

H.R. 2209. An act for the relief of Carlo DeMarco;

H.R. 2241. An act for the relief of John T. Anderson;

H.R. 2407. An act for the relief of Elbert C. Moore;

H.R. 2458. An act for the relief of Frank J. Enright;

H.R. 2481. An act for the relief of Cmdr. John W. McCord;

H.R. 2950. An act for the relief of Edwin E. Fulk;

H.R. 3558. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Smith;

H.R. 3723. An act for the relief of Robert G. Smith;

H.R. 5337. An act for the relief of the late Albert E. Jameson, Jr.

H.R. 6375. An act for the relief of Amalia P. Montero;

H.R. 6377. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Earl Spofford Brown, U.S. Army Reserve (retired);

H.R. 6850. An act for the relief of Maj. Clyde Nichols (retired);

H.R. 9092. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Condon;

H.R. 9591. An act for the relief of Elgie L. Tabor;

H.R. 10662. An act for the relief of Walter L. Barker;

H.R. 11890. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Peter Elias Gianutsos, U.S. Air Force (retired);

H.R. 12176. An act for the relief of Bly D. Dickson, Jr.;

H.R. 12622. An act for the relief of Russell L. Chandler;

H.R. 12887. An act for the relief of John A. Avdeef;

H.R. 15118. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Ohio Northern University;

H.R. 15354. An act for the relief of Anthony P. Miller, Inc., and

H.R. 17548. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2484. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize marketing agreements providing for the advertising of papayas.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 3, 1970 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14619. An act for the relief of S. Sgt. Lawrence F. Payne, U.S. Army (retired).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 5, 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:

2274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for the period July 1969, through May 1970, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2275. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, in order to promote increased traffic safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2276. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2277. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the opportunity for accelerating construction and reducing the cost of low-rent housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4665. A bill for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5017. A bill for the relief of A. Hughlett Mason; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5943. A bill for the relief of Roger Stanley, and the successor partnership, Roger Stanley and Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6100. A bill for the relief of Hershel Smith, publisher of the Lindsay News, of Lindsay, Okla.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7955. A bill for the relief of Charles Zonars; with amendments (Rept. 91–1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12958. A bill for the relief of Central Gulf Steamship Corp.; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13805. A bill for the relief of David Z. Glassman (Rept. No. 91–1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLOWERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 14271. A bill for the relief of Jack A. Duggins; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 703. An act for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually (Rept. No. 91–1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1187. An act for the relief of Marcos Rojos Rodriguez; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2514. An act for the relief of Arline Loader and Maurice Loader (Rept. No. 91–1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2661. An act for the relief of Kathryn Talbot (Rept. No. 91–1375). 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. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 18782. A bill to reorganize the government of the District of Columbia by establishing a Council of the District of Columbia to replace the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 18783. A bill to authorize the reduction of the salaries of teachers and school officers in the public schools of the District of Columbia for the purpose of purchasing annuities pursuant to the provisions of section 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 18784. A bill to limit membership on national securities exchanges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 18785. A bill to establish an improved program for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DORN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 18786. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to encourage physicians, dentists, optometrists, and other medical personnel to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 18787. A bill to provide for the mandatory civil commitment of certain narcotic addicts, to provide for more facilities for treating, supervising, and controlling narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 18788. A bill to amend section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to amounts to be shown on airline tickets and advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18789. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to establish procedures designed to balance energy needs and protection of the environment in planning and authorizing the construction of bulk electric power facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 18790. A bill to provide for financing the economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 18791. A bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a Channel Islands National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 18792. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the city of New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18793. A bill to amend the Truth-in-Lending Act to protect consumers against careless and erroneous billing, and to require that statements under open end credit plans be mailed in time to permit payment prior to the imposition of finance charges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 18794. A bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a Channel Islands National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 18795. A bill to carry out the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. BIESTER):

H.R. 18796. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the coastal waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 18797. A bill to extend for 5 additional years the authorization for programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and related programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. HOSMER, Mr.

ASPINALL, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. EDMONDSON, and Mrs. MAY):

H.R. 18798. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18799. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and improve the school breakfast program for children carried out under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 18800. A bill for the relief of persons who suffered damages as a result of the sonic boom tests over Oklahoma City, Okla., in 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

565. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Andrew Huggins, Avon Park, Fla., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Tuesday, August 4, 1970*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose Word declares "Commit Thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him and He shall bring it to pass," we now commit ourselves and our Nation to Thee in the faith that "Thou shalt bring forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgment as the noonday."

We ask Thee, O Lord, not to take away our burdens but to give us strength to carry them; not to make our way easy but to make it right.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BURDICK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 3, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MCINTYRE TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the disposition of the reading of the Journal, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) be recognized for not to exceed 1½ hours.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) completes his remarks, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a limitation of 3 minutes on statements made during that period.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, first of all, let me express my real appreciation to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader for their kindness and courtesy in convening early, despite the fact that we have long days, and making it possible for me to speak upon a subject that is of real concern to me, and I believe will be of real interest to the country as a whole.

OIL IMPORTS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised and startled yesterday to learn that as an advocate of the oil industry position in the controversy over the oil import quota program, I am, at least in the opinion of one Senator, opposed to the public interest.

Upon reading the remarks made here yesterday, I asked for time to discuss the charges here in the presence of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), and invited him to be present at this time. Because of a prior commitment, my good friend from New England could not be here, but I feel that I should set the record straight as to the blanket indictment he made against "advocates of the oil industry" and the "private influence" which he says "is strong enough to override the representatives of the public interest."

Inasmuch as I have been named as an advocate of the oil industry and its position in the oil import controversy, I presume Senator MCINTYRE included me in those he accuses of selling him "their bill of goods for years when it was so obviously and so outrageously contrary to the public interest."

First, I would like to assure the Senator from New Hampshire that I am not one of those oil industry advocates "with personal and financial ties to the oil community."

Second, I regret that he bought this "bill of goods" for so many years when it was actually a bargain, but now that the bargain rates have been sucked into the Middle East caldron, he would have us paying more for imported oil than our own.

I own no oil stock, no oil or gas royalty, nor any interest in any oil or gas company. I do, however, consider it in the public interest to do what I can to see that this country never has to submit to foreign blackmail for the oil and gas that provides three-fourths of our energy requirements and without which all transportation and most industry would come to a grinding halt.

The vital importance of oil and gas to this Nation's entire economy and America's national security has been recognized by four Presidents. Started by President Eisenhower, the basic concepts of the program have been carried out under the Presidential proclamation that established the program by Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. President Kennedy acted twice to strengthen the national security aspects of the program and President Nixon had that in mind, I believe, when he directed the study that resulted in the current controversy. The program had been riddled and weakened by exceptions and exemptions that had progressively raised the level of foreign oil in relation to domestic production until the original concept of preserving a strong and viable domestic petroleum industry was lost in the rush for more cheap oil.

We learned a lesson the hard way following the 6-day Arab-Israel war of June 1967, when all the Arab countries stopped shipment of oil to Western Europe and the United States.