

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

**RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW**

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 22, 1968, at 10 a.m.

**NOMINATION**

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 20), 1968:

**CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION**

Brig. Gen. William M. Glasgow, Jr., U.S. Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of

section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Brig. Gen. John A. B. Dillard, Jr., reassigned.

**CONFIRMATION**

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 20), 1968:

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

Manuel Frederick Cohen, of Maryland, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1973.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 21, 1968**

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

*And thou shalt be called the prophet of the Most High to give light to those who sit in darkness and to guide our feet into the way of peace.—Luke 1: 76, 79.*

Our Father, at the gate of a new day we bow in silence before Thee, praying for a renewal of our spirits as we face these times which try our souls, cause us to lose patience with each other, and make us impatient with ourselves.

That we may be at our best and do our very best for Thee and for our country, grant unto us the courage of a humble mind, the creative faith of a high hope, and the confident peace of a heart stayed on Thee.

By the power of Thy spirit may we maintain our integrity, be motivated by justice, and move resolutely in the direction of peace on earth and good will to men. Bless Thou the peacemakers and may the peace made be just and enduring and for the good of all.

In the Master's name 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. 15364. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15863. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the name of the Army Medical Service to the Army Medical Department.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15348. An act to amend section 703 (b) of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to grant a special 30-day period of leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas.

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

S. 2276. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to contract for the construction of works of improvement upon request of local organizations; and

S.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary funding of the emergency credit revolving fund.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY**

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

**INVESTIGATION OF HEATING OIL PRICES**

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am today requesting the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to investigate the procedures by which home heating oil prices are established along the east coast.

I am taking this action for the following reasons:

First. On April 4 of this year the per gallon cost of home heating oil sold to distributors was reduced by \$0.005 at gulf coast ports.

Second. Yet on April 17, Humble Oil Co. raised its per gallon price for distribution along the east coast by \$0.003.

Third. Immediately after the Humble increase all distributors along the east

coast increased their per gallon price by an identical \$0.003.

Fourth. This industrywide increase, despite the drop less than 2 weeks before in the gulf coast price, has been passed on to the consumer.

Fifth. The east coast increase came in the face of the following additional points mitigating against such an increase:

First. There is a traditional drop in home heating fuel prices during the spring.

Second. Stocks of home heating oil are higher than they have been in almost a year.

Mr. Speaker, there is no logical justification for an increase in consumer costs when prices are dropping at the original source of home heating oil. Moreover the unanimity in price among east coast distributors appears to be a collusive effort.

**FURTHERING FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS IN TAXATION**

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Western Governors' Conference at its 1968 annual meeting adopted a resolution urging the House of Representatives to further Federal-State relations in taxation by defeating H.R. 2158, the Interstate Taxation Act.

The Governors also urged prompt consideration and passage by the Congress of the consent bill, H.R. 9476, for the multistate tax compact.

Among other groups which have expressed earlier opposition to the Willis bill, H.R. 2158, are the National Governors' Conference, National Legislative Conference, National Association of Attorneys General, National Association of Tax Administrators, Council of State Governments and other organizations of State and local officials.

The resolution follows:

*Be it resolved, That the 1968 Annual Meeting of the Western Governors' Conference now in session urges the defeat of the Willis bill, H.R. 2158, by the United States House*

of Representatives and the prompt consideration and passage by the Congress of the consent bill, H.R. 9476, for the Multistate Tax Compact.

**THE 1962 EXECUTIVE ORDER OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY PROTECTING THE RIGHT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO FORM, JOIN, AND ASSIST ANY EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION OR TO REFRAIN FROM ANY SUCH ACTIVITY**

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a great deal of mail from voters in the Seventh District of Texas regarding the 1962 Executive order of President Kennedy protecting the right of Federal employees to form, join, and assist any employee organization or to refrain from any such activity.

My constituents are worried, and rightly so in my opinion, that by a new Executive order the last six words—"to refrain from any such activity"—will be deleted, opening the way for compulsory unionism among Federal employees. A Presidential Commission on Labor-Management Relations headed by the Secretary of Labor is reportedly suggesting that Federal employees be required to pay a service charge to employee organizations on the grounds that they are benefiting in agencies where unions have exclusive recognition.

In the private sector during labor-management relations, management is always protecting the interests of employees from any type of compulsory unionism. It is certainly in their best interests to do so. However, in the public sector—who is protecting this same interest of Federal employees? By the very nature of the public sector the Chief Executive is often receptive to proposals such as this. That is why I think it essential that the Congress state clearly that it is the right and privilege of Federal employees to join or refrain from joining a union. That is why I am introducing such legislation.

**TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS**

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, securing employment for our so-called permanently unemployed is one of the great challenges facing us today.

Finding jobs for these hard-core unemployed is not easy. Our vocational and technical schools are doing a marvelous job in training. But manpower training programs cannot create jobs. Neither can the Government create on a wide scale the jobs that are now needed.

Manpower training programs can train those who are needed to fill job vacancies already in existence. We need also to give business—private industry—the incentive to create new jobs and take the chance with these "permanently unemployed."

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would encourage private industry to hire these hard-core unemployed. Under this bill a determination would be made of the hard-core unemployed and they would be issued a green card. Businesses, large and small, would be encouraged to hire these unemployed persons. For the first 6 months an employer would be allowed a 75-percent credit; 50 percent for the next 6 months and 25 percent for the next year. An employer would be limited on the number of such persons he could hire and could not substitute green card employees for existing employees.

This legislation is patterned after the law that allowed tax credits for investments in new equipment by businesses. I believe this bill would be a step forward toward meeting the problem of locating jobs for our permanently unemployed and would help to make them self-supporting.

**PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to 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.

**VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4386) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

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.

**ARTHUR JEROME OLINGER, A MINOR**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 155) for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually.

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.

**CHESTER E. DAVIS**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 233) for the relief of Chester E. Davis.

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

S. 233

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Chester E. Davis the sum of \$2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Chester E. Davis against the United States for clothing, furniture, and household effects lost by him while serving in Cuba as an attaché of the Department of Agriculture, the said Chester E. Davis having been forced to abandon such clothing, furniture, and household effects in such country when the United States and Cuba broke diplomatic relations: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contact to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

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

**DWAYNE C. COX AND WILLIAM D. MARTIN**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin.

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.

**E. L. TOWNLEY**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11381) for the relief of E. L. Townley.

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.

**CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

The Clerk called the bill (S.1040) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy.

Mr. TALCOTT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

**JOSEPH W. HARRIS**

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 991) to refer the bill (H.R. 14109)

entitled "A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Harris," to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

**CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CONCORD, CALIF.**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2282) for the relief of certain employees of the Naval Weapons Center, Concord, Calif.

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.

**INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AT FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10327) for the relief of Louis J. Falardeau, Irva G. Franger, Betty Klemcke, Wineta L. Welburn, and Emma L. McNeil, all individuals employed by the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

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.

**PEDRO ANTONIO JULIO SANCHEZ**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 126) for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez.

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

S. 126

*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, Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 6, 1960, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date 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 read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**NICHOLAS S. CVETAN, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1052) for the relief of Nicholas S. Cvetan, U.S. Air Force (retired).

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

S. 1052

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nicholas S. Cvetan, United States Air Force (retired), the sum of \$2,556. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Nicholas S. Cvetan against the United States for emergency cost-of-living allowances for the period May 9, 1965, through July 18, 1965, during which his dependents, pursuant to instructions of superior military authority, temporarily resided in Lima, Peru, until dependents of military personnel stationed at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, were authorized to return to the Dominican Republic, the said Nicholas S. Cvetan having had his dependents with him while he was on authorized leave and visiting Lima, Peru, at the time all dependents were ordered evacuated from Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

**LAURENCE BLOOM**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1608) for the relief of Laurence Bloom.

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.

**HENRY E. BULLOCK**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2263) for the relief of Henry E. Bullock.

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

H.R. 2263

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Henry E. Bullock, regular warrant officer, United States Navy, retired, of Whitesboro, New York, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay the United States the sum of \$15,508, representing salary paid him during the period from April 12, 1962, through November 30, 1964, while he was an employee of the Department of the Air Force, in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 162).*

*SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Henry E. Bullock, the sum of any amounts received or withheld*

from him on account of the salary payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after "United States", insert "(1)".

On page 1, line 6, strike "\$15,508" and insert "\$14,799.19".

On page 1, line 9, after "(28 Stat. 162)", add the following: ", and (2) the sum of \$687.74, representing an overpayment of salary during the period December 1, 1964, to November 5, 1966, due to a downward adjustment of his salary rate by the Department of the Air Force arising out of the violation of the Act of July 31, 1894, during the period prior to December 1, 1964."

On page 2, after line 4, add the following:

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of all laws, rules and regulations conferring rights and benefits on Federal employees, including civil service status, retirement, and retention rights, the service performed by Henry E. Bullock from April 12, 1962, through November 30, 1964, as a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force, shall be held and considered to be creditable Federal Service. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The 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.

**HORACE H. EASTERDAY**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2758) for the relief of Horace H. Easterday.

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.

**JOSEPH H. BONDUKI**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4939) for the relief of Joseph H. Bonduki.

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.

**WASSON COAL MINING CORP.**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12539) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the Wasson Coal Mining Corp. against the United States.

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.

May 21, 1968

## MRS. RUTH BRUNNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12894) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner.

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.

## ROBERT J. BEAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15633) for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

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.

## DEMETRA LANI ANGELOPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1129) for the relief of Demetra Lani Angelopoulos.

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

S. 1129

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Demetra Lani Angelopoulos may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. Constantine Angelopoulos, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.*

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following:

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

## MISS AMALIA SERESLY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1808) for the relief of Miss Amalia Seresly.

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

S. 1808

*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, Miss Amalia Seresly shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien unmarried daughter of Mr. Demosthenes Raptelis, a citizen of the United States: Provided, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the language "no natural parent of the bene-

ficiary by virtue of such parentage," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary, by virtue of such relationship."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

## RACHEL STIMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1527) for the relief of Rachel Stimpson.

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## HUBERT ASHE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4404) for the relief of Hubert Ashe.

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.

## SHERMAN WEBB AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 1098) to refer the bill (H.R. 1624) entitled "A bill for the relief of Sherman Webb, and others" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

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

H. RES. 1098

*Resolved*, That the bill (H.R. 1624) entitled "A bill for the relief of Sherman Webb, and others", together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, for further proceedings in accordance with applicable law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DOUGLAS E. KENNEDY AND ALVIN B. BURT, JR.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 1110) to refer the bill (H.R. 9752) entitled "A bill for the relief of Douglas E. Kennedy and Alvin B. Burt, Jr." to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

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

H. RES. 1110

*Resolved*, That the bill (H.R. 9752) entitled "A bill for the relief of Douglas E. Kennedy and Alvin B. Burt, Junior", together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, for further proceedings in accordance with applicable law.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: On page 1, after line 7, insert:

"In the consideration of H.R. 9752 the Chief Commissioner and the court shall consider negligence or other fault of the U.S. and/or equity and good conscience and any other matter within the court's jurisdiction."

## AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNGATE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNGATE to the amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Strike out the words "and the court".

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

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

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri explain his amendment?

Mr. HUNGATE. The amendment I have is simply to delete the words "and the court" because there would be no proper relationship to the court. It goes to the Commissioner.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MR. AND MRS. RALPH J. MESSINA, SR., AND JOHN H. FITZGERALD

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 1111) to refer the bill (H.R. 1761) entitled "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph J. Messina, Sr., and John H. Fitzgerald," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri [Mr. HALL].

There was no objection.

## CHARLES BERNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) for the relief of Charles Bernstein.

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 [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

## CUBAN TRUCK &amp; EQUIPMENT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6321) for the relief of the Cuban Truck & Equipment Co., its heirs and assigns.

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 [Mr. HALL]?

There was no objection.

#### REMCO INDUSTRIES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10417) for the relief of Remco Industries, Inc.

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### LENNART GORDON LANGHORNE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15462) for the relief of Lennart Gordon Langhorne.

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

H.R. 15462

*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, Lennart Gordon Langhorne shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 4, 1962.*

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "February 4, 1962" and substitute in lieu thereof the date "February 1, 1962."

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.

#### MARTINA ZUBIRI GARCIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1648) for the relief of Martina Zubiri Garcia.

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### ENRICO DEMONTE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2046) for the relief of Enrico DeMonte.

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### AMALIA P. MONTERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5959) for the relief of Amalia P. Montero.

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### MARY JANE ORLOSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6655) for the relief of Mary Jane Orloski.

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### TIMOTHY JOSEPH SHEA AND ELSIE ANN SHEA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 171) for the relief of Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea.

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

S. 171

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea, husband and wife, of Orlando, Florida, the sum of \$2,000, in full satisfaction of all their respective and joint claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and suffering incurred by the said Elsie Annet Shea, and damages to their residence and property sustained by the Said Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea, incident to an accident which occurred on October 1, 1960, when two civil aircraft collided near their residence as the result of negligent landing instructions given to the pilots of such aircraft by operators of the Federal air traffic control tower, Herndon Air Port, Orlando, Florida: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

*"That notwithstanding the limitations of section 2401 of Title 28 of the United States Code or any other statute of limitations, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Timothy Joseph Shea and Elsie Annet Shea of Orlando, Florida, against the United States for personal injuries and damages, including damages to property, suffered incident to the collision of two civil aircraft on or about October 1, 1960, allegedly the result of negligent landing instructions given the pilots of the aircraft by the operators of the Federal air traffic control tower, Herndon Air Port, Orlando, Florida. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference or admission of liability on the part of the United States. The action authorized to be filed by this Act must be filed within one year of the effective date of this Act."*

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

#### ESTATE OF JOSIAH K. LILLY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2409) for the relief of the estate of Josiah K. Lilly.

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

S. 2409

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That upon delivery within thirty days following the enactment of this Act to the Smithsonian Institution by the Merchants National Bank and Trust Company of Indianapolis, as executor of the estate of Josiah K. Lilly, of the title to, ownership, and possession of the collection of gold coins left by the said Josiah K. Lilly and comprising approximately six thousand one hundred and twenty-five items, the said estate shall be entitled to a credit against its obligation for Federal estate tax, effective as of the date upon which the return was due to be filed, in the amount of \$5,534,808.00.*

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.

#### CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 349, the bill (S. 1040) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1040

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each individual named in section 2 of this Act is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount set forth opposite his name in such section. Such amounts represent overpayments of compensation made to such individuals as a result of administrative error while they were employed at the naval installations listed in such section. 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. The names of each individual referred to in the first section of this Act, the amount of overpayments made to each individual, the period during which the overpayments were made, and the naval installations employing each individual, are as follows:*

Name of employee and period of overpayment:	Amount overpaid
Frank Grey, Junior, from December 23, 1962, through October 10, 1964	\$607.20
Carroll L. Klives, from April 16, 1963, through April 25, 1964	452.00

Name of employee and period of overpayment:	Amount overpaid
Helen M. Morehouse, from April 16, 1963, through October 9, 1965	1,391.10
Jerome R. Weathermon, from February 19, 1963, through October 9, 1965	1,063.93
(2) United States Polaris Missile Facility, Pacific.	
Name of employee and period of overpayment:	Amount overpaid
George C. Solman, from November 22, 1964, through September 11, 1965	\$235.20
(3) United States Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Washington.	
Name of employee and period of overpayment:	Amount overpaid
Howard K. Asher, from May 24, 1964, through September 25, 1965	\$228.80
Charles A. Bary, from December 23, 1962, through October 9, 1965	668.80
James L. Dalton, from January 19, 1964, through October 9, 1965	432.00
Francis J. Hedeen, from August 2, 1964, through March 2, 1965	109.45
Richard M. Lynch, from November 29, 1964, through January 2, 1965	28.80
Douglas P. McAllister, from September 15, 1963, through September 11, 1965	459.60
Amos J. Pickrell, from January 19, 1964, through January 16, 1965	228.80
Robert B. Stewart, from February 2, 1964, through October 9, 1965	492.80
Richard L. Thompson, Senior, from July 19, 1964, through July 17, 1965	210.20

Sec. 3 The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual named in section 2 of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amounts appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any of these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract to the contrary. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### OLD-FASHIONED BOND BURNING CALLED FOR—\$50 BILLION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BONDS SHOULD BE BURNED NOW SINCE THEY HAVE BEEN PAID FOR ONCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a lot is being said about what is wrong with our country. Usually it is about monetary affairs, financial affairs, and interest rates. I want to say—and this can be backed up

by documentation and proof—that there is nothing wrong with our country that a good old-fashioned bond burning would not cure. In the New York Federal Reserve Bank we have accumulated \$50 billion—not million—\$50 billion in Government bonds which have been paid for once by the use of our own money. They have been paid for once. Notwithstanding that, the taxpayers are continuing to pay interest at the rate of \$2 billion on those bonds. Now, think about Members of the Congress permitting that to go on.

When you say that to any person outside of Congress, his immediate response is, "Well, I just cannot believe Congress would let that go on that way."

But it is the truth. It is going on. We are paying \$2 billion a year interest on bonds that have already been paid for once, and if we do not have this bond burning, we are going to have to pay for those bonds again. If we had the bond burning, the national debt would be reduced by \$50 billion. That would solve every financial problem that we have before our Nation today. It is terrible that it is not done.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDTS. 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. 144]

Ashley	Hardy	Rostenkowski
Baring	Hébert	Scherle
Burton, Utah	Holifield	Scheuer
Cahill	Holland	Selden
Carter	Howard	Skubitz
Cowger	Jonas	Stratton
Culver	Jones, N.C.	Stubblefield
Diggs	Kelly	Teague, Calif.
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	Tenzer
Frelighuysen	McMillan	Tuck
Gardner	Miller, Calif.	Tunney
Gilber	Morse, Mass.	Waggoner
Green, Oreg.	Moss	Wilson
Gurney	O'Hara, Mich.	Charles H.
Halleck	Olsen	Wright
Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.	
Hansen, Idaho	Resnick	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. 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. 17354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled

by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington.

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. 17354, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First I would like to express my deep appreciation to the members of this subcommittee. Their hard work and dedication coupled with their extensive knowledge of all parts of the Nation contributed materially to the committee's evaluation of the budget estimates considered.

Mr. Chairman, today, the House Appropriations Committee is presenting for the consideration of this House the 1969 appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and 22 related agencies.

Appropriations provided in this bill are to fund the various activities of bureaus in the Department of Interior, those in the U.S. Forest Service, Indian health activities, the Smithsonian Institution, National Art Gallery, Washington area metropolitan transit, and others.

Under the chairmanship of the very comes known as the all-American bill for from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], this bill become known as the all-American bill for it provides funding to serve not only the land and natural resources of America, but the people of America and those in the far-flung territories of the trust islands, Guam and Samoa.

Because of the fact that these islands and areas are not part of the American mainland, this bill has international implications. Other international implications of the bill come about in the field of negotiations in the commercial fish area.

As we present this measure today for your careful consideration, I would like to urge that each and every Member of this House read the information and factual material which is in the committee hearings, held for 21 full days and to which frequent reference will be made today. In these hearings is indicated the extent to which the committee discussed budget estimates in detail.

You will also find a careful analysis of the innumerable details concerning the operations of each department and bureau.

They can become for you a summary of your management of the American land for which you and I are the trustees.

As we make our recommendations, the committee is mindful of the current financial situation of our Government. We have made a strenuous effort to eliminate budget items which are not considered urgent in request, even though many of us feel that several of these are important to the growth, development, and welfare of America and Americans.

This bill, however, reflecting that concern for the budget restrictions and expenditure reductions, presents a 10-percent reduction in the budget estimate, exclusive of those items involving appropriations of receipts, which are earmarked for specific use under existing legislation.

This 10-percent reduction is approximately twice the reduction recommended in past years, in spite of the fact that the committee found the 1969 estimate pre-

sented far more stringent than any made during the past several years.

I will not attempt to go into detail at this time and give you a mass of figures indicating committee action.

However, I will insert in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of the action recommended by the committee on the various budget estimates considered.

Members of the committee are wholeheartedly in support of total efficiency and economy in the administration of our Federal interior and related operations.

However, it is important in our endeavors for economy to keep in proper perspective just what expenditures under this bill involve, and why in making expenditure reductions it is mandatory to use our fullest sense of responsibility to Americans living today and to those who will follow us and who will hold us responsible for the stewardship of this

American trust—our land, resources, and people.

The total new budget—obligational—authority recommended in this bill amounts to sixty-three one hundredths of 1 percent of the total new budget—obligational—authority contained in the 1969 budget estimate for all of the Federal Government's operations. Yet the activities funded in this bill are responsible for the maintenance, protection, and administration of public domain lands comprising slightly in excess of 33 percent of the total acreage of the 50 States of our Nation.

To a large extent, activities funded in this bill are self-sustaining. That is to say, revenue generated by activities in this bill comes very close to equaling the total appropriations for the bill. I will insert at this point a table for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969, indicating comparability between appropriations and receipts:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969

[Note: All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) <sup>1</sup>	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969	New budget (obligational) authority, recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>					
<b>PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT</b>					
Bureau of Land Management					
Management of lands and resources	\$49,253,000	\$51,750,000	\$51,196,000	+\$1,943,000	-\$554,000
Construction and maintenance	3,900,000	4,156,000	3,156,000	-\$744,000	-1,000,000
Public lands development roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(2,600,000)	(4,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(+900,000)	(-1,000,000)
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	10,881,000	12,175,000	12,175,000	+1,294,000	
Range improvements (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	1,444,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	+56,000	
<b>Total, Bureau of Land Management</b>	<b>65,478,000</b>	<b>69,581,000</b>	<b>68,027,000</b>	<b>+2,549,000</b>	<b>-1,554,000</b>
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
Education and welfare services	125,568,000	153,423,000	144,393,000	+18,825,000	-9,030,000
Education and welfare services (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(910,000)	(1,300,000)	(1,300,000)	(+390,000)	
Resources management	47,179,000	53,588,000	50,776,000	+3,597,000	-2,812,000
Construction	40,770,000	32,299,000	24,921,000	-15,849,000	-7,378,000
Road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(18,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(18,000,000)		(-2,000,000)
Revolving fund for loans	450,000	450,000	450,000		
General administrative expenses	4,627,000	4,817,000	4,767,000	+140,000	-50,000
<b>Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds</b>	<b>218,594,000</b>	<b>244,577,000</b>	<b>225,307,000</b>	<b>+6,713,000</b>	<b>-19,270,000</b>
Tribal funds (limitations on use of trust funds)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)		
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation					
Salaries and expenses	4,190,000	4,215,000	3,915,000	-275,000	-300,000
Land and water conservation:					
Appropriation of receipts (indefinite)	110,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-10,000,000	
Appropriation (definite, repayable advance)	9,191,000	30,000,000		-9,191,000	-30,000,000
<b>Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation</b>	<b>123,381,000</b>	<b>134,215,000</b>	<b>103,915,000</b>	<b>-19,466,000</b>	<b>-30,300,000</b>
Office of Territories					
Administration of territories	15,613,000	16,219,000	13,747,000	-1,866,000	-2,472,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	24,000,000	34,000,000	31,606,000	+7,606,000	-2,394,000
<b>Total, Office of Territories</b>	<b>39,613,000</b>	<b>50,219,000</b>	<b>45,353,000</b>	<b>+5,740,000</b>	<b>-4,866,000</b>
<b>Total, Public Land Management</b>	<b>447,066,000</b>	<b>498,592,000</b>	<b>442,602,000</b>	<b>-4,464,000</b>	<b>-55,990,000</b>
<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b>					
Geological Survey					
Surveys, investigations, and research	85,499,000	94,756,000	89,470,000	+3,971,000	-5,286,000
Bureau of Mines					
Conservation and development of mineral resources	35,821,000	39,015,000	36,886,000	+1,065,000	-2,129,000
Health and safety	10,721,000	11,449,000	11,237,000	+516,000	-212,000
Solid waste disposal	3,367,000	2,167,000	1,917,000	-1,450,000	-250,000
General administrative expenses	1,532,000	1,592,000	1,577,000	+45,000	-15,000
Helium fund (authorization to spend from public debt receipts)	16,200,000	17,600,000	16,200,000		-1,400,000
<b>Total, Bureau of Mines</b>	<b>67,641,000</b>	<b>71,823,000</b>	<b>67,817,000</b>	<b>+176,000</b>	<b>-4,006,000</b>
Office of Coal Research	10,980,000	13,900,000	13,350,000	+2,370,000	-550,000

See footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued

[Note: All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority, recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—				
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)			
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued</b>								
MINERAL RESOURCES—Continued								
Office of Oil and Gas	\$740,000	\$868,900	\$768,900	+\$28,900	-\$10,000			
Salaries and expenses								
Total, Mineral Resources	164,860,000	181,347,900	171,405,900	+6,545,900	-9,942,000			
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS								
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries								
Management and investigations of resources	23,809,650	27,014,000	23,997,000	+187,350	-3,017,0			
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	100,000	100,000	100,000					
Construction	1,730,000							
Construction of fishing vessels	6,000,000	6,004,000	6,000,000					
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development	4,714,000	4,722,000	4,719,000	+5,000	-3,000			
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation	2,428,000	2,334,000	2,333,000	-95,000	-1,000			
Administration of Pribilof Islands (indefinite, appropriation of receipts)	2,496,000	2,633,400	2,633,400	+137,400				
General administrative expenses	693,000	730,000	720,000	+27,000	-10,000			
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund	(336,000)	(347,200)	(347,200)	(+11,200)				
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	41,970,650	43,537,400	40,502,400	-1,468,250	-3,035,000			
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife								
Management and investigations of resources	44,148,800	46,354,000	45,784,000	+1,635,200	-570,000			
Construction	4,475,600	1,203,000	1,203,000	-3,272,600				
Migratory bird conservation account (definite, repayable advance)	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000					
Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation	2,425,000	2,325,000	2,285,000	-140,000	-40,000			
General administrative expenses	1,572,000	1,634,000	1,617,000	+45,000	-17,000			
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	60,121,400	59,016,000	58,389,000	-1,732,400	-627,000			
National Park Service								
Management and protection	40,672,000	44,531,000	43,429,000	+2,757,000	-1,102,000			
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	29,821,800	32,990,000	32,125,000	+2,303,200	-865,000			
Construction	11,627,000	13,889,000	4,368,000	-7,259,000	-9,521,000			
Parkway and road construction (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(38,000,000)	(27,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(-21,000,000)	(-10,000,000)			
Preservation of historic properties	770,000	1,168,000	783,000	+13,000	-385,000			
General administrative expenses	2,569,000	2,969,000	2,941,000	+372,000	-28,000			
Total, National Park Service	85,459,800	95,547,000	83,646,000	-1,813,800	-11,901,000			
Total, Fish and Wildlife and Parks	187,551,850	198,100,400	182,537,400	-5,014,450	-15,563,000			
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER								
Saline water conversion	19,800,000	27,358,000	24,556,000	+4,756,000	-2,802,000			
Prototype desalting plant		3,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	-2,000,000			
Total, Office of Saline Water	19,800,000	30,358,000	25,556,000	+5,756,000	-4,802,000			
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH								
Salaries and expenses	11,130,000	12,717,000	11,217,000	+87,000	-1,500,000			
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR								
Salaries and expenses	5,100,000	5,530,000	5,415,000	+315,000	-115,000			
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Salaries and expenses	6,881,500	8,530,000	8,301,000	+1,419,500	-229,000			
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of Interior	842,389,350	935,175,300	847,034,300	+4,644,950	-88,141,000			
Consisting of—								
Appropriations	826,189,350	917,575,300	830,834,300	+4,644,950	-88,741,000			
Definite appropriations	(701,368,350)	(801,266,900)	(714,525,900)	(+13,157,550)	(-86,741,000)			
Indefinite appropriations	(124,821,000)	(116,308,400)	(116,308,400)	(-8,512,600)				
Authorization to spend from public debt receipts	16,200,000	17,600,000	16,200,000		-1,400,000			
Memoranda—								
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization	(59,510,000)	(52,800,000)	(39,800,000)	(-19,710,000)	(-13,000,000)			
Appropriations, including appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization	(885,699,350)	(970,375,300)	(870,634,300)	(-15,065,050)	(-99,741,000)			
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriation to liquidate contract authorization	(901,899,350)	(987,975,300)	(886,834,300)	(-15,065,050)	(-101,141,000)			
<b>TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES</b>								
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE								
Forest Service								
Forest protection and utilization:								
Forest land management	185,618,000	189,175,000	185,374,000	-244,000	-3,801,000			
Forest research	41,257,000	40,127,000	39,067,000	-2,190,000	-1,060,000			
State and private forestry cooperation	19,751,000	19,847,000	19,833,000	+82,000	-14,000			
Total, forest protection and utilization	246,626,000	249,149,000	244,274,000	-2,352,000	-4,875,000			
Forest roads and trails (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization):	(110,000,000)	(91,970,000)	(91,000,000)	(-19,000,000)	(-970,000)			
Acquisition of lands for national forests:								
Special acts (special fund, indefinite)	80,000	80,000	80,000					
Cooperative range improvements (special fund, indefinite)	700,000	700,000	700,000					
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000					
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, Forest Service	248,406,000	250,929,000	246,054,000	-2,352,000	-4,875,000			

See footnotes at end of table.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1968 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1969—Continued

[Note: All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) <sup>1</sup> (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority, recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—				
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1968 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (6)			
<b>TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued</b>								
<b>FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$162,000	\$157,000	\$157,000	-\$5,000	.....			
<b>COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	115,000	115,000	115,000	.....	.....			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE</b>								
<b>Public Health Service</b>								
Indian health activities.....	82,005,000	95,907,000	90,860,000	+\$8,855,000	-\$5,047,000			
Construction of Indians health facilities.....	16,848,000	16,100,000	14,100,000	-\$2,748,000	-\$2,000,000			
Total, Public Health Service.....	98,853,000	112,007,000	104,960,000	+\$6,107,000	-\$7,047,000			
<b>Office of Education</b>								
Arts and humanities educational activities.....	1,000,000	(*)	.....	-1,000,000	.....			
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare.....	99,853,000	112,007,000	104,960,000	+\$5,107,000	-\$7,047,000			
<b>INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	500,000	619,000	619,000	+\$119,000	.....			
<b>NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	995,000	1,073,000	1,017,000	+\$22,000	-\$56,000			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>								
<b>Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority</b>								
Federal contribution.....	55,147,000	43,772,000	43,772,000	+\$43,772,000	-\$11,375,000			
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	55,147,000	43,772,000	43,772,000	+\$43,772,000	-\$11,375,000			
<b>PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	3,060,000	944,000	944,000	-\$2,116,000	.....			
<b>SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	23,913,000	27,130,000	25,748,000	+\$1,835,000	-\$1,382,000			
Museum programs and related research (special foreign currency program).....	2,316,000	6,000,000	3,000,000	+\$684,000	-\$3,000,000			
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	400,000	660,000	300,000	-\$100,000	-\$360,000			
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	1,125,000	1,200,000	400,000	-\$725,000	-\$800,000			
Construction.....	803,000	14,197,000	2,000,000	+\$1,197,000	-\$12,197,000			
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	3,054,000	3,291,000	3,200,000	+\$146,000	-\$91,000			
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	31,611,000	52,478,000	34,648,000	+\$3,037,000	-\$17,830,000			
<b>EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT</b>								
Salaries and expenses, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources.....	1,300,000	1,375,000	1,300,000	.....	-\$75,000			
<b>FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING IN ALASKA</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	240,000	298,000	235,000	-\$5,000	-\$63,000			
<b>HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS</b>								
<b>Lewis and Clark Trail Commission</b>								
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	.....	.....			
Total, new budget (obligational) authority, related agencies.....	386,267,000	475,167,000	433,846,000	+\$47,579,000	41,321,000			
<b>Consisting of—</b>								
Appropriations.....	386,267,000	475,167,000	433,846,000	+\$47,579,000	-\$41,321,000			
Definite appropriations.....	(385,487,000)	(474,387,000)	(433,066,000)	(+\$47,579,000)	(-\$41,321,000)			
Indefinite appropriations.....	(780,000)	(780,000)	(780,000)	.....	.....			
<b>Memoranda—</b>								
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	(110,000,000)	(91,970,000)	(91,000,000)	(-\$19,000,000)	(-\$970,000)			
Appropriations, including appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization.....	(496,267,000)	(567,137,000)	(524,846,000)	(+\$28,579,000)	(-\$42,291,000)			
Total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriation to liquidate contract authorization.....	(496,267,000)	(567,137,000)	(524,846,000)	(+\$28,579,000)	(-\$42,291,000)			
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>								
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, all titles.....	1,228,656,350	1,410,342,300	1,280,880,300	+\$52,223,950	-\$129,462,000			
<b>Consisting of—</b>								
1. Appropriations.....	1,212,456,350	1,392,742,300	1,264,680,300	+\$52,223,950	-\$128,062,000			
Definite appropriations.....	(1,086,855,350)	(1,275,653,900)	(1,147,591,900)	(+\$52,223,950)	(-\$128,062,000)			
Indefinite appropriations.....	(125,601,000)	(117,088,400)	(117,088,400)	(-\$8,512,600)	.....			
2. Authorization to spend from public debt receipts.....	16,200,000	17,600,000	16,200,000	.....	-\$1,400,000			
<b>Memoranda—</b>								
1. Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	(169,510,000)	(144,770,000)	(130,800,000)	(-\$38,710,000)	(-\$13,970,000)			
2. Appropriations, including appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization.....	(1,381,966,350)	(1,537,512,300)	(1,395,480,300)	(+\$13,513,950)	(-\$142,032,000)			
3. Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority and appropriation to liquidate contract authorization.....	(1,398,166,350)	(1,555,112,300)	(1,411,680,300)	(+\$13,513,950)	(-\$143,432,000)			

<sup>1</sup> Amounts have not been reduced to reflect reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-218 (H.J. Res. 888).

1969 budget estimate included in Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

<sup>2</sup> Funding for this activity previously carried under "Salaries and expenses" and "Operation and maintenance."

Item	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969
Appropriations.....	\$1,410,729,300	\$1,398,166,350	\$1,411,680,300
Receipts <sup>1</sup> .....	1,213,727,000	1,471,827,000	1,509,314,000

<sup>1</sup> Estimated for fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

#### SUMMARY OF BILL

At this time I am also placing in the RECORD a summary of this bill:

Item	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1969	Recommended in bill	Comparison
Title I, Department of the Interior:			
New budget (obligational authority).....	\$935,175,300	\$847,034,300	\$88,141,000
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	52,800,000	39,800,000	13,000,000
Title II, related agencies:			
New budget (obligational authority).....	475,167,000	433,846,000	41,321,000
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorization.....	91,970,000	91,000,000	970,000
Grand total.....	1,555,112,300	1,411,680,300	143,432,000

In brief recapitulation may I point out to you totals as follows:

Budget estimates for fiscal year 1969.....	\$1,555,112,300
The committee has recommended.....	1,411,680,300
A total reduction of.....	143,432,000

#### USE OF CARRYOVER FUNDS

It is frequently contended by those advocating severe cutbacks in 1969 appropriations that there are sufficient carryover or "pipeline" funds available from prior years to enable many agencies of the Federal Government to operate during fiscal year 1969 with appropriations greatly below those enacted for the 1968 fiscal year. An analysis of the items involved in this bill indicates an unobligated carryover from fiscal year 1968 to fiscal year 1969 amounting to about \$122.5 million as listed in the 1969 budget estimate. As could be expected, the majority of these carryover funds are involved in construction projects which extend over 2 years. It is for noting that about \$52 million, almost one-half of the total amount, is for the land and water conservation fund. This is explained by the fact that the portion of the land and water conservation fund available to States on a grant basis remains available for use by the States for a period of 3 years. During the past 2 years many of the States have been developing recreation plans which have progressed to a point where it is to be expected that in the coming year the States will have obligated a major portion of the funds earmarked for their use.

In all instances, due consideration was given to the availability of carryover funds, especially in construction programs. It will be noted from the committee report on this bill that almost without exception reductions have been made in construction estimates on the premise of the agencies making immediate use of carryover funds.

#### INCREASES AND DECREASES

On page 2 of the committee report is a summary of major increases and decreases in the bill. For ready reference, the summary is listed here in the RECORD:

#### Major increases:

Construction of rapid transit system.....	+\$43,772,000
Additional education and welfare services and other assistance to the American Indian.....	+31,396,000

Major increases—Continued	
Saline water program.....	+5,756,000
Administration of Territories.....	+5,740,000
Management, protection, and maintenance of National Parks.....	+5,449,000
Geologic surveys, investigations, and research.....	+3,971,000
Conservation and development of natural resources.....	+3,772,000
Smithsonian Institution and related activities.....	+3,037,000
Coal research.....	+2,370,000
Mine health and safety.....	+516,000
Subtotal, major increases.....	+105,779,000
Major decreases:	
Construction of roads.....	-39,100,000
Construction of facilities.....	-31,602,000
Acquisition of land under the Land and Water Conservation Fund.....	-19,191,000
Public land law review.....	-2,116,000
Solid waste disposal.....	-1,450,000
Subtotal, major decreases.....	-93,459,000
Other increases and decreases (net).....	+1,193,950
Net total increase over fiscal year 1968.....	+13,513,950

An analysis of this table will indicate major increases for the construction of the rapid transit system and additional education and welfare services to the American Indian.

The above table also reflects the major reductions in funding provided in this bill for the construction of roads and facilities.

#### ACTIVITY SCOPE OF BILL

I would like to call the Committee's attention to pages 3 and 4 of the report which contains a great many interesting figures relative to the U.S. involvement in areas covered by this bill.

In addition to the actual receipts funded here, the national economy is strengthened through industrial and commercial activities benefiting from services performed by these agencies.

For example, the Forest Service provides about 25 percent of the total timber cut for industrial purposes in the United States. Grazing for cattle is provided, material assistance is given to our fishing industries, of which I will speak in a moment, and extensive assistance is given to the Nation's mining industry.

There is deep economic significance, too, in our national parks and other recreation facilities. It has been estimated that 150 million visitor-days in the national forests produce an expenditure by private individuals visiting those areas of about \$1.3 billion.

Lest any of you assume that recreation is a "frill," I would refer you to page 198, part II, of the hearings wherein is listed the total national expenditure for recreation activities, the major part of which is in rural areas and which represents the primary source of income in many of the areas.

In 1965, approximately \$79 billion, or 11.6 percent, of the gross national product of \$681 billion was spent on recreation or was recreation oriented, as follows:

	Billions
Vacation travel.....	\$22.5
Recreation goods and services.....	26.3
Other personal recreation expenditures.....	20.1
Private domestic recreation investment.....	8.1
Government expenditures (Federal, State, and local).....	2.0
Total recreation expenditures.....	79.0

In addition, in terms of a national employment of 75 million in 1965, recreation accounts for about 10 percent of total and outdoor recreation, about 7.4 percent or 5.5 million persons.

In 1966, social and recreation travel accounted for a fourth to a third of the passenger automobile vehicle miles traveled in the United States—or from 177 to 236 billion vehicle-miles.

Relating this to revenue from use of highways, it means that up to one-third of the \$2.961 billion received from Federal excise taxes on motor fuel, lubricating oil, and other charges paid into the highway trust fund in 1965 was attributable to recreation use.

Mineral and oil resources contained in the outer continental shelf and the oil shale lands of Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming are estimated to be worth many billions of dollars. Agencies funded in this bill are primarily responsible for the development of these lands and the protection of the Government's interest in the administration and sale of these valuable natural resources.

There are 193,000 miles of road on the national forest system, of which 164,000 miles are maintained by the National Forest Service. This is greater than the mileage maintained by any one of the largest State highway departments. Over 6,000 miles of new forest roads are planned for construction in fiscal year 1969, of which about 85 percent will be by timber sale operators under Forest Service design standards and supervision. This mileage is more than twice the distance from New York to San Francisco.

There follows a listing of selected items which further indicates the extent of activities funded in this bill:

Management of public lands (acres):	
Bureau of Land Management.....	452,584,244
U.S. Forest Service.....	186,805,031
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	55,294,080

Management of public lands (acres)—Continued	
Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife	28,500,000
National Park Service	27,186,805
Total	750,370,160

Road Construction (miles):	
Road Mileage Inventory, 1967 (for maintenance and reconstruction)	268,234
Mileage to be Constructed in 1969	7,540

[In millions]

	1967 calendar year, actual	1969 calendar year, estimated
Recreation visitations:		
National Park Service	140	173
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	19	23
Bureau of Land Management	21	30
U.S. Forest Service	166	200
Total	346	426

## TIMBER PRODUCTION

**Forest Service:** An estimated harvest of 12.5 billion board feet is anticipated for 1969 with a value of \$200 million. This volume represents about 25 percent of the total timber cut for industrial purposes in the United States and is equivalent to the construction of 1.3 million average sized homes. It represents the raw material base for \$10 billion in gross national product, and \$1.9 billion annually in revenues to the Treasury under the present tax base.

The Bureau of Land Management administers the sale of over 1.5 billion board feet of timber annually.

## GRAZING

The Bureau of Land Management administers grazing of over 10 million head of livestock and 2.7 million big game animals.

The Forest Service provides grazing for 7 million head of livestock for a continued and necessary source of grazing required by about 20,000 family-size ranch units.

## MINERAL RESOURCES

The Bureau of Land Management administers mining and mineral leasing on some 760 million acres in the continental United States and over 250 million acres of submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf with estimated receipts of \$633,400,000 in 1969.

Geological Survey provides the basic scientific data concerning water, land, and mineral resources; provides financial assistance to private industry for exploration for critical minerals; and supervises the development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands. The annual value of production on Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf mineral leases is \$2.3 billion, with royalties of \$300 million. Bonuses from lease sales to date this fiscal year exceed \$600 million.

## COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Much has been written and said by members of other committees of Congress and by those interested in our commercial fisheries industry regarding the sad plight in which the industry finds it-

self today. If early and effective action is not taken to correct this situation, the United States will have to depend entirely on other nations for the supply of its commercial fish and fish products.

Information developed during the hearings indicated that the United States now imports 71 percent of its fishery products. Commercial fishermen of this Nation are at a great disadvantage competitively with other nations because of the superior fishing fleets and equipment now being employed by other nations, and also because of wage differentials.

In several instances, what used to be an abundant supply of various types of fish adjacent to our shores is now disappearing because of lack of adequate conservation measures, inadequate biological data on the activity and behavior of these fish, indiscriminate harvesting of these stocks by foreign countries, and ecological changes.

At the present time there is a rapid decrease in the availability of individuals who are skilled fishermen due to limited financial returns on investment of funds for equipment and also wages for labor.

In Boston, for example, in the Boston ground fishing fleet, the age of the average fisherman is about 60 years.

With the complete absence of younger men to take over this trade, even if other problems of the fishing industry are solved, this Nation will still be unable to take economic advantage of the resources of the sea.

We are finding increasing competition from the Soviets, the Japanese, Canadians, and Norwegians. It would sometimes seem in reviewing these fishing problems that the United States is solely interested in military progress while allowing its economic future in this highly competitive field to go to pieces.

It is to be hoped that in spite of the fact of other problems facing this Nation, we who are responsible for its total welfare do not continue to overlook the vast benefits that can be obtained from a greatly improved commercial fishing industry in this country.

Let us not wake up some morning moaning about Soviet fishing leadership. We ourselves will have been to blame for not taking the steps that are necessary to provide world leadership, and to provide it particularly in the fields of fishery conservation. I note in the Foreign Operations Subcommittee that we are constantly funding other nations for fishery programs, yet we have great reluctance to do anything about our own.

## INDIAN EDUCATION

I do not have time this afternoon to summarize for you each of the items with increases and decreases. However, some are of such major importance that I would like to review them as briefly as possible.

The Committee will note that among the items of increase this year we have escalated funding for education and welfare services and other assistance to American Indians.

The Appropriations Committee in the past several years has not been unmindful of the problems of the Indian population. We are deeply aware of them and are constantly seeking solutions, but these are not easy. Millions of dollars

have been spent, but we continue to be troubled by the dropout picture and are mindful that there is a larger rate of dropouts for Indians in the public high schools than there is in the BIA schools. What are the reasons that keep the young Indians in the eighth grade on the reservation, then the moment they go to a public school do not stay through the ninth grade school year.

Where are we failing? Where do we need to move ahead? Upon what bases can we work? Why is there an increased amount of mental illness? An increasing rate of suicides among young Indians?

There are many reasons—among them poverty, lack of education and training, et cetera. Simply stated, we have not yet brought these people into the mainstream of American life, nor yet brought the Indian educational system to full equality with the public education system in America. There are language and cultural lags which must be erased.

It is for this reason, this year that we are funding a beginning in the kindergarten field. More funds than are in this bill were requested, but it is difficult to secure personnel, and the committee felt a smaller successful beginning might give us better objectivity. We have funded one-half the kindergartens requested, both in the public and Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools.

I would like to bring to the committee's attention the following information and figures:

## Indian education and welfare

Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools	59,025
Indian children in public schools	68,655
Indians provided with welfare guidance services	37,000
Operation and maintenance of irrigation systems (number of systems)	300

I would ask each member of this Committee to read the committee hearings in part II, beginning on page 574, to find the extent of our Indian programs. At this time, however, I would like to point out some of the areas of success.

In the self-help housing field where Indians supply labor and we fund the materials, there has been a tremendous improvement in that basic commodity—housing.

Job training is succeeding. There is better management of their lands, although I would add that irrigation programs, particularly for the Navajos, should be stepped up. Indians are also making tremendous progress in converting some of their lands into industrial areas.

All Indian problems will not be solved by this budget, for money itself is not a complete answer.

The time is now at hand when those responsible for the administration of the Indian program must lay aside bureaucratic ideas. Serious attention needs to be given to basic policy. For example, may it not be more practical and economical to accelerate the road construction and provide education through consolidated schools with higher standard facilities? Is it really the best approach to maintain Indian children in segregated Indian schools rather than to make arrangements with local public school authorities for the integration of Indian

children in public schools? Should not greater emphasis be given to helping the Indian help himself with all the assistance and cooperation private industry seems willing to offer in this connection? These are some of the long-range objectives.

Bureau officials are urged to confer to the greatest possible extent with leading educators of Federal and State education systems in order to obtain maximum benefit from the experience of these individuals in the improvement and upgrading of school systems. This would be most helpful in the development of a forward-looking curriculum and higher educational standards for Indian schools. This interchange of constructive guidance will help to provide Indian children with the same educational quality as other children, and will enable the Indian pupil to transfer from Indian to public schools with a minimum of disruption to the child. Dropouts and failures will not decline until a better transition procedure is established.

This committee will continue to be deeply interested in the progress and development of the Indian, but we can no longer condone the "business as usual" approach to this situation.

May I also recommend to the Committee the discussion of Indian health programs, beginning on page 471 of part III.

The health of the American Indian is interwoven with their successful future. Sanitation problems in hundreds of villages should be of major concern to every American.

It is not possible to maintain high levels of health for the rest of the American people and yet allow an open sore of disease to fester in the Indian world. We provide increased funds.

#### SALINE WATER

For the office of saline water, \$24,556,000 is provided for saline water conversion. This is \$2,802,000 below the budget estimate and \$4,756,000 above the amount available for 1968. The amount included in this bill and the total amount authorized under Public Law 90-297, approved April 29, 1968, and is for distribution as follows:

Research and development operating expenses	\$17,274,000
Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities	4,292,000
Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules	1,175,000
Administration and coordination	1,815,000

Except for "administration," any individual amount listed above may be increased by up to 10 percent if such increase is accompanied by an equal decrease in one or more of the other categories.

#### PROTOTYPE DESALTING PLANT

The budget request included \$3,000,000 to fund the Department of Interior's participation in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of a nuclear-powered dual-purpose electric

power and desalting plant to be constructed in southern California, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90-18, approved May 19, 1967. The bill provides \$1,000,000 for this activity, a reduction of \$2,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The development of a practical and efficient desalination process would be of material assistance in mitigating some of the water problems facing this Nation today. For the past several years, ample appropriations have been provided to fund meaningful progress in this connection. Extensive research has been performed on the pilot-plant basis, and the opinion is held by many experts in this field that the time has now come for research results to be applied to actual operations.

The proposed plan in southern California, which is a cooperative project, could be a major milestone in the progress of desalinization, and high hopes are held for its success.

In all probability, funding provided for this activity would have been at a higher level had it not been for the construction delays that have been occasioned by the escalation of construction costs. The amount provided in the bill is considered sufficient to cover the Department of Interior's share of the project cost until all the financial details are settled and actual construction of the plant is progressing on schedule. Barring unforeseen circumstance, there should be no question on the availability of funds to carry out the Federal Government's responsibilities under the agreement as this project moves along to completion. I trust that the hope of diversion will not slow this.

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

The land acquisition program under the land and water conservation fund continues to present serious problems. The escalation of land prices is still one of the most serious threats to the estab-

lishment of national recreation areas and parks. Several proposals have been submitted to correct this situation but a cure has not yet been found. The appropriation of huge sums of money for the acquisition of this land is not in itself a solution.

Legislation is now being considered in the Congress which would provide an amplified source of funds for this program. Even with the enactment of this legislation, the escalation of land prices will still be a problem, in view of the large amount of acreage already designated for acquisition by the Federal Government.

Early action needs to be taken to expedite the payment of claims and judgments rendered by the courts in condemnation cases. In fairness to the citizens of this Nation, when the Federal Government finds it necessary to take over his land and our courts have determined the amount of adequate compensation, there is no reason why the landowner should have to wait 1, 2, or 3 years to receive the compensation due him. Not only is this unfair to the individual involved, but it results in the incurrence of additional cost to the Government because of interest accruals.

The budget estimate included \$130,000,000 for the land and water conservation fund program in 1969. The bill provides \$100,000,000 for this purpose. The total funding provided in the bill will be derived from receipts of the land and water conservation fund, thus obviating the need for the advance appropriation requested in the budget estimate.

In determining the amounts provided the various sections of the country for land acquisition, consideration was given to urgency of need, proximity to heavily populated areas, and "opportunity buying." The following table lists by activity the amounts provided in the bill as compared with the budget estimate:

Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1969	Change
1. Assistance to States	\$65,000,000	\$55,000,000	-\$10,000,000
2. Federal land acquisition program:			
National Park Service: Requirements for recently acquired areas:			
Assateague Island National Seashore	5,000,000	2,500,000	-2,500,000
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area	5,500,000	4,000,000	-1,500,000
Fire Island National Seashore	4,264,607	4,000,807	-263,800
Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site	15,200	15,200	
Guadalupe Mountains National Park	1,446,000		-1,446,000
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site	300,000	150,000	-150,000
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	10,000,000	5,000,000	-5,000,000
Ozark National Scenic Riverway	2,307,900	1,153,900	-1,154,000
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore	2,401,293	1,201,293	-1,200,000
Point Reyes National Seashore	685,000	685,000	
Roger Williams National Memorial	105,000	105,000	
San Juan Island National Historic Park	975,000	400,000	-575,000
Whiskeytown-Shasta National Recreation Area	4,000,000	2,500,000	-1,500,000
Subtotal, new areas	37,000,000	21,711,200	-15,288,800
Inholdings	9,500,000	6,763,800	-2,736,200
Total, Park Service	46,500,000	28,475,000	-18,025,000
Forest Service:			
Wilderness areas	99,000	99,000	
Other recreation areas	11,901,000	11,901,000	
Total, Forest Service	12,000,000	12,000,000	
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Endangered species	1,500,000	750,000	-750,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Emergency planning and acquisition	2,000,000	1,000,000	-1,000,000
Total, Federal program	127,000,000	97,225,000	-29,775,000
Administrative expenses	3,000,000	2,775,000	-225,000
Total, 1969	130,000,000	100,000,000	-30,000,000

## OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Another item of significant increase is the \$13,350,000 included in the bill for the Office of Coal Research. This is an increase of \$2,370,000 over the 1968 appropriation and represents a reduction of \$550,000 below the budget estimate.

This program was first funded in fiscal year 1961 and is responsible for developing the full potentiality and versatility of coal to the maximum benefit of the United States. Efforts are being made to expand the use of coal through the development of new uses as well as within presently known fields of utilization. The scientific and technical aspects of the program are performed through a program of contract research.

Research conducted under this program to date, has progressed to the extent that it is now necessary to expand the research to the pilot plant level in order to make full use of research results attained thus far. The increase provided in this bill pertains to the additional cost to continue funding five pilot-plant projects which will be in various stages of operation during fiscal year 1969.

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

This bill normally includes an appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Although hearings were held on the 1969 budget estimate, the bill for consideration before the House today includes no funding for this agency. Existing legislation for this activity expires June 30, 1968. New legislation which would authorize the continuance of the activity in fiscal year 1969 has not yet been enacted into law.

In the absence of the required authorizing legislation, this item has been passed over without prejudice.

## JOSEPH H. HIRSHHORN MUSEUM AND SCULPTURE GARDEN

The budget estimate included a request of \$14,197,000 for construction of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, authorized by Public Law 89-788, approved November 7, 1966. This was in accordance with the terms of the agreement entered into by the Smithsonian Institution, which stipulated that total funding for the construction of the museum would be provided by the end of fiscal year 1969.

In a critical budget year the question could be raised by those not especially sympathetic to the arts as to why any funding should be provided for this activity.

On the other hand, we have the consideration that an art and sculpture collection valued at between \$30 and \$40 million is being donated to the Government if adequate facilities are provided to house the collection. One needs only to review the attendance figures at the National Gallery of Art here in Washington to say nothing of other art museums, both in this country and in various parts of the world, to realize the tremendous interest that exists today in viewing art collections. Millions of people enjoy these galleries.

In view of the urgent necessity to keep expenditures at a minimum, alternatives

were explored with a view to compliance with the terms of the agreement and also to keeping 1969 expenditures to an absolute minimum.

As a result, the bill provides \$2,000,000 for the first phase of construction of the museum to be accomplished in fiscal year 1969. It is understood that this arrangement has been discussed with the donor and is satisfactory with him.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill. It is for the maintenance of our American earth and our American people.

What profit have we in rebuilt cities if the citizens of those cities have no water? What military laurels won in battle can compensate a nation where there is no space for mankind to walk through a forest, park or museum, or where the earth has died from lack of care?

If our stewardship does not preclude these possibilities, the latter part of this century will be a monument to our lack of vision, and our generation can only inherit censure.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the authorizing committee for which the gentlewoman and her committee have the responsibility of providing and recommending appropriations, I wish to commend the gentlewoman and the members of her subcommittee and the members of the full Appropriations Committee for the presentation which they have brought before the House at this time. I wish to say further that it has been a pleasure throughout the years to work with the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and a special pleasure to work with the charming and able gentlewoman as chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, while this bill leaves many things undone that many of us would like to see done, nevertheless under the circumstances I think the gentlewoman and her subcommittee, as well as the full Committee on Appropriations, have done the best they could in the light of the needs of the day. We must keep in mind that appropriations here provided are largely to build the United States and therefore are for purposes which increase the wealth of the United States and, with few exceptions, in the provisions herein made, these moneys return many fold the investment that the United States provides.

I am right, am I not, may I ask the gentlewoman from Washington, that most of the moneys provided herein for appropriations are moneys which are received from those areas of operation which are now under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In response to the question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the receipts generated by activities funded in this bill are derived from the management by this Nation of its resources, and they would more than cover the full funding

of the bill if it were not for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the Trust Territory of the Pacific, Samoa, and Guam, to mention a few of the nonrevenue producing agencies.

I do not feel that this really needs to be justified when one considers that the Governor of Guam has been a leader in the South Pacific. The Trust Territory represents our image which we cast in the Orient, and American Samoa has become a showcase along that line in the South Pacific.

In further response to the question of the gentleman from Colorado, when the Indians, who were the first settlers of this land are brought into the mainstream of American economic life, I feel that all funds invested in this endeavor will be well worthwhile.

I do thank the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for his remarks. I had the great pleasure of serving on the gentleman's committee when I first came to Congress, and I will say the experience which I gained there has served me well in my other congressional responsibilities.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentlewoman will yield further, may I ask the gentlewoman a few more questions?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand it, it is the feeling of the gentlewoman and her subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations that the moneys which we have provided for expenditure in the Pacific are as high as we can go at this time in this program that is now provided; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This is correct. When we reviewed the unexpended balances to be available at the end of fiscal year 1969, this was the maximum amount of funding that was actually needed, and it represented an amount which would comply with the desire and wishes of this House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Now permit me to ask the distinguished gentlewoman one more question. This has to do with the matter of decreases in the Public Land Law Review Commission operation. I notice that the amount which is carried in the bill is \$2,116,000 less than what the provision was for 1968 as I understand it. I have not been able to go through this in minute detail, but will the gentlewoman from Washington please explain this a little bit further?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The Public Land Law Review Commission is funded at exactly the level that was requested by the Bureau of the Budget. I agree with the gentleman from Colorado and appreciate his great interest and desire to have this work completed as soon as possible. I do not feel it is going to be possible to untangle the myriads of problems which confront the users of public lands until this study is completed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield for one further question, this in no way handicaps the Commission in its operations and those operations will continue as they are being carried on now and as now projected?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Not at all.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. As I read the report—and I may be wrong—and I hope the gentlewoman will correct me if I am wrong, this appropriation bill calls for appropriations of about \$13.5 million more than was spent for the same general purposes last year; is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Actually if one considers the 1968 supplemental recently approved by the subcommittee, the amount in this bill is \$56.2 million less than the funds appropriated for 1968.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. In reference to the increase referred to by the gentleman from Iowa, I think it should be noted that there is an increase of \$43 million in this bill for construction of the rapid transit system in Washington. There was no funding for construction of the transit system in 1968.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman from Virginia is completely right. Last year there was no construction money in the bill for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and because of this the gentleman will note that the item carried this year does show an increase of \$43.7 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am just dealing with the figures in this bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. And I am dealing with the facts and figures.

Mr. GROSS. But, regardless of what the purpose is, this bill, if I read it right, is \$13.5 million more than for the same general purposes last year. This may be an exception, but there is spending here that would be authorized of \$13.5 million more than for last year.

Only a few weeks ago we cut the agricultural bill by 24 percent here in the House, and I was in hopes that this bill would come to the House with a very substantial cut in it to conform to the austerity program that we hear so much about.

I must say to the gentlewoman from Washington that I am disappointed that, having voted for a 24-percent cut in the agricultural appropriation bill only a few days ago, to find this bill increased, for whatever purposes, by \$13.5 million over last year.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that much of the funding in this bill is for the protection of our natural resources.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield for one comment, I believe the House would want their attention drawn to the fact that this bill is \$143 million below the budget, and I would consider that a very substantial savings, for which the committee should be complimented.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me further at this time?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am sorry, but I cannot yield further to the gentleman from Iowa at this time.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join in commanding the gentlewoman from Washington insofar as this bill is concerned, which involves the stewardship of the lands and resources of the United States of America. I believe this is one of the most important appropriation bills to come before the Congress. The gentlewoman and her committee have looked into this matter with a great deal of diligence, and they have lived up to their responsibilities. I personally would like to see a rise in expenditures. I believe the stewardship of the land and natural resources of this country require that we spend increasing sums of money in this area.

The gentlewoman from Washington well knows that in the management of our timber resources, for instance, we come back with a three-fold return many times for the expenditures we make in the field of increased productivity from our forests.

This is just one example of many, many areas where the sound expenditure policy and the sound investment of funds by our Government can repay themselves manyfold back into the Treasury.

So, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman and her committee for doing an excellent job.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield once more?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will be delighted to yield further to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I believe I understand what bothers the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], but I would suggest that we look at the facts presented here. That is, Congress authorized the construction of a rapid transit system. The appropriation for the rapid transit system calls for \$43,772,000, a newly authorized program. This proposed legislation, by the way, provides for, in the amount of \$11,375,000 of what the estimate was as provided by the Bureau of the Budget.

If it were not for this item, a new item, this bill would provide for considerably less appropriations than what we have for fiscal year 1969; is that not correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is completely correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Washington has consumed 32 minutes.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take very much time because our chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished

gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Hansen] has done an excellent job by presenting to you the elements in this legislation. I think we ought to consider ourselves fortunate to have someone as chairman of this subcommittee whose background as a State legislator and whose full life's experience has been in the very areas that are considered by this legislation—the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, soil and moisture conservation and, indeed, including the Indians of this country, many of whom live in the State of Washington in the gentlewoman's district.

You will note, if you look at the report on page 2 with respect to the appropriations for 1969, we recommend \$1,411,680,300. The estimated receipts for this next fiscal year is slightly more than that—\$1,509,314,000.

The difficulty presented to the committee with respect to the various aspects of this bill, as we considered it very thoroughly over a period of several weeks, is first that we are faced with the matter that each of these agencies in the Department of the Interior that we considered, outside of that affecting the Indians, are revenue-producing agencies.

For example, with respect to the Forest Service, in some aspects of its activity, for a dollar of investment we get somewhere in the neighborhood of \$17.50 in return.

With respect, let us say, to land buying and in-holdings in the Forest Service, in prior planning if we spend one dollar now, we will save \$5 to \$6 in the future.

So you could go on—with the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, in the area of heavy metals, which is certainly important to us in these times.

The breakthroughs that have been made possible through the funding of these important agencies such as the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey, have made it possible for the discoveries of heavy metals and oil and other resources that are sorely needed for a rapidly growing country. Also, for the Park Service which now has to accommodate more and more people each year in order to provide the necessary recreational services.

So our problem has been to try to keep the appropriations down so that we would not materially affect the revenue producing agencies that are in the bill and at the same time also be mindful of the budget constraints that face us.

So we come then to the reduction over the budget request of somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 percent. These are hard cuts across the appropriation bill—there is no way in which they can come back and ask for more because there is no open-ended arrangement here—as I said, there is no way in which the affected agencies could come back and ask for more as they do in the Department of Agriculture where it may be necessary to pick up more payments with respect to an increase in agricultural production and say it becomes necessary to replenish the funds that have been reduced in that regard.

This is not possible here except in the instance of fire in our timber and grazing lands or damage that might be done through acts of nature, having to do with floods. But other than that these are hard cuts across the whole gamut of all the appropriation requests.

There is one item I think I would like to emphasize that is a new one in the Indian Bureau appropriation, and that has to do with kindergarten training, something that is an innovation so far as the Education Department of the Indian Bureau is concerned. Through all these years we have had Indian children coming from homes where there is a language difficulty and a language handicap that surely would benefit from kindergarten programs. But for the first time such an item has been included in this budget. Since it is an innovation, and it is going to be difficult to get adequately prepared and qualified teachers, it was the judgment of the committee that the request be cut in half.

As you know, something over 100,000 Indian boys and girls are in the first 12 grades. Over half of those are in public schools for whom the Federal Government assumes some responsibility, and the less-than-half are in Federal schools. This is an effort to see what can be done in this regard, since it has been so well demonstrated through Headstart programs throughout the Nation that an early start with Indian children may make the difference between their succeeding in the educational program and going into adulthood properly prepared to meet the demands of our society.

In closing, I wish to pay tribute to the many employees throughout the country, and these are in every State in our Union, plus Puerto Rico, employees who are dedicated and qualified. As I visit them in the various agencies across the Nation, I find them dedicated to their job and prepared to carry on with a spirit that is necessary in these times, even though we make these budget cuts and make their operation still more difficult.

So to them throughout the Nation—and I know the Committee joins me in this—we extend to them our heartiest commendation and hope that they will continue to give of themselves, as they have in the past, in order that we might keep this group of agencies which they serve continuing to provide the kind of service and leadership necessary in order that we will be able to preserve the resources of our Nation, and not only to preserve them, but even to strengthen and enlarge upon this great valuable asset which is ours in the country.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely wish to thank the gentleman for what he has just said regarding the personnel and the spirit of the personnel in the Department of the Interior, and particularly in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It has seemed to me that some people lately have been making a popular sport out of attacking the Bureau of Indian Affairs and throwing all kinds of rocks at its personnel. Without any doubt there are in

any agency some men who do not measure up to the standard that we would like to see for them, just as there is in any legislative body a likelihood that you will find some who do not come up to the standard that the public would like to see in effect for that body. But my own observation has been that the Bureau of Indian Affairs today, under the very able leadership of Commissioner Bob Bennett, is as highly motivated and as dedicated an organization as any I have ever run across in government, and I think we have on the area director level in our own State, particularly on the eastern side of Oklahoma, as fine a spirit of service to the Indian—and am talking about 24-hour, around-the-clock type of service—prevailing at this time as we have had in the period of my service in government. I think the gentleman certainly has spoken in a timely way today about the caliber of personnel that we have today in this Bureau and about the job that is being done by them.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Oklahoma. I wholeheartedly agree with his comments with respect to the employees of this specific bureau which the gentleman mentioned.

It may be of interest to some to know that I am a product of the Indian Bureau. I was born and reared on an Indian reservation, and I never would have finished school had it not been for those dedicated Federal employees who, 50 years ago, encouraged me to continue, after half a dozen dropouts, and finally I find myself here a Member of the U.S. Congress.

This is the result, I believe very largely, of the influence and encouragement coming from the very employees my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, has mentioned.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to commend my colleague, the ranking Republican member of this subcommittee, for the wonderful statement he has made, and to commend him as well for the dedication he has shown as we went through the hearings on this bill.

Every bill that has been reported out bears in large significance the imprint and influence and dedication and intelligence and industry of the gentleman in the well who has just spoken. He serves as an inspiration for all of us in being willing to bare his own personal experiences during his childhood in surmounting difficult obstacles and in achieving a status which we hope today still holds some esteem with the American public.

I take this opportunity to express my thanks for the leadership he has shown on this subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to echo the sentiments expressed about the gentleman from South Dakota about the wonderful leadership we have had

from the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

I express also my agreement with the member of the other party who mentioned how impressed we are all daily by the contributions of the gentleman from South Dakota. I have never seen a person who approaches things in a less partisan way. It seems to me his guiding interest is always the interest of his district and the Nation.

I know Leo Durocher once said, "Nice guys finish last," but I believe the gentleman in the well has disproved that. Nice guys still finish first. We are proud to see somebody who really exemplifies the true meaning of the word "gentleman." It has been a pleasure to serve with the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, usually we reserve these thing for wakes and retirements. I am glad that is not the case, because I believe in flowers for the living.

I join my colleagues in saying I do not know anybody in the House of Representatives who deserves more richly the nice things that are now being said about the gentleman in the well. I fully concur in all of them.

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

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

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this, if I may, to my colleague from South Dakota: I had the very great pleasure, as the gentleman remembers, of traveling with the gentleman and seeing him in action with a number of kinds of people. I think I have never been with anyone who had a broader view, a more sensitive reaction to what is going on around him.

I feel that somehow I would like to commend the people that the gentleman has mentioned as having been of value to the gentleman in his life. I am glad to know they are there.

I had the pleasure—and it was not all pleasure—when I first came to the House, of serving on the Indian Affairs Committee. I have been serving with the Public Health nurses in a very tragic study of what we were not doing on the reservations. So I am particularly glad to find myself with the gentleman in this Congress, and I am so very proud to be one of his colleagues.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my very dear friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio. She has been a real source of encouragement to me ever since I first came to Congress 8 years ago.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. My dear friend in the well knows of the esteem I hold for him and for many other individuals who are in the Bureau of Indian Affairs at the present time and who have served in the past. He knows, too, of my deep interest in the Indian people.

I guess I cast myself in the role of a "party pooper" at this time by saying that after 150 years and billions of dollars of expenditures we have done some very monumental things in detail in the treatment of our Indians but our policy in toto for this 150-year period has been the most dismal failure.

When 65 percent of the people of a large tribe in the United States cannot speak English, when there is the death rate there is among the infants, when there is a lack of education and a lack of sanitation and poor health, and there exist all the things which are not good, I still cannot point with pride to the white man's efforts to take care of the Indian problems which exist in this country.

I believe we are going to have a complete change in policy somewhere, some rededication or some redirection of purpose, if we are going to right a lot of wrongs that have been committed.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank my friend from Iowa.

I should like to add, since the gentleman mentioned the billions that have been spent, it would be interesting for all of us to go back and check, to learn that from 1900 to 1950, a period of 50 years, just a little more than \$1 billion was spent on behalf of the Indians for welfare and health and educational programs.

Only now are we making a beginning, in the last 4 or 5 years, particularly since we have had the interest of a former chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MIKE KIRWAN. We have had, I believe, relatively speaking, monumental increases in the attack on disease and in solving health and education problems among the Indians.

Today the death rate from tuberculosis alone has been reduced phenomenally. If we can go forward with this kind of a program, made possible by this committee and this Congress, in the years ahead, and even in larger form, as we are in this instance bringing in kindergarten training for the first time, we will see some tremendous improvements from here on out.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Inasmuch as we are discussing appropriations for the Department of the Interior, I wonder if the gentleman or the gentlewoman who is the chairman of the committee could tell me what funds, if any, are being spent from the Department of the Interior appropriations, or from other Government funds, for the poor people who are camped down near the Lincoln Memorial. I have been down there and visited this encampment, and I have noticed water and sewer and electricity and telephones going in. Is Government money being spent to house and to feed these people, and to provide utilities at this camp-in?

Mr. REIFEL. In answer to the gentleman's question, all I know in regard to expenditures there is what I have read

in the papers, which say that the people who are with the Poor People's March have had to put up a bond, to the extent of \$5,000, and that they are to take care of the equipment that is brought in there and whatever is necessary in connection with the sewer systems and so on, that were unused after they moved the buildings out. The supervision is what would be provided by the Park Service for any visitors who come into park areas.

Personally I am not aware of any funds being used for that purpose, but I shall be glad to yield, Mr. Chairman, to the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of our subcommittee, for any further answer she may want to provide.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this morning we contacted the Department of the Interior to obtain current information on this. Mr. Nash Castro, of the Department of the Interior, stated that only \$7,000 had been spent for Park Police overtime, and \$178 for engineering design.

Mr. Chairman, I will place at this point in the RECORD a memorandum of the agreement with the Department of the Interior pertaining to the permit so that you may all have it for your information:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, NA-  
TIONAL CAPITAL REGION,  
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1968.

Rev. BERNARD LAFAYETTE, Jr.,  
National Coordinator, Washington Poor Peo-  
ple's Campaign, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REV. LAFAYETTE: Pursuant to the provisions of 36 CFR 50.19, permission is granted the Southern Christian Leadership Conference ("Permittee"), 334 Auburn Avenue, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia:

(a) for the purpose of setting up and maintaining tents and appurtenant temporary structures designated by Permittee as "Resurrection City, U.S.A." for the use of not more than 3,000 persons, to use that portion of park land in the District of Columbia which is an area west of 17th Street, N.W. and north of westbound Independence Avenue to be agreed upon by the staffs of Permittee and the National Park Service and marked by stakes placed in advance by the National Park Service, said area being referred to herein as "Area A";

(b) for the purpose of holding meetings, to use the paved platform on the west terminus of the Reflecting Pool and the steps leading down to said platform daily from 7:00 p.m. until 12:00 Midnight, said area being referred to herein as "Area B";

(c) for the purpose of installing a display, consisting of not to exceed six (6) facilities such as a rural type dwelling and appurtenances and used trailers or buses, which facilities shall be maintained solely for display and shall not be occupied as living quarters, to use an area adjacent to the Smithsonian Institution to be agreed upon by the staffs of Permittee, the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service, said area being referred to herein as "Area C."

This permit is granted in response to Permittee's application of May 10, 1968, for certain purposes of the demonstration designated by Permittee as the "Poor People's Campaign." This permit covers the areas designated and the activities described herein and is issued subject to all of the conditions enumerated herein.

1. This permit shall take effect as of 8:00 a.m. on Saturday, May 11, 1968, and shall remain in effect until 8:00 p.m. on Sunday, June 16, 1968.

2. Permittee shall provide in advance a general layout and construction plan for Area A for review by the National Park Serv-

ice for adequate compliance with health and safety standards and shall proceed in accordance with said plan as approved by the National Park Service. Permittee shall install the structures in Area A in a neat and orderly plan beginning at the westernmost edge of Area A and moving eastward in a reasonably compact pattern. Permittee shall maintain the premises in accordance with applicable health and safety standards and shall facilitate periodic inspection of structures and facilities by appropriate health, safety and fire authorities of the National Park Service and of the District of Columbia to insure maintenance of such standards.

3. Permittee shall provide toilet, bathing and washing facilities and shall provide for the disposal of sewage from such facilities by making connection with available sewage lines. Permittee may connect into available water, communication and electric facilities. All utility connections shall be at the expense of Permittee. Permittee shall comply with the requirements of the National Park Service and of the District of Columbia regarding the construction and maintenance of such connections. Permittee shall arrange for the installation of necessary utility meters at its expense. Payment to suppliers for utility services shall be the responsibility of Permittee.

4. Permittee shall hold the United States and the District of Columbia harmless in the event of the death of or injury to any person or the destruction of or damage to any property, not arising out of acts of the Indemnitees' employees or agents.

5. Ingress to and egress from Area A by vehicles necessary to serve said area and the parking of such vehicles shall be at locations designated by the National Park Service.

6. Permittee may install fences within and around Areas A and C. The design of exterior fencing shall be subject to the approval of the National Park Service.

7. No firearms, weapons, explosives, or incendiary materials, and no fossil-fueled lanterns or open fires shall be permitted in the designated areas.

8. Upon cessation of the use of the designated areas under this permit, Permittee shall remove all facilities installed by or for it and shall restore the areas to their prior condition, reasonable wear and tear of the turf excepted. To guarantee compliance with this requirement, Permittee shall deposit \$5,000 in cash with the National Park Service or shall execute an undertaking in the amount of \$5,000 with two sufficient sureties satisfactory to the National Park Service or to furnish a contractual commitment therefore satisfactory to the National Park Service.

9. Permittee shall provide sufficient medical personnel and facilities to insure first aid and the maintenance of adequate medical care.

10. Permittee shall provide marshals, appropriately identified, in sufficient numbers to maintain good order, but this shall not limit, impair, or otherwise interfere with the authority of law enforcement agencies in the exercise of their responsibilities.

11. Permittee shall cause garbage and refuse of all kinds to be stored in covered, fly- and vermin-proof receptacles to be provided by Permittee, and Permittee shall be responsible for daily removal thereof, at its expense.

12. In the event Permittee desires to use other park areas during the term of this permit or to request an extension thereof, the issuance of permits will be considered in good faith upon the receipt of specific requests therefor. However, Permittee may make use of areas for appropriate forms of recreation in sites designated by the National Park Service for that purpose.

13. Any loud-speaking equipment used will be so adjusted as to be audible only to those people in the immediate area.

14. Permittee shall keep the designated areas in a reasonably neat and clean condition, taking into account the purposes for which they are assigned. Permittee may plant flowers and shrubs in Area A for the enjoyment of the participants. No existing trees and shrubs may be disturbed.

15. No livestock may be stabled or kept in the designated areas.

16. This permit does not authorize any activity or conduct by Permittee or participants in violation of applicable laws or regulations. The National Park Service reserves the right to revoke this permit at any time in the interest of public safety and the general welfare.

17. The rules and regulations set out in 36 CFR Part 50, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" shall be applicable to Permittee and participants to the extent not inconsistent with the express provisions of this permit.

Upon the acceptance of the conditions contained in this letter, indicated by the signature of Permittee in the space provided and the return of the carbon copy properly executed to this office, this letter becomes a permit for the purposes described.

Sincerely yours,

NASH CASTRO,  
Regional Director.

Accepted And Agreed To This 10th day of May, 1968, by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

BERNARD LAFAYETTE, Jr.  
National Coordinator of Washington Poor People's Campaign.

WALTER E. FAUNTRY,  
Director, Washington Bureau, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC., LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE, POOR PEOPLES CAMPAIGN,

Washington, D.C., May 10, 1968.

Re Application for permit.

Mr. NASH CASTRO,  
Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. CASTRO: The undersigned of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., as counsel for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, hereby applies for a permit for use in connection with the Poor Peoples Campaign and the establishment of and maintenance of "Resurrection City, U.S.A." pursuant to 36 C.F.R. 50.19 of Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

Name of applicant: Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Time: 8 a.m. on Saturday May 11, 1968, until 8 p.m. on Sunday, June 16

Place of proposed event: An area west of 17th Street, N.W. and north of westbound Independence Avenue to be agreed upon by the staffs of the applicant and the National Park Service.

Estimate of number of persons expected to attend: 2,000-3,000.

Statement of equipment and facilities to be installed by applicant for use in connection therewith: Pre-fabricated shelters; sanitary facilities; water; electricity; telephone; connection to existing sewers for waste disposal; etc.

We shall be available to furnish such additional information as you may require in the processing of this application.

Very truly yours,

FRANK D. REEVES,  
Chairman, Legal Services Committee.

LEROY D. CLARK,

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., as Chief Counsel for the Poor People's Campaign of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, would

the gentlewoman, the chairman of the subcommittee, since this is an appropriation bill and I feel that they are knowledgeable in this field, know whether any other Government agency is providing the money necessary for these utilities going into tent city in our Capital?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington for a reply.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say that it is not in my province as chairman of my subcommittee to monitor the activities of other agencies. I speak only for the agencies in my bill. For your information, I will read some excerpts from the agreement:

Permittee shall provide toilet, bathing and washing facilities and shall provide for the disposal of sewage from such facilities by making connection with available sewage lines.

Permittee may connect into available water, communication and electric facilities. All utility connections shall be at the expense of Permittee.

Permittee shall comply with the requirements of the National Park Service and of the District of Columbia regarding the construction and maintenance of such connections.

Permittee shall arrange for the installation of necessary utility meters at his expense. Payment of suppliers for utility services shall be the responsibility of Permittee.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentlewoman tell me who issued this permit? All of the Members from Virginia joined in introducing a bill that would have prohibited this permit from being issued, and I am just interested in knowing who issued the permit.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield further, it was signed by Mr. Nash Castro, the regional director of the National Park Service, as representative of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. What has the \$7,000 been spent for? Does the gentleman know? And where did the National Park Service or the Department of the Interior get the \$7,000 that has been expended?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington for a reply.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This \$7,000 was expended for Park Police overtime which is a protection to any person in that area. It involved the use of funds appropriated for maintenance of police protection by the National Park Police.

Mr. GROSS. There are certain other lesser expenses I believe the gentlewoman mentioned.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There was \$178 expended for engineering and design involved in laying out this city to Park Service specifications.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any contingency funds in this bill from which the moneys could be used?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There are none.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to be sure that in the future there is no money they can tap for purposes of this kind.

I happen to have here a copy of the permit that was issued. Who provided the fence? Did these so-called poor marchers provide their own fence to set up the enclosure in which they hold forth?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. They borrowed the fence.

Mr. GROSS. They borrowed it?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, from the Park Service.

Mr. GROSS. From the Park Service?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes, and they erected the fence themselves. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that in the 1969 fiscal year budget which we are presenting to the House today, there are no funds provided for situations of this kind, nor have there been any items presented to the committee with reference to reprogramming with which to finance any part of this installation.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, here is a tract of land which is Federal property, administered by the Federal Park Service that is now enclosed. As I understand it, if an individual citizen went to this enclosure and tried to get in, he would be barred and would not even have the protection of the Park Police in trying to use such Federal property. What is this all about? When and how did this Federal property become property to be dominated exclusively by a bunch of people who have marched upon Washington? Has the committee not gone into this situation at all in order to determine who is administering that Federal property?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's question, which I think is a very valid one, that is under the jurisdiction of one of the authorizing committees of this Congress, as to just where and when and how this situation is going to be met. In other words, this question does not come within the purview of the Committee on Appropriations.

In my opinion, the gentleman can check on it with the committee of this Congress which has jurisdiction over these matters.

Mr. GROSS. I am told that the people who are there today have sole control of this tract of land within that enclosure, of this Federal property, and this is very hard to believe.

Mr. REIFEL. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that it is covered under the conditions of control as outlined in the document to which he referred with respect to the agreement which has been reached under which the marchers worked out this arrangement with the Federal Government.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield to me at this point?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I have one question which I would like to ask the gentlewoman.

It is a matter of record that the National Park Service has many impoundments and reservoirs which have obviously been available throughout this free land of ours for people to use, predicated upon the fact that they had paid for the construction of the dams, acquisition of land, and the ingress and egress roads, and so forth. Now, by an Executive order issued by the President upon the recommendations of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior; a fee is required to be paid by our citizens, whether they are senior citizens over 65 years of age or other. This has been dubbed as the golden eagle fee which has to be paid for entrance into a national park on a yearly basis.

Are these people who are camped on National Park property in the Federal City being charged on a daily fee or golden eagle pass basis?

Mr. REIFEL. I cannot answer the gentleman's question because I do not know whether some have the golden eagle stamp or whether some do not. However, I would be glad to yield at this time to the very able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to respond to the gentleman's question.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I can well understand what is bothering our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. I am not one of those who wishes to take any personal exception to what has created this situation. But I do want it understood that the golden eagle passport as such, or a fee as such, is not called for, is not demanded for most of the facilities which are under the National Park Service and the National Park Police in Washington, D.C., as these facilities are used in Washington, D.C.

If they were, we would be paying a fee to travel on the Rock Creek Parkway; if they were, we would be paying a fee to travel on the Baltimore Parkway; if they were, we would be charged a fee to travel the Washington Memorial Parkway; if they were, we would be charged to use the Mall, or any other of the National Park facilities.

Now, it just so happens that no fees are charged or have been charged any time, as far as I know, in the history of our Nation for these particular facilities.

Now, going on to the other side of the coin—and I do feel a little bit about this matter myself—if it is fair to charge fees for the use of the Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, or for the Yellowstone National Park, all of which are provided for by the Federal Government, then of course there is some equity. But as far as the present users of the Mall are concerned, they are under no more obligation to pay down there for what they are doing than anybody else.

I do object, and it is my understanding that others have been denied the use of these areas heretofore, but that is not the question Dr. HALL asked. What Dr. HALL was asking was why, if we charge fees, why do we not charge fees down

there? We have never charged fees for using these facilities in Washington, D.C.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when he states that we would have to pay a fee, which some of us have already paid, to enable us to travel back and forth between Baltimore and Washington on Project 66 in the national park system here; but what I do wonder is that should the Boy Scouts of America, for example, wish to hold a jamboree or a camp on this site, or on the polo grounds on the south side of Ohio Drive, or some other place in the District, that all such groups and citizens will have an equal and a just, petitionable, and equitable opportunity to so camp without the posting of bond, or any necessity for producing a "Golden Eagle," or paying an admission fee. I would believe that one would follow the other.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would not be in position to answer the question of the gentleman from Missouri, and I am sure that if that situation should arise it would have to be handled at that time.

As it has been suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, however, I do not know if this has to establish a precedent. Certainly it does not have anything to do with the appropriation bill that is before us, but as far as the authorizing bill, it does.

What has bothered me in this whole matter, I might say to my personal friend and colleague from South Dakota, now in the well, is that the bill that provided for what is going on down in the Mall did not come to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; it went to the Committee on Public Works, because there is a dual jurisdiction in this whole matter, and the decision was made—although there was some request made of the Department of the Interior—the decision was made purely as an administrative decision. I hope that it does not establish a precedent. But if some group like the Boy Scouts or the Girl Scouts had no other place to go—and I am not so sure but that there were other places rather than this particular place—that the present petitioners in Washington could have used—but I believe that as American citizens I think they have the right to look back to see what others have been given, and then to say that they would like to receive the same treatment.

Mr. REIFEL. I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado establishing some legislative history in this regard.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, it would be interesting to see what would happen to a camper from Colorado, South Dakota, or from Iowa who would pull in this evening down on the Mall with his camper, or pitch a tent on the Mall. It would be interesting to see how long he would be permitted to stay. I was about to suggest that the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the gentleman from Iowa, who is presently speaking, should get together and pitch a tent down there tonight, and see how long we would last.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. I suppose that in the interest of justice, if rich people want to march and set up shanties to petition their Government, they should have the same privilege as the poor.

A great French author wrote, "The law in its equal justice prohibits the rich and poor alike from sleeping under bridges."

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. This is a good time again to point out the problem that faces the Interior Department appropriation committee and the authorizing committee of the House and those here who seek to be conservationists.

In the report there is a table indicating how much money is being appropriated to buy land which has been authorized for purchase by the Federal Government for recreation and for conservation purposes and parks and so on.

One can see from that table that we have a problem—and the actual problem is much bigger than that—because we have \$350 to \$400 million worth of land to purchase and we are not being granted the money in this bill and will not be for a long time in other bills to purchase this land.

The Committee on Appropriations has sought to acquire these lands from the conservation fund. Basically, these are earmarked funds for the purpose of acquiring land. Yet, if the Federal Government's portion of that fund is not expended over a 2-year period, those funds revert to the General Treasury so it is not completely an earmarked fund.

There is not enough money in that fund presently to fulfill the promise that the Congress has made to the American people so far as acquiring park lands is concerned.

Unless we are to become half conservationists, we authorize the purchase but do not appropriate the land to actually consummate the purchase.

Later this week, or certainly within a matter of a short time we will have before this House a bill, a revised water and conservation fund. There has been some disagreement with that bill. But if a Member is prone to disagree with the contents of that bill—if he does tend to oppose it, I think he should have it incumbent upon himself also to try to find some other solution.

This is the best solution that the legislative committee could come up with. It is the only way that I know of at this time that we will be able to fulfill the obligations of our authorizing legislation. If we do not get that bill passed, would the gentleman in the well agree with me that we will fall farther and farther behind in acquiring the lands authorized for purchase; and, second, that these lands will be continually escalating in price until we probably will have to pay double the present value? Is that a true statement?

Mr. REIFEL. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa. Unless we do find some means to begin buying up these lands, in holdings and other areas where land

prices are escalating 4 and 5 and 6 and even more percent per year, we just are not going to have the money to preserve America to the extent that we should.

I am entirely in agreement with the gentleman and I hope that when the bill eventually comes before this body we are going to be able to act upon it favorably.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman or anyone serving on the subcommittee for a further explanation of the increase in authorized salaries for the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, an increase of \$1,419,000.

When we look to the language of the report on pages 31 and 32, there is a discussion of the decreases from the budget items which come to only \$229,000. But there is no indication as to the justification for the increase in salaries involved.

I would call to the attention of the gentleman that the increases provided are very considerably in excess of what will be required merely to cover pay increases. This must be an increase in personnel. I wonder at this time in facing the budgetary crisis in which we now find ourselves whether in the opinion of the committee such an increase would be justified?

Mr. REIFEL. You mean the increase in the Office of the Secretary?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. REIFEL. Which amounts to \$1,419,500. It is on page 31 of the report.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Of the increase, \$674,200 is for the transfer of the departmental library. This cost was previously distributed among the bureaus. In 1969, the library and its costs were transferred to the Office of the Secretary as should have been done long ago.

Mr. TAFT. Could the gentlewoman indicate what the total cost of the library would be?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. It is \$674,200. There were corresponding reductions in the funding of the various bureaus. Formerly they were each assigned a certain assessment for library costs.

Mr. TAFT. I might say to the gentlewoman that with a total budget of \$600,000 and some, the increase I suppose would be in the 3- or 4-percent category in salary increases in the library. This certainly, to me, would not explain the sort of increase under salaries for the Office of Secretary that we observe. Are there additional positions authorized in the Office of Secretary under this increased authorization?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes; the bill provides two additional positions for Urban Affairs, two additional positions for Marine Resources, and one additional position for administration.

May I very frankly say to the gentleman, I would be glad to provide more funds in the managerial field if they could achieve some of the better manage-

ment features which our committee is constantly advocating. I might further suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, if he would read the record of our hearings, he would find that the committee has consistently tried to improve the management activities in all agencies in this bill.

The testimony will reflect the areas where this committee has endeavored to upgrade the management process. As a comparison, you could eliminate the president or the vice president of Ford Motor Co., if you decided you did not want to sell cars. I do not know whether you want to apply this policy to the agencies in this bill or not. I strongly recommend against it.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I certainly share with her a concern about the management of our various departments, particularly in the Office of the Secretary; but I wonder whether the five additional personnel would likely result in as much improvement as a reduction in the personnel.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly recommend this appropriation bill to the Committee and urge its unanimous passage this afternoon.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], a member of the committee.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for this time. It is a pleasure always to come to the floor on a bill that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] has worked up.

I would say to the Committee the gentlewoman's work is no exception to the very fine work she gave to this bill last year. I simply remind the Members that the gentlewoman from Washington is the first woman in the history of the Republic to chair a Committee on Appropriations. I can tell the Members that although she is a lady and gracious in every way, nevertheless she has steel in her backbone and can have fire in her eye.

I would say to members of the subcommittee on the minority side as well as those who serve on the majority side, I think they have done a very fine job and I was much impressed by the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota as he mentioned some of the great problems we face in this particular bill.

Really, this bill is a keystone. It is a keystone bill from the standpoint of the Nation's economy, and it is our linchpin to the future from the standpoint of America's resources. I think it is also significant to note this bill this year is only \$450,000 more than in fiscal year 1967. It is 10 percent below the budget request.

The Interior Department is charged with the responsibility for managing the entire resources of the Nation. This bill in its budget request represents six-tenths of 1 percent of the total new obligational authority for the entire Federal budget. It has to do with America's streams, and with its maintenance, with its wildlife, with its water resources, with its minerals and metals, and with

its offshore resources. It has to do with the quality of our life. It has to do with the quality of the air we breathe. It has to do with the quality of the water we drink.

There is a real danger that in this particular piece of legislation we can be pennywise and pound foolish, because this is the seed money for the Nation's economy. This bill generates revenues. For example, in the National Park Service alone, in the National Forest Service alone, there are 150 million visitor days to visitor centers, which generated to those areas \$1.3 billion for their own economy—and it was spent in their own economy, and it was spent to a great extent in the rural areas of this country.

We spend for recreational development in the National Park Service about \$4.5 million in this bill and \$36.1 million in the National Park Service. That is about \$40 million. Europe spends \$43 million in tourist promotion alone. We spend approximately \$40 million in recreational development of our national parks and our national forests.

To those Members who have not observed it, I think it is significant to note that in recent years there has been the multiple-use concept of our public lands—multiple use from the standpoint of resources, timber cutting, and mining, multiple use in recreational purposes such as camping and fishing, and now to a great extent water sports, and more recently winter sports.

It is this area that provides America with low-cost recreation. Yet it is in this area we have a tremendous number of problems. I could not help noting the problems recently referred to in the comment on the floor with reference to the assemblage down near the Mall. I for one do not favor this sort of thing. I introduced a resolution that would have prohibited it. But it is not the only problem that is confronting us and that is being considered in this particular piece of legislation.

In our public land resources and the demands being made on them by the American public, we are witnessing problems that relate to health and sanitation, to the maintenance of campsites, construction of facilities, supervision of the areas from the standpoint of fire and police protection and also from the standpoint of water accidents. There is a denial of these areas to many people who come thousands of miles to visit them, simply because the areas are inadequate to accommodate them and the facilities are inadequate to accommodate them.

The crime rate in the national park system is running ahead of the national crime rate. The crime rate in serious crimes is running in the national parks well ahead of the national average.

Every time these new areas are opened up, it creates problems of supervision and management. Indeed, the Director of the National Park Service has pointed out that if we have to cut down further on manpower and supervision and management, we may be faced with the possibility of closing some of our national parks because of the demand that is being made on their use.

Not only are there complaints from the using public, but also the National Park Service reports complaints from Members of Congress who relay to the National Park Service complaints of their constituents.

In addition to this overuse of these facilities, we see the Park Service and the Forest Service caught between a hammer and an anvil. With an effort made to stem the outflow of gold in this country there is a program to visit America, not only for American tourists but also for the foreigners. This increased tourism to the national parks and the national forests will further generate problems as to the use of public land spaces in this Nation.

In talking about the recreational resources of this bill, and the multiple-use concept of America's parks and forests, we should not overlook other very serious areas of national concern which are funded in this bill. As an example, look at the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

For those Members who come from inland areas—and I do not live on the coast—they may be surprised to know America's fishing fleet is badly depleted, very antiquated, in need of modernization, and in need of research in order to preserve America's fishing industry.

The Russian fleet is highly modern. It fishes all over the world. The Russian fishing fleet uses new techniques in catching, processing, and packing fish, and has literally fished out huge schools of fish and denied those fish to the American fishermen.

The American fishing industry needs research. Our fishermen in certain key fishing industries are idle because of the inadequacies of our fishing resources program.

This is an area we seek to do something about in this bill.

Also, the Members should familiarize themselves with what happened under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in the Kennedy round negotiations at Geneva lately, as it affects fishing. The fishing industry has been adversely affected by this, and in the next few years we will see further demands and drains on America's ability to compete in the fishing markets of the world.

This bill seeks to come to grips with those problems.

I have mentioned only a few of the broad areas of national resources this bill touches. These are serious problems. These are serious problems requiring funding. These are serious problems requiring research and study. These are problems we can meet. They are problems we must meet in order to provide for America's future.

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

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

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman spoke earlier and gave an accolade to my leader, the gentlewoman from Washington who is the chairman of the subcommittee. I join him in those remarks.

I would say to the Members of the House that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] for years was chairman of the roads and bridges committee of the State Legislature of the

State of Washington. She had steel in her backbone and fire in her eyes then and has not gotten any different from then on.

Mr. MARSH. I thank the gentleman.

I would say to her colleagues, she has the interest of the Nation at heart, and not that of any particular State or congressional district.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, early in the session I advised the House that I would offer spending limitation amendments to each one of the appropriation bills as they came on the floor.

This I have done. In several cases they have carried. One that I recall, quite recently, failed.

I still feel that spending limitation is necessary to the economy of the country. We are in a fiscal crisis which is most serious. The integrity of the dollar must be preserved.

However, since the last appropriation bill was on the floor, there has been an agreement in a conference committee between the two bodies, the House and the Senate, which would put a spending limitation of \$6 billion on the proposed expenditures for 1969.

Members of the House will have an opportunity, I hope, to vote on that spending limitation within a short time, and if that spending limitation is adopted, it will take care of each one of these appropriation bills. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer a spending limitation on the bill now presented by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], nor on the other bills that come before the House. However, I will support, with all the energy that I can muster, the \$6 billion reduction in spending for 1969. It seems to me futile, however, since that bill will be before the House and Members will have an opportunity then to vote on it, to offer these amendments on each separate bill. So I say to my delightful friend, the gentlewoman from Washington, that so far as I am concerned, I shall not offer the amendment for a spending limitation on this bill nor will I use it as a motion to recommit. However, I say again that I sincerely hope when the question comes before the House to preserve the integrity of our dollar and to bring about fiscal responsibility, that then will be the day that we can stand up and be counted as to whether we believe in the things we say we do or not. I shall support the \$6 billion reduction in spending for 1969. I think that is the day when we will find out whether we believe in fiscal responsibility.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman will recall, last year when we were discussing expenditure cuts, my subcommittee was the only subcommittee that had a rescissions hearing to reduce spending. We were prepared to bring this rescission bill to the floor. I may say that our subcommittee has

been deeply concerned with fiscal responsibility. It is in this context that we have tried to reduce spending in areas that were on the fringe of necessity.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement.

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

Mr. BOW. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. As I understand the gentleman's position today, he is in favor of spending cuts, but he is going to keep it a secret as to where he thinks the cuts shall be made.

Mr. BOW. Now, the gentleman from New Jersey always tries to throw a little bit of stuff into this and it hits the fan and nobody seems to pay much attention to it, you know. No, I don't try to say where these cuts are going to be. I can tell you and I will sit down with you sometime and tell you where I think the cuts can be made, and I believe they can be made. Your President says \$4 billion can be cut. I have not heard him say yet where he is going to take that \$4 billion from. You go down and ask your President who has advocated \$4 billion in cuts where he is going to make them, and then I will show you where you can make \$2 billion more. You get him to tell you first, because, after all, he has the great Bureau of the Budget down there with hundreds and hundreds of employees. He has a big staff with many more employees than we have. I can give you \$6 billion in cuts now, but I would be very interested to find out, if you can get your President and my President, who says \$4 billion in cuts can be made, to tell us where that \$4 billion is coming from, and then, my friend from New Jersey, I will tell you where you can get another \$2 billion that is not going to hurt the services of this country.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would also like to know if the President is going to cut and where he is going to cut.

Mr. BOW. Has the gentleman asked him where the cuts will come?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I wrote him a letter the other day with reference to this matter and I received a call back from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget today in which I received a very evasive answer.

Mr. BOW. That is just another example as to where we get into the credibility gap again. I cannot tell the gentleman where the \$4 billion is coming from. It is my opinion that it is the responsibility of your side of the aisle to find items which are contained in the budget from where that \$4 billion will come.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would think it is the responsibility of this House of Representatives to do this. If we are going to cut we ought to do it here in the Congress of the United

States and not go to the White House and say, "Big Daddy, you do it for us; we do not have the courage to do it ourselves."

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from New Jersey has been here for some years. How many times has the gentleman voted to cut, as the gentleman from New Jersey says he has done? How many times has the gentleman voted for cuts?

Mr. JOELSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. In the last month or two—

Mr. BOW. You have been here longer than that, and the gentleman from New Jersey knows I know that fact.

Mr. JOELSON. I have voted against appropriations in this House for space, for public works, and for agriculture, for instance.

Mr. BOW. Yes; but has the gentleman voted to cut any of the programs which have been proposed for the cities?

Mr. JOELSON. I have voted for them. I do not feel that we do enough for the cities.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has voted against agriculture and that is true. I have the gentleman's record and I have gone over it very carefully. It is very amazing to me to hear the gentleman undertaking to be an advocate of economy when the gentleman's record is to the contrary.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to get into this colloquy but since the gentleman from Ohio has raised it, I think it is important to stress the fact that we are now concerned about where the cuts should be made. The gentleman from Ohio thinks they should be made in the programs for the cities. I think they should be made in other areas. But the issue is that it is the responsibility of the Congress to appropriate money.

Yet through the years we have heard voices here which have been howling about the usurpation of the powers of the legislative branch by the executive branch of the Government who in this instance urges that it lies within the jurisdiction of the executive branch to make the decision.

I now hear voices saying that we will do it and, therefore, we will ask the executive branch to do our work and take over our responsibilities which the voters elected us to assume.

I question very strongly if this is not an attack upon the separation of powers, and I am very concerned and I would be very interested to hear the views of the gentleman from Ohio as to whether or not he is willing to let the President take over?

Mr. BOW. I might say that the Democrat majority of the Congress has for many years been delegating many of the powers of the Congress to the executive branch of the Government.

I am a strong advocate of the separation of powers. But I will say to the gentleman that if we can get the Members of the House to stand up for cuts, we will make those cuts here in the Congress. But it is a question of who is will-

ing to stand up and be counted on this matter. The gentleman said he did not want to take the money from the cities. Last year \$37 billion went into the cities.

Mr. JOELSON. I question that figure, but I know that over \$70 billion went into the military.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman from New Jersey want to take the money away from the military? Does the gentleman want to leave the men in Vietnam without supplies?

Does the gentleman want to take away their guns, and give the butter to somebody else, or is the gentleman willing to leave the men there? Is the gentleman talking about cutting down on the men who are fighting to preserve freedom in the world?

Mr. JOELSON. No, I am talking about the unconscionable profits of the defense contractors. That is what I am talking about, and I resent—

Mr. BOW. That, of course, is another story.

Mr. JOELSON. I do not have any further time to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

I resent the attempt, whenever anybody talks about cutting defense spending, to have his patriotism impugned. I have never turned my back on our men in Vietnam, and the gentleman knows that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman from New Jersey on his question about defense spending of \$70 billion, and the unconscionable profits to war contractors, that it is his administration, it is his Secretary of Defense, it is his executive department on his side of the aisle that have been making these decisions. Do not charge us with such policies.

Mr. JOELSON. Is it not strange, then, that I am the one on this side of the aisle who wants to do something about it, whereas the gentleman from Ohio is playing politics, as usual?

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I want to commend the gentlewoman and her entire subcommittee, including the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], and all the other Members on the minority side, for working so closely with the majority in bringing out what I consider to be a very, very fine bill.

I believe it provides for the orderly development of our national resources at a time when we are watching very carefully the tight budgetary situation.

If I could have the attention of the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, I have read the report of the committee very carefully, but I have been unable to find the provision for a request I made of the committee for an amount of \$50,000 in

planning funds for the George Rogers Clark Scenic Highway in southern Illinois, and I would appreciate it if the gentlewoman from Washington would reply as to whether or not there is in the bill before us any provision for taking care of this very important project?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I might say to the gentleman that I had anticipated his question because the gentleman personally appeared before our committee and did an excellent job in presenting his case for our favorable consideration of providing planning funds for the George Rogers Clark Scenic Highway.

I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that, while there is no specific mention of the project in the report, it is the intent of the committee to recommend that \$50,000 of the funds to be made available to the Forest Service be earmarked for the planning of this project.

I am sure the gentleman from Illinois realizes that, with the hundreds of individual projects in the bill, it is a difficult matter to mention each and every specific item in the report concerning these items on which the committee is favorably disposed.

This is one of those infrequent occurrences, and I want to assure the gentleman that, should the project be given consideration in the conference on this bill, I will give it my unlimited support, solely on the basis of the very able presentation made by the gentleman from Illinois in behalf of this project.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the members of the subcommittee, for their very kind consideration, and appreciation of the importance of this project to the whole Nation.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of considering a very small item concerning assistance to non-Federal schools, the request for \$1.8 million to start a kindergarten program, and on which the committee has allowed only \$900,000.

This, I believe, is a very important program as far as the Indians are concerned, and I wonder if the gentlewoman from Washington, or the members of the committee, did not have in mind the fact that it would be rather difficult to staff these schools in starting a new program?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. In reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Florida, I would say yes, it would be difficult, and I would like to say further to the distinguished gentleman that the committee was enthusiastic in its support of the kindergarten program. We regret we could not fund the program at a higher level.

However, may I say, as the gentleman is well aware, that kindergarten teachers are among the most difficult in the entire teaching profession to obtain.

We hope there will be a training program which will enable them to develop some type of system in this field. We do want to see this program begin at a small experimental level and we want to see it continue and grow to become a vital part of the Indian educational structure.

The gentleman from Florida, who is a friend of the Indian people in United States, knows, one of the greatest insufficiencies is in the Indian child's ability to adapt to the regimentation of the American school system.

I have seen this in other programs such as Headstart and the nursery programs where early transitional assistance has made the difference between a child who goes to school with self-confidence and one who becomes a school dropout.

I am delighted to have the gentleman's enthusiastic support.

Mr. HALEY. I hope that the gentleman and her committee will follow this program because I think it is a very vital program and I hope that they will follow through on it and see that it does work because I think this will do a great deal to advance the Indians economically and in many other ways.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], a member of the committee.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17354, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

The bill before you contains a recommended cut of 10 percent in new obligatory authority. In dollar amounts, this means that your committee has cut this bill by \$142,432,000. This is a substantial amount of savings, and in this time of stress will contribute an element of stability to our difficult fiscal crisis. It also means that expenditure reductions totaling \$83 million will occur during the life of this bill.

And note this. At no time did your committee permit the budget estimate to be exceeded. Not once. In fact, the bill before you today for your approval, and I hope you do approve it, totals \$6.4 billion, and that is \$56 million below the amounts thus recommended by your subcommittee during fiscal 1968.

So this is a tight bill. But please do not get the impression that the cuts have been made in a cavalier fashion.

At all times your committee has been fully aware of the basic worth of the activities funded by this bill. We have tried to treat it with prudence, bearing in mind and trying to balance out the needs of the Nation, both from a fiscal viewpoint and remembering the needs of the Nation.

In that regard, I should like to point out an area that is of intense interest to me.

From the earliest days of mining in the anthracite region, there was deposited on the surface of the land a quantity of refuse which was removed from the mines. It was composed partially of coal, but contained such a high percentage of slate or other forms of stone, that the marketing of this refuse was impracticable. It is known as culm.

Over the course of the years, the culm banks in the anthracite area have reached formidable proportions, and in doing so they occupy land which might have great value if the banks were removed. The sheer physical presence of these culm banks has meant the loss of land sorely needed for industrial development and for the construction of residences.

The loss of such land alone should be sufficient justification for us to look upon this problem with concern. But a greater problem has arisen. Over the course of time, some of these culm banks have caught fire, and the very virtues of anthracite have mitigated against the area. Anthracite burns slowly. The culm banks have burned slowly also. Some of them have been burning for over 50 years. Left untouched, they might burn for another 50.

Out of these culm banks has come a serious problem of air pollution. Out of them also has come a serious problem of water pollution. These banks must be removed if the anthracite area is to achieve its full potential. This bill will be a giant step toward that achievement. I hope I may review the steps which led up to this bill.

In 1965, just after I came to the Interior Subcommittee, recognition was given to the problem we face in this area, and in the budget for 1966, there was placed a substantial amount of money to investigate the "economic feasibility of converting coal refuse dumps for direct use in the construction of roads, building materials, or the manufacture of concrete."

The committee noted at the time its great concern at the "lack of research being conducted by the office—of coal research—to develop new uses for anthracite coal and its byproducts and believes this project exemplifies the type of research that should be implemented if practical results are to be achieved.

The project financed under that appropriation was terminated later when it was determined that the end product of the experiment was unsuitable for commercial development. A start, however, had been made.

In 1966 the committee again looked at the problem of the culm bank in the anthracite region, particularly the burning culm bank. The amount of \$300,000 which I requested was designated for research into the development of a practical means of extinguishing smoldering fires in culm dumps in the State of Pennsylvania.

Here, for the first time, the committee took note of the seriousness of the problem, and of the absolute necessity to mount a fight against it.

These fires—

The committee said—

constitute a serious threat to the health of individuals in the vicinity, and are causing considerable property damage. In the opinion of the Committee, it is imperative that a practical and feasible way to extinguish these fires be developed at the earliest possible moment.

In 1967, again at my request, the committee continued the funding of research into "determining characteristics, eco-

nomic value, utilization and disposal of current and in situ refuse." That research is even now being carried on. And coincident with this research, there was the continuing program of work on the extinguishing of the fires of the burning culm banks.

That brings us up to today.

Today we know that we can extinguish the fires. We know also that, with the extinguishment of these burning culm banks, we can reclaim the land on which they have rested for long years. It is precisely this which is proposed in this bill. The committee has recommended the expenditure of \$1,050,000 for the purpose of a major attack on the problem of the burning culm banks. It is made contingent on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's contribution of a matching sum in the amount of \$250,000. I can assure my colleagues that Pennsylvania will certainly contribute that amount willingly to fight this serious problem.

I would also point out the language of the committee in making this recommendation.

If it were not for our critical budget situation—

States the report—

the committee would have been inclined to fund this activity at a higher level.

The report continues:

The undesirable situation which has been created by these culm dump fires has existed for many years at great expense to both health and property of those individuals residing and conducting commercial activities in this area. Therefore the committee strongly urges that this project be given urgent priority and that work on extinguishing these fires be accelerated to the fullest possible extent within available funds.

In this recommendation, I heartily concur. In so doing, I would point out one further fact of significance. Under the law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, any owner of property on which a burning culm dump stands, may be directed by the Commonwealth to extinguish the fire forthwith. If he fails to do so, the Commonwealth may then enter upon his property and proceed itself to put out the burning material constituting, as it does, a public nuisance. This bill will enable the Commonwealth to do such a job in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Mines. In doing so, however, the Commonwealth places a lien against the property, so that any increase in value which might come about would pay back the money invested in extinguishing the burning culm bank. In no sense, then, can anyone profit from the action of this bill.

For all of the reasons I have cited and which the committee has cited, I urgently request the passage of this bill. It is a good bill. It is an investment in the future growth of this Nation.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I have examined carefully the report of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with H.R. 17354. There are cuts from budgetary amounts therein that I regret very much to see—most particularly in

the areas of forest land management, forest research, and forest roads and trails, all part of the appropriations for the Forest Service. It is my own strong feeling that we should be spending more, not less, in these fields, and I regret that we are not.

But I recognize the fact that the subcommittee and the full committee which had the responsibility of bringing this bill through the hearing process to the floor were deeply concerned about the economic crisis in which this Nation now finds itself. They used their very best efforts and best judgment to bring forth a bill which they consider well balanced, and I regretfully must defer to their judgment on the above points.

I earnestly hope and expect that, as soon as our Nation's financial crisis is past, the Appropriation Committee and this House will increase our appropriations in these critically important areas of forest management, research, development, and utilization.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE].

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I like to address a question to the gentlewoman from Washington concerning the allocations to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

The report indicates that a slowness in the development of the fish protein concentrate plant has resulted in an additional \$1 million being allocated for this particular function.

Also the report indicates that since there is no commercially feasible process, the additional development money is required. I wonder if the gentlewoman is aware of the fact that the Food and Drug Administration has approved a commercially feasible process and that within the last month there was a contract for almost a million dollars which was let for fish protein concentrate for human consumption?

The reason I ask the question, if I may just sum it up, is that I am not sure it is necessary for us to continue to fund the research and development on this program inasmuch as there is a commercially available process that has been accepted by the Food and Drug Administration for human consumption.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say to the gentleman that the contract he is referring to is a contract let for foreign aid for fish protein concentrate. I believe the price was a sizable one and, in fact, I intend to ask questions about this in the foreign operations subcommittee.

They are seeking technical ways of doing more productive operations in the field of fish protein concentrate to reduce the cost of production.

There is no end to the research that can be done. As the gentleman knows, we have cut the funding for this activity by \$1,370,000, and there is available \$2,129,000.

I would be the last one to oppose funding of the fish protein concentrate process which may be one of the most useful means to alleviate starvation and hunger not only in other nations of the world

but among some of the low nutrition areas of our own Nation.

Mr. REINECKE. I am delighted to know that you are as aware of the details of this particular contract as you are. We are all aware that the price was higher than anticipated, but we feel that this will be a large step in the right direction to accomplish the results. I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] such time as he desires.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from the State of Washington, Mrs. JULIA HANSEN, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], and all our colleagues on the subcommittee for the outstanding work they have done on this bill.

The passage of this legislation, including the \$5 million appropriation for the Dunes National Park, permanently guarantees the eventual construction of this great dunes recreation area on the south shore of Lake Michigan. Approximately 10 million people in the Calumet region, Chicagoland, northern Indiana, and southern Michigan are within an hour and 30 minutes' automobile drive and in the near future can enjoy a natural park facility which, as the years pass, will develop into the finest in the Nation.

The area set aside for this park will not in any way interfere with the expansion of industry. It will be but a few years, with the scientific progress being made on methods to eliminate water and air pollution, until this lakeshore and natural park will become a haven for millions in northern Indiana for present and future generations.

The legislative work and the problem of creating public opinion and support for this great recreation and conservation project has met with considerable opposition by powerful organizations and lobbies. The passage of today's legislation has assured the public of the park's completion by the Federal Government.

It has been 10 years since I joined with the small group on original plans to establish a Federal national park in the Indiana dunes. Great credit must be given to Congressman EDWARD ROUSH of the Fifth Indiana Congressional District for his untiring work on this legislation. Mrs. Dorothy R. Buell, president of the Save the Dunes Council, Inc., Mrs. Sylvia Troy of Munster, Ind., Mrs. L. W. Bieker of Munster, Ind., and many others devoted many months and years of work to bring to pass this ultimate victory for the installation of a great conservation and recreation park which will be utilized by millions in years to come.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the motion to recommit with its instructions for further cuts under the committee recommendation. As this vote represents a departure from the vote I cast last year in the affirmative for a similar motion I should like to note that in addition to the fact that this year's bill represents a much sharper cut under requests than contained in most

other appropriations bills brought before us, there is the additional probability that in the near future we will vote on a proposal to cut all nondefense flexible spending from \$4 to \$6 billion under the presently proposed budget.

I intend to vote for that spending reduction and I believe that a further reduction today in this bill coupled with the probable additional reduction under the proposal soon to come before us would be adverse to the national interest. I will therefore vote in the negative today on the motion to recommit and in the affirmative on final passage.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, the House today can give tangible evidence of its commitment to ease the Washington area transportation problems by its support of the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, H.R. 17354. Favorable action will provide the initial construction funds for the Washington metropolitan area rapid rail transit system.

While the Appropriations Committee in its judgment reduced the transit request by 20 percent, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority General Manager Jackson Graham states that they will still be aiming for the October 1, 1968, groundbreaking. This is good news for all of the metropolitan Washington area jurisdictions. I am particularly pleased with this evidence of congressional support since my own Montgomery County, Md., in the Eighth District has recently seen fit to put its own commitment on the line toward its future share of transit costs.

Mr. Chairman, I commend to my colleague's attention the following editorial from the Sunday Star of May 19, 1968:

#### RAIL TRANSIT ADVANCES

The House Appropriations Committee's curtailment of about \$13 million in federal funding requests for Washington's rail rapid transit system is disappointing. But it is hardly surprising in view of the current economy wave in Congress.

The other and brighter side of the coin is that the committee's approval of a substantial \$43.8 million in federal dollars for the next fiscal year would constitute, if this money becomes available, a very significant commitment by the federal government to the cause of rapid transit in the Nation's Capital. In its encouraging aspect, this action parallels that of Montgomery County the other day in voting to set aside a specific percentage of its property tax revenues toward the county's own future share of the transit costs.

The House curtailment in federal funds presumably would require some modification in present expenditure plans. There is every likelihood, however, that it would allow construction of the system to get under way as proposed this fall.

Indeed, the real problem facing the program at the moment is not at all financial in nature, but political. For the federal dollars, under the House committee action, would become available only if Congress also permits the District of Columbia to contribute half the federal amount as the city's share. And Representative Natcher, who is handling the District budget, reportedly has threatened to hold up the local subway money unless an agreement is reached on the city's freeway impasse.

We hope there is no occasion for Natcher to follow through on this threat. The Kentuckian is entirely right in fighting for the freeway program, which is an essential complement to transit. Congress, moreover, has

an obligation to see that the freeway program proceeds. This can be accomplished, however, through separate legislation which the House Public Works Committee should push along without further delay.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I am highly pleased that the Department of the Interior and related Agencies Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1969 includes moneys needed for the establishment of a cooperative fishery unit to be located at Delaware State College. This will be money well spent in an effort to increase fishery science in the Middle Atlantic region.

While, at present, there are 23 cooperative fishery units operating in as many States across the Nation, the establishment of the unit at Delaware State College will fill an existing void in the Middle Atlantic region. Delaware, centrally located in that region, offers an ideal site for this cooperative fishery unit because of its proximity to the Delaware River-Bay and Chesapeake Bay estuaries, the Atlantic Ocean and to the population and education centers of the east coast.

Delaware State College has in recent years embarked upon an ambitious and far-reaching program of growth and expansion to better serve the educational needs not only of Delaware, but surrounding States, as well. Facilities for administrative offices and laboratories of the Delaware Cooperative Fishery Unit professional staff, instructors, and students are available now in the modern Center for Agricultural and Natural Resources at the college. In addition, the fishery unit will add an undergraduate dimension and contribute feeder services to existing graduate programs at the University of Delaware and other universities, providing unparalleled opportunity for minority-group students in fishery science.

I am by no means completely familiar with the workings of units in other States, but the Delaware unit would, I believe, most effectively utilize the considerable capabilities of the State and its institutions of higher learning. The combined curricula of Delaware State College and the University of Delaware would offer a broad spectrum of courses and disciplines to interested students, and bring them into contact with specialists from both schools. Through extension courses and services, students from other colleges in the State, scientists, and engineers from local industries, conservationists, fisherymen, and the general public could also be reached.

Serving on the Oceanography Subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have been struck with the enormous potential of aquatic sciences to benefit our country and, indeed, the world. But, there exists a great need to produce trained personnel in the field to enable us to progress as rapidly as we must. Although the resources of the sea seem limitless, we have already recognized the need to protect and conserve them to insure that they will continue to supply man his needs in the future. Training of fishery biologists through the cooperative fishery unit program will help overcome the shortage of men and women specializing in this field.

Because of our location on a peninsula, the people of Delmarva have long been accustomed to working together on problems of common interest. Research findings by unit staff and students would provide much-needed knowledge on fishery resources and management in the area to State agencies of Delaware and neighboring States and to the Federal Government.

Delaware and the Delmarva Peninsula have for many years provided areas of recreation for the great urban centers of the Middle Atlantic region. Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, three of the largest metropolitan areas on the east coast, lie within 125 miles of the central part of the peninsula. Delaware, itself, has, according to the special census taken last September, registered a population increase of 18 percent since 1960, making it one of the fastest growing States in the Nation. It is important that Delaware begin now to provide for the future.

As I noted at the beginning of my statement, this appropriation request includes \$41,000 to be used for salaries for two fishery biologists who will serve as leader and assistant leader of the Delaware Cooperative Fishery Unit, to support student research projects, and for equipment and supplies associated with the program.

The application of Delaware State College for a cooperative fishery unit was supported by the Governor of the State of Delaware, Charles L. Terry, Jr., the Delaware Game and Fish Commission, and the congressional delegation of our State.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the funds requested for fiscal 1969 should complete the development program outlined in 1965. As you know, the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch is the location of the birthplace of the late President Hoover and, also, is the location of the final resting place for him and his wife. The Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, containing the Hoover Presidential papers and memorabilia which illustrate his outstanding national and international career as a dedicated public servant, is also located on the historic site. Work on the site has progressed in an orderly manner, but it is time to complete it. The work to develop an adequate and deserving memorial to President Hoover goes back many years. I have long had a keen interest in the project. While in the Iowa Legislature I was involved in the original planning. My interest has continued as a Member of Congress.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS  
EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy

Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops, \$145,693,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to ask the question and to make sure that there is no provision in this bill for funds for the arts and humanities.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I made it very plain in my statement on the floor of the House that there are no funds in this bill for the arts and humanities. The authorizing legislation has not yet been enacted into law.

Mr. GROSS. I notice that the committee did hold hearings on that request.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Of course we did. We hold hearings on all items contained in the President's budgetary request. Authorizing legislation could have been enacted prior to our bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. GROSS. So that if funds are made available to the so-called arts and humanities, it will have to be through a supplemental appropriation bill at a later date?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Not necessarily. There is another body of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Another body of Congress?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Or do you wish to call it the other half of the Congress?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; they would be able to put money into a bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I cannot peer into their minds, but the ability is theirs if authorizing legislation is enacted into law prior to their taking action on this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), including \$2,775,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interests therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the State or Federal agency concerned, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 of said Act, and to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$100,000,000 of which (1) not to exceed \$55,000,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount; (2) not to exceed \$28,475,000 shall be available to the National Park Service; (3) not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be available to the Forest Service; (4) not to exceed \$750,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; and (5) not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for supplemental allocations to the above agencies: *Provided*, That in the event the receipts available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund are insufficient to provide the full amounts specified herein, the amounts available under clauses (1) through (4) shall be reduced proportionately.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIS: On page 11, after line 2 insert the following: "As an advance appropriation to the Land and Water Conservation Fund under the provisions of subsection (b) of section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 900; 16 U.S.C. 4601-7(b)), \$100,000,000."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward and simple. It would simply appropriate \$100 million for the land and water conservation fund. Such an appropriation is expressly authorized by section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Later on this week this House is scheduled to debate another bill, H.R. 8578, which was reported out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill would provide essentially the same amount of money as my amendment for the purpose of the land and water conservation fund. However, that bill is, in my opinion, objectionable because it contains unnecessary earmarking provisions which would establish an undesirable connection by the land and water conservation fund and the many controversial problems that exist with respect to Federal revenues derived from the Outer Continental Shelf.

I have consistently made it clear that I, for one, strongly favor the land and water conservation fund, but that I am opposed to the earmarking of Outer Continental Shelf receipts for the purposes of that fund. In offering my amendment to today's appropriation bill, I hope to demonstrate to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs my complete willingness—indeed my strong desire—to support our Nation's park programs. In addition, I would like also to urge all of my colleagues who are in favor of the Nation's park programs to support my amendment as a means of assuring that this program will receive adequate moneys during the next fiscal year.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, when someone wants to appropriate \$100 million out of an advance appropriation for the land and water conservation fund, I am sure it could be well used, but I think it would be fiscal irresponsibility to take this action at this time.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a copy of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964. It provides expressly for an advance appropriation for a period of 8 years. We have now come to the third year. So actually, if I may disagree with the gentlewoman, it would be in order to appropriate at this time, not \$100 million, but \$480 million. The act which I hold in my hand states that these advance appropriations should not average over \$60 million for 8 years. So we could appropriate \$480 million and still be within that act.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 88-578—SEPTEMBER 3, 1964

## ALLOCATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND FOR STATE AND FEDERAL PURPOSES: AUTHORIZATION FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) ALLOCATION.—There shall be submitted with the annual budget of the United States a comprehensive statement of estimated requirements during the ensuing fiscal year for appropriations from the fund. In the absence of a provision to the contrary in the Act making an appropriation from the fund, (i) the appropriation therein made shall be available in the ratio of 60 per centum for State purposes and 40 per centum for Federal purposes, but (ii) the President may, during the first five years in which appropriations are made from the fund, vary said percentages by not more than 15 points either way to meet, as nearly as may be, the current relative needs of the States and the Federal Government.

(b) ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS; REPAYMENT.—Beginning with the third full fiscal year in which the fund is in operation, and for a total of eight years, advance appropriations are hereby authorized to be made to the fund from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated in such amounts as to average not more than \$60,000,000 for each fiscal year. Such advance appropriations shall be available for Federal and State purposes in the same manner and proportions as other moneys appropriated from the fund. Such advance appropriations shall be repaid without interest, beginning at the end of the next fiscal year after the first ten full fiscal years in which the fund has been in operation, by transferring, annually until fully repaid, to the general fund of the Treasury 50 per centum of the revenues received by the land and water conservation fund each year under section 2 of this Act prior to July 1, 1989, and 100 per centum of any revenues thereafter received by the fund. Revenues received from the sources specified in section 2 of this Act after July 1, 1989, or after payment has been completed as provided by this subsection, whichever occurs later, shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. The moneys in the fund that are not required for repayment purposes may continue to be appropriated and allocated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by this Act.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will recall, we appropriated an advance of \$9,191,000 last year. We did not pursue this action this year in view of the critical budget situation and in view of the expenditure problems, so regretfully I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentlewoman I sympathize with her position. I understand it thoroughly, but I want to assure the gentlewoman that she knows that later this week there will come another bill from the Interior which will provide for \$100 million per year for 5 years. However, the money would come from the Outer Continental Shelf Act receipts, to which I object.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I say that bill is pending before the authorizing committee, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and that is not before our committee.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I regret it. This is the Appropriations Committee.

But again I say, it is the committee which has charge of the authorization of

this funding. A bill will be before this House this week from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to appropriate \$100 million for 5 years. However, they would rob Peter to pay Paul. They would want to grab the \$100 million per year, but from where? They want to grab it from the Outer Continental Shelf Act fund.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I still must persist in opposition to the amendment because it would be sheer fiscal irresponsibility to put another \$100 million of Treasury funds in this program at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

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

I take this time to try to clarify something in the report which I read and find really very beneficial.

If I may, I should like to have the attention of the gentlewoman from Washington.

On page 16 of the report, under the National Park Service, the committee states that while the committee recommended a certain specified sum of money for the acquisition of in-holdings in park lands this does not give the Park Service carte blanche authority to acquire in-holdings indiscriminately. Then the report goes on to say, in clarifying that language:

On the contrary, the committee directs that no obligation shall be incurred for the acquisition of in-holdings until the prior approval in writing for the acquisition is obtained from this committee.

This would be literally interpreted, I hope.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. BATTIN. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This is to be literally interpreted.

May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Montana, as he is well aware, in some of the large States of the West some problems of in-holdings exist. The Park Service probably has the most aggravated problem, because many in-holdings of the National Forest Service have a better management pattern in that trades are made and the land exchange program provides a better pattern.

In order to keep the park management efficient, the committee would like the privilege of reviewing all of these in-holding items.

Mr. BATTIN. I will say to the gentlewoman in the case of Glacier National Park in Montana the Organic Act creating that particular park recognized the in-holdings and the right of the individual to those in-holdings and to pass them on in-fee. In recent years there has been an attempt, based on a case coming out of the State of Alaska, where the Park Service evidently feels it can go in and condemn and buy up these holdings without any prior approval by the Congress.

I interpret the language in the report to say they must first come to the committee. This is a limitation upon their

action to acquire the inholdings, is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The acquisition of all inholdings funded by this appropriation must be approved by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

I also should like to ask the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], having heard the colloquy, is this the gentleman's understanding of the language in the report?

Mr. REIFEL. That is my understanding.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to finance interdepartmental boards, commissions, councils, committees, or similar groups under section 214 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946 (31 U.S.C. 691) which do not have prior and specific congressional approval of such method of financial support.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: On page 42, immediately after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 303. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned."

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today is identical in wording to those adopted during our consideration of the two most recent appropriations measures.

It states that no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used to pay the salary of any Federal employee who is convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned.

I am pleased to note that the intent of Congress is indeed being made clear with regard to the participation of Federal employees in acts of violence. Our colleagues in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee are preparing to report a measure for consideration in the near future which will make conviction of these acts grounds for immediate dismissal from Federal employment, and will further bar such employees from re-employment for several years and deny would-be employees consideration for Federal employment for the same period. In the other body, action is also being taken along these lines in the Senate consideration of the omnibus crime bill.

Yet we are faced with the threat of violence at almost any moment, not only in Washington, D.C., but in cities throughout our Nation. We must con-

tinue to incorporate this amendment into appropriations measures until Congress has finally passed, and the President has signed, legislation which will effectively deal with all Federal employees who are in any way connected with the insurrection rampart in our land.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I see no objection to the gentleman's amendment, and we are willing to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inform the members of the Committee that it is my intention to offer a motion to recommit, if recognized for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, the motion to recommit will add a new section which will state that money appropriated in this act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in the aggregate expenditure of Federal funds by all agencies provided for herein beyond \$1,383,432,068.

I shall take a moment to explain that figure and what the motion to recommit would accomplish if adopted by the House. It would impose a ceiling upon expenditures for fiscal year 1969 for the agencies dealt with in this bill that will be at exactly the figure that is the lower amount for each relevant item in the 1968 fiscal year or in the 1969 fiscal year expenditures as shown in the January budget, increased by the amount of all mandatory increases which result from action taken by the Congress such as the annualization of salaries, postal rate increases, and mandatory salary increases. Thus, the ceiling will be the lower figure for fiscal year 1968 for the fiscal year 1969, plus an amount necessary for the mandatory increases.

Essentially, Mr. Chairman, this will represent an additional cut of approximately \$101 million from the bill as reported by the committee.

Most of us are receiving mail from throughout our respective congressional districts as well as from elsewhere in the country. We are well aware that there is a need to hold spending down. Further, we are also aware that this is an important bill and the funds that this bill will appropriate will be for needed items. There is no question about it.

However, it is my view that it would be perfectly responsible for this body to hold spending down to the lower of the spending levels for 1968 in 1969, while at the same time providing for the more urgently needed items contained in this bill. Certainly some of the items in the committee bill can be postponed to another year.

It is, of course, difficult to cut, I know this. But we also know that we have to

start some place. We have made some attempts in previous bills, and it is my hope that the Members will look into the future and recognize that we are faced with possible tax increase legislation within a matter of a few weeks. This is not a meat-ax approach. This provides for the mandatory increases which we are all aware have to be provided for because they are the result of previous actions by the House of Representatives and by the U.S. Senate.

So, when the motion is voted on, and we will attempt to get a record vote on it, I would hope the Members will support the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to ask the gentleman if he believes a limitation such as this would prevent, or what effect this would have on, say, the costs of fire protection that must be met at the end of the year, or at some time later, because we may have fires that could be as damaging as last year?

Floods are also a source that call for additional expenditures. How would the gentleman meet those situations?

Mr. RUMSFELD. My response to the inquiry of the gentleman from South Dakota would be fourfold. First of all, in most agencies there is the capability of reprogramming.

Second, the President does have a contingency fund to handle serious unexpected situations and disasters, such as the Alaskan disaster. Third, the Members of the Congress have always been quite quick to respond with special legislation or appropriations, to deal with serious emergency situations when necessary.

Fourth, there is no question but that we are going to be seeing a supplemental later on in the year, so that if such a situation should arise, some act of God that would require prompt attention, the gentleman can be absolutely sure that this Member will be here on the floor supporting such legislation as may prove to be necessary, just as the Congress always has when the need arises.

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

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

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

I am sure the gentleman is well aware of the fact that this bill is \$13.5 million more than for the same general purposes of last year, although it has been mentioned previously that it is some \$100 million, or whatever the figure, lower than the budget.

Anyone who has spent any time in the House of Representatives knows that budget figures are ordinarily inflated and ballooned till out of shape. That argument was used earlier this afternoon in an attempt to make it appear this bill had been cut. I simply want to say that anyone who depends upon budget figures as a true indicator of economy is subject to delusions.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Do I understand the gentleman will support the motion to

recommit which will attempt to put a ceiling on expenditures?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly will support the gentleman's motion, and I commend him for offering it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain the various categories of spending that the gentleman is attempting to cut. Ordinarily, a bill involves just one department, but that is not true with this bill. We have the Department of the Interior, and 22 related agencies.

If the gentleman really wants to be a fine economizer, I would suggest that instead of this expenditure limitation he designate exactly the activities to be cut.

Does the gentleman want to cut the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

Does the gentleman want to see many, many youngsters who cannot go to school?

Does the gentleman want to cut the Federal forest roads program?

Does he want to arrange it so that the individuals who are bidding on timber will be only the people with a great deal of capital investment who can finance the necessary road construction?

Does the gentleman want to say that we should cut the fishing industry below what the committee has done?

Does the gentleman want to eliminate the Metropolitan Rapid Transit? Perhaps the gentleman does.

That is the prerogative of the House of Representatives, of course.

But, speaking very frankly as a member of this subcommittee who has struggled with these items, I am going to say that I believe the judgment of the House Committee on Appropriations is as good or better than that of the Budget Bureau. I do not intend to abdicate my responsibility as a Member of Congress to the Bureau of the Budget.

There are three branches of the Government, and I was elected to the legislative branch.

You get into very deep water when you take a bill that deals with 23 agencies and say to the Bureau of the Budget, "You go ahead and make these reductions."

Are the reductions going to be assigned against the Forest Service or the Park Service?

Read the testimony taken in the hearings.

If you want to cut the National Park Service any deeper, why do you not close some of the national parks instead of ruining the ecology and making them unsafe for people to use? If you want to do that, then take down the signs at the entrances that say, "Welcome to America, Come and Visit Here," and put up instead, "Closed for the Duration."

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, I certainly hope that we will not recommit a bill that deals with 750 million acres of American land—one-third of this Nation.

May I say to the gentleman that other committees provide funds to be spent

abroad with far greater abandon than we have approved funding for our own natural resources. I would hesitate to cut 1 cent more when it could mean lack of education, lack of food, and lack of training for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in their administration of the Indian people of this Nation.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, and I will not use all the time, to speak in opposition to the motion to recommit that the gentleman from Illinois said he will offer.

While one can sympathize with his overall efforts to try to bring about some effort at fiscal sanity in the Government, I suggest to you that this is hardly the way to do it.

Everyone in this Chamber has seen this amendment or one similar to it offered on previous occasions. It is interesting to ask the question, Who offered it on those occasions? It was offered by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations. He has not offered such an amendment today.

The gentleman who offers this amendment does not sit on the Committee on Appropriations. I defy anybody to look through the hearings that were conducted by the Committee on Appropriations for months in an effort to try to bring this bill to the floor in a fashion that will represent a balance between what we have to do with our Nation's resources and what we must do with relation to our fiscal problems, as I say, I defy anybody to look through those hearings and find one recommendation from the gentleman who now offers this motion to recommit.

Let me refresh your recollection by pointing out that this bill represents a cut of 10 percent in new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1969.

Let me point out to you that in not one instance did your committee exceed the budget requests that were submitted to us.

Further, let me point out that this bill unlike so many others that Members of this body vote on is a revenue-producing bill.

This bill is estimated to bring in to the Federal Treasury \$1.5 billion in the same year that we are being asked to appropriate \$1.4 billion to run the operation through fiscal year 1969.

I want to point out as well that there have been additional items added to this bill that very substantially increase the efforts we have had to make. One of them is the Washington metropolitan area transit authority.

I think the way to approach this bill is the way the members of this subcommittee have. After months of labor and numerous witnesses we presented it to the full Committee on Appropriations with our recommendations. And there I would remind all in this House, it was approved in the full Committee on Appropriations without one dissenting vote.

Now at the 11th hour from a quarter unexpected, from an individual, a colleague of mine whom I respect, we find an amendment offered that has no relationship whatsoever to the bill and where we cannot find his recommendations at

all included in the hearings in testimony conducted over a period of several months in an effort to bring you a meaningful bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the motion to recommit will be resoundingly defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] did not appear before the Appropriations Committee is not unusual in the conduct of the affairs of the House, and I know of no reason why that should in any way be construed by anyone here, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as disqualifying him from offering a motion to recommit.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Iowa. It seems that it is possibly a sign of the absence of any valid arguments that the gentlewoman from Washington and the gentleman from Pennsylvania seem to be arguing their case on that point. The gentleman from Illinois is not a member of the Appropriations Committee. With all respect to that committee—and I recognize the difficulty of the task they face—I personally feel that each of the 435 Members of this body has an obligation to review the work of all committees and subcommittees of the Congress.

I have no hesitancy or reluctance whatsoever to support enthusiastically those actions which I happen to approve, and to oppose just as vigorously those things with which I happen to disagree. I believe it is time that this country established some reasonable priorities in spending.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman from Illinois does not have to be a member of the Appropriations Committee to know that this country is in deep financial trouble, does he?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Indeed, one does not. And I might also say that one of the reasons the country is in this serious trouble is the fact that each committee of the Congress, including the Appropriations Committee, possibly has not found enough places that we could defer, delay, or postpone spending. We are faced with a \$20 billion deficit. We are faced with a request for a tax increase. We will soon be facing that right here in this Chamber.

I know that at least my constituents in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois are anxious to see the Congress of the United States act in a responsible way. I believe that that means we must start trimming these appropriation bills wherever we can. I know it hurts. I do not like to do it any more than anyone else. But I am willing to do it. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

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

I merely wish to join in the remarks just made by my colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], and those of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

We have gone over this budget request with a fine-tooth comb. As was pointed out on several occasions this afternoon, this legislation covers agencies that are revenue-producing, and it is very likely that we have cut too deeply in some instances.

I would just like to say in closing that if this body of the House is going to act responsibly, it will vote down the motion to recommit and pass the bill unanimously when it finally comes to the floor.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 17354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and on the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RUMSFELD moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 42 following line 2, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 303. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in the aggregate expenditure of Federal funds by all agencies provided for herein beyond \$1,383,432,068."

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 207, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—174

Abbitt	Findley	Pelly	Gettys	McCloskey	Reuss
Abernethy	Fino	Pirnie	Giaimo	McClure	Rhodes, Ariz.
Adair	Fisher	Poff	Gibbons	McDade	Rhodes, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Pollock	Gonzalez	McFall	Roberts
Arends	Fountain	Price, Tex.	Gray	Macdonald,	Rodino
Ashbrook	Gallifianakis	Quile	Green, Pa.	Mass.	Rogers, Colo.
Ashmore	Gathings	Quillen	Griffiths	Machen	Ronan
Ayres	Goodell	Railsback	Gubser	Madden	Rooney, N.Y.
Bates	Goodling	Randall	Gude	Mahon	Rooney, Pa.
Belcher	Griffin	Rarick	Hagan	Marsh	Rosenthal
Bennett	Gross	Reid, Ill.	Hamilton	Mathias, Calif.	Roush
Betts	Grover	Reid, N.Y.	Hanley	Matsunaga	Royal
Bevill	Haley	Riegle	Hansen, Wash.	Meeds	Ruppe
Bester	Hall	Robison	Harrison	Mills	Ryan
Blackburn	Halpern	Rogers, Fla.	Hathaway	Minish	St Germain
Bolton	Hammer-	Roth	Hawkins	Mink	St. Onge
Bow	schmidt	Roudebush	Hays	Mize	Saylor
Bray	Harsha	Rumsfeld	Hechler, W. Va.	Monagan	Schwengel
Brock	Harvey	Sandman	Helstoski	Moore	Shipley
Broomfield	Heckler, Mass.	Satterfield	Henderson	Moorhead	Sikes
Brown, Mich.	Horton	Schadeberg	Hicks	Morgan	Sisk
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Schneebeli	Hull	Morris, N. Mex.	Slack
Broyhill, N.C.	Hunt	Scott	Hungate	Murphy, Ill.	Smith, Iowa
Broyhill, Va.	Hutchinson	Shriver	Ichord	Murphy, N.Y.	Staggers
Buchanan	Jarman	Smith, Calif.	Jacobs	Natcher	Steed
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, N.Y.	Joelson	Nedzi	Steiger, Ariz.
Burleson	Jonas	Smith, Okla.	Jones	Nix	Stephens
Bush	Keith	Snyder	Karath	O'Hara, Ill.	Stuckey
Button	King, N.Y.	Springer	Kastenmeier	Passman	Sullivan
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe	Stafford	Kazan	Patman	Taylor
Cederberg	Kuykendall	Stanton	Kee	Patten	Teague, Tex.
Chamberlain	Laird	Steiger, Wis.	King, Calif.	Pepper	Tierman
Clawson, Del	Langen	Taft	Kirwan	Perkins	Udall
Cleveland	Latta	Talcott	Kluczynski	Pettis	Ullman
Collier	Lipscomb	Teague, Calif.	Kyros	Philbin	Van Deerlin
Colmer	Lukens	Thompson, Ga.	Landrum	Pickle	Vanik
Conable	McClory	Thompson, Wis.	Leggett	Pike	Walde
Conte	McCulloch	Tuck	Lennon	Poage	Walker
Corbett	McDonald,	Utt	Lloyd	Podell	Watts
Cramer	Mich.	Vander Jagt	Long, Md.	Pool	White
Cunningham	McEwen	Vigorito	McCarthy	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Curtis	MacGregor	Wampler	Reinecke	Pryor	Willis
Davis, Wis.	Mailliard	Watkins	Ashley	Pucinski	Wyatt
Delaney	Mathias, Md.	Watson	Baring	Purcell	Yates
Dellenback	May	Whalen	Blatnik	Rees	Young
Denney	Mayne	Whalley	Cahill	Reifel	Zablocki
Derwinski	Meskill	Whitener	Clancy	Reinecke	
Devine	Michel	Widnall	Hardy		
Dickinson	Miller, Ohio	Wiggins	Hébert		
Dole	Minshall	Williams, Pa.	Blatnik		
Dorn	Morton	Winn	Cahill		
Dowdy	Mosher	Wolf	Hollifield		
Duncan	Myers	Wydler	Scherer		
Dwyer	Neisen	Wylie	Howard		
Edwards, Ala.	Nichols	Wyman	Cowger		
Erlenborn	O'Konski	Zion	Jones, Mo.		
Esch	O'Neal, Ga.	Zwach	Karsten		
Eshleman	Ottenger		Diggs		
Evans, Colo.			Edwards, La.		

NAYS—207

Adams	Brown, Calif.	Downing	Downing	Resnick
Addabbo	Burke, Mass.	Dulski	Baring	Rivers
Albert	Burton, Calif.	Eckhardt	Blatnik	Rostenkowski
Anderson,	Burton, Utah	Edmondson	Cahill	Scherer
Tenn.	Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, Calif.	Hollifield	Scheuer
Andrews, Ala.	Cabell	Eilberg	Howard	Schweiker
Andrews,	Carey	Everett	Cowger	Jones, Mo.
N. Dak.	Casey	Evins, Tenn.	Karsten	Skubitz
Annunzio	Celler	Fallon	Diggs	Stratton
Aspinwall	Clark	Farbstein	Edwards, La.	Stubblefield
Barrett	Clausen,	Fascell	Freilinghuysen	Tenzer
Battin	Don H.	Feighan	Gardner	Martin
Bell	Cohelan	Flood	Gilbert	Thompson, N.J.
Berry	Conyers	Flynt	Green, Oreg.	Tunney
Bingham	Corman	Foley	Gurney	Morse, Mass.
Blanton	Daddario	Ford,	Halleck	Moss
Boggs	Daniels	William D.	O'Hara, Mich.	Wilson, Charles H.
Boland	Davis, Ga.	Fraser	Hanna	Olsen
Bolling	Dawson	Friedel	Hansen, Idaho	Wright
Brademas	de la Garza	Fulton, Pa.		
Brasco	Dent	Fulton, Tenn.		
Brinkley	Dingell	Fuqua		
Brooks	Donohue	Gallagher		
Brotzman	Dow	Garmatz		

#### NOT VOTING—52

Ashley	Hardy	Resnick
Baring	Hébert	Rivers
Blatnik	Blatnik	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Cahill	Scherer
Carter	Hollifield	Scheuer
Clancy	Howard	Schweiker
Cowger	Jones, Mo.	Jones, Mo.
Culver	Karsten	Skubitz
Diggs	Kelly	Stratton
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Freilinghuysen	McMillan	Tenzer
Gardner	Martin	Thompson, N.J.
Gilbert	Miller, Calif.	Tunney
Green, Oreg.	Morse, Mass.	Waggoner
Gurney	Moss	Wilson,
Halleck	O'Hara, Mich.	Charles H.
Hanna	Olsen	Wright
Hansen, Idaho	O'Neill, Mass.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Freilinghuysen.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Cahill.  
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Baring with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Martin.  
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Skubitz.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. Waggoner with Mr. Scherle.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Schweiker.  
Mr. Howard with Mr. Gardner.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Resnick.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ashley.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Gilbert.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Culver.  
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Karsten.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.  
Mr. Wright with Mr. Tenzer.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McMillan.  
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Scherle.  
Mr. Selden with Mr. Olsen.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Herlong.  
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Holland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 364, nays 14, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—364

Abbitt	Denney	Jacobs	Patten	Rooney, Pa.	Teague, Tex.	Mr. Karsten with Mr. Selden.
Abernethy	Dent	Jarman	Pelly	Rosenthal	Thompson, Ga.	Mr. Stratton with Mr. Rivers.
Adair	Dingell	Joelson	Pepper	Roth	Thomson, Wis.	Mr. Olsen with Mr. Herlong.
Adams	Dole	Johnson, Calif.	Perkins	Roudebush	Tierman	
Addabbo	Donohue	Johnson, Pa.	Pettis	Roush	Tuck	The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Albert	Dorn	Jonas	Philbin	Royal	Udall	
Anderson, Ill.	Dow	Jones, Ala.	Pickle	Ruppe	Ullman	A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Anderson, Tenn.	Dowdy	Jones, N.C.	Pike	Ryan	Utt	
Andrews, Ala.	Downing	Karth	Pirnie	St Germain	Van Deerlin	
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dulski	Kastenmeier	Poage	St. Onge	Vander Jagt	
Andrews,	Duncan	Kazan	Podell	Sandman	Vanik	
Annumzio	Dwyer	Kee	Poff	Satterfield	Vigorito	
Arends	Eckhardt	Keith	Pollock	Saylor	Walde	
Ashmore	Edmondson	King, Calif.	Pool	Schadeberg	Walker	
Aspinall	Edwards, Ala.	Kirwan	Price, Ill.	Schwengel	Wampier	
Ayres	Edwards, Calif.	Kleppe	Price, Tex.	Scott	Watkins	
Barrett	Eilberg	Kluczynski	Pryor	Shipley	Watson	
Bates	Erlenborn	Kornegay	Pucinski	Shriver	Watts	
Battin	Esch	Kupferman	Purcell	Sikes	Whalen	
Belcher	Evans, Colo.	Kuykendall	Quie	Sisk	Whalley	
Bell	Everett	Kyl	Quillen	Slack	White	
Bennett	Evins, Tenn.	Kyros	Railsback	Smith, Calif.	Whitener	
Berry	Fallon	Laird	Randall	Smith, Iowa	Whitten	
Betts	Farbstein	Landrum	Rarick	Smith, N.Y.	Widnall	
Bevill	Fascell	Langen	Rees	Smith, Okla.	Wiggins	
Blester	Feighan	Leggett	Reid, Ill.	Snyder	Williams, Pa.	
Bingham	Findley	Lennon	Reid, N.Y.	Springer	Willis	
Blackburn	Fino	Lipscomb	Rhodes, Ariz.	Stafford	Wilson, Bob	
Blanton	Fisher	Lloyd	Rhodes, Pa.	Staggers	Winn	
Boggs	Flood	Long, Md.	Riegle	Stanton	Wolf	
Boland	Flynt	Lukens	Roberts	Steed	Wyatt	
Bolling	Foley	McCarthy	Robison	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyder	
Bolton	Ford, Gerald R.	McCloskey	Rodino	Steiger, Wis.	Wylie	
Bow	William D.	McClure	Rogers, Colo.	Stephens	Wyman	
Brademas	Fountain	McCulloch	Rogers, Fla.	Stuckey	Yates	
Brasco	Fraser	McDade	Ronan	Sullivan	Young	
Bray	Friedel	McDonald	Rooney, N.Y.	Taft	Zablocki	
Brinkley	Fulton, Pa.	Mich.	Rosenthal	Talcott	Zion	
Brooks	Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen	Roth	Taylor	Zwach	
Broomfield	Fuqua	McFall	Rubin	Teague, Calif.		
Brotzman	Galifianakis	Macdonald,	Rutherford			
Brown, Calif.	Gallagher	Mass.	NOT VOTING—55			
Brown, Mich.	Garmatz	MacGregor	Ashley	Derwinski	Hall	
Brown, Ohio	Gathings	Machen	Baring	Devine	Latta	
Broyhill, N.C.	Gettys	Madden	Blatnik	Dickinson	Rumsfeld	
Broyhill, Va.	Giaimo	Mahon	Cahill	Eshleman	Schneebeli	
Burke, Fla.	Gibbons	Mailliard	Carter	Gross		
Burke, Mass.	Gonzalez	Marsh	Clancy			
Burleson	Goodell	Mathias, Calif.	Cowger			
Burton, Calif.	Goodling	Mathias, Md.	Culver			
Burton, Utah	Gray	Matsunaga	Diggs			
Bush	Green, Pa.	May	Edwards, La.			
Button	Griffin	Mayne	Frelinghuysen			
Byrne, Pa.	Griffiths	Meeds	Gardner			
Byrnes, Wis.	Gubser	Meskill	Gilbert			
Cabell	Gude	Michel	Green, Oreg.			
Carey	Hagan	Miller, Ohio	Miller, Calif.			
Casey	Haley	Mills	Grover			
Cederberg	Halpern	Minish	Gurney			
Celler	Hamilton	Mink	Halleck			
Chamberlain	Hammer-	Minshall	Hanna			
Clark	schmidt	Mize	Hansen, Idaho			
Clausen,	Hanley	Monagan	So the bill was passed.			
Don H.	Hansen, Wash.	Montgomery	The Clerk announced the following pairs:			
Clawson, Del	Harrison	Moore	Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Halleck.			
Cleveland	Harsha	Moorhead	Mr. Kelly with Mr. Cahill.			
Cohelan	Harvey	Morgan	Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Frelinghuysen.			
Collier	Hathaway	Morris, N. Mex.	Mr. Green of Oregon with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.			
Colmer	Hawkins	Morton	Mr. Baring with Mr. Carter.			
Conable	Hays	Mosher	Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Martin.			
Conte	Hechler, W. Va.	Murphy, Ill.	Mr. Culver with Mr. King of New York.			
Conyers	Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, N.Y.	Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Schewelker.			
Corbett	Helstoski	Myers	Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Gardner.			
Corman	Henderson	Natcher	Mr. Ashley with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.			
Cramer	Hicks	Nedzi	Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Grover.			
Cunningham	Horton	Nelsen	Mr. Diggs with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.			
Daddario	Hosmer	Nichols	Mr. Resnick with Mr. Holifield.			
Daniels	Hull	Nix	Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Waggoner.			
Davis, Ga.	Hungate	O'Hara, Ill.	Mr. Howard with Mr. Wright.			
Dawson	Hunt	O'Konski	Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McMillan.			
de la Garza	Hutchinson	O'Neal, Ga.	Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Moss.			
Delaney	Ichord	Ottinger	Mr. Tunney with Mr. Passman.			
Dellenback	Irwin	Patman	Mr. Holland with Mr. Hardy.			

Mr. Karsten with Mr. Selden.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Rivers.  
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Herlong.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

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

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

There was no objection.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON PLACES A PROPER PERSPECTIVE ON THE NATION'S PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. BOOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an address by the President of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in a speech last night to the Arthritis Foundation in New York, President Johnson placed a proper perspective on the Nation's problems and opportunities. The President said:

To me, the fact that we recognize a gap—a gap between achievement and expectation—represents a symptom of health; a sign of self-renewal; a sign that our prosperous Nation has not succumbed to complacency and self-indulgence.

I agree. And I commend the President for saying what has needed to be said to counter those who are continually downgrading America and uttering prophecies of doom.

The President rightfully rejected the idea that America is plagued by indifference and neglect. He cited the billions of dollars now working to try to conquer poverty, illiteracy, and disease. Perhaps America could do even more—but we, as a people and a Nation, can never be accused of ignoring human want and need.

I earnestly commend the President's speech to my colleagues. For as the President said, our problems "will not be solved if we give way to crippling despair."

I include this inspiring address in the RECORD:

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS BEFORE THE ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION DINNER AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 20, 1968

Nothing could give me greater pleasure than to join you in paying honor to Floyd Odlum.

Floyd Odlum's life, his career, and his civic concerns reflect a great deal, not only about the man, but about our country.

He has built a legendary record of personal and financial success.

But we who know Floyd are more impressed by the riches he has given than by the riches he has received.

His unselfish spirit tells us something about America: it reflects the truth, I believe, about a land and a people who, for all our faults, remain the most compassionate on earth.

Tonight we honor Floyd Odlum's contributions to a noble and vital cause: the Arthritis Foundation.

For a long time—and especially in the past four and a half years—I have made health and education a special interest of mine, for at least two reasons:

First of all, it puzzled and troubled me that these two vital fields were so often, and for so many years, the step-children of public policy.

Second, everything in my background and my career has led me to the conviction that we can find no solutions for our problems unless we overcome physical incapacity and ignorance—wherever they exist.

During my Administration, I have tried to show just how much government can do in these fields.

But I have known all along how little government can do—without the active and vocal support of private citizens, private organizations. You are such citizens—and the Arthritis Foundation is such an organization.

Surely no more vexing health problem can be named than the one you battle: arthritis.

It is the Nation's number one crippler.

It robs the national economy of nearly \$4 billion a year in lost time, medical expenses, diminished strength and productivity.

Worst of all, it ruins lives.

Like so many problems that we face in our Nation, this one is deep-rooted, pervasive, mysterious, unyielding. Like many other problems, it is buried beneath layers of ignorance and years of indifference. Like many other problems, this one is a long way from final solution.

But like our other problems, it is within our power to solve.

A famous commentator on the social scene once wrote, "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair; we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way."

That was Charles Dickens, one of the early warriors against poverty and illness and injustice. He was describing a period nearly 200 years ago. And he saw many similarities in his own period a little over a century ago.

Many would find similarities today.

As a people, we have never been more prosperous. Our Gross National Product has risen to over \$830 billion—and the median family income in America is over \$8,000 per year.

In the past seven years the growth alone in our nation's wealth has been greater than our entire gross national product thirty years ago.

Yet we have never been more conscious of—or more troubled about—the poverty in our midst.

More Americans than ever before are in school today: one-third of the nation's population. More people are going to college—more to adult education classes, more to job

training and all the other forms of education from post-craddle to post-graduate.

Yet never have we been more restless about the shortcomings of public education; never have we been more eager to extend the opportunity for learning to those who have been neglected.

Our nation's health standards are at an all-time high, measured by any index we can devise: life expectancy, infant mortality, incidence of disease, delivery of health services.

Yet never have we as a people been more anxious—and more eager to extend the quality and the reach of health care.

There are some despairing critics who look at this gap between achievement and expectation and claim there is a sickness in our society.

To me, the fact that we recognize a gap—a gap between achievement and expectation—represents a symptom of health; a sign of self-renewal; a sign that our prosperous nation has not succumbed to complacency and self-indulgence.

I suppose there will be many who call me a Pollyanna for saying that; and I have been called worse. But I am no Pollyanna.

I simply refuse to accept the diagnosis of fatal sickness in our society.

I refuse to accept the diagnosis of indifference in our society—because I see millions of Americans and billions of dollars working to conquer poverty; I see an unprecedented outpouring of imagination and concern and money to cure the handicap of poverty.

I refuse to accept a diagnosis of deep racism in our society—because I see a people struggling as never before to overcome injustice; I cannot ignore the progress we have made in this decade to write equality in our books of law.

Look at these simple facts. In 30 years of struggle—from 1935 to 1964—we increased the Federal share of our gross national product going into health and medical care from .2% to .7%. Then, in 4 years time we more than doubled it—from .7% to 1.7%.

The same thing is true in the field of education. From 1935 to 1964, the Federal share of GNP for education moved from .1% to .7%. Then in 4 years time, we doubled it—from .7% to 1.4%.

These are the true measures of our progress; how much of our nation's wealth we allocate to these two areas of our greatest public concern—education and health.

In the past five years, the Federal government has enacted over thirty major health measures. It has more than doubled annual spending on health, from \$6 billion to almost \$14 billion.

We are beginning to see the results. The death rate in the United States is now as low as it has ever been in the nation's history. It is 3% lower than in 1963—an annual saving of fifty-four thousand American lives.

Infant deaths have declined 13% since 1963—to the lowest rate in our nation's history.

And Medicare now brings the guarantee of adequate health service to over 19 million senior Americans.

Now is no time to retreat from this progress.

This nation has not yet solved its problems. Poverty, racism, ignorance and illness still plague us.

But we are on the move. The age-old ills which agitate our communities can be solved. They will not be solved if we give way to crippling despair.

They will not be solved if we delude ourselves with labels and slogans which are substitutes for ideas—not ideas.

They will be solved by realism, by determination, by commitment—by hope and by self-discipline.

They will be solved by the impatience of the American people—but not by pessimism.

They will be solved by the concern of individuals like Floyd Odlum, the man we honor

tonight—and organizations, like the Arthritis Foundation.

We must face the future with the spirit attributed to Winston Churchill in a story which may or may not be true. It seems that the Prime Minister was visited by a delegation of Temperance ladies who came to complain about his consumption of brandy.

One little lady addressed Mr. Churchill and declared, "Why Mr. Prime Minister, if all the brandy you drank in a year was poured into this room, it would come up to here."

Mr. Churchill looked solemnly at the floor, at the ceiling, and at the little lady's hand somewhere near the midway mark. And then he muttered, "So little done; so much to do!"

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the distinguished minority leader is on the floor, and I take this time for the purpose of advising the House that we will go ahead with the program as scheduled tomorrow, but before going into the interstate taxation bill we will take up the conference report on the truth-in-lending bill.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, after the consideration of the conference report on the truth-in-lending bill, we will then proceed down the whip's notice in order?

Mr. ALBERT. That is the plan now, and we will certainly go on with the interstate taxation bill, and the resolution. That is the present schedule.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, on the last preceding rollcall I was in the cloakroom, and did not hear my name called. Had I been present I would have voted affirmatively.

#### ANTI-SEMITISM IN POLAND

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, it seems almost incomprehensible that today's Communist leaders of Poland should find it expedient to institute the kind of anti-Semitism and persecution which led to Hitler's program of genocide as a "final solution" to a problem that existed only in his demented mind and in the hysteria of the society.

As early as 1939, the Germans began to organize walled ghettos for European

Jews, particularly in Poland. Because Warsaw was a leading center of European Jewry, thousands of Jews fled to Warsaw to evade Hitler's brutal deportation program. At one time, nearly 500,000 Jews were concentrated in the ghetto of Warsaw. However, between the autumn of 1941 and autumn of 1943 nearly the whole population was deported to Hitler's death camps and exterminated. It was in the face of this hideous program of deportation that the last 40,000 Jews staged their desperately heroic uprising against their Nazis oppressors during April and May of 1943. The magnificent heroism shown by these Jews in their daring attempt to attain liberty is truly an inspiration to freedom loving people around the world. Almost unarmed and against overwhelming odds these courageous souls resisted the German deportation order, and for nearly a month held out against the brutal onslaught of regular Nazis troops armed with flame throwers, artillery, armored cars, and tanks.

After the war the full horror of the German program of genocide was documented and all civilized men were shaken by the details of this atrocious crime against humanity. Yet today, Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, the Communist government of Poland is conducting a virulent, anti-Semitic campaign of intimidation and abuse.

Mr. Speaker, all free people must heartily condemn this latest display of anti-Semitism in Poland, and make known to the Polish Government their concern for the fate of Jews presently residing in Poland who are being subjected to this scurrilous campaign that is as hateful to all men of good will as it is unwarranted.

#### A NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK LAW FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that support for the Federal Employees Freedom of Choice Act of 1968, introduced in the Senate by the distinguished gentleman from Utah, Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, and by myself in the House of Representatives, is pouring in from all points of the political spectrum.

These indeed are true bipartisan bills designed to protect by law some 3 million Federal employees' right to join or not to join a union. At present this right is protected only by an Executive order issued by President Kennedy in 1962.

We feel that this basic right is too important to be left to the sole discretion of the President, no matter who holds that office, and therefore I am asking President Johnson to endorse the bills and seek a speedy passage.

An editorial that appeared in our Nation's largest daily newspaper yesterday, the New York Daily News, I feel truly reflects the attitude of the American people. The News states:

#### A VERY JUICY PLUM

—will be snatched from the eager hands of the labor bosses if Congress gives its approval to a bill introduced last week by Sen. Wallace Bennett (R-Utah) and 14 colleagues.

The bill will write into law the language used by the late President John F. Kennedy in 1962 when he spelled out the rights of federal employees to join—or refrain from joining—unions.

It is the right to refrain from such affiliations that is in peril.

#### STUDY GROUP REPORT DUE

Since last September, a commission created by President L. B. Johnson has been studying government policy in its own labor relations. Its report is due shortly, and the word is that the commission will recommend that the "right to refrain" be quietly dumped.

It would be a windfall to big labor's treasury. There are about 3 million federal workers. Under a policy of compulsory unionism, those who did not sign up to join a union would be forced to fork over "agency fees" equivalent to membership dues.

Union chiefs have been quietly but persistently pressuring the administration to grant them this bountiful bonanza for some time. It may be that LBJ is tempted to go along as a show of gratitude for solid labor backing during the past few stormy months.

The Bennett bill would end any such temptation by taking the problem out of the President's hands. It should be passed—and quickly.

Mr. Speaker, when I refer to these as bipartisan bills, I point out that among Senator BENNETT's cosponsors are Senators of such various political persuasions as the Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois; MARK O. HATFIELD, of Oregon; and SPEASSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida.

In the House I have been joined by distinguished Representatives from both sides of the aisle, including Representatives ALTON B. LENNON, of North Carolina; LEO FARBSTEIN, of New York; JOHN N. ERLINBORN, of Illinois; and JAMES UTT, of California, to mention a few.

A brief check shows that 300 letters a day urging support of the bills are pouring into appropriate Federal agencies such as the Civil Service Commission, appropriate congressional committees, and the offices of Members of Congress.

I have received editorials from leading newspapers from New Hampshire to California, and from Florida to Iowa, urging passage of the Federal Employee Freedom of Choice Act of 1968.

The Professional Engineers in Government, a coalition of city, county, State, and Federal professional employees, is just one example of government workers who oppose any form of agency shop requirement for Federal employees.

In their widely circulated newsletter the engineers point out that serious concern has been generated over reports that Federal employees represented by exclusive union contracts may be forced to pay a service charge equal to the amount the union can show it costs to represent them.

The engineers and all Federal employees have ample cause for alarm, particularly in view of the White House's sudden reluctance to reveal contents of

the Labor-Management Review Committee's secret report and in view of recent events indicating an attack on President Kennedy's "right to refrain" clause.

Let me review briefly the course of events:

On January 17, 1962 President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988 stating:

Employees of the Federal Government shall have, and shall be protected in the exercise of, the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join and assist any employee organization or to refrain from such activity.

This was followed 3 days later by then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, who told members of the American Federation of Government Employees:

I know you will agree with me that the union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the Federal Government. And because of this, there is a larger responsibility for enlightenment on the part of the government union. In your own organization you have to win acceptance by your own conduct, your own action, your own wishes, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements. And let me say to you from my experience representing the trade union movement that this is not a handicap necessarily . . . Very often even the union that has won the union shop will frankly admit that people who come in through that route do not always participate in the same knowing way as people who come in through the method of education and voluntarism. So you have an opportunity to bring into your organization people who come in because they want to come in and who will participate, therefore, in the full activity of your organization.

In September 1966, speaking on the growing trend toward compulsory unionism of some 11 million public employees, Federal, State, county, and municipal, Jerry Wurf, president of the AFL-CIO American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees told U.S. News & World Report:

In a number of very important instances, like Michigan State University, we even got a union shop . . . It's happening in Michigan, Wisconsin, Delaware, Connecticut, Massachusetts—a whole flock of states.

There are now more than 125 unionized police departments across the Nation. By a recent count more than 10,000 policemen are members of the AFL-CIO and according to Mr. Wurf, the organizing drive is just beginning.

The wisdom of police membership in any private organization with disciplinary power has always been a matter of serious question. But of particular concern to today's civic-minded citizen is the growing number, not only of policemen, but of all categories of public employees, who have no choice about joining a union. They either join or lose their jobs.

Now in the face of this trend toward compulsory unionism of government workers, President Johnson on September 8, 1967, appointed a Labor-Management Review Committee to review experience under President Kennedy's right-to-refrain Executive order and to recommend "any adjustments needed now to ensure its continued vitality in the public interest."

The Presidential choice to head the Committee is Labor Secretary W. Wil-

lard Wirtz, one of the country's most avid proponents of compulsory unionism. Secretary Wirtz' views, already well known, were put on the record previously when he testified before a House subcommittee in hearings concerning the ill-fated attempt to repeal section 14(b) of the Labor Management Relations Act as follows:

I hold strongly the views I represent. The argument that union shop agreements violate the freedom of individual employees has no substantial basis. There is no violation of freedom in a minority's having to accept a majority's fair judgment fairly arrived at. There is no "right" of a minority to endanger the freedom of a majority of the employees to protect the security of the bargaining representative that gives them a voice in the shaping of their wages, hours, and conditions of employment . . . The view of a few who oppose belonging to a union or to any other organization as a matter of conscience or religious principle must be accommodated to the obligations of living together.

One of the first witnesses to appear before Secretary Wirtz' committee was AFL-CIO President George Meany who testified on October 23, 1967:

We recommend that the Executive Order be amended to state explicitly that the federal government accepts the principle that unions and management in federal service should have the right to negotiate union security agreements.

Another expression of compulsory union's confidence in the Labor-Management Review Committee came from B. A. Gritta, president of the AFL-CIO Metal Trades Department. Mr. Gritta told a convention of the Operating Engineers at Bal Harbour, Fla., just last month:

I am confident that within the very near future that we will be able to negotiate union security provisions in our contracts with the government, or at least have an agency checkoff . . . and this would mean everybody would have to pay your organization.

But Dr. Nathan Volkmir, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, one of the oldest and most respected unions representing more than 30,000 U.S. Government workers on a completely voluntary basis, was not happy about the drive for forced unionism of government workers.

He told the Wirtz committee that organization of Federal workers by international unions will, and I quote, "Handicap the legitimate and proper organizing activities of many independent unions of Federal employees which are not plagued by the quarrels which so afflict the affiliated unions. He further said:

The introduction into the Federal service of various bare-knuckle type organizing methods, taken from private sector unionism, has had widespread adverse effects.

He told of beatings, distribution of scurrilous literature and name calling, all of this new to Government employee unionism.

Meanwhile as the veil of secrecy was more tightly gathered around the Wirtz-White House Committee's deliberations, concerned Members of Congress had to be content with gleanings from the public prints.

For instance respected author Joe Young of the "Federal Spotlight" re-

ported in the Washington Star, March 12:

The question of union security in the Federal Government is being considered by the President's cabinet level review committee on the government labor management problem. The committee is near a decision on whether it would be proper and feasible in the federal service to require some sort of participation where unions have exclusive bargaining rights.

Authoritative columnist Jerry Kluttz wrote in his Federal Diary in the Washington Post on April 21:

A limited form of union security has also been considered by the panel but the legality of any such proposal was questioned. This one issue could be changed by either the Review Committee or the President.

We have many other causes for alarm over this drive for compulsory unionism for Federal employees.

The Wall Street Journal, on May 7, quotes an official of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, complaining about the competition from organizers of industrial unions, as stating:

The public employee field is wide open and everybody wants a piece of the action.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in an editorial just last week, states:

Upset by failure to increase its membership in the ranks of non-government employees, organized labor is now mobilizing for a drive to compel some 11.2 million federal, state, and local governments to join a union.

Now let us pause just a moment and look at these figures. Eleven million public employees. If each one was forced to contribute just \$5 per month in compulsory union dues, the take would amount to \$700 million a year. The stakes are enormous and the compulsory union bosses are at work.

Let me quote from the newsletter published last month by the Engineers in Government I mentioned previously:

While many legal experts feel the Executive Branch does not have the authority to require Federal employees to pay money to unions as a condition of continued employment, legal opinion is by no means unanimous, and some believe that the Administration could well go ahead with such a plan if it is not vigorously opposed in advance.

In addition, regardless of the legality of the matter, the Administration might well believe it stands to gain more than it loses even if such an order were subsequently overturned either by the courts or Congress. In either case, the Administration would have demonstrated its friendship for the union cause in an election year when such support may be most important. Once in effect, the unions might well block repeal even by a Republican congress, and if overturned by the courts several years later, it would be of scant concern to either the present or succeeding administrations.

*Only if sufficient opposition is generated beforehand, it is reasoned, will the Administration feel it has more to lose than gain by establishing an agency shop for Federal employees. Because of this, all concerned engineers are urged to write or wire the President and their congressmen expressing their views on any proposal to require Federal employees to pay dues or the equivalent to exclusively recognized unions.*

I say to my distinguished colleagues, if you believe with me and thousands of other Americans that there is no room

for "bare knuckle" organizing methods among Federal employees;

If you believe that no citizen should be forced to donate part of his salary, salary paid by the dollars of hard-pressed American taxpayers, to compulsory international union bosses in order to work for the U.S. Government;

If you believe as did President Kennedy and former Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg that voluntary, not compulsory unionism, is fitted to the American way of life;

If you believe as Senator BENNETT said in introducing his bill that good unions "do not need compulsory unionism and bad unions don't deserve it";

If you believe with me, that the right of Federal employees to join or not to join a union is too valuable to be subject to the whims of whomever might occupy the White House;

Then I ask you to join with my distinguished cosponsors on the House side, with Senator BENNETT and his illustrious co-sponsors on the Senate side to remove the problem from the President's hands forever and seek a speedy passage of the Federal Employee Freedom of Choice Act of 1968.

#### THE MORAL CASE AGAINST RACISM

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1968 the mayor of Indianapolis stated the moral case against racism as it has seldom been said before. He did so with clarity and without political equivocation.

As I read his words I see not the calculated utterances of a fellow officeholder from another political party. Here are the utterances of a fellow American, speaking from the heart.

Mayor Lugar and I have each specifically opposed the other in election contest. But this is a good time to take time out from politics and recognize that the tragedy of racism in America involves not partisan politics, but human morality. His statement follows:

MAYOR RICHARD G. LUGAR'S REPORT TO THE PEOPLE, APRIL 9, 1968

My friends, on April 4, 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King spoke his last words from the second floor balcony of a motel in Memphis, Tennessee. He turned to his Musical Director and said, "My man, be sure to sing 'Precious Lord' tonight, and sing it well."

And the words that Dr. King would have heard are these:

"Precious Lord, take my hand,  
Lead me on, help me stand,  
I am tired, I am weak,  
I am worn. Through the storm  
Through the night—lead me on to the light.  
Take my hand, Precious Lord, lead me home."

Tonight, many of us have that same feeling. There is a void left in our hearts and consciousness following the events of this day and the past few days. It is important that we understand the meaning of this man, Dr. Martin Luther King. He was a

prophet in our time, the Reverend Mays has reminded us in the funeral service, just as Amos was a prophet in the times of the Old Testament and Our Lord Jesus Christ in the times of the New Testament. He worked within the context of American democracy and fundamental Christian theology and this was a difficult context in which to work. And herein, of course, lies the importance of what we have witnessed during the past few years of the life of this man.

It is difficult to be a prophet within the context of a system. Dr. King, who had every reason to doubt the word of the system, instead accepted at face value the words of the system and said, let us make it better. Let us do the job we need to do for the equality of all men, through the law and through non-violence, and this he continued to preach to the last.

His act of public ministry began December 1, 1955, when a Negro seamstress in Montgomery, Alabama, by the name of Rosa Parks, refused to give up her seat to a white man on bus. After 382 days of boycott and turmoil in the history of Montgomery, and in America, we saw the first traumatic victory, the most successful Negro boycott ever held and the beginning of a long and active ministry by Dr. King. His words at that particular time are appropriate in the context of our sorrow tonight. He asked then for non-violence in Montgomery: "If you will protest courageously, and yet with dignity and Christian love, when the history books are written in future generations, the historians will have to pause and say, 'there lived a great people, a black people, who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization. This is our challenge and our overwhelming responsibility.'

Many of us remember on August 28, 1963, when Dr. King injected new meaning into American life with his speech "I Have a Dream" in front of the Lincoln Memorial. Our legislators in this case acted well ahead of the hearts and consciences of the American people and they passed laws of a federal, state, and local nature which have never really been enforced to date. And this of course is both the irony and the dilemma of our times and certainly of the last days of Dr. King—that we could live in a country in which through the legislative process so much has been promised, so much has been fulfilled and yet so much has not been enjoyed. A country in which there were many calls for law and order and for enforcement of laws dealing with property, but much less vigor for enforcement of laws dealing with civil and human rights. And this was one of the great hypocrisies and great dilemmas that Dr. King faced. It is still with us tonight.

There are many in this country who still do not realize the peril of the dilemma that we are in. *The choice, ladies and gentlemen, was not between Dr. Martin Luther King and tranquility and peace. It was between a man who fought for solutions to our dilemmas inside the American context and those who say Dr. King fought within the system, but look what happened to Dr. King.*

And those same voices would counsel others tonight that the system is no good, that the possibilities have run out, that the time for change really calls for a different order.

But there are many of us—I hope a very great majority of us tonight—who say that Dr. King was right. Non-violence is the way within the system of Christian theology and American democracy and we who have often been indifferent, can be so no more, and will not be indifferent.

Indifference has taken many forms in our community and yet we are most grateful tonight for the very great leadership given in our community during the past few days by those who are not indifferent. Many were clergymen and many were black. Many said that the way to celebrate the life of Dr. Mar-

tin Luther King was in churches and many thousands of our citizens, black and white, went to church today to pray for the future of our country and to celebrate the life of a great man.

Many really do not realize to date why we enjoy peace and tranquility in our community today. It came because there was active leadership which asked that we have reverence for a great life committed to non-violence, committed to the highest aspirations of democracy.

And yet, every day we, in our various ways, have insulted people in our community—some white, some black. We talk tonight about many cases in which our staff members, members of local government, whom I know well, have testified to me in their sorrow, in their agony today, of case after case, such as the one staff member whose wife was about to be delivered of child. When a local doctor found that she was Negro and the child would be Negro, he refused service.

Another board member prominent in our local government, on the day of Dr. King's assassination, heard one of his employees tell of harassment by a local police officer who was astounded to find that a Negro worked in a particular office building along North Meridian Street, further astounded to find that a Negro public relations agency in fact leased the whole floor, and thought that the Negro thus found must surely be out of place. Another board member's wife was followed by police officers recently with lights out and was forced to the curb, forced to emerge from the car, and asked why she should be out and about in the normal pursuit of her life. When she identified herself, the police officers asked embarrassingly, "Have we harassed you?" These are prominent, local, negro officials. This is the type situation that many of us, who drove steadily by on North or South Meridian or West or East on U.S. 40, without the feeling of Good Samaritans, miss. We have looked neither to the right nor to the left. It is not so much that we have condoned hypocrisy or cruelty or harassment. We have been indifferent to it. We have known about it and have cared even less. In so many ways, an insensitive community has compounded its difficulty.

And this is the case from which we try to unravel and extricate ourselves at present. Because Dr. King preached non-violence, he said that the workings of American democracy would overcome these failings. And many believed him.

Many who have returned recently from Vietnam, who are black who are fully capable of using other means than those that Dr. King preached. And yet he said to them, "The American dream for which you fought is one in which everyone will have power to buy that which his money can buy. Freedom to move, freedom to exercise all of the liberties of our society."

This freedom does not exist in our society presently. Some of us have not gotten used to that fact, some of us have never believed it, but it is time we recognize that this is so. And it is time we recognize that it must be remedied. And it is time that we talked specifically about some of the areas in which we are going to have to make progress—and make it very rapidly. One of these areas we have talked about at an earlier meeting—that of employment. We have asked 2,000 of our citizens to step forward—and to come forward immediately—each to work in a man man relationship with a person who is unemployed, black or white. We have not yet found the 2,000 volunteers. They have not yet stepped forward. We have 400 persons in our community who had faith in the system, who signed up and asked to be helped and have not yet found a partner, a single individual, who would help them. We need to match up our employment situation tonight.

We need to work in the area of housing, low cost housing for those who have been dis-

placed by public projects which have benefitted the rest of us. Too many of us, in our haste to go to and from work, have said build the highways, build them anywhere, build them any way, on skyhooks if necessary, but get the job done. And we have moved expeditiously in the last few months to get the job done. But let us never forget that we have displaced and dislocated in the past few years in our community, hundreds of families. Some 450 of these families tonight need relocation within the next six months. As many of 400 need relocation within six months after that. These families are black and white, but let us remember that the black families involved bore the brunt of the attack earliest, and this is the major burden in our community presently and one which we must solve this year, because the houses will be torn down and the families will need shelter.

This is to say nothing about the other and most complex problem of the freedom of choice of housing. It is extremely important that in this community we deliver ourselves from the hypocrisy that every man may live wherever he wishes. Presently this is just not so. It is time that it was so. It is a problem not only for realtors, for those who deal in real estate for a living as apartment owners or as managers, it is also a problem of conscience for us all.

It is a problem that is very difficult for most of us to face as we see our returning Vietnam war veterans who say to us, "I went over there at a sacrifice. Not everyone has been called to this war." It is an interesting fact that 16% of the Staff Sergeants in the United States Army presently in Vietnam are Negroes, a very disproportionately high number. The sacrifice has fallen disproportionately high and American democracy has been defended against communism by young men who come back to our community and are saying, "You know it really cannot be this way." It cannot stay this way and we must say to them tonight, it will not stay this way.

We are committed to change. It can and will occur within the system and the fabric of democracy we enjoy here. In the field of education we have continually committed ourselves to equality of opportunity, but the fact is that we have rarely produced it.

Once again, we have not been the good Samaritans of biblical testimony. We have looked neither to the left nor to the right and have ignored the fact that many children come to our schools ill clad, or do not come at all in the winter because they lack coats and sometimes shoes. By only a vote of four to three, two or three years back, we determined that 8,000 children in our community, coming from families with incomes of \$2,000 or less, would be given at least one meal at school—breakfast—every day. And still there are those in the community who would argue that this debilitates the responsibility of parents. Where have we been in noticing that in some cases within the black community there are no parents in the home, no one to take up the load and the children are shifted back and forth as a responsibility that no one wants?

Now some of us are going to have to take up the load. Some of us are going to have to take the responsibility for an educational system in the United States of America which, in part, we inherit, as those who have been deprived come to Indianapolis. Ours is a system in which children in many all-Negro schools are achieving two to three grade levels behind, on the average, the composite mean of our city's educational level. That is they are reading two grade levels behind at the eighth grade level, three grade levels behind as they get into high school, and this is not good enough. It will call for expenditures of money. It will call for sensitive teaching. It will call for at least a school administration that recognizes the need for integrated teaching faculties even

If we cannot obtain integrated school populations.

This is something that will also call for teachers who are willing to accept reassignment, who are willing to commit themselves to the fact that an integrated society is better than a segregated one. Because, ladies and gentlemen, we find a very strange and perverse match-up between those in the white community who continually, in racist terms, espouse white supremacy in all of its subtle and not-so-subtle forms and those in the black community who are not only proud of their blackness, but now espouse its supremacy. Both of these exclusive societies have something very perverse and something very akin to each other, but this is not America, this is not Indianapolis, and we are committed to an integrated society in which color does not make a difference in terms of the enjoyment of life.

As the proverb says, "The beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord." Some of us have not been very much afraid, certainly not afraid of the Lord. Up to this time, not very much afraid of our own situation. But the fact is that we are responsible for what we do and the responsibility lies very heavily in terms of the education of our youth.

And finally I would say that a very heavy responsibility lies in the area of city government, one which I believe that all of us in city government are willing to bear in the area of police-community relationships. It is important that every police officer knows my stand and that of the City Council and of all those who are responsible for this Government who say that we are not going to condone harassment and that we are asking for sensitive, intelligent, compassionate leadership in the area of police enforcement. We want firm control in terms of law enforcement but we have an equal craving for justice. And it is extremely important that we get this point across, and that we enact it and that we do it promptly, and that everyone in this community has faith that this is going to occur.

I would say, furthermore, that we had better begin to admit that there are legitimate causes for doubt about our sincerity, and that there are any number of reasons why persons looking at the record, as some persons in the black community might look at the record tonight, to doubt that we are going to be successful. But I would say simply that Dr. King would not have been among them. To the very last, and in the march that was contemplated for yesterday, Dr. King clung to the position that a march could be held that was non-violent. He was distressed and dismayed by the march which led to violence in Memphis and led to a local injunction against a march planned for April 8, but he was determined to say that the American system of non-violence still works and he was determined to prove that this is so.

Now in my judgment, some of us who are white, who are presumably free to act and to choose and to do what we wish to do in this society, have not really been truly free to act. We have watched with dismay and with embarrassment billboards on our highways that said Dr. Martin Luther King was a communist, and this sheer rubbish has stood day after day and intimidated many of us because we were afraid to become involved. We were afraid of what our families would say. Of what our friends would say, of what our neighbors would say—we were afraid of isolation and, in fact, we were not truly very free at all. We were never free to act out what our consciences and our hearts stated was right and this today is the great victory of Dr. Martin Luther King.

In a very real sense not only did he have something to say to the black community, and he said it frequently and he said it well, but in my judgment he also had something equally as important and vital to say to the white community. He said it is time to act as

free men, free of prejudice, free of intimidation by one's friends and neighbors free because God has made us free.

God has given us a certain finite number of years to work out that freedom and we have a very great responsibility to do so, and to get about it rapidly. For Dr. King—his span was but for 39 years. His speech at the Lincoln Memorial was made at the age of 34 and his Montgomery boycott at the age of 26. He was a brilliant student who skipped grades, who obtained a Ph. D. at an abnormally young age. He was a man who lived a very full life in a very short time. He was a witness to the truth. He was a prophet in our time.

Last Sunday at Broadway Methodist Church I was asked to say the first words of tribute to Dr. King. It was a very difficult task because Dr. King had spoken the final words of the Battle Hymn of the Republic just before his death, and the assembled choir of 300 singing to a multitude of 2,000 gathered there at Broadway Methodist, sang the Battle Hymn of the Republic. I replied in response to that great hymn, and to that occasion, that Dr. Martin Luther King's death is one of those points in each of our lives in which each one of us will always be able to remember exactly what we were doing when it occurred. It was an essential turning point which some of us may now realize and which all of us will see in the life of our nation and in the life of our city. Word of it came to me as I attended a banquet for the Shortridge High School Basketball team—runnersup in the state of Indiana—and I had an opportunity to say a word about that death on that occasion. I chose not to. I knew that the meaning of the moment to those young men, who had done so well for their school, was more important if expressed in affirmative terms. I reminded them that just three weeks ago last Sunday we rode in the sunshine on a fire engine down North Meridian Street. My children and I were on the engine and so were the co-captains of the team and all the team members. Thousands of persons, black and white, stopped, some in dismay, most in joy, but all with love in their hearts, and they waved and they showed their gratitude and the great reservoir of love which is in our community.

Ladies and Gentlemen, there are easier ways to make a living than being Mayor of Indianapolis. But, so long as I am Mayor, we are going to prove that the Constitution of the United States and the Judeo-Christian tradition offer a context in which we can live and progress and in which we shall prove that Indianapolis is a model city for the world to emulate. We are going to improve human relations, and we are going to prove that human rights come first. We have many powers to do so. We are going to exercise them and we are going to say to all who will hear, to all who have despair in their hearts tonight, to all who feel that a gap has not been filled, that the life and witness and example of Dr. King have filled a great void in our consciousness and in our spirit, that we are stronger because he lived; that we believed him; that we are going to witness our belief.

Finally each of us, in his own way, whether it be as Mayor, as City Council Member, as policeman, as civic servant, as a booster for Indianapolis, as a person with love and compassion in his heart, will do all he can to reach out in the next few days and in the next few months to make certain that we have a vigorous and dynamic change of attitude.

There is great love in this City. There is love for democracy, there is love for every man, there is love for all that we have ahead of us. I pray that we will remember the words of Dr. Martin Luther King and that his example will truly have made all of us free at last!

Thank you, and goodnight.

#### PROPOSED CENSUS REFORM

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

**MR. BETTS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

**MR. BETTS.** Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset I have no intention of taking very much time myself. I secured this special order because a number of Members who had introduced census reform bills, so to speak, similar or identical to the one I introduced had indicated that they would desire an opportunity to express themselves on the floor of the House.

Just for the record and before some of these Members do express their views on this subject, I would like to say that the bill, H.R. 10952, which I introduced in June of 1967 was introduced for two reasons.

In the first place, in my opinion there is only really one constitutional reason for a census and that is to secure a head count of people for the purposes of congressional reapportionment—in other words, to determine congressional districting.

In the second place, it appears over the years that the operations of the Census Bureau have expanded to the extent that in 1970 we are probably faced with the matter of getting answers to around 120 questions and in back of it all is a statute which provides that in the case any person fails to respond or answer to any of those questions, he is subject to a fine of \$100 and imprisonment for 60 days.

Frankly, those are the two reasons that motivated my introduction of the bill—plus the fact that some of my constituents had indicated to me that there was the element of harassment to a certain extent.

Since the bill was introduced it appears that the issues have expanded beyond what was my original intention to deal with. In other words, in the development of the subject before the committee and in various publications throughout the country, it has been indicated that there is also a constitutional question—the right to privacy which it involves.

There is also the question of the data bank and various other aspects—whether or not private enterprise could do some of this much better than a government bureau, the Census Bureau can do it.

It goes back in a sense to the distinction that I made in the bill, H.R. 10952, between compulsory and voluntary answering of questions. In other words, under the bill that I introduced, I selected seven questions which I thought were directly within the constitutional intention of the census, and that is the head count—and the existing penalty of \$100 and 60 days in prison would apply so far as those seven questions are concerned.

In other words, these seven questions would remain compulsory and subject to the present penalty.

The rest of the questions—however many there are—100 or 120 questions—would be asked by the Census Bureau on a voluntary basis.

I am going to be frank about this. This opens up the question of whether or not the information which the Census Bureau desires could be secured on a voluntary basis rather than compulsory. The research that I have put into this in my office, indicates that certainly you could get as high a percentage of coverage and accuracy through voluntary solicitation of questions as you could through compulsory solicitation of questions.

These are some of the issues which originally arose and some of the collateral matters.

Mr. Speaker, my reasons for introducing H.R. 10952 and urging census reform today are discussed in detail in two statements I wish to include at this point. The first is the full text of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on October 24, 1967, when H.R. 10952 and related bills designed to remove the mandatory provision from all but seven essential population questions. The second is a summary of some of the findings I have made on a major pretest of the 1970 decennial census taken in New Haven, Conn., last year. These two statements illustrate the real need for congressional action before the adjournment of the 90th Congress. They follow:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACKSON E. BETTS OF OHIO BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND STATISTICS, COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1967

Mr. Chairman: When I appeared before this distinguished committee in June, I presented several reasons for urging a change in 1970 census plans. I hold the view that the constitutional intent of the census—that of counting the people to determine congressional districting—is not being followed, particularly with the extensive, mandatory questions now included on census forms. Because many of the questions asked in a decennial census are of a very personal nature, I contend this violates the privacy of our citizens and in most instances for no public purpose. I believe Congress should take an active role in determining what types of personal information will be sought from the American people. For that reason I introduced H.R. 10952 as a means to focus attention on this important subject.

Let me also on this occasion make clear several possible misconceptions as to my interest in the census. First, I am not against providing adequate information for the federal government. I do not oppose the Bureau of the Census or plans to conduct a mid-decade census for I respect the competence of the Census Bureau and voted for establishing a mid-decade census. Finally, I am not fighting to weaken census plans and procedures; on the contrary, I want to streamline the 1970 census forms so the maximum number of persons will participate in providing accurate data on themselves and their households.

The crux of the issue we consider today is embodied in H.R. 10952. My bill will keep the mandatory provision under which the

census has been conducted for many years. However, citizens would be required to answer questions on only seven subjects: Name and address; relationship to head of household; sex; date of birth; race or color; marital status; and visitors in home at the time of census.

H.R. 10952 removes the penalty provision for any additional questions the Director of the Census wishes to present on a second voluntary portion of the questionnaire. This is a simple, workable approach, it seems to me.

I have submitted to the committee a statement on the feasibility of this mandatory-voluntary plan. This statement shows that the Census Bureau itself already receives a high level of cooperation from citizens in its many periodic surveys and samplings which are voluntary. A study of the fifty State statistical gathering programs revealed that in only two States was population information sought under penalty of fine or imprisonment for non-compliance. The States engage in considerable data collection and have found no need for compulsion to secure satisfactory results. Inquiries were mailed to major private market research organizations in the United States. Private companies, of course, must rely on the voluntary cooperation of the public for the success of their survey work. Presidents of these commercial organizations were nearly unanimous in their support for the voluntary approach to securing information from the public.

As we ponder the problems the Census Bureau will face in conducting the 1970 census of 205 million Americans, I would advance three additional reasons for limiting the mandatory questions and designating any other inquiries as important but not subject to punishment if not completed.

1. In 1970 some 60-65% of the people will receive their census forms by mail. *The Toledo Blade* of Toledo, Ohio, in an editorial on October 13, 1967, made this pertinent analysis:

"Of course, Americans have been accustomed to mandatory questions in the past federal censuses. But an important difference in the 1970 one is that it will be conducted mostly by mail. Without the subtle pressure of the personal interview by the door-to-door census-taker of the past, many citizens may indeed just fail to send the 1970 form back to the census bureau daring it to come find them and haul them into court.

"Chances are that it will get more cooperation—and therefore more reliable information on all those personal matters if, for a change, it asks rather than tells people to answer the questions."

Mr. Chairman, public cooperation will play an exceedingly important part in the success of this mail-out census. I can see every advantage to *asking* rather than *demanding* people to answer the questions.

2. The element of distortion becomes more vivid when people complete the census questionnaire without an enumerator present and return it to census officials by mail. Some market research experts caution against compulsion for all questions as a negative reaction may result in considerable false or erroneous information being provided by citizens.

3. The necessity for a complete count and Congress' interest in keeping census costs to a reasonable level is another reason for adopting the type of census questionnaire I propose. A short, simple form will get maximum results completely and promptly. This will require a limited number of interviewers to make household visitations or telephone for further details.

These are some of the reasons for my requesting favorable consideration of H.R. 10952 by this committee. I want to underscore the point that this is simply a vehicle for examining other possible approaches which might solve the objections to present 1970 census plans as I see them. In the four

months since I met with you, the interest in the census, its questions and mandatory features has far exceeded my expectations. Let me reflect on the areas of major concern which have been brought to my attention from people in nearly every state in the Nation.

1. You are familiar with the privacy issue. Questions like these taken from the New Haven pretest are of most concern:

(If a woman) How many babies has she ever had, not counting stillbirths?

Have you been married more than once?

Did your first marriage end because of death of wife or husband?

Where did you live in April, 1962?

What was your major activity in April, 1962?

Place of birth of parents?

What is the value of this (your) property?

What is your rent?

Last year, 1966, what did sales of crops, livestock and farm products amount to?

Did you work at any time last week?

These and other proposed subjects are private matters and should not be part of a survey, particularly a national census.

2. The threat of a \$100 fine and 60 days in jail is considered both an insult and an intimidation by many Americans. Since this penalty is more of an harassment than a method of actual enforcement, I see no reason for maintaining it for the entire census questionnaire.

3. We all recognize that the first requirement of a census is to find every person. The long, complex form, many non-essential questions and several very personal inquiries will discourage maximum cooperation. The mail-out method is new and can have some operational problems without being burdened with confusion and hostility by many citizens. The success of the 1970 census depends on early and accurate returns. Why gamble that success to get facts on some extraneous questions?

Mr. Chairman: There is little doubt in my mind that if present 1970 census plans are executed, the results can be chaotic. I do not make this assertion without having made a careful analysis of reports on the 1960 census and proposals advanced by the Census Bureau for 1970. Let me compare these two national censuses.

In 1960 the census of population and housing was conducted completely by interview which required the hiring of 160,000 enumerators to visit the households of 179 million residents of the United States. According to official reports of the Census Bureau, the 1960 census failed to count 5,702,000 persons, or 3.1% of the population. This compares with 5,675,000 population undercount in 1950, or a 3.6% undercount. An official of the Census Bureau, Jacob S. Siegel, has reached these conclusions regarding the 1960 census:

"The 1960 census failed to count a substantial portion of the nonwhite population in the United States. It is clear that a disproportionate share of the omissions occurred in large cities. A highly conjectural inference may be made that the enumeration of Puerto Ricans and other population groups concentrated in the deteriorated sections of our large cities was also rather defective.

"It is quite probable that serious distortion does occur in the figures for many smaller geographic units within the country, particularly units in cities (such as census tracts, congressional districts, and enumeration districts) where Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other relatively poor minority groups are concentrated."

Let us look now to 1970 census plans. The Census Bureau has concluded that a mail-out, mail-back procedure will be used in the major metropolitan areas, which include 60 to 65% of the total population of the United States. The use of the postal system to deliver census forms will result in cutting

the number of enumerators from the 160,000 in 1960 to 125,000 in 1970, even though the number of people to be counted will rise from approximately 180 million to 205 million. The use of data processing equipment has resulted in some changes in the form in that respondents are filling in dotted lines to expedite automatic tabulation. The number of questions in the 100% census has increased from 17 to 21 subjects; the 20% sample questionnaire affecting some 16 million households, now has as many as 67 subjects rather than 56 subjects in 1960. The 1970 questionnaires are all to be delivered in a one or two-day period, maximizing promotional efforts, but will spread thin the personal attention which can be given city dwellers receiving the mail type questionnaire.

What conclusions do these facts lead to? It certainly requires a basic education for inner-city families to successfully complete the census without the help of an enumerator. I asked the Education and Welfare Division of the Library of Congress what educational level they would estimate necessary to complete the long-form questionnaire used in both New Haven and North Philadelphia. Mr. Francis Crowley of the Legislative Reference Service, after consulting an expert in the field, reported to me that few people with less than a tenth grade education could complete the form. Mr. Ellsworth Tompkins, Executive Secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, responding to the same question indicated that at least an eighth grade education would be needed to understand most parts of the questionnaire. There were an estimated 17 million adults over age 25 in 1960 with only an eighth grade education. How are the inner-city poor, Negroes and Puerto Ricans going to be counted if they can't fill out and return the census form?

I think the length and complexity of the 1970 form for the 20% sample questionnaire is self-evident to anyone who has tried to complete it. No one who has attempted this task has been able to fill out the form completely in under thirty minutes. Thirty minutes of interest and concentration is a lot for many people, especially those who have difficulty with reading. Add sensitive, personal questions or inquiries which will take research such as the value of your property or amounts of income, and you further jeopardize maximum participation.

Mr. Chairman, if millions of citizens are uncounted in 1970, think what effect this will have on congressional districting, state legislative apportionment, allotments of billions of dollars in federal grant-in-aid programs to states and cities and the power minority groups are calling for today. The dubious validity of the count will be minor compared with the tremendous impact it will have politically and economically.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this committee again today. My study of the census, the public concern for the questions to be included in 1970 and the real possibility of a major undercount leads me to ask your consideration for receiving additional information on limiting mandatory census questions at a later date. When the committee conducts a further hearing on the actual questions for 1970, I think you will find great interest and concern over many of these items. After your deliberations, I hope you will consider the responsibilities of every member of the House to decide the important issues of the day. The census which affects every citizen is such an issue. The 1970 census questions, framed in the form of H.R. 10952 or by adopting another approach, should be brought to the full House where debate and a vote will establish our national census policy.

COMPLETENESS OF COVERAGE OF THE NONWHITE POPULATION IN THE 1960 CENSUS AND CURRENT ESTIMATES, AND SOME IMPLICATIONS

(By Jacob S. Siegel, U.S. Bureau of the Census)

COMPLETENESS OF THE 1960 CENSUS COUNTS FOR NONWHITES

*Principal findings*

I turn now to consideration of our principal findings relating to coverage of the nonwhite population in the 1960 Census and, to a more limited degree, in the 1950 Census. By comparison with coverage for whites, coverage of nonwhites in these censuses was particularly deficient. Our studies suggest that the 1960 Census counted about 98 percent of the resident white population but only about 90½ percent of the resident nonwhite population (table 1). (See tables 1-13, p. 149.) In 1950 the general picture was about the same, but a small gain in coverage between 1950 and 1960 is implied: 97½ percent of the white population and 88½ percent of the nonwhite population were enumerated then. Of the estimated total net underenumeration of 5.7 million persons in the 1960 Census, 2.1 million or 38 percent was nonwhite. The amount of underenumeration was about the same in the 1950 Census: an estimated total net underenumeration of 5.7 million of which 2.1 million was nonwhite.

Very substantial improvement was achieved in the enumeration of nonwhite children between 1950 and 1960 (table 2). The undercount rate for children under 5 dropped from 9.5 percent in 1950 to 7.1 percent in 1960; the rate in 1940 was 15.2 percent. The rate for children 5-14 dropped from 8.4 percent in 1950 to 5.0 percent in 1960, and the rate for teenagers 15-19 declined from 13.0 percent to 11.3 percent. Improvement in coverage did not appear to characterize young adults 20 to 39 years. In 1960 this group had an estimated net undercount of about 12.5 percent, whereas in 1950 the estimate for this group was 10.8 percent.

Our studies indicate a substantially greater underenumeration of males than of females among nonwhites. The figures show an 11 percent underenumeration rate for males and an 8 percent underenumeration rate for females in 1960. Four males were missed for every three females. In 1950 also, the rate of underenumeration for males was substantially higher than for females (13 percent and 10 percent, respectively). The net undercount of young adult males 20 to 39 years of age was especially high in 1960; about 17 percent, or 1 out of every 6 men, in this age range was omitted. The corresponding rate for women was less than half as great: 7.6 percent, or 1 out of every 13 women in this range was omitted. There appears to be an irregular decline in the undercount rate of men, and an irregular rise in the undercount rate of women, above age 40. As a result, from age group 50-54, the rate for women exceeds that of men. The rates are subject to greater and greater error

as one goes up the age scale, however, so that little credence can be placed in the level of the estimates for the group 65 and over.

An analysis in terms of sex ratios (males per 100 females) is independent of the absolute level of the percents of net undercount. A comparison of estimated "actual" sex ratios calculated independently of the census, and the "enumerated" ratios, for 1960 indicates that the "enumerated" ratios are lower than expected at all ages below 50 for nonwhites, especially at ages 20 to 49 (table 3). At ages above 55 the "enumerated" ratios are higher than expected. The comparison of sex ratios suggests an overall omission of 3 men for every 100 women enumerated. These findings indicate that whatever the extent of omission of nonwhite women may be, there is little question that nonwhite men are missed in relatively greater numbers.

There is evidence from the reinterview studies of 1960 of poorer enumeration of housing units in very large cities and in rural areas than in small and moderate-size cities and in suburbs. No specific evidence from these studies is available by race relating to city-size variations in coverage, whether of housing units or of persons in enumerated housing units; so we cannot say definitely whether the Negroes in the very large cities are more or less completely counted than Negroes in small or moderate-size cities or rural areas. There is a basis for suggesting that Negroes are counted most poorly in the very large cities in the fact that in 1960 enumeration in urban slums was more difficult and took longer than in other urban segments and in rural areas. The Pritzker-Rothwell paper offers some valuable conjectures regarding the locus of underenumeration.

**CONCLUSION**

The 1960 Census failed to count a substantial portion of the nonwhite population in the United States. It is clear that a disproportionate share of the omissions consisted of young adult males, and it is probable that a disproportionate share occurred in large cities. A highly conjectural inference may be made that the enumeration of Puerto Ricans and other population groups concentrated in the deteriorated sections of our large cities was also rather defective. The failure of the census to count the population more completely has a pervasive effect on the statistical programs of government and industry. Current estimates and many types of derived data and measures are affected. It has been shown that in many respects the counts and estimates of national population, by age, sex, and color, do not seriously distort the picture of the demographic situation in the United States as a whole. It is quite probable, however, that serious distortion does occur in the figures for many smaller geographic units within the country, particularly units in cities (such as census tracts, congressional districts, and enumeration districts) where Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other relatively poor minority groups are concentrated.

[Numbers in thousands. Figures for 1967 include Armed Forces overseas; figures for 1960 and 1950 relate to the total resident population. Base of percents is corrected population]

Color, sex, and year	Current estimates or census counts	Corrected population	Net understatement	
			Amount	Percent
1967				
All classes.....	198,467	204,169	5,702	2.8
Nonwhite, total.....	23,913	26,055	2,142	8.2
Male.....	(11,618)	(12,834)	(1,216)	9.5
Female.....	(12,295)	(13,221)	(926)	7.0
White, total.....	174,554	178,114	3,560	2.0
Male.....	(86,016)	(88,289)	(2,273)	2.6
Female.....	(88,538)	(89,825)	(1,287)	1.4
1960				
All classes.....	179,323	185,025	5,720	3.1

[Numbers in thousands. Figures for 1967 include Armed Forces overseas; figures for 1960 and 1950 relate to the total resident population. Base of percents is corrected population]—Cont.

Color, sex, and year	Current estimates or census counts	Corrected population	Net understatement	
			Amount	Percent
1960				
Nonwhite, total	20,491	22,633	2,142	9.5
Male	(9,964)	(11,180)	(1,216)	10.9
Female	(10,527)	(11,453)	(926)	8.1
White, total	158,832	162,392	3,560	2.2
Male	(78,367)	(80,640)	(2,273)	2.8
Female	(80,465)	(81,752)	(1,287)	1.6
1950 <sup>2</sup>				
All classes	151,327	157,001	5,675	3.6
Nonwhite, total	16,177	18,274	2,097	11.5
Male	(7,932)	(9,122)	(1,190)	13.0
Female	(8,245)	(9,152)	(907)	9.9
White, total	135,150	138,728	3,578	2.6
Male	(67,255)	(69,407)	(2,152)	3.1
Female	(67,895)	(69,321)	(1,426)	2.1

<sup>1</sup> The figures for 1960 and 1950 based on the total population including Armed Forces overseas are 10.8 and 12.8 percent, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Figures relate to 50 States.

CENSUS PRETEST IN NEW HAVEN, 1970  
(Statement by JACKSON E. BETTS, Eighth  
District of Ohio)

In the growing discussion over a proper 1970 census policy, particularly as to whether the questions meet public acceptance and will result in a successful count of each person in the United States, I believe a sample of the reaction from the New Haven, Connecticut, pretest will be a useful indicator. The Census Bureau conducted a test of mailing techniques to be used in the decennial census in the New Haven area in April, 1967. This pretest was similar to those in other cities but illustrated a gradual decline in response to the long-form (120 item) questionnaire. Before referring to letters I have received from New Haven residents about the complicated form containing many overly personal questions, let me review the actual per cent return of this long-form in pretest cities:

	Percent
1964: Louisville	84
1965: Cleveland	75
1967: New Haven	72
1967: North Philadelphia (approximate)	140

<sup>1</sup> According to a figure presented at a Hearing, House Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, October 24, 1967.

Here is the New Haven experience. This is a letter written by an attorney—who is irate:

"I have just spent one hour and fifteen minutes filling out the above-captioned special census form consisting of 20 pages. I resent losing the amount of time it required me to fill out this form as I place a high value on my time. In checking with my (legal) colleagues, it seems that the amount of time it took me to fill out the form is average.

"I also do not like the personal nature of many of the questions contained in this form and consider it an invasion of privacy. I don't think it is any of the Census Bureau's business how much income I grossed in 1966, how much I netted and the amount of income that I received from interest on savings accounts and stock dividends. This is the Internal Revenue Service's business. There are many other personal questions on the form which I object to but will not go into due to the length of time it would require me to record them.

"I realize the value to our government of a Federal census every ten years, and I am wholeheartedly in favor of a census being taken every ten years and have always cooperated in filling out the census form. It would seem to me that the only questions that the Census Bureau would need to have on a form would be the name, address and birthdate of occupants of a residence and possibly color or race and marital status.

"If you have not had the opportunity to check this special census form, I request that you do so. I feel certain that you will agree that many of the questions are of a highly personal nature and that most of the questions are not related to a census and are only going to be fed into some computer so the government may tell the nation how many homes have baths and piped water, how many radios and automobiles, etc., the American people own.

"I think Congress ought to take steps to stop this government prying into the lives of citizens of this country."

The compulsory nature of the decennial census (\$100 fine or 60 days in jail, or both, for not answering *all* questions) irritates many persons. In several cases I have found if requested and not threatened with penalties for non-compliance, persons would volunteer such information. This response explains many people's viewpoint:

"If all American citizens were criminals, their intimate affairs should be recorded and made public."

"But, since we live in a free society, our personal affairs, if made public, would lead to many abuses such as exploitation and even criminal abuse."

"This is nothing new to your studies, but is a protest against a census which would lead to no privacy."

Taken another way, the necessity for each question and length of the form can be most bothersome and harassing. There are 17 million Americans over 25 years of age without an eighth grade education, the minimum needed to complete the census form as now prepared. One person summarizes his opposition to the present census as follows:

1. Invasion of privacy of the individual. I do not mind filling out a form and giving NECESSARY information for the taking of a census, but I most certainly do feel that the information required on the new long form goes way beyond census-taking. In this day and age when the internal revenue service has all kinds of information on file concerning the individual's income and dependency information, it certainly is redundant to ask this same information on a census form. Many of the other questions I also consider to be too personal and out of place on this type of questionnaire.

2. The time it takes to prepare this form for return to the census people. At our house this form was worked on during three evenings. Some information had to be looked up in our records, some questions had to be thought about in order to arrive at the correct answer, and it just plain took a lot of time to go through the whole form. I suppose I am particularly against the filling out of so many government forms due to the multitude of business tax forms we are required to fill out and for which I am personally

responsible. I doubt that a good many people in this country, who may have a limited education, or who may have a language barrier, could even fill out such a form, at least in a way in which the data would be meaningful.

The New Haven Chamber of Commerce has carefully studied this issue and advised me on April 3, 1968, their Board of Directors formally adopted this resolution:

"The right to privacy of individuals and business groups is endangered by the form and content of census questionnaires which require answers to many personal questions not necessary for the function of government.

"We believe census answers required under penalty of law should be limited to essential information such as: name, address, relationship to head of household, sex, date of birth, race, marital status, and visitors in home at time of census.

"The answering of other census questions should be on a voluntary basis and should not be correlated with social security numbers or similar personal identification factors."

Faculty members at Yale University, housewives, businessmen and others have advised me of their displeasure with the New Haven pretest. I had hoped this would have bestirred the Census Bureau to re-evaluate plans for 1970. Regrettably, this has not been the case.

I have raised many objections to these census plans myself and 23 of my colleagues in the House are co-sponsors of H.R. 10952. Senators Lausche, Scott and Thurmond have introduced similar legislation in the United States Senate. My bill removes the penalty provision for all but seven essential questions about population. It is a realistic solution to what is now a dilemma in public policy but by April, 1970, if not altered, spells chaos. Let me conclude with the sincere position of one New Haven housewife:

"I did not answer these questions in the sample survey carried out in New Haven earlier this year, for I considered the questions a complete invasion of my privacy. However, there is no way I will be able to refuse if the bill which is supported by the Bureau of the Census is passed and a fine levied on citizens refusing to answer."

"Please do all you can to restrict the questions put on the form. The census started out as a means for reapportioning the House. That is how I would like to have it in the future. I don't want any information about me filed in a computer store somewhere to be used as some census bureau official might want."

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

Mr. BETTS. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Montana first, and I now yield to him.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate him on his efforts in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. Based upon the work he has done, and as a result of that and the emphasis that has gone into other fields, I became interested not only in the general census but also in the one pertaining to agriculture, the agricultural census.

THE CENSUS: THE DOOR IS OPEN  
Mr. Speaker, in February, I brought to the attention of the House a "farm problem" which has important implications for every individual in the United States though he may never have left the confines of an urban neighborhood.

The problem is a growing invasion of individual freedom by governmental snoops—primarily in the name of the census. At that time I warned that while the invasion has gone the farthest in agriculture, the principles being violated are fundamental to the freedom of every individual in the Nation. Today I renew the warning with increased emphasis and, with an increased sense of urgency, I call upon my fellow Members of Congress to join with those of us who are already working on the problem to act now to save individual freedom from being buried under the shifting sands of a bureaucracy that knows all and controls all.

There are presently over 2,900,000,000 records in dusty Government cabinets filed by individual name. At the moment, there is some protection from those who would improperly use this information against the individual due to the sheer bulk of the information. With modern computer techniques, however, this protection is quickly becoming a thing of the past. The use of a common linkage unit such as an individual's social security number would make possible a yearly surveillance of a citizen's every move, his occupation, his income, his residence, his voting behavior, his religious preference—literally his every thought, word, and deed.

"Big Brother" will begin his surveillance not in 1984 but on January 1, 1975. Unless we act now, for the Nation's farmers and ranchers, "Big Brother" will begin to watch in January 1970. However, before I take up the future, let us consider what is happening right now.

Right now, throughout the country, businessmen are burdened with the extra bookkeeping, the extra accounting, the extra paperwork it takes to complete the required forms of the census of business or the economic census as it is sometimes known. There is not just one general form. There are approximately 150 forms each tailor-made for an individual type of business. The forms are long, tedious, and burdensome. The information asked is not always readily accessible and sometimes is confidential. Many corporations have had to put off annual stockholder meetings from January until March simply because of governmental paperwork. Listen to the comments of some of my constituents:

From Rex F. Hibbs, Billings, Mont.:

I have just completed the preparation of the peculiar 1967 economic census form which is prepared for answering by most offices. Our accountant tells us that equally insane and foolish forms have been submitted to other businesses which he represents.

These forms and their answers can serve no useful purpose. They provide a vehicle for the employment of a lot of no-good help that can't possibly make a living any other way. They enable the bureaucrats to pry into the affairs of the private citizen, whom the bureaucrats obviously deeply envy, and whose courage in facing world affairs the bureaucrats cannot emulate.

You will remember, Jim, that the Government has made assurances that income tax returns were confidential. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no report made to the Government that is not available to some other department of Govern-

ment. Assurances made to the citizenry have no bearing on the question of availability. The only question is whether or not there is an exigency which is of sufficient importance to abandon the promises made to the citizen. Again, some impractical bureaucrat is to decide that fact.

I have a ranch client. His neighbor wants to buy his ranch. The neighbor's wife is a census taker. The fact they most want to know is the indebtedness against his ranch. If he doesn't answer, he goes to jail. If he does answer, he loses his ranch.

From Harold Brosz, a contractor:

We hope you will continue to oppose the overwhelming paper blizzard our government and others are piling on us employers.

Enclosed is an example of an annual report which required two full days of an employee to prepare. We believe the details are far too much to expect us to continue furnishing these reports gratuitously.

If the details requested were always in the form that our records are kept it would not be so severe, but to breakdown and analyze a total year's transactions in order to obtain the required detail is just too much for us to bear.

From Verlon Cox, an equipment wholesaler:

The time required to search out or guess at some of the seemingly unneeded, irrelevant information is just another needless burden on the American Businessman.

The pertinent information for such a census is already available through the Department of Internal Revenue from tax returns, and I am sure the costs of obtaining it would be only a fraction of the cost of the present methods and I would venture, much more accurate.

From Jerome Anderson, a lawyer:

If the U.S. Government continues to plague the legal fraternity with the amount, number and kinds of reports, etc. that we are required to make every year, we are simply going to have to hire one secretary for the sole purpose of answering governmental inquiries.

From Ben Hurlbut, an engineer:

This appears to be a new activity of the Bureau of the Census and I feel that some of the information requested is personal and in my opinion does not fall within the activities of the Bureau.

To Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Brosz, Mr. Cox, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Hurlbut, and the hundreds of thousands of people similarly situated—I am sorry to report, this is just the beginning.

The census of population and housing, of course, is going to affect everyone. If all goes as planned, by the Bureau, more questions than ever will be asked. Among the proposed subjects are questions relating to residential movements, occupation and employer, education, marital status, income, fertility, and nationality of origin. Action by Members of Congress has been for the present resultant in withdrawal of a question on religious preference and the use of the social security number in this census, but unnecessary and personal questions still remain. Here again, to the hundreds of people who have expressed their concern to me, to the thousands that have become aware of the danger, to the entire Nation that is threatened, I can only say—this is just the beginning.

Now let us look at the present state of the census of agriculture. The final form for the 1969 Census will be established about March next year. They will go to

the printer in July or August. The forms are expected to be just about the same as they were in 1964. There are some changes in procedure. A mail-out form will be used despite the fact Dr. Eckler testified in hearings May of 1967 that mail-out procedures were not practical for rural areas. A letter on March 26 of this year informed me that the smaller farms would not have long forms to fill out but that it had not been decided what small farms were. Well, by the next day, March 27, someone had decided a small farm included 1.3 million or 42 percent of the farmers. Actually the decision was made last fall that a small farm was one with gross value of sales of less than \$2,500. That is less than 4 percent of the Nation's farms. Now I do not know what they are calling a small farm, and I do not think they do either.

So let us look at what they are actually asking the Nation's farmers. There will be numerous questions on land ownership and rentals. For instance, if land is rented, the landlord's name and address is asked, how many acres are rented, how much is paid, if the farmer or rancher is a sharecropper, what share of the crops or livestock he gets. If land is rented to someone, his name and address is asked and how many acres are rented him. For each type of crop raised, there will be questions on how much was harvested, how many acres were fertilized, how many tons of liquid fertilizer were used and how many tons of dry fertilizer were used.

The farmer-rancher is asked how he uses his other land: How much is pasture; how much for building; how much for woodland; how much is idle; and how much cropland was there on which crops failed. He is asked what forest products he might have.

There will be questions on livestock and whether it is used for breeding or is for sale. One of the most insidious questions asks whether he has any contract, agreement or understanding with a processor or cooperative to produce any farm products. The answer cannot be confined to yes or no. The census will also ask which products are involved, the name and address of persons with whom the farmer has the agreement and even how much money will be received under the agreement.

One question asks what machines are on the place. It is followed by one asking the value of all machinery and equipment usually kept on the farm and used for farm business. There are more questions on how much is spent for chemicals, how much hired workers did farmwork, and how much was spent for farm labor.

The finances of the farmer-rancher are investigated: What were his expenses? How much of that was for livestock; for feed; for fertilizer; for seed; for gas and oil; for labor and for machine hire and custom work? How much did he receive for all his agricultural products? How much did the farmer-rancher receive: From the Government; for custom work and other agricultural services; for recreational services?

One very interesting question proposed—remember the letter I read from Rex Hibbs? Wait until he sees this—

"About how much would the land and buildings sell for?"

Finally, there are six questions about the person who makes the day-to-day decisions about work on the farm; how long he operated the farm; who he is and his relationship to the owner; does he live on the farm; how old is he; what is his race; and how many days did he work on the farm?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the Members of Congress look at form ATF-4B which is a pretest used by the Bureau of the Census this January. This is an example of the general form which up to 96 percent of the Nation's farmers and ranchers will have to fill out.

This 1969 Census of Agriculture will embody the same faults of the economic census businessmen are presently filling out and the proposed census of the population. The faults in the farm census, however, are magnified. They are not just the problem of today's agriculture census. They show what the business and population censuses will be like.

The first problem is the length of the questions and the detail they ask. To answer all these questions accurately and within the letter of the law would take an accountant and a land surveyor.

I would like to share with you the actual answers of one harried rancher out in the "Big Sky Country" where ranches are large and the work is demanding even without the breath of the Government down a man's back. These are the actual answers to questions asked on the 1964 Census of Agriculture. They are the answers of a man who was honest, but did not like what the Government was asking and could not afford to hire a surveyor and bookkeeper to do it any other way.

Question No. 3: How many acres do you own?

Answer: This question cannot be answered correctly. Supposedly I own somewhere in the general area of 1300 acres. Most of this land has never been properly surveyed and subdivided into quarter sections. Some of it lies on steep hillsides and therefore has probably more land in a section that was surveyed by section. I am not absolutely sure that I do own this land because I have been told by the ASC office workers that I merely own the right to live upon and use the land.

Question No. 44: How many acres and tons of silage crops were harvested and how much was to be sold?

Answer: I have never measured this acreage and I have never figured the tons but I had enough hay to feed my cows.

Question No. 233: How many acres were in house lots, barn lots, lands, roads, ditches and wastelands?

Answer: Even the county surveyors have not been able to answer this.

Question No. 234: Of the total land in this place (reported in question No. 233), how many acres were irrigated this year?

Answer: Last year I had very good water and I normally can irrigate about three acres a day. I started irrigating May 15th and continued until mid-June, however, at the latter part of the irrigating season the water went down and I probably did not get more than one-half acre a day.

Question No. 266: The number of sheep and facts about them.

By this time, this rancher's patience was wearing thin but he still had his sense of humor:

Answer: There may not be any sheep on this place. I have neighbor who runs several bands of sheep, and they have trespassed on me many times. The last band of sheep trespassing on my property was approximately 800 head. I told the owner that if he ever trespassed again I would impound the sheep and let the law take its due course. It is possible that sheep are out there now for I have been too busy making this report to go and see. Normally I raise no sheep.

Question No. 333 parts 9 and 10 asked the amount of welfare payments, veteran's payments, unemployment compensation, social security payments, etc. being paid to the residents of the farm.

Answer: I do not consider this anyone's business whatsoever nor can I see how it can help anyone.

Question No. 353: About how much would the land and buildings sell for?

Answer: The only way one could get an accurate evaluation of my land and buildings would be to see our County tax assessor.

This rancher had no debts and so did not have to answer question 354:

Are there any debts represented by real estate mortgages, deeds of trust, land purchase contracts on land and buildings owned by you, your wife or partners? If "Yes," for b (borrowed from other than Federal government), how much is the total unpaid principal now owed on these debts?

Now, I would not recommend that farmers and ranchers answer these questions in this manner, but it is not surprising that great errors are made in farm forecasting when the predictions are based on questions that cannot be answered accurately.

The problem is not just the length. May 23, 1967, in a statement submitted to the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, it was admitted the Bureau would not dare ask individuals how much welfare they were receiving. I submit, they are asking this and other questions now of the farmers and ranchers and they will be asking everyone these questions and more by 1975 if the mid-decade census which passed the House last August—which, I might add, I voted for—is passed this year by the Senate. Surely, these personal and invasive questions will be on the 1980 census. But it is not just the ever-increasing number of questions being asked. It is the possibility of greater use of information so gained to curb freedom that is the ultimate danger to us all.

You will recall, I said that Dr. Eckler had testified in 1967 that it was not practical to take a mail-out, mail-back census in rural areas. Well, it is practical now. Why? Because the farmers and ranchers are going to be asked their social security numbers. Dr. Eckler wrote me this spring, discussing the new methods of the Bureau of the Census, and said,

The lists of farmers to whom questionnaires will be mailed is to be taken largely from the records of the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration. In addition, to assure complete coverage, lists will be taken from the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and from the 1964 Census of Agriculture. Except for the last source, these lists already include the Social Security numbers of the farmers. The lists of large employers of farm labor include the Employer's Identification number (EIN). To avoid sending two or more questionnaires to any farmer, it is necessary to eliminate duplicates from the list, and this is done by searching the combined lists for

duplicate Social Security numbers or EIN numbers. To make sure that all large farms included in the 1964 Census are included also in 1969, we plan to ask them for their Social Security or EIN numbers in advance of the census, and then to see to it that each such farm receives only one questionnaire.

This motive, to remove duplicates, is a valid one. Indeed, I am sure Dr. Eckler is an honest, sincere, and dedicated public servant. He has written me:

Our use of the number is therefore a limited one strictly for avoiding duplicate inquiries and unnecessary burden on the farm respondents.

I believe also, however, that Dr. Eckler and all those who would accept his decision without question, without investigation, fail to realize that what might be a proper use today can easily be subverted into an improper use tomorrow.

A Bill Smith used to know that when he filed a form, the fact that there were countless other Bill Smiths kept the Government from comparing that form with others. Why, opening the telephone book purely at random the other day, it was found that there are 17 Frank Halls in this area. But for each individual in the United States, there is only one social security number. Thus each time a form is filed, the information or even merely the location of the form in the filing system can be fed into a computer. And someday, all some obscure little man will have to do is feed a number, 999-99-9999, into the Federal computer, and out will come the entire life history of citizen John Q. Public, who thought he was free.

As I have said, the first use of this universal linkage will be in 1970 for the farmer and rancher, but it is just around the corner for everyone else. May 23, 1967, the Bureau of the Census was considering having everyone give his social security number on the census of population and housing. The reaction was so great when it was tried on a 25-percent pretest in New Haven, that the Bureau announced on June 20 that maybe just a 5-percent subsample would make use of the social security number.

Dr. Eckler testified:

It would be possible therefore, for a small group of the population, to get a more complete set of characteristics; to relate, conceivably, something from Social Security or something from the Internal Revenue Service which might supplement in a useful way what is collected in the census.

The chairman and other members of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics and other Members of Congress quite correctly recognized at that time that the 5-percent subsample would merely be a foot in the door. Thus, for the moment the citizens of the United States will not be asked for this vital link.

I believe the question will be on the next census, whether it be 1975 or not until 1980. The desire among the statisticians is too great. Their very existence is justified by the amount of information they can collect. As testified, with the use of a connecting link, a computer can take records from the census and combine them with records of the Internal Revenue Service, with the Social Security Administration, or any file containing connecting factors. A computer

could compare not only present records, but also records filed in the past. Daniel O. Price, of the University of Texas, in a written statement for the subcommittee told what could be done with the use of the social security number as a linking factor. This would make possible a survey of geographic mobility.

Even more important than geographic mobility—

Says Price—

however, would be information on occupation ten years earlier.

Next, he notes it would be possible to put together information on education. Changes in income could be examined. Also, marital status and its changes as one changes in other ways could be observed. Changes in employment by company would be available. After all, he points out, one could change his employment without changing his residence or occupation so for the professional snooper this information is important. He happily points out that questions on fertility are already being designed. Because social security numbers are not accurate and prevalent in poverty areas, he suggests that questions should be asked regarding the amount of assistance or training one receives from welfare or poverty programs. He notes:

There is opposition to such a question because of the established position that the receipt of public assistance is not to be public information.

I wonder if he knows that the question is already asked on the census of agriculture. He obviously accepts the so-called confidentiality of the census as enough protection. Mr. Price points out that in properly understanding a population, it would be valuable to have information on the aspirations and values of the people. Therefore he suggests a "simple question" is the question on religious preference. "Experience indicates that less than 1 percent" he says, "objects to answering such a question." He would like a record of voting behavior. He would like also to have "information on some measure of political knowledge," but doubts if it would be "feasible to suggest collecting information in this area." Mr. Price points out that it would be useful if information on crime and delinquency were available along with other census data, but says he is realistic enough to know this is impossible unless "record linkage by social security number could be made."

The motives of all those who would record our every move are good. Such information would be especially valuable for minority groups whose social mobility could thereby be more closely watched and the effectiveness of Government programs measured. But on the other hand, despite their good motives, the people who see protection in a strict law prohibiting anyone but select Government officials from seeing the individual files are blind to the realities of life. They are blind because their good intentions have built ivory towers in which they hide secure from the realities which make Hitlers and Stalins possible. Think what Hitler or Stalin would have done if they could have pushed a button and had a complete history of any man

or group they sought to persecute. Those who would know so much about individuals in order to help mankind, those who would pass laws to prevent unauthorized use of data from the machines, those who refuse to act now to define adequate safeguards, I ask—who is going to help when the man who is authorized to use the data decides that to save his concept of society your independent thinking must be eliminated?

There is only one way to provide adequate protection now. In the census of housing and population, limit the number of mandatory questions. Prohibit the use of the social security number to produce individual dossiers. In the areas of agriculture and business, begin an intensive investigation to determine exactly what information is needed and the best possible methods of obtaining it using maximum voluntary response.

A dangerous tradition of blindly accepting the decisions of bureaucrats who are totally unresponsive to the greatest restraint of a democracy, the power of the vote, must be avoided. In this country, I am thankful to say, while calling upon experts for advice, we have not surrendered to a dictatorship of the bureaucracy. True progress is best achieved by freemen. Here are some legal questions that should be answered.

In *United States v. Mitchell*, 58 F. 993 (1893) the following questions were raised but not answered. They have not been answered by any court test of the penalty clause:

First. "Inasmuch as the direct and declared object of a census," as authorized by article 1, section 2, clause 3; article 1, section 9, clause 4; and amendment 14, section 2 of the Constitution, "is to furnish a standard by which representatives and direct taxes may be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this Union," the accomplishment of this constitutional end renders it wholly unnecessary" to inquire as to property, or wealth, or business"—citing *Loughborough v. Blake*, 5 Wheat. 317, 320-321 (1820).

Second. Since Congress "has only such legislative powers as are expressly conferred it cannot be claimed that a power to take an enumeration for the purposes above declared, confers, by implication, a power to ascertain the value of property or the methods of using it."

Third. Legislation compelling an answer to inquires about business and property, is violative of the guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures contained in amendment 4. Inasmuch as a demand by a special agent of the Census Bureau that a business man turn over his books and papers for a search and extraction of information therefrom would be violative of that amendment, a statutory requirement compelling the business man to furnish such information at his own expense, upon penalty of fine or imprisonment for failure to do so, also would be violative of that amendment. In either case the books and papers of the citizen are searched and seized.

Fourth. A requirement that a businessman, at his own expense, collect and surrender information pertaining to his business establishment also offends

amendment 5 providing that private property shall not be taken for public use without compensation. It is not infrequent that answers to certain questions propounded in schedules, if fully and properly prepared, entail the collection and compilation of facts that require the labor or a large force of clerks for days and weeks, at great expense and embarrassment to the ordinary business of the citizen. It is questionable whether it is within the power of Congress to make such answers compulsory, and require the citizen to prepare this information at a great personal expense, without proper compensation.

Also, if a citizen, by his long experience in a special line of business, and by his superior organizing and administrative ability, has so systematized it that he can carry it on at a much less expense and with greater facility than others, it seems highly improper to compel him to disclose the information so acquired, and thereby open to his rivals in trade the methods by which he has been able to outstrip them in the sharp competition for business. The system so established and the knowledge so acquired is a property right as much as the land and shop in which he conducts his business, and he should not be compelled to part with the former without just compensation. The zeal with which such information is sometimes solicited to maintain favorite theories of public officials, or to afford the basis for discussing economical questions, often leads to excesses, and imposes upon the citizen duties for which no compensation is afforded, either in money, or in his proportion of the reward of the good results to follow to the public.

No Federal court has commented on these questions, but generally have assumed that such legislative requirements are valid.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman from Montana. I am sure he has made a contribution to this question.

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

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

Mr. FISHER. I also desire to commend the gentleman for the contribution that he has made to a better understanding of this problem which is related to the bill he has introduced, and I also wish to associate myself with the position he has taken on the census questions. I have taken occasion, since the gentleman raised the issue some months ago, to look into it to some extent. In my judgment, there is simply no justification for applying criminal penalties to these questions that are not essential for the purpose of the census. Certainly the vast number of those to which the gentleman referred cannot be considered essential. With respect to the nonessential questions, certainly people who voluntarily wish to contribute information that is one thing, but so far as punishing them if they do not answer where the question actually does not contribute to the enlightenment that is sought by legitimate questions—and I think the 7 questions to which the gentleman has referred constitute proper and legitimate questions—then certainly there should be no penalty attached ex-

cept to those for failure to respond to the essential questions. Again I commend the gentleman.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he has had any response from the Bureau of the Census or any indication as to whether they might be in a mood to review the situation and perhaps come up with something that is more acceptable.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. His statement brings up a point I would like to mention. I have had various discussions with the Director of the Bureau of the Census. I wish to say that this is not particularly a fight against the Census Bureau. They are dedicated public servants. They are doing the work they are permitted to do under present law. I think our whole attention should be directed to Congress. There should be a congressional review of the method of enumeration. In the last analysis, the Census Bureau does not have much to say about the final results. I know they can modify questions. I believe they have made some changes since I introduced the bill and since other Members have done so also. The Director has been very kind in discussing this question with me. I do not think the issue is one particularly to be joined with the Census Bureau, but it is an issue that I believe is the responsibility of the Congress. They are operating under present law and, so far as I know, that law has not been reviewed in 100 years. It has just been allowed to grow.

Frankly, that was one of my purposes in introducing the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's position—and I know he has given this more thought and study than perhaps any other Member of the House—is that the proper way to correct the thing, and the only really effective way, is through the passage of legislation.

Mr. BETTS. I am convinced of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I also thank the gentleman for his leadership in his effort to bring to the attention of the Congress the problems with respect to the upcoming census.

My principal interest has been in connection with the business census forms that have been sent out to all large and small businessmen throughout the country. You will see from the samples I brought with me that the questions are very detailed.

In my particular congressional district, the 36th Congressional District of New York, the burdensome nature of these census forms was brought to the attention of the news media. As a result, I received a great deal of correspondence from large and small businessmen alike who are very much concerned about the extent and detail of the questionnaire. As a matter of fact, I also received copies of bills that some businessmen sent along from their accountants and others who prepared the information for them so they were able to comply with all the questions contained in the forms.

I might add that there is a penalty for failure to report. Today I am introducing

a bill similar to one introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, because I believe that this penalty should be removed.

I do want to bring again to the attention of some of my colleagues the problems regarding these business census forms, so that we might have a review of this entire matter—by the Census Bureau and appropriate Members and committees of the House—in order that a less detailed questionnaire can be prepared, and less burdensome information can be required of the small businessmen throughout the country.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] have shown a high caliber of leadership in bringing this serious problem before us for review and consideration. I am proud to join them in expressing alarm about certain policies and practices in the Bureau of the Census.

Despite repeated assurances and "safeguards" designed to protect the privacy and limit the inconvenience caused by census requirements, it is evident the Census Bureau is rapidly becoming a clearinghouse of information on many subjects irrelevant to government, garnered from private citizens and businesses under threat of punishment for failure to complete census forms.

Every Member of Congress recognizes the importance of having accurate and sufficient statistics on the American society and economy, in order to properly plan and carry out programs designed to improve and assist the Nation and its people. But, the term "accurate and sufficient statistics" does not encompass the intricate degree of detailed information that is called for on today's business census forms.

Asking businessmen to enumerate the dollar and cents amounts of their yearly sales of many detailed categories of merchandise, asking homeowners to relate the number of bathrooms in their homes, or their bathing habits, etc., asking restaurant owners whether or not they offer curb service—none of these inquiries seem essential to the functions of the census.

I am particularly concerned with the 1967 economic census. On April 30, small and large businesses throughout the Nation were required to submit completed forms designed specifically to gain information about individual categories of businesses. There are almost 200 different categories of forms for various businesses, each one requiring the businessman to supply over 100 separate items of information about his business. Countless merchants, manufacturers, lawyers, and small businessmen in my district have expressed their concern to me about the inconvenience and expense they have undergone in obtaining and supplying the information called for in these forms. Some were forced to spend close to \$100 in order to comply with the law.

Two months ago, I spoke to my colleagues in the House about the abuses of the business census, and I included in the RECORD five typical forms to demonstrate the extent of the burden which is placed on these businesses.

Today, I join with several other colleagues whose constituents have also ex-

pressed concern over the business census and other census surveys, including the coming Decennial Census of 1970. After carefully studying many of the census forms, I am convinced that the Congress can no longer place all of the Census Bureau's inquiries under the protection of penalties for noncompliance and for refusal or failure to supply the information called for.

Thus, I felt it necessary to introduce legislation that would strictly limit the categories of information in census surveys which citizens will be required to provide under penalty of law.

These categories will not invade the privacy of citizens, or unnecessarily inconvenience them. They include: First, name and address; second, relationship to head of household; third, sex; fourth, date of birth; fifth, race or color; sixth, marital status; and seventh, visitors in home at the time of census.

I want to emphasize that this bill does not prohibit the Census Bureau from asking questions outside of these categories, it merely removes the threat of penalties from those who do not for any reason supply information requested which does not fall into these seven categories.

I am pleased that so many colleagues have joined in this discussion of the census and its encroachments on our constituents.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] because I am sure the angle he is pursuing is making a definite contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman in the well, and join my colleagues in commanding him for bringing this to the attention of the House.

I believe this is important, and I share with the gentleman his concern about the problems that small business has all over this country, as well as those in agriculture.

It is an almost impossible task for these businesses to continually fill out form after form, because someone here in the Census Bureau has thought up a lot of questions that someone would like to have some answer to.

The questions border almost on absurdity when they want to find out how much money the son has, and the aunt has, and the uncle has. It is just unbelievable, when we look at some of the questions that are asked. I believe it is high time that the Congress look into this whole problem, not only for the census itself, but for these yearly forms which are imposed upon the businesses of this country. So I commend and support very vigorously the action in the House with respect to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

MR. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

As a cosponsor of the bill, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for having taken the leadership in moving in the direction of having the census serve the original purpose for which the system was established. I do not believe it was ever the intent for the Census Bureau to write family biographies, which is what the procedure is developing into.

I had occasion to look at a census form from 30 and 40 years ago, which I secured. One must do this, and look at the proposed form, to understand the direction in which the census system is traveling.

I hope the Congress, recognizing this, will take some action to bring the whole system back into its proper perspective.

MR. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

MR. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] is to be commended for reserving this time today to discuss the "super census" proposed for 1970.

I personally find it difficult to understand why any of our citizens should be required to answer as many as 120 questions in the regular decennial population count.

And this formidable form with which the Census Bureau is currently experimenting is but one aspect of a problem that should concern all Americans: The gratuitous intrusion of government into the everyday lives of its citizens.

Just as regrettable as the proposed 1970 Census of Population is the Census of Manufacturers now being circulated among many of our small businessmen.

Earlier this month I received an appeal from the publisher of a weekly newspaper in my district to "please save us little guys from undue paper work such as this." Attached to his letter was a Census of Publishers form asking for more 100 separate items of information. My publisher friend tried to provide the required data himself, finally gave up in disgust and sent the six-page form to me.

He said that to comply with instructions on the form would cost his firm about \$100 in auditing and research expenses. So the Government, in effect, was charging him money to invade his privacy.

Many of the questions on these forms are necessary if the Government is to have the information it must have to chart the course of our economy and the growth of our population. But I can see no earthly reason why Washington needs to know how many volts of electricity a weekly editor consumes, or whether a head of household shares his shower.

Unfortunately, respondents are required to answer all the queries, or face penalties that could include jail. Congressman BETTS and others have introduced legislation to make some of the answers voluntary, thus removing some of the coercive quality that now pervades these forms.

Although the punishments authorized are rarely invoked against anyone in de-

fiance of the census, it is obvious that Census Bureau employees have gone far beyond the intent of Congress, and far beyond what any sensible administrator would permit, in preparing many of these questionnaires.

The troubles of my publisher friend, as well as the revelations by CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, JACK BETTS, and other colleagues about the Government's propensity for snooping, lead me to wonder about certain unsettling trends both in and out of Government.

There is, in fact, something almost Orwellian about the new technology which can reduce a human life to markings on a tape to be fed to a computer.

What can—or should—we hide from Big Brother and his sophisticated data-processing equipment?

The citizen is fast becoming a soulless cipher in a bureaucratic jungle. He is observed and recorded at birth, at school, and at the time he gets his first job, his numerous licenses and his selective service and social security numbers.

But how do we evaluate the information that is provided by the computers? Is it always fair—and accurate? I have reviewed some of the expert testimony taken by Mr. GALLAGHER's Special Subcommittee on the Invasion of Privacy, and the answers to these questions are inescapable: Rather than being foolproof, the computers can be both misleading and a menace to our personal liberty.

The computers, after all, have to rely on people to provide the data which they consume with such devastating efficiency, and people are subject to human error. A teacher or employer can be out of sorts when he gives a bad rating that will be computerized forever into the record of the victim. Or a man can successfully appeal an adverse court judgment; but a computer, possessing incomplete data, recalls only the original conviction.

There is even something basically wrong with that most useful of exercises in factfinding, the decennial census. How else do we explain the fact that nearly 6 million Americans were not counted in the 1960 census?

In view of the obvious shortcomings in our present systems for collecting and correlating data, Congress must be especially alert to the proposed National Data Bank, which would centralize information collected by some 20 Federal agencies. Congressman GALLAGHER's subcommittee has performed yeoman service in persuading the executive branch to postpone the submission of this plan to Congress. The implications of the data bank are frankly frightening. I cannot think of a more powerful weapon to place in the hands of a Government that might seek dictatorial powers over its people. We should look long and hard at this proposal before approving it, when it finally is formally presented to Congress.

MR. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

MR. AYRES. I, too, wish to commend my colleague from Ohio for the leadership he has shown in this particular

field. Those of us who have known JACKSON BETTS for some 25 years, even back to the days when he was Speaker of the House of Representatives of Ohio, realize the thoroughness with which he goes into an issue. I am quite certain the fact that he has exposed this ridiculous operation which is being proposed will certainly be appreciated by the American people, because they have gone far beyond, as Congressman BETTS has pointed out, what was originally intended for a census to provide.

I commend the gentleman.

MR. BETTS. I thank my colleague from Ohio.

MR. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BETTS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the Census Subcommittee.

MR. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my other colleagues in extending commendations to the gentleman.

My first exposure to this problem was as a member of the subcommittee before whom the gentleman appeared. His testimony was so persuasive and his ideas and criticisms of the existing system so impressive to me that I became considerably interested in the problem he brought to our attention.

Not only do I concur in the gentleman's representation of the extent of that problem, but I believe perhaps it goes even deeper.

It occurs to me there is a penchant in America in increasing degree to obtain as much information in as great detail as the Government can possibly get hold of concerning every individual citizen in the country. I believe there is a correlation between freedom and the extent of information possessed by the Government about individual citizens within a country. So far as I am concerned, there is greater individual freedom to the extent that there is less information available to the Government about individuals.

The gentleman has performed a great service in calling to the attention of this Congress the possibility that exists that the Government, through the census device coupled with the social security number, added to the concept of the National Data Bank, is intruding into the realm of individual privacy far more than any circumstances warrant.

I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this matter before the House.

MR. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BETTS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Alabama.

MR. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the general accolade to the gentleman in the well [Mr. BETTS]. The gentleman from Ohio has rendered a service to the country and, in my judgment, has struck a blow for the individual rights of American citizens with his concern for this matter, and through the legislation that has grown out of it.

As a former member of the Census Statistics Subcommittee, I have long shared in this concern, and I join with him in this and congratulate him for this service to the people which I believe to be a very important one.

Mr. Speaker, revision is needed in the 1970 census of population, housing, and unemployment. The extent to which the Census Bureau may lawfully probe into the personal affairs of citizens is circumscribed by article I, section 3, clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution which commands that:

Census or enumeration of the inhabitants shall be made within three years after the first meeting of Congress, and within every subsequent term of ten years thereafter.

The original intent was that of enumeration, and a census is necessary to reapportionment. But the census of 1960 and that proposed for 1970, if the special census forms used in North Philadelphia last September and New Haven in April 1967 serve as any indication, would go far beyond the category of enumeration. According to the Bureau of the Census, 67 subject items are currently proposed for inclusion in the 1970 decennial census of population and housing. These 67 subjects, however, are translated into many more particular questions when they actually appear on the official questionnaire. The sample form used in New Haven contained 120 items and the North Philadelphia form contained 94 inquiries. Who knows what the final count may be when in 1970 one-fourth of this country's population is required to complete the "long form" questionnaire which already fills some 20 pages?

The American citizen has a right to be anxious over his right of privacy in view of what he may be required to answer on the 1970 census questionnaire. For example, the mail coming into my office now—2 years prior to the census—indicates that my constituents are concerned about the personal nature of the proposed questions contained in the 1970 census, and about the penalty to which the citizen is liable if he does not complete his questionnaire. They are apprehensive lest individual privacy be lost in the name of technological efficiency, and about the possibility that the individual may become nothing more than a dossier in a data bank controlled by an impersonal bureaucracy.

In this 1970 census many personal questions, unnecessary for the functions of government, are being asked. Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis once said:

Every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the fourth amendment.

Americans do have a right to their privacy. Indeed, individual privacy is a prerequisite of human dignity and freedom. Alan Barth, author of "The Price of Liberty," once wrote:

A respect for privacy. It is in this as much as in any other single characteristic that the free society differs from the totalitarian state.

Questions such as What were you doing in April, 1962? What is the value of your property? Do you share your shower? What is your income? How do you enter your residence? How much is your rent? proposed for the 1970 census could well be in violation of the constitutional intent of the census. As you know, consideration has even been given for the inclusion of such items as social security num-

ber, religious and political affiliation, which could involve far more serious implications, and I am pleased that these inquiries have been deleted from consideration.

The American people have, up to now, been more than willing to cooperate with the Federal Government in providing essential information to meet constitutional requirements on population. But the nature of the questions asked and the extensiveness of the questionnaire itself could destroy the accuracy of the 1970 census. There have been reports that some 5 million people were uncounted in the 1960 census by avoiding the census taker. Since the 1970 census is to be handled solely by mail the final tabulation may leave millions more uncounted because of the refusal of the independent American to divulge the intimate facts of his private life to anyone.

The mandatory features of the census are germane at this point. Section 221, title 13, United States Code, provides a \$100 fine and up to 60 days in jail for noncompliance with various censuses, including the decennial census of population and housing. For willful misrepresentation of fact the penalty is greater—\$500 fine and up to 1 year in jail. There is little disagreement that certain basic questions should carry penalties for non-compliance. But Congress ought have grave reservations about penalties attached to questions which serve no constitutional purpose. What kind of society would propose to send someone to jail for refusing to say if he voted, or whether his children are retarded, or whether he shares his shower?

Known Communists, members of the Cosa Nostra, and practicing Ku Klux Klanners have appeared before our legislative committees and, in order to preserve their privacy and lest they incriminate themselves, have invoked the fifth amendment. What was their fine and imprisonment? Has it become more of a crime to fail to answer personal census questions of doubtful constitutionality than to conspire to overthrow the U.S. Government or engage in syndicated crime? The penalty imposed upon the American citizen for failure to answer such extraneous questions is a serious infringement upon the traditional rights of free American citizens.

For this reason I have joined the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] in proposing legislation which would limit the mandatory questions which would be subject to penalty to seven in the 1970 census: Name and address; relationship to head of household; sex; date of birth; race or color; marital status; and visitors in the home at the time of census. If the Census Bureau wants to sell data to other governmental agencies and private businesses the extraneous material can be obtained on a separate form marked, "voluntary." Questions not essential to the basic enumeration of population as provided in the Constitution to determine congressional districting but deemed useful to governmental agencies and private businesses could be included in this separate voluntary form.

Mr. BETTS reported to the House on October 10, 1967, that in fiscal 1967 the Census Bureau expected to sell \$19,021

million in data to Federal agencies and \$4,995 million of such data to non-Federal or private organizations. As I understand it, this includes all types of statistical information, not just population and housing reports. This constitutes a tremendous pool of market research data for business.

The Wall Street Journal on January 7, 1963, reported that the Ruben H. Donnelley Corp. buys "tracks" from the Census Bureau which list geographic areas containing 4,000 to 7,000 persons with similar education and income. "The 'tracts,'" said the Wall Street Journal, "help Donnelley spot appropriate neighborhoods for the 700,000,000 pieces of direct mail it sends out for its clients annually."

It would seem that we gather for private industry at the possible jailing and fining of the American citizen what private industry should be willing and able to do through private, voluntary market research. Data can be gathered well enough for their purposes through sample surveys relying on voluntary cooperation rather than through the Bureau's broad power of compulsion.

With the advance of modern technology and scientific research the privacy of the individual seems on the decline. Governmental involvement into the many facets of the lives of our citizens in the name of efficiency may have produced a statistician's dream and conversely, the citizen's nightmare. The fantastic advances in the field of electronic communication constitute a great danger to the privacy of the individual. Presently, the information about individuals is usually fed into the computers to serve a socially useful or economically or politically attractive purpose. But will it always be? We are becoming exposed more and more to the tyranny of the statistic.

As I see it, our task is, in part, to see to it that technology remains subject to human values. Vance Packard, sociologist-author of "The Naked Society," has said:

My own hunch is that Big Brother, if he ever comes to the United States, may turn out to be not a greedy power-seeker but rather a relentless bureaucrat obsessed with efficiency.

Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, speaking at a meeting of the Royal National Federation in Athens, Greece, in June 1966, offered good advice when he said:

What seems to me of utmost importance is that we never for a moment forget that a free society centers on Man. It gives paramount consideration to human rights, interests, and needs. Society ceases to be free if a pattern of life develops where technology, not man, becomes central to its purpose. We must not permit this to happen, lest the human liberties for which mankind has fought, at so great a cost of effort and sacrifice, will be extinguished.

The American Government, as we know it, was made for man; not man for the Government.

Added to the controversy of the 1970 census and the intrusion of technology into individual privacy is the proposal to create a Federal data center. Presently, the proposal seems to have been delayed. But with the 1970 census asking so many personal questions one wonders

If the census is not a foot-in-the-door proposition. The report of the Task Force on the Storage of and Access to Government Statistics in October, 1966, recommended creation of a single statistical agency into which information from 21 governmental agencies would be collected, stored, analyzed, tabulated, and published by the data center. One protection of the individual's privacy, up to now, has been the decentralization of information which the Government has on record concerning him. The New York Times on March 15, 1967, reported that:

The names of American citizens already appear 2.8 billion times in government files: Social Security, 1.5 billion; police records, 264.5 million; medical history, 342 million; psychiatric history, 279 million; court actions, 19 million; security reports, 17.6 million; and others, including personnel and employment questionnaires.

When 21 agencies pool their information, individual dossiers would be immediately available. The dossiers composed of tax returns, census responses, social security data, military records, security files, fingerprints, mortgage guarantees, school records, property holdings, bank and credit references would be available at the push of a button.

How will the individual's privacy be protected under such an arrangement? Could it ever be protected? No less an expert than Paul Bryan, an executive of the Rand Corp., testifying before the Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy of the Committee on Government Operations during hearings held in July 1966 on the computer and invasion of privacy stated:

These systems are wide-open to tampering by anyone sufficiently intelligent and motivated enough to take advantage of their weak spots.

In my judgment too much power would exist behind the Federal official who would have the authority to push the button of the data bank. We need nothing which would place individual citizens any more completely at the mercy of the great bureaucracy, or which might subject them any further to bureaucratic tyranny.

Such an exhaustive dossier would tend to deny a fundamental aspect of American justice, the guarantee to the accused to face his accuser. This would be virtually impossible once the individual finds himself in chains of plastic tape. Is it any wonder that the American citizen is overcome with a sense of insecurity and distrust of his Government once he becomes aware of the possibility that he may be on file in the computer from the cradle to the grave?

By limiting the mandatory questions in the 1970 census, by providing for voluntary participation in the other material sought by the Census Bureau, and by restricting certain areas of inquiry as in violation of the constitutional intent of enumeration, Congress can well serve the Nation and the people.

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

Mr. BETTS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my praise to the gentleman in the

well for the fine work and leadership he has shown in this area. I would also like to add that I think he makes an excellent point that there need be no conflict between the Bureau of the Census and the Congress if the job is outlined clearly as to what we want done and what we do not want done.

I share the concern expressed by the gentleman over the criminal penalty. I also share the concern expressed by the gentleman from California about the expense and the burden that this places on small business. In fact, let me say, in my district, if a man has 9 employees, he is a large business. This places a great burden on commerce in this area.

I am also concerned with the fact that facts frequently determine the law. In many of our allocations of Government funds, this is done on the basis of information and facts which are obtained from the Bureau of the Census. If you live in an area of over 2,500 people, you are in an urban area. If it is lower than that, it is a rural area. Now, this is interesting to people who travel from a town of 2,600 to a town of 2,400 and do not realize they have gone from a city back to the country. This whole area needs to be reexamined. We need to realize that we have places and we need places as small as 2,500 people and less.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the work he has done and commend him for it and wish him good luck with respect to this legislation.

We all recognize the need for a population count to meet constitutional requirements for congressional districting. Many Members of Congress think that a short, simple, and direct questionnaire can satisfy this requirement. We think that it is unnecessary to burden our people with a 20-page form which includes questions in 67 subject areas.

The American people are concerned about "big brother" peering over their shoulder. Many of them view the proposed mail-out, mail-back multiquestion form as an invasion of their privacy. As one of my constituents wrote:

Thanks for making it your business to see that Uncle Sam doesn't make a farce of the sworn statements of the census. Your efforts to protect the citizen's privacy are thoroughly supported by my husband and me.

I am concerned with more than the issue of invasion of privacy. We face the possibility that this lengthy questionnaire will result in error—either through carelessness or outright deception. There will be the person who doesn't want to be bothered, the one who resents the time it takes to complete the form and the one who willfully distorts the answers.

Others have expressed opposition to the unnecessary questions, such as Mr. and Mrs. Wilbern Hardcastle of Center, Mo., who wrote:

We are behind you 100 percent concerning the foolish questions that they are trying to put in. It most certainly invades the citizen's privacy and we think it most unfair. To our way of thinking all that needs to be answered are the ones pertaining to the numbers of people in each house as that is supposed to be the reason for taking the census.

I have introduced legislation to limit the mandatory questions to seven. If the Bureau of the Census deems it necessary to ask other questions about personal habits and business practices of the American people these questions should be put to the individual with a clear statement that responses are voluntary.

We must remember that the decennial census is vital in determining Federal grant funds to States and local communities and in formulating the size and shape of congressional districts. Accuracy is essential. We know that more than 5 million were missed in the 1960 census, a census taken by enumerators. If the 1970 census—a census by mail—yields substantial errors the needs of the people will be misrepresented.

I urge Members of Congress to give thoughtful consideration to the pitfalls of such a detailed census, one that invokes the ire of the American people.

Mr. BETTS. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for the interest he has shown and the support he has given to this matter.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BETTS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable JACKSON BETTS, for bringing to the attention of this body the bold encroachment upon our private lives that lies within the pages of the proposed 1970 census, and for affording us the opportunity to debate the issue.

Mr. Speaker, the principle involved here is much more important than the actual questions which are to be asked according to the census form. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is just one more evidence of the growing "big brother" image of our ever-increasing and ever-encroaching Federal Government.

As has been pointed out, when this information is elicited, there is no way of knowing the ultimate and aims or objectives for this information, and how it is to be utilized. With the ever-increasing ability of computers and data banks we are indeed reaching a point where no one has any substantial privacy from the Federal Government.

At the rate we are advancing and in the direction we are traveling, it is inevitable that within a very few years certain people or agencies within the Federal Government—possibly without the Federal Government—will be able with only a social security number, to find out all vital statistics concerning an individual, such as; voter preference, party affiliation, credit rating, and a great deal about their sociological, religious, and other background information.

Pointing to only two of the many impertinent questions contained in the questionnaire, why should a woman under threat of a \$100 fine or a 60-day jail sentence be compelled to answer the question: "How many babies have you had?" Or why should any head of the household be forced under penalty of law to answer the question: "Do you share your shower?"

Mr. Speaker, what possible legitimate reason could the Federal Government have in compelling American citizens to answer these and other similar questions? What business is it of the Federal Government how many times a person has been married or when they were married for the first time?

Not only is this a trend of the Federal Government, but it is reaching down into various agencies and arms of the State and local governments, now that the Federal Government is leading the way?

Just recently my children brought home a questionnaire from their school which was supposed to be a school census and which again clearly violated the privacy of the family.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter and speaking for the people of the Second District of Alabama, it is a highly emotional matter. I commend my good friend, our colleague from Ohio, on his endeavor in the premise and wish to pledge him my wholehearted cooperation and support for his bill limiting the types and numbers of questions which may be contained in the next census.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for those kind comments.

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

Mr. BETTS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman from Ohio now in the well of the House for taking the leadership to limit not only the kinds but the number of census questions.

May I ask a question? I understand this bill has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Have there been any hearings or when will hearings be held?

Mr. BETTS. In response to that question, let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], was very kind enough to give me hearings on it last fall. I appeared before the committee at that time and had some witnesses present. Unfortunately, we had to adjourn before it was completed. I had hoped we might have a continuation of the hearings this year, but apparently the committee has been kept from doing so by the press of other business. But I will say that the chairman was kind enough to give me a hearing on it last fall.

Mr. RANDALL. I think we should all recognize that this is not an effort to array the executive branch against the legislative branch of the Government. Rather it is simply a bill to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law.

Some remarks were made a few moments ago about the 200 different categories of forms, involved in the census of business now in progress. Some of us remember the complaints we received at the time of the last census. I can easily remember the bitterness of some of the complaints that came in at that time. I am sure that unless we pass this bill there will be a repetition during the next census. There was an article, I think, in the Nation's Business or one

of the other business publications recently on this very subject. I commend this article to the membership, because it was along the lines of the thoughts expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] concerning the cost placed on small business because of all the forms that have to be completed.

Today we hear a lot about each individual being computerized. That means "Big Brother" must look over the shoulders of each of us to get the data to feed into these computers.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we have a means here to put the harness on "Big Brother" and to restrain him through the enactment of a bill such as the one which has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], or some similar bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to limit the number and kinds of census questions. Unless this Congress moves to bring some reason to the function of the 1970 census, Americans will be required to answer more than 120 questions or risk fines and jail terms.

I see no justification for demanding, in a population census, that all citizens be forced to provide such information as:

First. Income, dollar by dollar, from all sources, including alimony, public assistance, pensions, investments, and so on;

Second. The value of property or the amount of rent paid;

Third. Educational, marital, employment, and military history in detail;

Fourth. The names of people with whom bathroom and kitchen facilities are shared;

Fifth. A listing of television and radio sets, dishwashers, and other household items; and

Sixth. The place of birth of the parents of the citizens.

The constitutional purpose of the census is to count people and to provide a basis for congressional redistricting. In what manner do the above questions, or answers thereto, assist in congressional districting or determining how many people are within our environs?

The 1970 census form should be limited to seven questions, as follows: First, name and address; second, relationship to head of household; third, sex; fourth, date of birth; fifth, race or color; six, marital status; and seventh, visitors in home at time of census.

It might even be possible to take one or two of these questions off. But the addition of any further inquiries would, in my opinion, constitute an unwarranted invasion of the people's privacy, and would most certainly violate the purpose for which the decennial census is prescribed.

It is encouraging to observe there has been participation in this special order on the limitation of census questions by both sides of the aisle. This should prove that while the effort to reform the census to avoid the invasion of privacy is not a controversy between the legislative branch and the executive branch, neither is it a partisan matter.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for his studious and forceful efforts in this field.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman raises a point that I, too, have mentioned several times and for which I am very grateful. This, obviously, is not a partisan matter. This is a bipartisan matter. Not only have I had expressions from others on our side of the aisle but have also had such expressions from Members on the other side of the aisle who have asserted that something ought to be done. I am very happy that the gentleman has raised this point.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman in the well knows I have introduced a bill somewhat similar to the one which he has introduced. My approach is different in that it would limit the questionnaire to 10 basic questions, with the right of the Director of the Bureau of the Census to ask any additional questions upon obtaining approval from the two committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have urged the chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics on numerous occasions to hold hearings on this bill, as well as the bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from Ohio. His response has been to the effect that there is not sufficient interest on the part of the membership of this House in these matters to hold further hearings.

By the luck of the draw I am the ranking minority member on this Subcommittee on Census and Statistics, three rookie Members having been assigned to the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, let me add my compliments to the gentleman from Ohio for the stand he has taken and for what he has done today. I say this because various Members who have responded to this special order have indicated that there is an interest in further hearings and I am publicly calling upon the chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics to hold hearings. Certainly the response today indicates clearly that there is sufficient interest in this body to hold hearings. There is a demand for it. My mail indicates that people are concerned about these numerous questions, about this invasion of privacy and about the "data bank" that has been suggested by some sources. This is something about which the people have concern and who have expressed their feelings to both the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any limitation to be placed upon the questions to be asked during the taking of the census, that limitation ought to come from the Representatives in the Congress of the United States. I say this because I do not believe the Bureau of the Census is going to limit the questions. They have certain pressures exerted upon them by various business groups which want more and more questions. It is our responsibility to limit it.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that we shall be able to hold hearings upon this legislation.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman has been of very great help and has made an outstanding contribution toward the achievement of this goal.

I certainly wish to share with the gentleman the hope that the chairman of the committee does permit further hearings to be held on this bill in the very near future.

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

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and I wish to join with the many other colleagues in praise for your courage and foresight in bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House, this attempt by "big brother Government" to illegally extend the constitutional authority for census to interfere in our individual lives.

Mr. Speaker, I have coauthored similar legislation. I certainly feel based upon some of the mail I have received from the congressional district which it is my honor to represent that our people as soon as they are fully awakened to this problem are going to rise up and likewise regard this as an infringement upon their constitutional liberties. Therefore I take this opportunity to address myself briefly to a matter of vital importance to every Member of Congress and to every citizen of our Nation as well—namely, the current plans for the 1970 census.

As it stands now the 1970 census will be considerably more extensive and complicated than it was in 1960. According to latest plans, the number of questions in the 100-percent census will be increased from 17 to 21 subjects. The 20-percent sample questionnaire, which will be addressed to some 16 million American households, will be composed of 67 subjects rather than 56 subjects as in the 1960 decennial census. And based on estimates, the 67 subject questionnaire for example, will contain over 120 questions which must be answered by those 16 million American households surveyed by the census taker in the 20-percent sample.

The authority for a decennial census goes back to the Constitution itself. Upon its adoption in 1787, the Constitution provided:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers. . . . The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every ten years, such manner as they shall by law direct.

Over the years we have seen the census evolve from a simple population count to become a comprehensive national survey involving a wide range of questions relating not only to characteristics of population but to matters involving housing, education, and employment as well.

When we consider the fact that 20 percent of the population, based on current plans, are to be compelled by law to answer over 120 questions about themselves and their circumstances, it seems

to me that the Nation, and in particular the Congress, should pause for a moment and make a determination as to what kind of a monster we have turned loose? Is the census, as currently structured, an undue burden among the American people? Are all of the questions asked in the census absolutely necessary? And, does the 1970 census in many respects involve an invasion of privacy? Is the far-reaching search of the census constitutional?

Until these questions have been fully debated and resolved by the membership of Congress, I deem it imperative that the Congress refrain from making an explicit or implicit endorsement of the proposed 1970 census.

As matters stand now, the Census Bureau, under the authority of the Secretary of Commerce, has been delegated more or less blanket authority to make the sole determination concerning the number and types of questions being asked in the decennial census. Of course, the Census Bureau in its advance planning consults a wide range of interests in our Nation in order to get their views on what questions should be incorporated in the final questionnaire. Members of Congress, including myself, and in particular Congressman BETTS, have voiced strong opposition to the Census Bureau including one's social security number and his statement of religious preference and other personal data in the forthcoming census. In this case strong opposition by Members of Congress and other interested Americans has resulted in the elimination of these two questions, which in my mind not only constituted a serious invasion of privacy but have no particular relevance to census of population, housing, education, and employment. Aside from our success in this area the Census Bureau has held steadfastly to its plans to ask of our citizens many other questions which clearly are either too personal or unnecessary.

In light of these circumstances, I think that we have reached a stage where Congress in its wisdom and fairness must enact legislation which would set certain reasonable limitations upon the scope and content of the decennial census. On February 15 of this year I introduced legislation which would, in effect, place a reasonable limitation on categories of information required to be divulged under penalty of law in certain censuses. Specifically my bill—H.R. 15365—would provide that any census conducted under section 141 of title 13 of the United States Code be allowed to include information on matters relating only to the following categories:

First, name and address;  
Second, relationship to head of household;  
Third, date of birth;  
Fourth, race or color;  
Fifth, marital status; and  
Sixth, visitors in home at the time of the census.

Aside from the categories just cited, my bill would no longer make it mandatory for Americans to answer questions on such matters as: do you share your shower? where did you live in October 1962? income earned last year; place of

work; marital history; whether you rent or own your home; and so forth. In short, such legislation would no longer threaten Americans to a 60-day jail sentence or \$100 fine for not responding to questions which clearly have nothing to do with the essential facts about our population.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say on this matter at a later date, but I do hope that the Congress, without any further delay, will devote serious attention to this matter so that all Americans can be assured of fair and equitable treatment from the Nation's census taker.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I too wish to commend the gentleman for uncovering what he has. Many people will be answering questions about their personal lives that it may or may not be necessary to uncover. I am sure that business could use the answers to even more questions than are in the questionnaire, but it certainly is not the responsibility of the Federal Government to gather this information.

Many organizations would like to have that information, and I believe it is their responsibility to gather that information.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues for their efforts in working for a sensible 1970 decennial census of population and housing.

It has been my privilege to cosponsor a bill, H.R. 16101, which would limit the mandatory census questions to seven: name and address; relationship to head of household; sex; date of birth; race or color; marital status; and visitors in home at time of census.

The aforementioned questions are the ones essential to the basic enumeration of population as provided in the Constitution to determine congressional districting. Any other questions, which are deemed useful to Government agencies, should be asked on a voluntary basis.

At the present time, the Bureau of the Census has proposed 67 subjects for inclusion in the 1970 questionnaire. These recommended subjects amount to a violation of personal privacy and harassment to the public.

Furthermore, the proposed Bureau of Census questionnaire will require higher Federal appropriations and may cause incomplete reports which distort essential statistics.

As it has been pointed out previously, the overall questionnaire should be evaluated as to the likelihood of maximum response, the cost benefit ratio of questions asked, priorities of Federal information needs, and the possible extension of Federal authority into citizen rights of privacy.

The legislation that we are discussing today places the proper emphasis on the questions that our citizens must answer and only the information that the Government needs under the Constitution.

I strongly urge that the Members of this House join with us in exercising

proper congressional control over the questions asked in the 1970 decennial census.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his comments.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Ohio has performed a real service to the country in not only introducing this bill, but in doing the research and the work necessary in support of the bill.

I do not recall any piece of legislation in many months that has created as much correspondence from my own district as has the bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, and I want to say that 100 percent of the correspondence is in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great feeling in this country—throughout the whole country—that the Government is moving more and more into the daily lives and the existence of all of the people. Certainly this unwarranted invasion of privacy is evidenced by the length and scope of the Census Bureau's questionnaires, and this is a good indication of that.

One has the feeling that there is a little bureaucrat who is just sitting around throwing Gem clips into a waste basket and dreaming up more questions that might be added on to the census questionnaires with no rhyme or reason.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hope that the gentleman is successful, and I support and endorse what he is doing. I hope that soon the committee will report the bill to the floor of the House so that the House can give the bill an overwhelming favorable vote.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his comments.

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

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

I would also ask the gentleman in the well, since this is the era of civil disobedience, when so many people are deciding for themselves as to what law they will obey or disobey, what would be the penalty if a citizen were to decide that he would disobey the law by refusing to fill out the census information questionnaires that are submitted to him.

Mr. BETTS. Is the gentleman from Missouri asking what the penalty now is in the law?

Mr. ICHORD. That is correct.

Mr. BETTS. There is a \$100 fine, and 60 days' imprisonment.

Does that answer the question of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. ICHORD. It does. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BETTS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, just how big must the Government's role be in gathering census information of private individuals? And how open ended must fact gathering of people's private lives become before it is considered complete? No one, it seems to me, has answered these questions to the general satisfaction of the people.

Census taking can constitute an undue invasion of the people's privacy. I seriously question the depth to which the Census Bureau may inquire into a private life under penalty of law. Under a proposal brought to my attention, some 120 questions would be involved. Such a huge inquisition really would overstep the constitutional requirement of Congress to take a census.

A compilation of facts on an individual's age, sex, race, marital status, education, and occupation appears to be adequate for a census which would provide the information for equitable redistricting of the House of Representatives.

There must be a limit somewhere. Excessive questions also are made on business, industry, and agriculture. Great demands are made on their time and resources for answers which are often of a highly questionable use. So matters of invading privacy through census procedure pertains not only to individuals but to all strata of activity. Perhaps additional questions, of value to those who rely heavily on census data, could be made optional. But a reassessment is in order.

It is essential, however, that the public good and private life both be served in the taking of the census—and that only basic questions may be required to receive answers.

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

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] for his dedication to providing the American people with an uncomplicated census form.

In 1960 the Bureau of the Census reported the total population of the United States to be 179 million. On this report the apportionment of the seats of the House of Representatives was determined. Five years later the Census Bureau estimated that it had not counted 5.7 million people or 3 percent of our population. This amounted to an 11-seat error in the House. It is imperative for the effective representation of all of the people that the census figures be accurate and immediately available.

But we can have an accurate census immediately available when the form is 123 questions long? It has been estimated that the form takes 35 minutes and an eighth-grade education to complete. Of the 5.7 million uncounted in 1960, 2.1 million were nonwhite. Will they be counted in 1970? Are they to remain unrepresented and uncounted because their educational level frustrates them and prevents them from completing the form? Are they to remain unrepresented because their non-English

speaking background prevents them from completing the form?

Yet these are the same people to whom so many of our welfare and human programs are directed. How can we possibly estimate how many people are going to be eligible for payments over 72 years of age if the undercount rate in this age group gives the census figures little credence? With a \$30 billion deficit can this Congress afford to legislate programs such as social security with this inaccurate count?

The statistic givers—the American people—have no role in determining the questions asked. This is decided by the statistics users. The Bureau of the Census uses three committees in preparing the census form. Membership to these committees is based upon the individual's expertise in his respective field and his experience in using different types of census data. There is no balance—every step is staffed with those who have a vested interest in the decennial census providing them with statistical data. Who is going to protect the privacy of the public? Who is going to insure that every possible American is counted? It is clearly up to this Congress to take this task—I think it imperative that we accept this responsibility.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed over the plans that are being made in the Federal Government for the taking of the 1970 U.S. census. I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, because I believe these plans are faulty to the point of being ridiculous; and I think unless they are corrected, 1970 might become the year of the most inaccurate census this country has ever taken.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this year the plan is to mail questionnaires to approximately 60 percent of the population. The remainder will be canvassed by enumerators. This would require 60 percent of the population to willingly fill in the questionnaires and mail them back to the Government.

I can tell you that the nature of the questions on some of these questionnaires is so personal that it would surprise me if any large percentage of recipients will fill them out accurately and return them.

Mr. Speaker, according to the present plan, in 1970 some residents of our 50 States will be asked to answer over 100 questions covering 67 subjects. For example, the Census Bureau will want to know the answers to such questions as: "Do you share your bathtub or shower?" "What is your telephone number?" "How much rent do you pay?" "How many hours did your husband work last year?" "Do you walk to work or take a taxi?" "How much money did you make last year?"

Some of the forms run eight pages long, but not every citizen would be asked the same questions. For example, one household in four would receive the long form; 5 percent of those who receive the long form would get an additional list of detailed questions. Nevertheless, all those who refuse to answer for any reason could be penalized.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the bureaucrats in the Federal Government came up with the idea that the American

people should be compelled to answer such questions. It certainly was not from the Constitution, for the Constitution has only one sentence on this subject and it says:

The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

Originally, of course the census was to be used primarily for the purpose of reapportioning the Congress. Later it was expanded to include statistics on housing and unemployment. However, nothing in the Constitution or the laws justified making mandatory the answers to the kind of questions I have just mentioned.

For those who do not know it, the Federal law requires every citizen to answer all the census questions or face 60 days in jail or a \$100 fine. It is my belief that privacy is invaded and violated when a Government bureau can make questions it arbitrarily decides upon mandatory upon American citizens.

Certainly nothing in recent congressional intent was meant to justify such invasion of privacy because not since 1940—not in 28 years—has Congress considered legislation affecting the taking of the Decennial Census.

I believe the proper approach to this problem is the one devised by my friend and colleague, Congressman JACKSON BETTS, Republican of Ohio, who has made a long and detailed study of the census problem. His approach, with which I would like to associate myself at this time, is incorporated in H.R. 10952.

This bill contains a largely voluntary approach on the taking of the census except for several questions which are essential to the constitutional purpose of the canvass. These few, pertinent questions should be mandatory on all citizens, and would be under H.R. 10952. But all other questions that the Bureau might want to put into its questionnaire would be regarded as voluntary and the American people could answer them or not as they see fit.

This I believe, Mr. Speaker, is the true way to fulfill the requirements of the U.S. Census Bureau and still preserve the privacy which the American people hold dear.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague from Ohio. This proposed monstrosity, the 1970 census form, must be corrected now.

There is a great deal of talk across the land about cutting down on "big government" and here is one instance where the Congress can act to do just that. The average citizen, as all of us here well know, is overburdened with the filling out of Government forms today to an extent that is almost intolerable. He does not need another burden of this nature.

There is also a great deal of talk about the "invasion of privacy" by our Government. If the proposed 1970 census form does not represent just that I would like to know what does.

Furthermore, we are in a time of financial crisis in our great Nation. The use of the 1970 proposed form will add an extra \$20 to \$25 million to our Government expenses in 1970. This is not

necessary just in order that the Government be in a position to answer more marketing research questions, in my view.

We always hear that such and such a record is confidential and would never be given to unauthorized persons. But, how many times a year is information from someone's personnel files leaked to a friendly newsman for one reason or another. You and I know that it happens more times than we like to think about.

Therefore, I support my colleague from Ohio in this matter and would hope that our census forms can be kept simple and limited to proper questions.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] for obtaining a special order this afternoon to draw attention to a matter that will soon affect the entire population of this country—the U.S. census.

The proposed census form that all Americans will come face to face with in 1970 is long. It is detailed. It is complex. It is all encompassing. Worst of all, answering is mandatory.

My feelings on the matter became quite apparent on the afternoon that I sat down with the latest informational copy of the U.S. census. The further I waded through the forms, the more I bristled. If I am merely to give my name and address and other vital information such as sex and date of birth—I do not mind in the least. But when I am told in a national census that I am forced, under threat of fine and imprisonment, to answer with whom I share my shower—that, Mr. Speaker, dampens my whole outlook.

When the census form, which to my way of thinking is basically a survey of the American home and its occupants, takes on the gargantuan proportions of an epistle requiring a great deal of time to go through, I think the emphasis has become misdirected. The American people are not going to have the interest or patience to answer the numerous and complex questions asked. I do not think either the type of questions asked on the census form, or their number, justifies making nonanswering a crime subject to fine and imprisonment. Questions relating to the value of the property, the equipment in the home and the appliances, do nothing but clutter the important and vital questions a census is supposed to answer.

I am in favor of limiting the questions that will appear on the official 1970 census to seven simple and direct questions as proposed by H.R. 10952 and other bills. These questions are as follows: Name and address, relationship to head of household, sex, date of birth, race or color, marital status, and visitors in home at time of census. These questions should be made mandatory. If other questions are going to be asked, such as with whom I share my shower, how I enter my home, and where I lived in October of 1962, they should appear on a separate form and should be voluntary. If the Government, research organizations, and the academicians want a complete sociological survey done, let it be done at the convenience of the American dweller and not under force of law requiring a mandatory answer.

Mr. Speaker, the general census that is going to the American public in 1970 is not the only census form that will hit the people in my district. The North Dakota farmers will be hit as will farmers across the Nation in 1969 with the agricultural census, which is required by law every 5 years. Here, too, I ask the question, "How much of the information asked is really needed?"

Farmers next year will have to give the precise figures on the amount of fertilizer and irrigation water used. They will have to give an account of their production practices. They will have to give their crop yields. They will have to disclose how much money they owe. They will have to show how their operation is financed. I say "have to," Mr. Speaker, because the farmer must answer under the threat of fine and imprisonment.

I think the Government has crossed the line that until this time marked the limits of a person's privacy. And this invasion of the farmer's privacy is especially repugnant because agriculture is the foundation of this country's economic growth. It is not my intent to stop the Government from having a legitimate and appropriate access to farm records. But let us remember one fact. No farmer—or other businessman for that matter—is likely to want to divulge his secrets of operation to the Government or anybody else.

The Department of Agriculture obtains numerous periodic reports from farmers already. Here, too, I hesitate because the inaccuracy of many of the Department's estimates of production in the past have had disastrous effects on market prices. I have no intention of putting the farmers in my district, already in a financial crisis because of high production costs and low selling prices, at the further mercy of speculators and competitors because of the Government's desire to get all the information it can.

Mr. Speaker, there is another frightening aspect to the agricultural census. That relates to the tremendous amount of time and effort required to answer. The farmer of today must have a recordkeeping system of some kind. But the questions asked the farmers will go beyond the farmer's expertise in many cases and require him to hire an accountant, lawyer, land surveyor, and statistician. This is a burden that should not be placed on the farmer. It is a clear case of the Government getting carried away with its own census system.

There are a number of bills in Congress designed to limit the questions that may be asked in the 1969 agricultural census. I am in favor of bills like this, for example H.R. 15418 introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BARTIN], because it brings the issue into sharp focus. Hearings on those bills will answer the questions that have arisen on the propriety of the Government's inquiry into the affairs of the American farmer. Let us put the burden on the Government to show this Congress just why it needs the answers to the numerous and detailed questions on its 1969 agricultural census.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to associate myself with the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Ohio in bringing to the attention of this body the questionnaire proposed to be used in the 1970 census of population, housing, and employment.

My own attention has been directed to this subject by many of my constituents who have become aware of the Federal Government's growing interest in various personal aspects of their lives. A cursory glance at the questionnaire which 16 million American families will be required to answer, under penalty of \$100 fine or 60 days' imprisonment, gives substance to their alarm. It is incumbent upon us in this Congress to know exactly what this Government is asking of its citizens and to take the steps necessary to protect the interest of these citizens.

The concept of Government questionnaires rankles me and many of my constituents. Where does the information go? Who sees it? Is it melded with income tax return data to form a complete pic-

ture of me and my family? Do my answers to this questionnaire jibe completely with answers to similar questions on other studies? Will these results be put into a computer bank to be the basis of a dossier which will be updated and enlarged as more information is gathered?

Let us note that this census inquiry is but one of many Federal Government surveys being conducted among private citizens and private businesses. Not only are these surveys time-consuming to complete, they are often offensive in their intrusion into confidential personal or business affairs. At times, they are so complex that the services of a professional specialist—an accountant or an attorney—are required, at the expense of the citizen. Some of these surveys are mandatory, some are voluntary—but a man receiving an official form from the U.S. Government, requesting specific facts and statistics and demanding that

it be returned within a time certain, is not always aware that he has a right, in some instances, to ignore it.

Attached to my comments is a list of Census Bureau surveys of businessmen. These surveys number 113. And this list does not include surveys of private citizens, of which the decennial census is but one example. Nor does it include surveys and studies under the jurisdiction of other Federal agencies and departments, such as the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and countless others too numerous to mention.

There is a very fundamental question here of possible invasion of privacy, a question with far-reaching implications. I urge its serious and immediate consideration by every Member of this body.

The list follows:

LIST OF CENSUS BUREAU SURVEYS DEPENDENT UPON RESPONSES FROM BUSINESSMEN COVERING THE FISCAL YEAR 1965

Title	Frequency	Voluntary (V) or mandatory (M)		Frequency	Voluntary (V) or mandatory (M)
<b>Agriculture (cotton ginning):</b>					
Cotton Ginned by States.....	Semimonthly, 12 times during season.	M			
Cotton Ginned by Counties.....	Monthly, 6 times during season.	M			
<b>Business:</b>					
Weekly Sales of Retail Stores.....	Weekly.....	V			
Monthly Retail Trade Report.....	Monthly.....	V			
Retail Trade Annual Report.....	Annual.....	M			
Monthly Wholesale Trade Report.....	Monthly.....	V			
Canned Food Report.....	5 times year.....	V			
Green Coffee Inventories and Roastings.....	Quarterly.....	V			
Selected Service Trades Survey.....	Monthly.....	V			
County Business Patterns.....	Annual.....	M			
<b>Construction:</b>					
Construction Reports—Housing Starts.....	Monthly.....	V			
Construction Reports—Housing Sales.....	do.....	V			
Construction Reports—Building Permits.....	do.....	V			
Value of New Construction Put in Place.....	do.....	V			
<b>Industry:</b>					
Manufacturers' Shipments, Inventories, and Orders (M-3).....	Monthly.....	V			
Manufacturers' Export Sales and Orders of Durable Goods (M-4A).....	do.....	V			
Annual Survey of Manufactures (MA-100).....	Annual.....	M			
Flour Milling Products (M20A).....	Monthly.....	V			
Confectionery, Including Chocolate Products (M20C).....	do.....	V			
Poultry and Livestock Feed Production (M20E).....	Annual.....	M			
Salad Dressing, Mayonnaise, and Related Products (M20F).....	do.....	M			
Fats and Oils (M20J).....	Monthly.....	M			
Fats and Oils (M20K).....	do.....	M			
Woven Fabrics (M22A).....	do.....	V			
Consumption on Woolen and Worsted Systems (M22D).....	do.....	V			
Woolen and Worsted Machinery Activity (M22E).....	Annual.....	M			
Spun Yarn for Sale (M22F).....	Monthly.....	V			
Narrow Fabrics (M22G).....	Annual.....	M			
Knit Cloth for Sale (M22K).....	do.....	M			
Tufted Textile Products (M22L).....	Semiannual.....	V			
Stocks of Wool and Related Fibers (M22M).....	Annual.....	M			
Cotton, Man-Made Fiber Staple, and Linters (M22P).....	Monthly.....	M			
Rugs, Carpets, and Carpeting (M22Q).....	Annual.....	M			
Cotton, Silk and Man-Made Fiber Woven Goods Finished (M22S).....	do.....	M			
Cotton Broad-Woven Goods (M22T).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Man-Made Fiber Broad-Woven Goods (M22T.2).....	do.....	V			
Woolen and Worsted Woven Goods (M22T.3).....	do.....	V			
Tire Cord and Tire Cord Fabric (M22T.4).....	do.....	V			
Bonded Fiber Fabrics (M22T.5).....	Annual.....	M			
Felts, Except Woven Felts and Hats (M22T.6).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Apparel (M23A).....	Annual.....	M			
Men's Apparel (M23B).....	Monthly.....	V			
Knit Underwear and Nightwear (M23C).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Gloves and Mittens (M23D).....	Annual.....	M			
Women's, Misses', and Juniors' Apparel (M23H).....	Monthly.....	V			
Brassieres, Corsets, and Allied Garments (M23J).....	Annual.....	M			
Sheets, Pillowcases, and Towels (M23X).....	do.....	M			
Red Cedar Shingles (M24C).....	do.....	M			
Hardwood Plywood: Production and Shipments (M24F).....	do.....	M			
Softwood Plywood (M24H).....	do.....	M			
Lumber Production and Mill Stocks (M24T).....	Monthly.....	V			
Mattresses and Bedsprings (M25E).....	Annual.....	M			
Manufacturers' Shipments of Office Furniture (M25F).....	Monthly.....	V			
Pulp, Paper, and Board (M26A).....	do.....	V			
Converted Flexible Packaging Products (M26F).....	do.....	V			
<b>Industry—Continued</b>					
Inorganic Chemicals and Gases (M28A).....	do.....	M			
Superphosphate and Other Phosphatic Fertilizer Materials (M28D).....	do.....	V			
Paint, Varnish and Lacquer (M28F).....	do.....	V			
Shipments of Pharmaceutical Preparations, Except Biologicals (M28G).....	Annual.....	M			
Asphalt and Tar Roofing and Siding Products (M29A).....	Monthly.....	V			
Sales of Lubricating Oils and Greases (M29G).....	Annual.....	M			
Rubber Supply and Distribution for the United States (M30A).....	Monthly.....	M			
Shipments of Selected Plastics Products (M30D).....	Annual.....	M			
Plastics Bottles (M30E).....	Monthly.....	V			
Shoes and Slippers (M31A).....	do.....	V			
Luggage, Briefcases, and Personal Leather Goods (M31E).....	do.....	V			
Refractories (M32C).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Clay Construction Products (M32D).....	Monthly.....	V			
Pressed and Blown Glassware (Except Glass Containers) (M32E).....	Annual.....	M			
Glass Containers (M32G).....	Monthly.....	V			
Fibrous Glass (M32J).....	Annual.....	M			
Iron and Steel Foundries (M33A).....	Monthly.....	M			
Steel Mill Products (M33B).....	Annual.....	M			
Commercial Steel Forgings (M33C).....	Monthly.....	V			
Nonferrous Castings (M33E).....	do.....	V			
Magnesium Mill Products (M33G).....	do.....	M			
Steel Mill Shapes and Forms (M33H).....	do.....	V			
Metal Cans (M34D).....	do.....	V			
Plumbing Fixtures (M34E).....	Quarterly.....	M			
Steel Power Boilers (M34G).....	Annual.....	M			
Closures for Containers (M34H).....	Monthly.....	V			
Steel Shipping Barrels, Drums and Pails (M34K).....	do.....	V			
Heating and Cooking Equipment (M34N).....	do.....	M			
Converted Aluminum Foil (MA34P).....	Annual.....	M			
Farm Machinery and Equipment (M35A).....	Monthly.....	V			
Typewriters (M35C).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Construction Machinery (M35D).....	Annual.....	M			
Mining Machinery (MA35F).....	Monthly.....	V			
Farm Pumps (M35G).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Fans, Blowers, and Unit Heaters (M35H).....	Annual.....	M			
Internal Combustion Engines (MA35L).....	do.....	V			
Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Equipment (MA35M).....	do.....	M			
Pumps and Compressors (MA35P).....	do.....	M			
Office and Computing and Accounting Machines (MA35R).....	do.....	M			
Tractors and Farm Equipment (M35S).....	Monthly.....	V			
Coin-operated Vending Machines (MA35U).....	Annual.....	M			
Metalworking Machinery (M35W).....	Quarterly.....	M			
Switchgear and Switchboard Apparatus, Relays and Controls (MA36A).....	Annual.....	M			
Electric Lamps (M36B).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts (M36C).....	do.....	V			
Electric Lamps (M36D).....	Monthly.....	V			
Electric Housewares and Fans (MA36E).....	Annual.....	M			
Motors and Generators (MA36H).....	do.....	M			
Wiring Devices and Supplies (MA36K).....	do.....	M			
Lighting Fixtures (MA36L).....	do.....	M			
Radios, Television, Record Players (MA36M).....	do.....	M			
Selected Electronic and Associated Products (MA36N).....	do.....	M			
Backlog of Orders: Aircraft (M37D).....	Quarterly.....	V			
Complete Propellers (M37E).....	Semiannual.....	V			
Complete Aircraft (M37G).....	Monthly.....	V			
Truck Trailers (M37L).....	do.....	M			
Selected Instruments and Related Products (MA38B).....	Annual.....	M			
Atomic Energy Products and Services (MA38Q).....	do.....	M			

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the procedure and questionnaire proposed for the 1970 census are complicated, time-consuming, and lengthy to a point of being ineffective.

The Bureau of the Census plan for a mailout, mailback procedure in the major metropolitan areas, which includes 60 to 65 percent of the total population in the United States, of a form of more

than 120 items for citizens to check or fill in, renders the necessity of a census useless.

The Library of Congress has figured that it required at least a 10th-grade

education to complete the test forms proposed for use in 1970, and when this is placed in the light of the fact that an estimated 17 million adults over age 25 in the United States have only an eighth-grade education, it renders the purpose of the census useless. I ask how you can question the heavily populated inner city population, where census figures are the most needed, with a census form too complicated for their use.

Plus, Mr. Speaker, these people face prosecution for failing to complete and return the completed questionnaire.

The purpose of the new, lengthy, and often personal census form appears to be to cut costs, which is always desirable, but if the result is that an inadequate or incomplete census is obtained, then not hiring enumerators would appear false economy indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a complete revision of the plans and questionnaires for use in the 1970 census so that the Government might obtain a dollar's worth for every dollar spent.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, a recent examination of my mailbox indicates that a great many people in southern Indiana are concerned about their "snoopy" Government in Washington. Once upon a time, in our distant early history, the word "census" denoted a decennial event which was utilized mainly to determine the proper apportionment of Representatives in the Congress. Although, from these early times, citizens were required by the law to answer the limited questions contained in this census, the brevity and intent of the questionnaire caused Americans to cooperate in answering it.

Now we are besieged by censuses on every hand. It is not enough that every citizen be subjected to the old decennial item, now encompassing 67 subjects contained in 120 questions. John Q. Householder may, in addition, be confronted with a business census or a veterans census or an agricultural census—all in the name of efficient Government. Efficient for whom? Certainly not the small businessman who must, in many cases, retain outside help at a considerable fee to assist him in preparing the mountainous form that pries into every aspect of his operation. Certainly not the average householder who is confronted with a complex and involved set of inquiries into all facets of his personal life over a period of years.

It has been pointed out that, in response to the 1960 census, some 5.7 million of our citizens did not report. These, for the most part, were apparently disadvantaged and uneducated persons living in the deteriorated portions of urban America. These people simply were not equipped to handle a form of such complexity. Under the mailout plan for the 1970 census, an even more complicated document by some 11 subject areas, it may be anticipated that an even greater number will fail to complete the form. Without a census enumerator to assist them, the entire purpose of obtaining accurate census results will be defeated. A great deal of money and preparation may have just as well been poured down the drain. I submit that a simpler mandatory questionnaire is the answer to

this and therefore I intend to support fully the legislation introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, JACKSON BETTS, to limit the number of mandatory questions in the decennial census to those dealing with name, address, age, sex, race, head of household, and visitors in the home at the time of the census. All other inquiries should be voluntary in nature.

Ours is not and should not be a big brother society. Individuals have the right to retain their privacy and Government has an obligation to respect this right.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], for leading this discussion on needed reforms in the 1970 Census on Population, Housing and Unemployment. The issue of reform has been before us for several years, and now the time for the censustaking is less than 2 years away.

A little over a year ago I proposed a bill, H.R. 5247, which would include a category on the physically handicapped in the 1970 census. Present statistics on the number of people handicapped in the United States, and the degree to which they are incapacitated, are hopelessly inadequate.

The hodge-podge of data and estimates with which we must work today are the result of many scattered surveys of often casual or biased interpretations. Figures quoted on the number of handicapped Americans vary considerably. Some estimates run as high as 20 million. The confusion is partly the result of the lack of any clear definition of what constitutes being handicapped. Many of the definitions represent only medical determinations, not activity limitations.

This suggests the difficulties that may be encountered in developing services to meet the needs of the handicapped. The national health surveys presently provide regional and national statistics based on sample studies. What is needed are statistics on a local or State basis.

The United States has been regrettably slow in realizing that given an opportunity, many physically handicapped persons can lead normal, productive lives. These people constitute a hidden asset in our society, one that we have long overlooked and are today only beginning to utilize. Most Americans are not fully aware of how many people are handicapped. This is in part due to the fact that some handicapped tend to remain out of sight. Lacking confidence in their own abilities and perhaps afraid that they are a burden on society, they withdraw. At the same time, industry and business, uncertain of what these people are capable, do not generally seek them out.

A lack of awareness on the part of society in general has in some cases led to discrimination against the physically handicapped. For example, most Federal buildings have not in the past been constructed in a way that would make them easily accessible to the handicapped. This was not due to any conscious effort on the part of the architects, but the result has been that the Government has been losing the services of a whole sector of

society. Had we been aware, the problem might have been easily resolved. I think that precise statistics, of the kind we get in the decennial census, would help bring about such an awareness.

Each year some \$20 to \$25 billion are spent by volunteer and public agencies for benefits and services to the handicapped. With a statistically sound base, these organizations could better coordinate their present programs. We need to know exactly how many persons are handicapped, and to what degree. We need to have more raw information on the causes of these handicaps. We need to know not only how many are employable, but also how many are employed and at what kind of work. We need to know how much money is needed to provide income replacement, medical care, rehabilitation, and training.

An accurate, objective enumeration of the handicapped can at this time assist us to resolve problems of the manpower shortage. It can enable us to facilitate for many their entry or return to the labor force through rehabilitation, job promotion, and other services.

Many persons around the country have complained about the extreme personal and even irrelevant nature of many of the questions planned for inclusion in the 1970 census, ones that are of questionable use to the Government. If these are to be even considered, a proposal as useful as a census of the handicapped should clearly and emphatically be included, or even better used to replace some of the unnecessary questions.

We need to provide for a more efficient use of the enormous sum spent yearly for benefits and services to the handicapped. We need to turn what, in some cases, are national liabilities into assets by facilitating their reentry into the labor force. I would call to my colleagues' attention the necessity to coordinate these efforts by a first step in that direction: the inclusion of a census of the handicapped in the 1970 census.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] in support of his objections to the mandatory requirements of the 1970 census.

I have read recently of admissions by the Bureau of the Census that some 5 million citizens over the Nation were missed in the last census. Certainly the requirement that something like 120 items be answered will not encourage those who may be reluctant to be counted anyway to sit down and divulge the innermost secrets of his or her household.

There has already been enough smoke over the possibility of the establishment of a National Data Center to remove any doubt that the Bureau of the Census, and other Government agencies are really cooking up a plan to consolidate and centralize personal factsheets on every American. The threat of a \$100 fine or 60 days in jail should they decline to reveal some very personal information smacks more of the tactics of a totalitarian society than a democracy such as ours.

I do not believe all this information is necessary for the purpose of a census of the population and housing.

Some of this information could better be left to private polling or research organizations and certainly should not be obtained under duress or the threat of fine or imprisonment. The census questionnaire has grown from a simple five questions to 50, far beyond the number necessary for the constitutional requirements of enumeration for congressional redistricting.

The Congress has allowed this number to increase over the years and I think that it is time to draw a line between the permissible and the mandatory. Should the Bureau feel that it does need additional information, they may ask for it on a voluntary basis; but the individual should not be penalized by law for refusing to allow his privacy to be invaded.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] when he points up the need for reforms in the 1970 Census of Population, Housing, and Unemployment.

A great many of the questions proposed for inclusion in this census constitute, in my opinion, gross invasions of the privacy of individuals. For the most part, they are none of "Big Brothers" business.

If the "dry run" questions employed by the Census Bureau in the 1967 census of New Haven, Conn., are any criteria, here are some samples of questions the people of the Nation as a whole may expect in 1970:

"How do you enter your living quarters? Directly from the outside? Through a common or public hall? Through someone else's living quarters?"

And, "Do you have a flush toilet?" One of three suggested answers: "Yes, but shared with another household."

If the party to be questioned is a woman: "How many babies have you ever had, not counting stillbirths? Do not count stepchildren or adopted children."

And, "How did you get to work last week? Were you looking for work, or on layoff from a job?"

If some of this information is really needed, which is doubtful, the questions should be subject to voluntary response and not subject to the penalties of law for failure to answer. The mandatory questions pertinent to a population count should be limited to about six: name and address, relationship to head of household, sex, race or color, date and place of birth, and marital status.

Congress must not permit our nosy "Big Brothers" of the executive branch to demand information of a private nature from free Americans—information that would be mighty useful to a government bent on exercising ever more control over the lives and activities of those free Americans.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the attitude of the Federal Government concerning the proposed 1970 decennial census of population and housing.

The mandatory approach suggested by the Census Bureau leaves a vast area of doubt in my mind as to their primary function in enumerating the growing populace of these United States.

I contend that the abundance of questions, dealing with personal, private topics constitutes an invasion of privacy on the American public. The questions involved are self-serving to a multitude of groups, businesses and organizations that would gain considerably in having access to such information, while the basic concept of the census is merely the tool utilized in order to gather such information.

The crushing blow is of course the mandatory nature of the questionnaire and the strict penalties allowed for punishing those citizens who feel that the answers demanded are of no business or concern to the Government in establishing the official population count.

I am concerned about the lengthy and complicated form planned for the 1970 census.

An estimate shows it would take a literate person more than 30 minutes to complete the form.

The frightening thing about this is the fact that there are about 17 million Americans over the age of 25 who lack the eighth-grade education required to complete the proposed form.

I am not suggesting that the census procedures be weakened. I do suggest as I have indicated in my bill H.R. 13703, that the census forms be held to the seven basic questions that has been required over the years: Name and address, relationship to head of household, sex, date of birth, race or color, marital status, and visitors in the home at the time of census.

My bill would also remove the penalty provision for any additional questions the Director of the Census wishes to present on a second voluntary portion of the questionnaire.

I feel it is the duty of Congress to carefully examine the questions to be asked the public in the 1970 census so as to protect them from invasion of privacy and governmental harassment.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues here today in a discussion of the problems which we appear to be facing in the census of 1970. That we will face problems is very clear, unless the Congress makes clear to the Census Bureau that it is mandating a sensible approach to the census, within the framework of the purpose of the census, and going beyond that framework only on a clearly defined optional basis.

The basic information which must be gathered by the census is clear.

We must know the name, address, age, sex, and race of the inhabitants of the United States. To secure such information, it is necessary to know who is visiting the household at the time of the census, so that that person will not be missed in the count. It seems altogether proper to secure the name of the head of the household.

Upon this information are based many items of American life—not the least of which is the determination of representation in this House of Representatives.

The information is clearly vital to all of us.

But what we are concerned with here is not this list of vital information. We are concerned with a veritable ocean of extra information which the Census Bureau wishes to gather at the same time it is gathering the vital statistics needed by the Nation.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not object to the gathering of superfluous information by the Census Bureau. I am well aware of the fact that many private industries turn to the Federal Government in determining policies, to secure information needed in formulating those policies. I am equally aware that scholars turn to the Federal Government for statistical information gathered by the Census Bureau, and I am certain that the fact that this information is available is a significant contribution not only to scholarship, but to a great deal of long-range planning here in America.

To repeat, I am vigorously in favor of the gathering of information by the Census Bureau, however irrelevant that information may be to the basic purpose of the census.

I am not, however, in any sense in favor of giving the Census Bureau the right to gather that information under the threat of fine and imprisonment.

Our Nation was founded on certain basic rights. Certainly one of those basic rights is the right to privacy. I have the right to open my front door to invite my friends in. I have an equal right to close my front door to keep my friends out. Similarly, I have a right to divulge any amount of personal information to an individual or to the public at large. I have an equal right to divulge no personal information to an individual or to the public at large.

It seems inconceivable to me, therefore, that the Census Bureau should designate a vast number of areas of inquiry as part of the 1970 census, and to compel American citizens to answer questions concerning these very personal areas under threat of fine and imprisonment.

I have been informed that the Census Bureau proposes to send a detailed questionnaire to 20 or 25 percent of all Americans in 1970. If the answering of the questions were made optional, I am certain this would still give the Census Bureau an utterly fantastic sampling of America today.

I have been informed by experts in the field that a valid sampling of America may be obtained from as few as 1,500 people. I feel certain that the optional answering of personal questions would give the Census Bureau hundreds of thousands of answers, and probably even millions of answers. By any measure, therefore, the sample obtained would be overwhelmingly sufficient for any valid purpose determined by the Census Bureau.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to take note of this vital right to privacy, which must be protected for every American. I would urge them to join all of us here on the floor today in prohibiting the Census Bureau from making mandatory what should be voluntary. This is an important matter of principle which we are

discussing today. I hope it is a matter in which all of my colleagues will join.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the points raised by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], concerning needed reforms in the 1970 census are well taken and worthy of close study. May I take this opportunity to thank him for bringing this before the House?

The U.S. Constitution provides that a census of the population shall be taken every 10 years for the purpose of determining the apportionment of the House of Representatives. Apparently the Census Bureau is attempting to convert this simple headcount into a nationwide snooping operation into the personal affairs of the people of this country. Such questions as, "Do you share your bathtub or shower?" "How much rent do you pay?" "How do you enter your home?" are a violation of personal privacy and they have nothing to do with essential facts about population.

Furthermore, the planned mail-out, mail-back procedure for taking the 1970 census, together with the complex questions, may result in missing more people than was the case in 1960 when more than 5 million Americans, mostly in the inner cities, were not found by interviewers.

In order to be effective the census form should be as simple as possible, with only those questions needed for a true population count, such as: Name and address, relationship to head of household, sex, date of birth, marital status, and visitors in home at time of census, required to be answered.

Perhaps, although I am not enthusiastic about the idea, a second form, marked "voluntary," could accompany the required census questionnaire for citizens to complete. Questions not essential to the basic enumeration of population as provided in the Constitution to determine congressional districting, but deemed useful to Government agencies, could be included in this second form. However, this should not take on the nature of a family "confession" nor of an inquisition.

Congressman BETTS deserves the appreciation of all of us for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress. I hope that this initiative will result in great reforms in the proposed 1970 census.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, our Decennial Census was provided by the Constitution to accomplish two purposes. First, because membership in the House of Representatives was to be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, a periodic enumeration of the people was required. Second, the Constitution also provided that any direct taxes imposed upon the people should be apportioned among the several States according to their respective populations. The only direct tax levied by the Congress on the people today is an income tax which was specifically exempted by the 16th amendment from the requirement of apportionment according to population. So there remains only one constitutional reason for a census, and that is the

enumeration of the people for purposes of apportioning representation in this House.

The Congress has directed a Decennial Census not only to population but of unemployment and housing and has vested in the Secretary of Commerce the power to determine the inquiries to be made. The Bureau of the Census has developed over 120 questions to be asked on 67 subjects in 1970. Most of the inquiries reach far beyond the stark requirements of enumerating the people, but are based, I suppose, on the congressional directive that there must be a census of housing and unemployment as well. To accomplish those objectives many of the inquiries proposed to be asked constitute an outright invasion of privacy and some of them seem almost irrelevant.

For example, they ask not only if there is a telephone on which people who live at the location can be called, but they go on and demand the telephone number. For what reason? Is there to be a national telephone directory?

Then there is the question about how one enters his living quarters, whether it be directly from the outside or through a common hall, or through someone else's living quarters. It seems to me that statistics on housing would be sufficiently meaningful if the fact were ascertained whether a person lived in a single family dwelling or in a building with multiple family units. As a matter of fact, the census people propose to elicit that information in addition.

The statute's instruction that the Census Bureau count unemployment in its decennial enumeration does not require a disclosure of income by those who are employed. As has been repeatedly pointed out, that information is already in the hands of the Federal Government. The income tax people have it. Is it intended that some Government computers might compare the information obtained by Census Bureau with that obtained by Internal Revenue? As a matter of statistics if the Census Bureau totaled up a national income considerably at odds with that obtained through the Internal Revenue Service, which would be the more accurate?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] is to be commended for his interest and determination to protect the privacy of the people against the demands of the Census Bureau whose basic function remains that of enumerating the people, to find out where they live for congressional apportionment purposes. The gentleman from Ohio has spoken from the well of this House on numerous occasions about this matter and now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to review the breadth of scope which the bureaucracy has been able to include under three statutory words—"population," "unemployment" and "housing"—coupled with the statutory power vested in the Secretary to "determine the inquiries."

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, "Killed With Kindness by an Overzealous, Paternalistic Federal Bureaucracy" may be the epitaph of personal liberty in this country if present trends continue. At what point does the American citizen draw the line on Federal intrusion? A

logical place would seem to be his own front door. But a Federal Government which has just acquired the right to intrude into the disposition of his domicile now wants to find out all about his dwelling and his own personal habits, with a list of 120 questions which he must complete or face a \$100 fine or 60 days in jail. In the offing are other plans to permit Federal electronic monitoring of his home under selected circumstances and to centralize the information gathered on each citizen in a Federal data bank. If a citizen of this wonderful complex society wants to get away from it all, there is no point in attempting to escape to the moon. In fact, the multitudinous data collected on the astronauts may be what the Federal Government has in store for all Americans if Congress does not call a halt and pass the legislation which I join my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, JACKSON BETTS, in sponsoring to limit the census questions asked under penalty of fine and imprisonment to seven essential population questions.

Under a simple constitutional requirement for a census of the population every 10 years for the purpose of apportioning the House of Representatives, the list of census questions has lengthened from seven in 1790 to a proposed 120 for 1970. It is understandably difficult for the average American to comprehend why his Government in Washington requires information about his whereabouts in October 1962, or whether he has a clothes drier or if he shares his shower. But he may feel it is adding insult to injury to use his own taxes to force this information, especially if a survey of data marketing firms indicates that most experts believe information obtained voluntarily is more likely to be accurate and that conversely, compulsory studies may actually encourage falsification and consequent distortion of data.

Congressman BETTS has provided me with a letter from the vice president of Young and Rubicam, Inc., Mr. William T. Moran, who has spent the bulk of his career in market research. This gentleman makes the interesting suggestion that censuses be eliminated and replaced by a number of more frequent sampling studies. He observes that:

With small scientific samples on various subjects there would be less opportunity to compile a complete dossier on every aspect of an individual citizen's life.

He also points out that:

Smaller more infrequent sampling would make more frequent data updating economically feasible.

If the Federal Government actually needs selected specialized information, would it not make more sense to obtain it in the most efficient and least expensive way? Certainly, this suggestion is worth considering before the Census Bureau embarks on a costly compulsory study which in the opinion of experts is doomed to encourage false information and which will be out of date long before the next census is taken.

But the overriding concern of the Congress must first be the protection of the privacy of the individual. He must be assured that a legitimate Government need

for each mandatory question is strong enough to justify the intrusion involved.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the personnel in the Bureau of the Census apparently are lying awake nights thinking up the questions that are to be asked in the 1970 census. I object to many of these questions because they impose a heavy burden on the American citizen and make an outright invasion of his privacy.

I understand the form being seriously considered by the Bureau of the Census runs to eight pages in length, a burdensome piece of work for the citizen. Not every citizen will be asked the same questions. One household in four would receive the long form, while 5 percent of those who receive the long form would get an additional list of detailed questions.

The time required to fill out such an extensive form is not the only factor, for undoubtedly many individuals would have to seek the advice of others in handling some of the technical-type questions. And the irony of it all is this—anyone who refuses to answer the questions for any reason could be fined \$100 and face a jail term of up to 60 days.

Some of the questions proposed by the Bureau of the Census invade the privacy of the individual and could easily cause him embarrassment. For instance, here a few of the questions that could be asked of the individual 2 years from now in this census:

"Do you share your bathtub or shower?"

"How many babies has your wife had?"

"How much money did you make last year?"

"What is your telephone number?"

While many people might think these questions are too personal, it is reported that the Bureau of the Census has been considering some other questions that could not properly be listed in the public media.

Mr. Speaker, all of this raises the question as to the origin and purpose of the census. The U.S. Constitution authorizes the census, determining that it shall be used for the purpose of apportioning the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Constitution says:

The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.

The information sought through these many questions might be useful for some economic purposes; however, much of such information is already available through regular Government reports. Furthermore, many private enterprises currently are conducting research projects for public commerce and obtaining considerable commercial information accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I would have no objection if some extra questions were placed on the census form, leaving the citizen to answer them at his option. No compulsion would be involved, and if the individual felt a question invaded his privacy, he could ignore it.

As things set up, the census has grown far beyond the purpose for which it was originally intended—it has developed

from what was a "headcount" into a "head probe."

The census procedure should be limited to a few simple questions, such as contained in legislation introduced by Congressman JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio. These questions would provide the Government with the information it needs and would, at the same time, preserve both the disposition and dignity of the American citizen.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, it is time that Congress step in and bring to a screeching halt the Federal Government overstepping its bounds and invading the privacy of the American citizen. The questions proposed for the 1970 census are a blatant invasion of privacy.

Not only is the proposed 1970 census an invasion of a citizen's privacy, it is being used as a weapon, surely as if you held a gun on a person. If the citizen refuses to answer all the questions, he, or she, could be fined or jailed.

There is no justification for asking some of the questions in the census—I cite just one for example:

Is there a telephone which people who live here can be called? If the answer is yes, what is the number?

If the Federal Government is that interested in knowing, then I suggest it turn to the phone book and look it up.

There is a good reason for a census as long as it deals with the population of the United States. But when it deals with matters other than population, then the Federal Government is going too far.

Heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, we have enough questionnaires and surveys going on throughout the breadth of this land conducted by the Federal Government to find out how John Q. Public lives. At least with these questionnaires and surveys, the American citizen has the right to make a voluntary reply if he so desires.

But this is not so with the census taking. Either you answer or else.

Congress should put to an end these threats and limit the census questions, through law, to the population of the United States.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am concerned about the serious constitutional ramifications that may arise by using the proposed 1970 census questionnaire. Under the present law, every household would be required to answer the myriad of questions contained therein under the threat of 60 days in jail or a \$100 fine or both. The content of the questions poignantly emphasizes the pronounced drift in census taking away from the basic idea of the decennial count. In addition, this form of governmental blackmail to secure personal information constitutes a serious threat to the privacy of every American.

I feel that I can speak with some authority on this subject because in 1960 I served as a census supervisor in Wayne County. My area, which encompassed two congressional districts, was perhaps the largest one in the country. Due to the size of the districts and diversity of the inhabitants, I was pleasantly surprised by the reactions of most people to our enumerators. In that year we distributed to one out of every four homes a much more detailed form than the standard questionnaire. It was interest-

ing to note that these recipients were generally quite willing to answer the additional questions. Moreover, it was felt that the statistics acquired in this manner provided a more than adequate sampling of the population. For these reasons, I believe the Bureau of Census could acquire the data it seeks if each household were given the opportunity to voluntarily answer, in addition to seven mandatory questions, a plainly identified separate form. By employing this procedure, the Bureau should be able to achieve its goals without coercing every citizen into relinquishing his or her right to privacy by threats of legal reprisal. I will grant the fact that special efforts may be needed to encourage meaningful participation in some of our inner cities. However, I do not believe the entire census program should be set up to cope with this specific problem.

While I am not opposed to the Government seeking access to the information in the 1970 census questionnaire, I do vehemently object to the means proposed to achieve this end. For this reason, I hope Congress will take prompt and favorable action on the legislation which has been introduced to assure the privacy of our citizens during the 1970 census.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, when the 1960 Decennial Census was taken, an estimated five million Americans were missed. These citizens were on the fringes of society, quite often they "slipped through the cracks" of society's floor. Many of the benchmarks used to measure life in America—a permanent residence, an auto tag, a social security number, an income tax file—just do not exist for these millions. It is in the interest of all Americans to properly document the diversification and true demographic profile of the people. As the 1970 Decennial Census approaches, Congress and the administration must insure that this census is properly conducted and the constitutional requirements are fulfilled.

It is clear the extent and nature of the problems of minorities in America was underestimated at the beginning of this decade, due in part to the inaccurate statistics generated by the Bureau of the Census.

THE DIVERSIFIED PROBLEMS OF THE 1970 CENSUS

My immediate reaction to such gross inadequacy as we have witnessed is to call for a full review of census procedures by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We cannot afford to repeat the mistakes made in 1960.

But now, as I review the proposed Census of Population, Housing, and Unemployment for 1970—I am convinced this proposed form involves questions entirely irrelevant to the purpose and nature of a census report. This additional problem area reinforces my desire to see congressional review of census procedures.

I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will review the desirability of asking the general population the following questions:

"How many bathrooms do you have?"  
"Do you have air conditioning? If so, do you have one or two individual room units or a central air-conditioning system?"

And other questions of similar nature. The absurdity of this procedure is brought home when one considers the penalty for "failure to comply" and answer these consumer-industry oriented questions is \$100 fine or 60 days in jail. Any marketing survey for any consumer industry should, generally, not involve the taxpayers' money.

The emotional suggestion of "Big Brother is watching you" is always a danger. The Congress has the proper duty of protecting the general population from harassing questions, unnecessarily personal questions, questions impossible to answer, and questions causing such resentment as to encourage the citizen to reject the entire form as objectionable, and thus undeserving of his effort to complete and return.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman JACKSON BETTS, has introduced legislation calling for a statutory limitation on the nature and number of questions allowed in a decennial census. I support this effort and hope hearings can be held to determine the motivation and advisability of certain questions posed by the Census Bureau in the 1970 Census of Population, Housing, and Unemployment.

#### AGRICULTURAL AND BUSINESS CENSUS FORMS HARASSING

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which would limit the 1969 Agricultural Census. My bill, H.R. 15671, would place statutory limitations on the questions posed in the agricultural census. Certain questions on this form are duplications of information gathered by other Government agencies, and thus wasteful of taxpayers' money; some are confusing and harass the farmer needlessly; and some are entirely too prying into his decisionmaking process and his professional approach to farming. Such questions as "What were your expenditures for spray dusts, etc., used to control insects on livestock and poultry?" require recordkeeping considered unessential by most family farmers, and therefore harassing when demanded—under penalty—by the Federal Government.

The businessmen—the small businessmen—face the same harassment. The business census calls for information not normally kept by the small businessman, and thus is de facto harassment when the questions are complemented by mandatory answering requirements—under penalty of fine and jail.

#### VOLUNTARY REPORTS URGED

I urge the Congress to consider "voluntary forms" to be completed and returned, for other than essential, minimum information. Certainly enough farmers, businessmen, and householders will answer the voluntary queries to provide accurate statistics. Thus, we avoid the overburden of heavy-handed governmental demands for seldom-kept information.

I urge congressional action on my bill limiting the agricultural census, and Congressman BETTS' bill restricting the Census of Population, Housing, and Unemployment.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as set out in article I, section 2 of the Constitu-

tion, the primary purpose of the census every 10 years is the enumeration of the citizenry so that seats in the House of Representatives may be properly apportioned among the States. The census figures have subsequently become valuable to various agencies of the executive branch in determining the formula for grants in aid to the States.

The Constitution and our laws, however, have traditionally protected the individual against invasion of his privacy by the Government. We follow the simple principle that governmental intrusion and requirements on the people be strictly limited to those areas where public benefit is not only clear, but where a public danger results unless intrusion or regulation is imposed.

While it is true that many valid governmental programs might benefit by complete statistics on each person from the cradle to the grave, our history and customs steadfastly oppose only the most necessary questioning of individuals by the Government.

Particularly at this time in our history, where grave public suspicion exists as to the credibility and efficiency of our complex Government, is it important that the individual citizen not look upon his Government as an inquisitor. Similarly, the concept of imposing criminal sanctions on individuals for refusing to answer questions unrelated to the national security is not only distasteful but wholly unwarranted.

Against this background, consider the 67 questions proposed to be included in the forthcoming 1970 census. Some of these will pry into the most personal parts of a person's life. Do you share your shower? Why does the Government have to know how many times and when a person was married? Why must they know who has air conditioners? Why do they ask what country a person's parents came from? Other questions ask about veteran's status, level of education completed, income and bathroom facilities. Failure to answer any of these questions would make a person liable to a fine of \$100 or 60 days in jail.

The threat that these questions pose to the individual's right of privacy is obvious, but the inclusion of the 67 questions recommended by the Census Bureau poses other problems. Experts estimate that with the relatively simple forms used in 1960, the Bureau failed to count 5.7 million people. Part of the reason may have been the difficulty many undereducated people had with the questions. With the more complex questions planned for 1970, this error is bound to increase. The forms used for the 1967 business census were so complex that many businessmen in my district had difficulty with them, sometimes taking as long as 2 full days to complete them. Thus not only would the new questions abridge our right to privacy, but they would also inhibit the primary purpose of the census, which is to count the people.

I therefore urge the passage of the bill I have introduced today, identical to Congressman BETTS' proposal. It limits the criminal penalty for failure to answer census questions to the seven most im-

portant categories: name, address, age, sex, race, head of household, and visitors in home at the time of the census. Other questions which are placed in the form at the request of other Government agencies, or which may be of use to private industry as market research, will still be on the form, but failure to answer them will not be punishable by law, and answers will thus be voluntary.

In these troublesome times, a great deal depends upon our ability in Congress to restore public respect for law and government. A system of law which threatens criminal prosecution for failure to answer unnecessary personal questions deserves sharp criticism.

Let us, therefore, do away with this particular aspect of paternalism in government by limiting the Census Bureau's power.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] and to associate myself with his efforts to obtain sensible revisions in the census questionnaire proposed for use in the 1970 census. The Congress must act this year if the desired changes are to be made in time to have millions of forms printed.

The proposed questionnaire is an intolerable attempt to probe into the individual and personal lives of Americans.

The 20-page document carries questions on 67 different subjects. Citizens would be required to answer all of them under threat of a 60-day jail sentence or a \$100 fine.

On the questionnaire form are such questions as these: "Do you share your shower?" "How do you enter your home?" "Where did you live in October 1962?" "How many babies have you ever had?"

The questions on housing go into greater detail than ever before. They are far removed from the simple survey of dwellings and occupants which is all that the Government needs to know. Questions seek to discover the value of your property, the amount of your rent, and extensive detail concerning the contents of your house.

I doubt that the Government would get very accurate answers, anyway. It is likely that a great many persons would not have the patience, even if they had the desire, to fill out these forms. Many are likely to give inadequate or inaccurate information.

In any event, these are matters which are simply none of the Government's business and the Congress should forestall the administration's plans to get into them.

To do this, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] has introduced H.R. 10952, which I support. It would limit the official census to simple, direct questions which would meet the constitutional requirements for congressional redistricting. There would be only a few mandatory questions. All other questions which the Bureau of the Census wished to include would be marked as voluntary questions. The mandatory questions would include name and address, relationship to head of household, date of birth, sex, marital status, and other basic information. All information would be kept in the strictest confidence and used solely for statistical purposes.

This legislation would permit the Government to meet its constitutional duty of taking the census while protecting the individual's right of privacy.

I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have tried very hard to comprehend what overriding public purpose will be served by my answering a knock on the door—and having to tell the complete stranger who is standing there—how much rent I pay, whether I have a flush toilet, and where my mother was born.

My initial reaction to such questions would be to say, "That's none of your business." However, if I were to say that, I might wind up spending 60 days in jail, thinking about what else I could have done with that \$100 I had to pay, in addition, as a fine.

These questions—and others equally ridiculous, prying and offensive—are going to be asked of every American householder in the 1970 census. As I say, I've tried to figure out why. And the more I think about it, the less I see any proper purpose for this kind of interrogation.

Now I am sure the Census people want to know how many children I have ever had, or how many times my wife and I have been married, or how my home is heated, or whether I share my kitchen, or what language other than English was spoken at home when I was a child. I do not doubt that they want to know everything. But that does not give them the right. And I resolutely believe in my right to close the door on this kind of snooping.

I fail to appreciate that the Government is serving any substantial public purpose in collecting this kind of information. What difference does it make how many television sets a person owns, or how his last marriage ended? Why should anyone have to account to the Government for these things?

And what is going to be changed by the answers? There is no suggestion that any legitimate governmental activity is being hampered by a failure to know—exactly how many people live in homes that have basements.

One gets the impression that this is a classic example of Parkinson's law: the Census Bureau is finding more and more things to ask, merely to give itself something to do and enhance its own importance. Yet, the danger is very real that our Government may become an informational pack rat, collecting a vast store of data on every citizen, without any conceivable application appropriate to a society cherishing freedom from Orwellian intrusion.

It is for this reason, that I have introduced H.R. 13536, which is identical to H.R. 10952, sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, JACKSON BETTS. This bill would limit the questions a citizen can be compelled to answer to seven: name, address, age, sex, race, head of household, and visitors in the home at the time of census. Other questions could still be asked, but they would be answered on a purely voluntary basis.

The present situation is intolerable in a free society. It is repugnant to me that the citizen can be forced to lay bare his present and his past, and to reveal

many intimate details of his life—or be punished like a common criminal if he refuses. The right of privacy is traditional and sacred, and should not be compromised by the Government unless there is some strong and demonstrably important public interest to be served. For example, the Internal Revenue Service may inquire into the details of one's income, because there is a compelling public interest in the collection of taxes. But what compelling interest is served by these questions?

I am not satisfied by the typical justifications for collecting this trivia. It is so marvelously easy to explain in vague generalities: We should record how much rent each person pays because this has "something to do" with the Nation's housing; we should know how many toilets are shared because this has "something to do" with the Nation's sanitation. There is no end to this sort of reasoning. Everything has "something to do" with something else. The same rationale would justify forcing people to compute for the census taker the number of times per day each toilet is used.

It is that "something to do with" that I object to. I want to know exactly what this has to do with, and whether this information is really necessary to the national well-being or is just a lot of pernicious nosiness.

We are told that it would be "convenient" for the Government to have this information in order to better perform its services. But some people seem to have forgotten that Government, in this country at least, exists as much to protect individual liberty as to perform services. Freedom cannot survive in a society where the details of the ordinary citizen's daily life become a matter of Government record. There is nothing quite so characteristic of a totalitarian regime as the notion that one's private affairs are the concern of the state. How long will it be before people feel constrained to give the census taker the "right," the "correct" answers?

Before we permit the Census Bureau to encroach any further upon our private lives, I want to know who is going to use this information, and for what purpose. We have at stake here our individual dignity and self-respect, and until I get some good answers to my questions, I for one am going to insist that the Census Bureau limit theirs to items essential to the basic purpose of a census, that is, counting heads.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], for taking this special order to allow us to discuss the vital issue of reform in the methodology of census taking. I would like to discuss one particular reform that I feel is needed both in taking the census and in compiling the data.

The problem is that of racial designation on the forms used in taking the census. No one will deny the need for such information in compiling statistics about the citizens of the United States; the point I would like to make is that previous census questionnaires have designated Americans of African ancestry as "Negroes." The word "Negro" is not a

proper designation of the background of these Americans, who should be termed "Afro-Americans." The term "Afro-American" provides both the racial identification and the cultural heritage of the largest minority group in America. I feel that the majority of the black people in the United States would prefer "Afro-American" to the term "Negro" because the etymology of the word has offensive connotations to many.

In recent years, Afro-Americans have begun to feel increased pride in our race and heritage, both in our African ancestry and in our contribution to this country. It is only fitting that all America, including the Federal Government, give black people the recognition due them by making this substitution in terminology whenever a racial or cultural designation is necessary for statistical purposes.

We must also avoid the unfortunate oversight in the 1960 census. Several million Afro-Americans were not accounted for in the last census because they were not in the places where the census takers went for data. The very existence of these Afro-Americans was thus denied by not including them in population statistics, unemployment statistics, or appropriations, estimates, or any other place where it is necessary to have accurate information with which to work. I am aware that steps are being taken to prevent a recurrence of an incomplete census, but I wanted to bring to your attention that America has seemingly passed from the era of Ralph Ellison's "Invisible Man" to a decade of the nonexistent black man.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague from the Eighth District of Ohio in discussing today the need for reforms in the 1970 Census of Population and Housing. There is certainly no more important or pressing issue facing our country.

As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Invasion of Privacy, I am particularly sensitive to the increasing need for continuous congressional scrutiny of all Federal programs to insure the traditional right to privacy of all American citizens. I am deeply concerned with the preservation of this right in the face of the instantaneous innovations in information-gathering procedures of both the public and private sectors. The gathering of personal data for the census deserves an especially close investigation because the stakes in terms of individual privacy are high.

The Bureau of the Census has decided to utilize a "mail out, mail back" system as the basic data collection procedure. Questionnaires will be sent to householders with the request that they fill them in and return them to the Census Bureau by mail. The new mail-out system will be supplemented by enumerator followup where necessary. I feel that this system, by reducing the number of persons who will handle the census information, gives an additional note of confidentiality. I commend the Census Bureau for this innovation and I feel that it reflects a concern for the issues of privacy that I have raised in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, the Census Bureau initially proposed to include in its 1970 questionnaire inquiries relating to voting habits, religious preferences and the social security number. At hearings before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, chaired by our distinguished colleague, Congressman ROBERT NIX, I raised objections to these proposed questions on the ground that no matter how useful such information might be, whether to the Federal Government or private organizations, official recording of such information would pose grave potential dangers from a privacy standpoint. Subsequent to these hearings, the Bureau of the Census deleted those questions from the 1970 census.

The proposed requirement of the social security number particularly distressed me. The use of computers for storing and compilation of census data, combined with the addition of the social security number would enable the Census Bureau to correlate new census data with other past collections. The Census Bureau felt that the state of computer technology would permit protection of personal privacy to be built into such a system. On the contrary, testimony before my special subcommittee by the most knowledgeable experts in the field discloses that no such protection is available at this time. There could be no discrimination between interested parties, be they benevolent or nonbenevolent. As Paul Baran, a computer technology expert for the Rand Corp. recently said:

The safeguards built into the present generation of time-shared systems all suffer the defect of requiring the assumption of complete integrity of too many persons connected with the computer installation.

I am particularly concerned with the relation between the computer and census data, because the computerization of such data will give an easily adaptable base and beginning to a national data bank. Data bank supporters have exhibited a great interest in linking the data held by the Census Bureau with information in the files of the Internal Revenue Service. Such a compilation and collation of information would be a significant first step in the establishment of an unprotected National Data Center.

Mr. Speaker, officials of the Bureau of the Budget recently informed me that the National Data Center proposal has been put off indefinitely, at least until technical and legal safeguards can be developed to protect individual privacy. I think we have to keep in mind that the beginning of this National Data Center can be initiated by other agencies of the Federal Government and combination of census and IRS information would, as I have said, constitute a very real beginning and start a dangerous precedent.

The more sophisticated our technological tools become, the more susceptible our country becomes to a form of dictatorial rule. In the past, this statement was always highly hypothetical. The state of the art of computers brings us daily nearer to reality. The hated "Fragebogen" of Germany in the early 1930's only gives a small indication of

the danger that centralized data holds for the people of a nation.

I am in the process of drafting legislation which would require the Bureau of the Census to submit its final list of questions to the Congress for review and approval. Under this plan, both the House and Senate would have an opportunity to instruct the Census Bureau to delete any question which unduly infringes on personal privacy or for which there is not adequate need for the information.

Mr. Speaker, the census has been collected and compiled for almost two centuries. From the first inaccurate and sketchy reports, the census has developed into a continuously flowing source of information about the American people. In turn, American society has become more and more dependent on this flow of data. It would be difficult to find an aspect of public or private life not touched or somehow shaped by census information. In the complex life of the second half of the 20th century the Federal Government needs, in order to carry out its constitutional functions, a vast and varied array of statistical information about the people of this country. The importance of this statistical information precludes mere polls or samplings. The most fundamental and serious question is: What questions may be properly asked by the Government, both from a standpoint of necessity of the information and from the standpoint of privacy. The Congress of the United States seems to me the agency of the people best suited to judge these considerations.

Mr. Speaker, privacy in America stands today at a crossroad. Technology has reduced the time span of judgment. We can no longer stand still and hope that answers to our dilemmas and protections for basic liberties will come with the due course of events. If such is our attitude, then we are surely doomed to be overtaken by the rapid events of technological progress. We must act now to provide, within our own system, the safeguards to insure that an ample measure of personal freedom and individual privacy remains. It will only be through a sensitivity to and recognition of privacy that this vanishing species of liberty can be saved.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the criticism voiced against present policies of the Census Bureau in the conduct of the population, business, and agriculture censuses are justified and should not be taken lightly. As the techniques of information gathering are improved and more extensive questions presented, a balance between proper inquiry and technological progress should be maintained. It is the necessity for restoring of this balance which I believe underlies the census debate today.

Letters from my constituents and reports from colleagues indicate a rising resentment over mandatory census questions. The number and personal nature of inquiries, beyond normal needs, understandably bothers many people. This is also the case among businessmen and farmers, especially where detailed questions require extensive research to supply information. The threat of a Na-

tional Data Center which would use census reports as a basis for a dossier file on every American is of deep concern to me. I think the values and sentiments expressed by citizens and businessmen should be weighed carefully and contrasted with the needs of the Federal Government.

Although the Census Bureau receives the recommendations of many organizations in the preparation of its major censuses as to the questions most needed, these are principally statistical users calling for more extensive interrogation of society. The statistical givers, the John Does of America, are not represented on any Census Advisory Committee. Furthermore, it is troubling that Congress has not voted on decennial census policy since 1940. The oversight hearings periodically held with committees of Congress and the scattered public and journalistic outcries against census activities are inadequate to the reestablishment of a balanced census policy for the 1970's.

Back in 1954 an intensive review committee, appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, made an appraisal of census programs. This committee studied the gamut of census activities and presented recommendations to the Secretary for implementation. An intensive review of census operations, with particular emphasis on the four major censuses—Government, population, business, and agriculture—would be most useful today. I believe any such group should include spokesmen for citizen groups, such as religious, patriotic, business, farmer, and consumer organizations. Those concerned with the proper operation of the Federal Government in the context of constitutional protections against invasion of privacy should be participants in a review panel of census programs. Several Members of Congress would add an important legislative dimension and anchor to public views if they were official participants in this task force.

Mr. Speaker, what I see then as necessary to untangle the many issues surrounding present census policy, is a special ad hoc committee appointed by the President or Secretary of Commerce, to undertake this responsibility. This is too important a function of government to drift without a coherent, balanced program with broad public support. I fear that public cooperation with the Census Bureau will continue to decline if action such as I propose is not followed:

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [JACKSON BERRIS], has very effectively dramatized the concern that Members are expressing on behalf of their constituents over the propriety and details that will be demanded in the 1970 census.

It has been noted that close to 6 million people were probably missed in the 1960 census and it certainly should be the first order for the Census Bureau to obtain an accurate count of our citizens before delving into questions which constitute an invasion of privacy. The census should concentrate on obtaining a valid count rather than concentrating on nonessential questions.

May I point out to the Members that the Internal Revenue Service has been under constant admonition to streamline their reporting forms so that citizens can properly and effectively file an income tax return. Despite this Internal Revenue Service forms for individuals as well as businesses grow more complicated annually. Obviously, the Census Bureau follows this bureaucratic pattern in that the 1970 forms to be used for 25 percent of the households are more complicated and difficult than those used in 1960.

There are needed reforms that could be made before the 1970 census of population, housing and employment is taken. It is my opinion that there will be a substantial interest exhibited by Members of Congress under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS], and that the Census Bureau will adopt a fundamental simplification which would certainly be in the public interest.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time may be allotted to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNISTS INFILTRATE POOR PEOPLE'S MARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] is recognized for 58 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, let me say initially that I appreciate the indulgence. The hour is late. I certainly do not propose to detain you any longer than is absolutely necessary.

I would say at this point that a number of the Members of the House wanted to participate in this special order but because of other commitments they had to leave. They have asked me, Mr. Speaker, to request at this time unanimous consent that all Members might have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this particular special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, obviously yesterday I struck a nerve when I announced to the House and in turn to the American people that we were going to discuss the Communist involvement in the Poor People's Campaign now being conducted in the Nation's Capital, because only this morning I received telephone calls among which was a cowardly call—all anonymous—that I am a marked man and that I had better not say anything about this matter.

Well, I say in response to the man who made that call and to any others that if they think they can intimidate or harass me or any other Member of this House into not speaking his convictions on any matter, then they have another thought coming. Because down my way when you threaten a person—and I am sure that this applies North, South, East, and West—it is just like saying "sic 'em" to a bulldog.

I think some things need to be said. We have had statements from leaders here in reference to the Poor People's Campaign from down in "Resurrection City." I hope the good Lord will pardon those who use that expression. One of the young members down there more properly described it as "Insurrection City" because it is an explosive situation if ever you have seen one.

There are upward of 5,000 people to be involved very soon. They seem to have no direct program or definitive plans. According to the old adage, the idle brain is the devil's workshop, I tell you it will be miraculous even if the Communists were not involved, for this Nation not to experience some tragic days in the weeks ahead.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that Americans throughout this country are asking the question, What is wrong up here? Is the Congress powerless to do anything about this situation?

The people are asking, Are we helpless? Have we turned everything over to those who resort to anarchy and who would say, "I do not care what the Congress does or what the Executive does or what anybody does, I am going to do exactly what I wish"?

I believe your people are asking that question. Certainly my people are. Are we going to sit back and say nothing?

This situation, in my judgment, has reached an alarming state. People can get up and make the statement, as did the leader of this campaign yesterday, and I quote him.

He said on Monday that demonstrations "more militant and more massive than have ever taken place in the history of the Nation" will begin in a few days.

His name is Ralph Abernathy and he goes further to say, before a cheering mob in "Resurrection City, U.S.A." that "We are going to raise hell."

Well, I happen to have a twin brother who is a minister and I am sure most of you are not familiar with that kind of language coming from a man who purportedly is a member of the clergy. But it appears that so many of these people, automatically, in order to qualify for a leadership position in this particular movement acquire a clerical robe in order to make them appear sanctimonious. This places them beyond the law and beyond criticism.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that just recently a leading spokesman for the Poor People's Campaign predicted that on Memorial Day approximately 1 million people will be in the city of Washington for a demonstration of some sort. This seems to be a rather ambitious pronouncement, especially in the light of the difficulties being encountered by the

march leaders even to obtain sufficient food and shelter for the some 3,000 or so poor people expected to reside in the tent city.

In my judgment this statement is only another example of how leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and other coordinating groups for this march are not only misleading District and Federal officials but, in addition, are misleading their own people.

In fact, it seems to me that a gigantic credibility gap is being created more and more every day by this entire spectacle here in the Nation's Capital. Possibly it had its beginning last year when the late Dr. Martin Luther King first announced a campaign for the poor. It apparently reached a semiclimax just recently when the House Public Works Committee publicly withheld reporting a bill or asking a rule for a bill denying access to public parks or areas for a camp-in until the march leaders, with Federal and District officials, could work out an agreement for alternate sites.

Let me say this parenthetically at this time: Are you aware of the fact that just a short time ago the Department of the Interior, a Mr. Fitch, denied a permit for a Baptist group which has never been identified with any violence in any shape, form, or description, to parade in the Nation's Capital. They wanted to march to the Capitol Building for a centennial observance on October 10th to the 13th and applied for a permit some months in advance, and the reason for the denial of that permit was because of the tense and explosive situation existing in the Nation's Capital? Oh, you talk about double standards and discrimination.

What is happening in this Nation of ours? Are we going to be blackmailed into succumbing to the wishes, the whims, and the desires of people who consider themselves above the law? I submit that I do not believe the Members of this Congress will acquiesce to such demands. I believe the Members of this Congress are going to stand up and be counted and tell the Executive that we still have law and order in this country and the law must be enforced regardless of the political consequences.

Mr. Speaker, today I must report to the Congress and the American people another episode in the apparent "lie technique" which has characterized the so-called Poor People's March or Campaign. In doing this I fully realize that certain segments of society will brand me as a racist, as a witch hunter, or some other equally derogatory name, which is always, if you will, used to describe anyone with whom they happen to disagree. However, let the chips fall where they may. I am not in the habit of backing down from a fight. I call the shots as I see them.

The people of my congressional district have placed their faith in me, just as yours have placed their faith in you, and I believe it is our responsibility to respond to that confidence and to be honest in relating the facts as we see them. To do less, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, would be a dereliction of our duty as a Member of this august body.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I must report today a serious matter which a number of my colleagues have alluded to before—that of active Communist involvement in the Poor People's Campaign. I know some Members would automatically say, "The Communists are supporting this campaign. Anyone knows that." Certainly, the Communist Party in its last convention in New York announced that henceforth there would be two main thrusts in its operation. The first was to move into youth areas. No doubt, I am sure, we could rightly conclude that some of the disorders and agitation on the college campuses of America today have come about as a result of this particular thrust of the Communist Party. The second thrust, of course, is in the so-called civil rights field.

I am sure we could perhaps even rely upon a secret memorandum which was sent out on May 1 by one William L. Patterson, a longtime Communist Party functionary, which was sent to all Communist cells throughout America and those who cooperate with them, calling for full support of what he called the new revolution in America.

I am certain some of us have seen this memorandum. I did not see it myself, but it has been called to my attention. Even Gus Hall announced recently in a public TV program that Communists were giving their full support to this particular movement.

Let me say at this juncture that I am not in any way accusing the leaders of this campaign of Communist Party affiliation. I am not one who sees a Communist behind every tree and a Communist behind every bush.

I am not suggesting that the Communists are in total control of this particular campaign, but I am going to inform the House of a highly secretive meeting which took place last month in Atlanta, Ga., that definitely links prominent members of the Communist Party with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference leaders. This 2-day meeting was originally scheduled for 3 days. It took place on April 25 and 26 at the Interdenominational Theological Center, 671 Beckworth Street, Southwest, in Atlanta, Ga. Actually it had been scheduled for the 27th, but they concluded their business the night of the 26th.

Mr. Speaker, this meeting supposedly was a routine meeting of the board of directors of the Southern Conference Education Fund, Inc., which usually meets in November and April.

May I say parenthetically at this time to some of my liberal friends, if you are in doubt as to what prominent liberals think about the Southern Conference Education Fund, there are statements to be included in the RECORD made by the late Eleanor Roosevelt when she disavowed any affiliation with this group because of its Communist activity.

In addition, Ralph McGill denounced this particular group.

This group has been cited as a Communist-front group since 1956 by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. SCEF claims among its ruling hierarchy no less than five members who have been previously identified as Communists.

In that connection, I will return later to the activities of this group which are well known as a result of various investigations.

This meeting of SCEF was somewhat unusual in that its principal topic of discussion was the so-called Poor People's March on Washington. In attendance at this meeting were Carl Braden and his wife, Anne, whose Communist identities are certainly well known to any reasonably knowledgeable American. Included in the 20 or so others in attendance were Rev. Fred L. Shuttlesworth, one of the original founders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference now sponsoring this march, and Rev. C. Kenzie Steele, who presently serves as a first vice president of the SCLC.

Of course, there were other prominent Negro civil rights workers or supporters at the meeting in addition to these names I have mentioned. We shall point to them later.

Actually, it was not unusual for this group to gather, since everyone there has been involved in the affairs of SCEF for many years. In fact, this group's activities have been watched over by the FBI as well as the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and also the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In the first place, the meeting was controlled by hard-core Communists who, by the way, are white. Carl and Anne Braden are white people who are deluding, deceiving, and exploiting these poor people even at this very moment. And it is tragic that the leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference would become the stooges and the dupes of such people as Carl and Anne Braden, whose involvement in Communist-front groups dates back to 1950, according to the available records.

At this particular meeting they chided Shuttlesworth and Steele for not giving them, or SCEF and the other Communist organizations, greater recognition for their role in promoting the Poor People's Campaign. Carl Braden went so far as to say that he had just returned from Washington and while there had succeeded in gaining financial support as well as personal commitments to assist in this campaign, and further contended that he was instrumental in drawing up the final plans for the march while he was in Washington. Apparently Shuttlesworth and Steele accepted the Braden story. They had no reason not to accept it.

Let me inject at this point that there is no wonder, and should come as no surprise, that Braden the Communist and others are helping Abernathy, because Abernathy was the first man to sign a petition asking for executive clemency or the release of Carl Braden when he was convicted of sedition in the State of Kentucky and sentenced to 15 years in prison and a \$5,000 fine. Incidentally, Braden has frequent correspondence with the Communist Robert Williams, the man in exile in Cuba and Communist China. He is the one who is sending all of these inflammatory pamphlets and leaflets into America telling Americans how to construct a Molotov cocktail and

how to paralyze the various cities of America.

These are the people with whom we are dealing.

Both Steele and Shuttlesworth have served with Braden in SCEF for years and they know him to be a tireless worker in their movement, which allegedly is used to further civil rights causes. No one really challenged Braden's right to infuse his energy into the Poor People's Campaign despite the fact that he and other Communists had a notorious record of un-American activities.

At this meeting Shuttlesworth proposed that SCEF formally adopt a resolution of support, both monetary and in terms of personnel for the campaign here in Washington. But in that resolution they proposed the inclusion of the term "nonviolent."

We have all heard that term. It is standard so far as the vocabulary of the leadership of the SCLC is concerned. But, you know, I cannot quite understand a man who would go out and say, "We are going to turn this place upside down, we are going to have more militant and massive demonstrations than we have ever seen in history," "We are going to raise hell," and yet at the same time say it is going to be "nonviolent." I do not believe he would even be able to get the poor people to believe such "poppycock" as that.

Braden was opposed to the use of non-violence because he said it was outmoded and archaic and that the campaigners have to be more militant. This is why he suggested that this term be stricken, and it was done. In lieu thereof a resolution was adopted calling for massive militant civil disobedience, whatever that is. That is the idea which became the theme of the final resolution that was passed by SCEF on April 25 and 26. It is interesting to note that Braden apparently appeased Shuttlesworth and Steele by pledging his support to Steele as the next president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in the event of the death of Rev. Ralph Abernathy. Steele, who is now serving as the first vice president of SCLC, was one of the original founders of this organization. Many observers feel that he should have succeeded the late Dr. Martin Luther King. However, Braden also indicated that he holds the Reverend Jesse Jackson in high esteem, and he feels that Jackson would make a good successor to Abernathy. Jackson has been recognized as the unofficial "mayor" of Resurrection City, although I understand that Abernathy was accorded that title last evening. Apparently, Braden's influence upon naming the leadership of SCLC is very substantial.

Of course, the birth of SCLC grew out of bus boycotts in several southern cities in 1955-56. Four leaders, including Steele, called a founding meeting of what was to become the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Atlanta on January 10-11, 1957. The call to the conference was jointly issued by Steele of Tallahassee, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., of Montgomery, the Reverend T. J. Jemison of Baton Rouge, and the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth of Birmingham.

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

Mr. WATSON. Yes, sir. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me.

Inasmuch as we are discussing the role of the Southern Conference Educational Fund in connection with the billionaires' promoted Poor People's March here in our Nation's Capital, I would apprise the gentleman from South Carolina that Carl and Ann Braden and their front, the Southern Conference Educational Fund, have arranged on this Saturday coming for a meeting at Charleston, W. Va., apparently to include writers and workers from the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina. The main announced speaker in their propaganda is one Rev. Andrew Young, who, according to the Evening Star paper of last night, is identified as the vice president of the SCLC. According to their format the meeting will be at John Adams Junior High School, at Dickerson and Lewis Streets in Charleston, W. Va. The announcement states:

This will be in preparation for the May 30 demonstration of the Poor Peoples' Campaign in Washington.

Movies are to be shown at 9 a.m., and the program will start at 11 o'clock. In the afternoon there are to be work sessions on welfare, taxes, elections, education, roads and bridges, co-ops, and youth.

I raise the question "why" Carl and Ann Braden, convicted Communists from the State of Kentucky, would be interested in roads and bridges unless they are completing their sinister plans to block the traffic in our Nation's Capital, to block the roads and bridges through our Nation's Capital City in conjunction with the announced Memorial Day, May 30, demonstration? But certainly this meeting and top level planning with identified Communists is clear evidence of Communist leadership in the so-called Poor Peoples' March.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me. I did want to bring him up to date on this latest development.

Mr. WATSON. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

So far as what their plans might be, I, for one, would not put anything beyond them.

Mr. RARICK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. RARICK. I might add that the Braden invitation just referred to ends up naming telephone numbers and individual names and reads:

Also, if you plan to come and do not have funds, please contact so and so. He is on the steering committee of the PPC.

Which I assume would be the Poor People's Campaign here in Washington, D.C., which for some obvious reason has tentacles that go right back to the Bradens in Charleston, W. Va. In other words there may be poor dupes in the march but the Bradens are well enough

fixed to finance the poor—provided they can use them.

I thank the gentleman from South Carolina again for yielding.

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

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to talk about others who attended this meeting and the discussions. Of course, the record of Carl Braden as an agent of the Soviet Union is practically endless. He has been prominently identified with no less than 15 Communist front organizations. He was indicted by a grand jury in Louisville, Ky., on October 1, 1954, on a State law against sedition, criminal syndicalism, and advocacy of forceful change of the Government. On December 13, 1954, he was convicted of advocating sedition and sentenced to 15 years and a \$5,000 fine. In 1956, while his appeal was pending in the Kentucky Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case, ruling that State sedition laws have been replaced by Federal law, was handed down, and Braden's conviction was nullified.

Mr. Speaker, House Report No. 1278, 87th Congress, first session, entitled "The Truth About the Film Operation Abolition," contains an explanation of the specific charge against Braden and others, and at this point I would like to include it as a part of my remarks.

The report follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT VERNON BOWN  
CLAIM

(a) The film says that Vernon Bown is a Communist although the committee's own hearings in San Francisco indicated that he is not a member of the Communist Party.

(b) The film also says that Bown was one of the "Louisville Seven" charged in 1954 with "sedition, destruction of property, conspiracy to destroy property to achieve a political end, and contempt of court," but does not point out that Bown was acquitted of these charges.

FACT

(a) During the morning session, Friday, May 13, the committee introduced certain documents in the San Francisco hearings—including some written by Bown himself—which revealed that, as a result of a policy disagreement with higher officials in the Northern California District of the Communist Party, Bown in 1959 was unwillingly ousted as the organizer of a Communist Party section embracing members of unions traditionally in the A.F.L. and was finally expelled from the party itself.

These documents indicated that Bown was expelled from the party despite the fact that he had the support of other Communists in his club and section in his dispute; that he was never informed of the charges made against him by higher party officials; and that neither he nor any of the Communists who supported him were allowed to attend his "trial."

During the San Francisco hearings, Bown and three identified Communist Party members who had supported him in the dispute with the leadership invoked the fifth amendment in response to questions about this controversy and Bown's expulsion.

Bown, during the San Francisco hearings, invoked the fifth amendment on *current* party membership.

In his report on the San Francisco riots, J. Edgar Hoover reveals that on May 6—about a week before the hearings—Mickey Lima, chairman of the Northern California District of the Communist Party, informed other

party members that he had already met with Bown to insure that Bown would be a hostile witness at the hearings. This indicates either that Bown was again in the party and under its discipline—a willing supporter of, and collaborator with, the party despite his expulsion from it—or else in fear of the party and, therefore, obedient to Lima's orders though not a member.

The fact that on May 13, Bown, his wife, and stepdaughter were all arrested as rioters would indicate that it was not fear, but rather obedience to orders as a party member or eagerness to work with the party while technically outside it, that guided his conduct.

The committee does not claim to know if Bown is today—or was on May 13, 1960—technically a member of the Communist Party. It may be that he has been restored to membership since his 1959 expulsion. Inasmuch, however, as he has given absolutely no evidence that he has broken with communism—though he may still be technically outside party ranks—the film's description of him as a "Communist"—(not as a "party member") is accurate. A person can be a Communist, a believer in the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and an active collaborator with a national Communist Party and the world Communist movement, without being a formal member of a Communist Party.

(b) Bown was never "acquitted" of the charges made against him.

On September 24, 1954, a Louisville, Ky., grand jury indicted Vernon Bown for contempt of court and for placing explosives under a house. In October 1954, the same grand jury indicted him for sedition. In November, a new grand jury indicted Bown for sedition, on the charge of damaging property to achieve a political end. Other persons indicted with him on this charge included Carl Braden and his wife, Anne Braden; I. O. Ford; and Louis Lubek.

The above indictments and an earlier indictment of Carl Braden on charges of sedition grew out of a dynamite explosion under a house in a Louisville suburb. The explosion took place at about 12:30 a.m., on Sunday, June 27, 1954. The house at the time was owned and occupied by a man named Andrew Wade IV, a Negro, and his family.

An organization called the Wade Defense Committee immediately demanded a grand jury investigation of the explosion. One followed.

The grand jury took over 1,000 pages of testimony from 53 witnesses. The indictments of Bown, the Bradens, and others grew out of its proceedings. In the course of its investigation and the sedition trial of Carl Braden which followed its indictment of him, the following information was developed.

On May 10, 1954, Carl and Anne Braden, both members of the Communist Party, at Wade's request and with his money, had bought the house in which he was living at the time of the explosion, informing the seller of the house that they intended using it for their own residence. On the following day, the Wades began moving into the house, and on May 13 the Bradens gave Wade the deed to the house. The Bradens had known the Wades for 8 to 10 years and, on two previous occasions, had tried unsuccessfully to buy a home for them in a white neighborhood.

The Wade Defense Committee was set up shortly after the Bradens bought the house. Bown, the Bradens, and all others indicted as a result of the grand jury investigation, as well as other persons with pro-Communist records, were members of this committee.

The committee adopted various measures to publicize the fact that the Wades had moved into a white neighborhood and to develop this into an inflammatory issue.

Anne Braden called the police, ministers, and a priest to protest threats allegedly made against the Wades. Letters of a similar nature were sent to churches in the area, both white and Negro. A radio script prepared by the committee claimed that bankers, real estate men, and hoodlums were attempting to drive the Wades out of their home. Carl Braden prepared a press statement for Wade in which the latter said: "We intend to live here or die here."

A police guard for the Wade home was requested—and provided. The Wade Defense Committee also provided "guards" for the Wades. Bown "volunteered" and, when he took up full-time residence in the house before the explosion, brought a rifle and shotgun with him. (Eighteen or more firearms—high-power rifles, ".22's," shotguns, and pistols—were found in the Wade home after the explosion.) In addition, although the Wades had a combination radio-TV set and a clock radio in their home, Bown bought a new portable radio, of the combination battery-electric current type, before moving into the house. He gave up his guard duty and moved out of the house immediately after the explosion.

The Wade home had a crawl space beneath it. The only entrance to this space was a small, window-size opening off the driveway. No fuse or wire was found running outside the house after the explosion. For this reason and because of the presence of the guards on the outside and around the house, the grand jury found that it would have been "impossible" for the explosive to be placed under the house by an outsider and that it had to be an "inside job," done by "someone having easy and ready access" to the house.

Bown's portable radio was found under the house in a damaged condition after the explosion. It was set to work on batteries rather than on current. Its speaker was missing. The set was suspended by wire from a nail that had been driven into a joist of the house. A piece of wire with its insulation scraped off was also found beneath the house. A terminal out of Bown's radio battery appeared to have been the point for connecting the explosive.

Melvin Edwards, another "guard" on duty with Bown at the time of the explosion, was familiar with the use of explosives—and Bown himself had knowledge of electricity and radio repair.

A radio expert testified that Bown's radio could have been used to detonate the dynamite that caused the explosion. Wade admitted in his testimony that he thought Bown's radio might have been used to set off the explosion.

At the time of the explosion, the Wades and their guards were outside the house or on the porch on the side opposite from where the dynamite had been placed beneath it. None, therefore, were injured by the explosion. The Wade child had been left with the grandparents for the night.

The residence which Bown had shared with I. O. Ford before moving into the Wade house was searched. In addition to large quantities of Communist literature, a letter was found which had been written to Ford by a California Communist. This letter, dated after the explosion in the Wade house, congratulated Ford on the good job he was doing in Louisville, referred to damage that had been done to the home of a Negro in California, and commented on the agitation that had developed there because of it.

A letter was also found in Braden's possession which had apparently been written to him by Giles Cooper, a Communist Party organizer of Lexington, Ky. It contained a newspaper clipping, dated in Manchester, Ky., which told of the dynamiting of a store owned by a Negro in that city on July 5, 1953. A note from Cooper to Braden, written

on the margin of this clipping, requested that resolutions and letters on the bombing be called to the attention of Negro and labor organizations. Cooper also wrote "I was maybe 20 miles away"—meaning, apparently, 20 miles from the scene of the explosion at the time it occurred.

Bown invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he owned the radio found under the Wade house; if he had ever taken a radio under the house, and if he was a member of the Communist Party.

When asked if Bown had ever been under the House, Wade testified:

I can only say that he did look under the house, and I don't know that, but my wife told me he had mentioned looking under there just for curiosity.

Bits of Bown's radio were found scattered about in the crawl space under the house. Bown testified he did not believe his radio was used in the explosion and that it had probably been damaged upstairs and part of it had then fallen through the hole in the floor made by the explosion. This, however, was impossible for two reasons:

(1) Bown's radio, as previously mentioned, was found suspended from a joist under the house, and

(2) parts of it were found under undamaged portions of the floor.

Bown testified that he had attended a radio school for a short time. He refused to say if he owned books and pamphlets on electrical work and the repair of radios and other appliances—but such pamphlets and books were found in his room, plus the kind of wire used for electrical connections.

Bown also testified that he had left the Wade house after work on Friday (a little more than 24 hours before the explosion); had gone to Milwaukee and Racine, Wisconsin; and then returned to Louisville Sunday afternoon, after the explosion.

If, as the Communists claimed, white racists were trying to drive the Wades out of their home, guards were needed more urgently after the explosion—because there was no telling what these people might do next. Despite this, Bown, the volunteer guard, moved out of the house. The morning after the explosion and his return to Louisville, he rented a room in a boarding house owned by a member of the Wade Defense Committee.

The grand jury found that all the evidence in the case seemed "to cause a reasonable person to believe beyond a reasonable doubt that Bown set off the explosion."

Braden was tried and convicted of sedition, received a 15-year prison sentence, and was fined \$5,000.

Bown and the others were scheduled to be tried in November of 1956. Shortly before this, however, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Nelson case, which invalidated all State sedition laws. This meant that Braden, who was then in jail pending an appeal of his conviction, was freed and that Bown and the others could not be tried. The Kentucky law under which they had been indicted had been invalidated.

Contrary to the claim of those who attack the film, Bown was not "acquitted" of the charges made against him—and, although he escaped trial, the evidence against him accumulated in the grand jury proceedings and in the trial of Carl Braden has never been refuted.

Mr. Speaker, Carl Braden was also indicted on sedition charges by a Pike County, Ky., grand jury, September 11, 1967. However, he and four other defendants were freed when the sedition statute was ruled unconstitutional by a U.S. district court. At this point I would like to include an article from the *Advertiser*, a Lafayette, La., newspaper of

September 13, 1967, describing the nature of the charges against him:

#### BRADEN IS INDICTED FOR SEDITION

An identified Communist who has been in the news in Lafayette and other Louisiana cities in connection with Un-American Activities hearings of a state legislative committee has been indicted for sedition in Kentucky, according to the Associated Press.

She is Ann Braden, a leader in the Southern Conference Education Fund (SCEF) and editor of *The Southern Patriot*.

The Braden woman and her husband, Carl, who has also been identified as a Communist were indicted Monday with three Pike County, Ky., poverty workers on sedition charges by the Pike County Grand Jury.

Named in the indictment were Ann and Carl Braden of Louisville, leaders of SCEF, Mr. and Mrs. Alan McSurely, field workers for SCEF in Pike County and Joseph Mulloy, Appalachian Volunteer staff member in the county.

#### POVERTY WORKERS COLLABORATE

The latter three were arrested Aug. 11-12 following raids on their homes, which, according to Pike County Commonwealth's Atty. Thomas Ratiff, produced a "truckload of seditious material." The Associated Press reported that the indictment charged that a "well organized and well financed effort is being made to promote and spread the Communist theory to overthrow the government of Pike County." The jury report said Communist organizers have been sent to Pike County by "racial organizations which have paid and supported them."

"Some employees of the Appalachian Volunteers and other federally-financed anti-poverty programs have collaborated and cooperated with known Communist organizers," the AP account said. The jury added that "local officials of the Appalachian Volunteers have cooperated with known Communist organizers."

When the Louisiana Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities exposed a Communist on the War on Poverty payroll, an undercover agent identified the Braden woman as the one who introduced the person who tried to recruit him into the Sparacast League, a Communist organization.

The legislative committee identified the recruiter as Virginia Y. Collins, who once earned \$4200 a year in the antipoverty program and who also worked for the director of SCEF in New Orleans. SCEF has been identified by congressional and legislative committees as a Communist transmission belt. The Southern Patriot is the house organ of SCEF and a representative of the paper attended the Lafayette hearing.

Braden was convicted of sedition in 1954, but the state court of appeals overturned the decision on the ground that the federal government has jurisdiction in the field of sedition. Braden once served a year in jail for contempt of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Carl Braden was also convicted of contempt of the House on January 30, 1959, and was sentenced to 1 year in jail. On March 16, 1959, his motion for a new trial was denied by the U.S. District Court in Atlanta, and on February 27, 1961, the Supreme Court affirmed the contempt conviction. He surrendered on May 1, 1961, to begin serving his 1-year prison term.

In turning to his wife, Anne, we find a record of subversive work which almost parallels that of Carl.

In 1954, during the sedition trial of Carl Braden before the grand jury in Louisville, Mrs. Alberta Ahearn, a rebuttal witness, testified that she had been doing undercover work for the FBI in a Communist cell of which Carl and Anne

Braden were members. Again, in 1957, Mrs. Ahearn appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and testified that Carl Braden and his wife, Anne, recruited her into the Communist Party, and that both were members of most of her Communist Party cells. Actually, Anne Braden's Communist activities indicate that she has been involved in more front groups than Carl.

In addition to the Bradens, the names of other very interesting persons turned up at the SCEF meeting last month. They include one, Alan McSurely, a white male, who together with the Bradens was indicted for the sedition charges in Pike County, Kentucky. It is also interesting to note that the reason for the indictment stemmed from a confiscation from McSurely's home of Communist propaganda used allegedly during his tenure as an antipoverty worker.

Another interesting participant in the 2-day meeting was the Reverend Jack Richard McMichael, a white male, who has long been associated with various Communist causes. McMichael testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities denying earlier sworn testimony by four witnesses that he was a member of the Communist Party. In view of the direct conflict between his testimony and that of other witnesses, the committee voted to transmit the matter to the Department of Justice for consideration of possible perjury prosecution. However, you guessed it, the Justice Department failed to prosecute.

May I say this at this point. We are dealing here with people who are extremely smart. We are dealing with the question of the intelligence and shrewdness of these particular individuals, people who are able to manipulate others who are not aware of the facts of life.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to submit for the RECORD an abstract from the committee's annual report for the year 1953, which summarizes testimony by and about McMichael:

JACK RICHARD McMICHAEL

As has been reflected in other parts of this report, the House Committee on Un-American Activities is charged by the Congress with the investigation of subversive activities wherever they may be found.

In the hearings held in New York City in July 1953, the committee heard the testimony of Manning Johnson and Leonard Patterson, both of whom had been members of the Communist Party in the United States. Both Johnson and Patterson had testified for the Government in the prosecution of Communist leaders in the Smith Act cases, as well as before the Subversive Activities Control Board. The efforts of defense counsel in these cases to shake the testimony of these witnesses failed and their testimony has been unimpeached.

In the course of his testimony, Manning Johnson, on July 8, 1953, testified as follows:

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Johnson, do you know of any other person who was an officer of the Methodist Federation [for Social Action] at any time who was a member of the Communist Party?"

"Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; the Reverend Jack McMichael was a member of the Methodist Federation."

"Mr. SCHERER. What was his connection with the Methodist Federation?"

"Mr. JOHNSON. He was executive secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Action up until 1953.

"Mr. SCHERER. How did you know that Reverend McMichael was a Communist?"

"Mr. JOHNSON. Well, during the period that I was member of the Communist Party, during the thirties, Jack McMichael was a member of the national committee of the Young Communist League, and he was also a member of the Communist Party, and from time to time he met with the now fugitive Communist, Gilbert Green, who was head of the Young Communist League at that time, and he attended occasionally meetings of the national committee of the Communist Party with Gilbert Green.

"Mr. SCHERER. Was Reverend McMichael still a member of the Communist Party when you left the party?"

"Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; he was."

During the same New York hearings, Leonard Patterson furnished the committee with the following testimony:

"Mr. KUNZIG. When you were in the Young Communist League, did you ever know one Jack McMichael?"

"Mr. PATTERSON. Yes."

"Mr. KUNZIG. What position did he hold in the Young Communist League?"

"Mr. PATTERSON. He was a member of the New York District of the Young Communist League and was a member of the top faction of the Young Communist League and the Communist Party in the American League Against War and Fascism. Also he was a member of the top faction of the American Youth Congress that was organized around 1934.

"Mr. KUNZIG. You knew him then as one of the leading members of the Young Communist League?"

"Mr. PATTERSON. Yes."

"Mr. KUNZIG. I hand you a document marked 'Patterson Exhibit No. 1' for identification. I am very carefully holding my hand over any names mentioned and in passing you this document marked 'Exhibit No. 1' for identification. I show you a picture and ask you if you recognize that person?"

"Mr. PATTERSON. Yes."

"Mr. KUNZIG. Who is that?"

"Mr. PATTERSON. That is the McMichael as I recognized in the Young Communist League together with me from 1931 until I went out in 1935."

"Mr. KUNZIG. Let the record show, Mr. Chairman, that the witness has identified a document which is a photostatic copy of an article from the New York World Telegram, September 15, 1951, headlined 'Controversial Federation Retains Methodist in Name.'

"'Body Reelects Reverend McMichael,' and then there is a picture under which appears the name of Reverend McMichael."

On the basis of this testimony, the committee called the Reverend Jack Richard McMichael, who is presently pastor of the Methodist Church at Upper Lake, Calif. The Reverend McMichael denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party. During the course of the hearing, the witness was confronted by Manning Johnson and the witness denied knowledge of him.

The committee also received the testimony of John and Martha Edmiston who stated they had met with the Reverend McMichael during May or June 1940 at the Southern Hotel in Columbus, Ohio, the occasion being a meeting of the Ohio Youth Congress.

The Reverend McMichael contended that his diary indicated that he was not in Columbus, Ohio, during the period of May or June 1940, and he denied that he knew Martha or John Edmiston.

In view of the conflict in testimony, the committee voted that the testimony of Manning Johnson, Leonard Patterson, Martha and John Edmiston, and the Reverend Jack R. McMichael be transmitted to the Department

of Justice for consideration of possible perjury prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, there are other names of those who attended the meeting whose identification with Communist fronts appears endless. Included among these is Miriam Nicholas, who is a close associate of the Bradens, and Mrs. Clarice T. Campbell, a white female, who was a principal participant in a conference called in 1962 by Carl Braden entitled "Ways and Means to Integration in the Deep South." Braden was highly successful in being able to use this conference to infuse Communist Party objectives into the civil rights movement in a manner acceptable to the majority of the attenders who apparently were unsuspecting and unaware of this Communist influence.

As I pointed out earlier, most of those attending the meeting who possessed questionable loyalty to the country were white. They have managed to identify themselves with humanistic causes and as a consequence have managed to convince unsuspecting loyal Americans black and white of their desire to eliminate poverty and other social ills, whereas in fact and in full truth they are only using that as an excuse to reach their ultimate objective, and that is the overthrow of our form of government.

It is alarming and indeed tragic, but the Bradens have tremendous influence and that influence has manifested itself in the Poor People's Campaign taking place in Washington at this moment. The Atlanta meeting of which I speak is an excellent example of how Communist rhetoric carefully wrapped up in the blanket of humanism conceals their real objective—to further the ends of international communism. An example of their ability to incite violence and project themselves as the true support of civil rights causes was clearly evident in Newark. No less a Negro militant than playwright LeRoi Jones has pointed this out in a dialog which took place on WCBS radio.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point as a part of my remarks a news account from the Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N.J., on April 13, 1968, describing this interview with LeRoi Jones, when he cited the activities of the Communists, and their agitators, in the riots that were held in the city of Newark:

NEWARK BLACKS, WHITES CITE AGITATION BY REDS

NEWARK.—Negro poet-playwright LeRoi Jones joined white militant and police captain Friday in charging that leftists had attempted to foment trouble among area Negroes following the death of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Jones, who is free on bail while appealing a weapons charge stemming from last summer's riots, said: "We found that a lot of the turmoil and a lot of the kind of riotous situation has been caused by instigators, people with no interest in the community except to cause riotous conditions . . ."

#### RADICAL GROUPS

"There are white-led so-called radical groups, leftists groups that are exploiting the people's desire for power . . . exploiting it and actually using the black people as a kind of shock troop to further their own designs . . ."

Jones was referring to unrest in the pre-

dominantly Negro Central Ward of this city following the recent death of Dr. King.

Some rock-throwing, looting and fire bombing incidents were reported but major trouble did not erupt.

Jones' statements were made in an interview over WCBS radio.

Also interviewed was Anthony Imperiale, president of a militant all-white North Ward Citizens Committee.

He declared: "We believed that the Communists and Trotskyites—persons who have no interest in the City of Newark except to cause destruction—on behalf of possibly Moscow or Peking—came in here and helped these riots."

POLICEMAN AGREES

Newark Detective Captain Charles Kinney added that leftwingers were responsible for much of Newark's racial woes.

"I have prepared a full report and I am accusing the New Left," Kinney said.

"This group has come to our city and it has been operating for some four years, and has been active in fomenting the trouble that we've had in the City of Newark."

Jones and Imperiale, who represent widely different viewpoints, were among the black and white militants invited to a conference by Newark Police Director Dominick A. Spina shortly after the death of Dr. King.

The 33-year-old Jones, an avowed black nationalist, was convicted in 1967, along with Charles McCray, 33, and Barry Wynn, 23, of illegal possession of weapons during the July riots which cost 26 lives.

He is free under \$25,000 bond pending an appeal of his 2½ to 3 year sentence.

Mr. Speaker, the Southern Conference Education Fund, which is certainly aiding and abetting the Communist conspiracy, has been exposed on a number of occasions. However, it continues to operate under the guise of a legitimate civil rights organization in order to further its goal of racial revolution in the United States, and the Communist conspiracy in this land. It has been repudiated, as stated earlier, by no less American liberals than the newspaper editor, Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution, and the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members might read these documents for themselves, I ask unanimous consent to insert copies of these records from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and others in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

THE ATLANTA JOURNAL,  
THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION,  
Atlanta, Ga., December 10, 1953.

Hon. AUBREY WILLIAMS,  
Publisher, *Southern Farmer*,  
Montgomery, Ala.

DEAR AUBREY: First off, it seems to me your letter is a little vulnerable. Obviously, if Dombrowski wanted to make advertising use of one of my columns, I haven't gone over to the mob. Therefore, I can't quite follow your long lament and your suggestion that I have succumbed to fear. If you are willing to spend money to advertise the fact that I had acted courageously in one breath, I don't quite see how you can in the next one mourn my fear.

At any rate, I put next in evidence my frequent, and I believe, strong condemnation of McCarthy and McCarthyism as further exhibit that I have not at all gone over to the mob to which you refer.

Thirdly, now let me say just as firmly as I can that I do not have any idea of denying

you. I will always admire you and respect you, but with Jim Dombrowski it is different. I never have accepted him, and I, therefore, don't have to deny him. I am awfully sorry to say so, but I have no confidence in Jim Dombrowski. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare did degenerate into a Communist front outfit, and as far as I am concerned, Dombrowski is one of those chiefly responsible for allowing it to do so. He and Clark Foreman, in my opinion, betrayed Mark Ethridge and Barry Bingham by an ardent bit of fellow traveling with the Communists who were in it.

I have no idea whether Dombrowski is a Communist, but I have no slight doubt but for at least 25 years he has, in my opinion, been running with that pack. You say you have been hissed off the stage by Communists on at least two occasions. You will never find where Dombrowski was hissed off any stage by any Communist.

So far as I am concerned, the Southern Conference Education Fund was set up after the Southern Conference for Human Welfare died and, as usual, a number of sincere people were pulled into it. If this disappoints you I am sorry. I am going right on opposing McCarthyism, and I hope I will go on writing columns which the Southern Conference Education Fund might like to run as paid advertisements. But I am also going right along believing that the Southern Conference Education Fund is, as far as Dombrowski can make it, a fellow traveling outfit, and I repeat again, I want no association with it, however indirect or remote. If this hurts you, Aubrey, I am sorry, but that is the way I feel about Dombrowski.

I must add that I wouldn't know him if he walked in the room. It seems to me that I did meet him a good many years ago, but I do not recall what he looks like, nor do I know a single one of his associates, friends or relatives; therefore, I can say very emphatically that I bear him no personal ill will, nor do I have any malice in my heart for him. I simply do not trust him, nor do I have any confidence in his political integrity.

Cordially yours,

RALPH MCGILL.

ATLANTA, GA.,  
December 8, 1953.  
JAMES A. DOMBROWSKI,  
Director, Southern Conference Educational  
Fund, Inc.:

I am having a notarized copy of this wire made. I regret it. But it is necessary for me to emphatically refuse permission to reproduce in any manner whatever in any of your publications the column to which you refer. I also must emphatically refuse permission to use it as an advertisement. I also notify you in advance that I will take legal action if any such use is made of it by your organization which I consider to be a fellow traveling outfit with which I wish no association whatever however indirect or remote.

RALPH MCGILL,  
Editor, Atlanta Constitution.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,  
April 18, 1960.

DEAR MR. DOMBROWSKI: Thank you very much for your letter.

I will not make any public announcement of my decision and I would hope that none need be made. Just drop my name from your literature.

When you come to New York, I will always be glad to see you, but don't make a special trip.

With every good wish,  
Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

VAL-KILL COTTAGE,  
Hyde Park, Dutchess Co., N.Y., May 11, 1947

MY DEAR MR. DOMBROWSKI: In answer to your letter of April 23rd, I feel I should write you quite frankly as to my feelings.

I think the idea of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is basically sound, and provides a method by which Southerners can speak out.

I think recently that some of your associations have given your enemies a chance to label you communist and it seems to me that you should have avoided giving your enemies the basis for such a charge.

In the case of the Columbia, Tenn. episode, I understand that Mrs. Durr refused to serve with the NAACP unless the communist party was represented on the Committee. Under other conditions, that might have been a good thing, but the situation there was difficult enough without giving the opposition additional ammunition.

I have heard from many people that the Conference, perhaps because of necessity, was devoting itself to the raising of funds instead of concentrating on the real job.

I tried working with American communists, as you know, and have long since given up trying. I cannot work with any one who is not completely honest and American communists are not honest. I know that often they work for the same objectives, and do good work, but that does not alter my opinion.

Very sincerely yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

Mr. WATSON. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this group claims among its most active members some who are also leaders in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. But this is the case. I am not saying that SCEF controls SCLC, or vice versa. But, the two organizations are completely woven together through their mutual membership and leadership, and I believe the objective of SCEF is to promote the Communist conspiracy. Its president is the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, one of the original founders of the SCLC. On the board of directors are people like the Reverend C. K. Steele, the Reverend James A. Zeller, and Ruby Berkley, all of whom are prominent in the civil rights movement. And, of course, Shuttlesworth and Steele are equally as influential in the SCLC, which has been the main organization responsible for the Poor People's Campaign here.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that substantial Communist planning and actual implementation of the Poor People's Campaign is a fact, and is beyond speculation. Campaign leaders have made the mistake of playing ball with people like Carl Braden and his fellow travelers, and this can only result in disaster for them, and for the American people. They are being duped by these Communists and, knowingly or unknowingly, I believe, are falling into a carefully prepared trap. Just as Carl Braden and other white Communists purposely helped a Negro move into an all-white neighborhood in Louisville, and then with cold, deadly calculation blew up his home for the purpose of stirring up racial trouble, so are they capable of doing the same thing, or maybe something even more drastic, such as setting fire to the tents in Resurrection City, and blaming it on other people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, my views of the Poor People's Campaign have been made clear. I testified both before the distinguished Committee on Public Works of this House and the distinguished Committee on the District of Columbia.

Frankly, I am not going to indulge in any further discussion so far as this particular matter is concerned. But suffice it to say, I believe it was a serious mistake initially to grant them a permit, in view of the admitted potentially explosive situation that exists here.

Mr. Speaker, I have revealed the details of this secret meeting, controlled by known Communists, with a profound influence upon the campaign.

We all know how tense this city is. We do not know what the campaign leaders really want other than their announced objective which is "to disrupt and to dislocate the Government of the United States".

Mr. Speaker, I think most Americans suspect that Communists are supporting this campaign. But I have pointed out they are not only supporting this movement, but are actually working with the leaders of the Southern Conference Leadership campaign.

Additionally, the question must be asked, Where is the money coming from? The SCLC leaders contend that they have serious money problems. But they must have already received vast amounts of money to get this far. Certainly the poor people would not be able to finance any effort of this magnitude. Thus far the only announced contribution of any size has been a \$25,000 anonymous contribution.

Mr. Speaker, reason with me. If this goal is so altruistic—if this objective is so praiseworthy—if this is for the best interests of the American people—why would any contributor not want to be publicly identified as making a \$25,000 contribution?

The American people can draw their own conclusions. But it might help you in drawing yours, if I would recall some of the testimony that was given under oath a few weeks ago before the House Committee on Un-American Activities when a prominent member of the Newark Police Department told us about three or four of these professional agitators who absolutely were dead broke and suddenly they made a trip to Prague, Czechoslovakia. When they came back, money was no particular problem.

This is sworn testimony by a man who was directly involved in the investigation of the riots in the city of Newark.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the consequences, I have been fair with the American people and my colleagues in the House. I think something should be done to let the campaign participants know about the Communists who are involved. They must be apprised of this, and then let them denounce these Communists, if they really do not want to work with them.

Most importantly I think it is incumbent upon us to let the American people know what is happening here in order that not only might we say, "God save America," but that we as Congressmen might have a little part in helping the Almighty save this great country of ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. That may be done with the consent of the Member having a special order at this time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order at this time and I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes of my time may be allotted to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to pay my compliments to the gentleman now in the well. I think he has performed a much needed and valuable service here in bringing out some of the facts known to some of us but not known to a majority of the people.

Those of us who have been closely associated with civil disturbances in the past, I am sure, are not too surprised at the evidence that has been presented here.

As a matter of fact, 3 years ago I pointed out from the very spot in which the gentleman now stands that the so-called civil rights march on Montgomery was led by what seemed like a "Who's Who of the Communist Party" in the United States.

I think the gentleman has been most circumspect in his presentation here. I do want to commend him and associate myself with his remarks, and simply add one additional comment. I think the gentleman has very purposely avoided mentioning one fact that is glaring, and that is that the predecessor of Reverend Abernathy, Martin Luther King, was even more prevalent in his associations with the Communist Party than is Reverend Abernathy, if that is possible. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

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

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

Mr. FISHER. I also commend the gentleman for the very excellent address that he has delivered, which I believe is very timely, quite appropriate, and very much in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, everyone sympathizes with the plight of poor people. There is reason to believe, however, that many of the 3,000 said to be encamped in the city of Washington at this time are victims of misleading representations as to what they can expect to accomplish by coming here.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] has provided documented evidence pointing to possible Communist connection with the march. Only recently a map charting the course of the "March of the Poor" was published in the Communist publication, *The Worker*. It traces the routes of the marchers from Jackson and Marks, Miss., Memphis, Chi-

ago, and Boston. This may be called a coincidence, but it serves to confirm the active interest the Communist Party, U.S.A., has in this invasion.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. RARICK. I certainly commend the gentleman from South Carolina for his courage, foresight, and wisdom in speaking out on the facts to get the truth to the American people so that they may be honestly apprised of the nature of the time bomb in our backyard.

Of course, we all love poor people. The Lord must love them—that is why he made so many of us. But we certainly cannot sit idly by and in silence watch poor people being exploited into what we have every reason to conclude will eventually turn into an attempt to link the civil rights movement and poor people with agitation involving our sons in Vietnam, or to thwart our peace talks in Paris. Yet, according to a wire to the local SCLC's leaders from the Vietcong leader, Ho Thu, the campaign here operated with the Braden's guidance was praised by the North Vietnamese Communists as "an offensive against the ruling circles" in America and would put "more weight behind the demand for an end to the war in Vietnam."

I again thank the gentleman for yielding and praise his contribution to enable our people to learn the truth.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would also like to thank the gentleman for bringing this most timely matter and subject to the attention of the Congress and the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the Poor People's March is being partially sponsored and directed by the Communist Party.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] has given you the names, dates, and places where known Communists have met with leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in planning the Poor People's March to Washington.

The Congress of the United States and the American people will have to recognize and believe that the Communist front organizations in the United States are giving funds and leadership to the occupants of Resurrection City.

The Communist pattern is to stay in the background as much as possible, but the poor people's camp is a place for them to openly exploit.

They are taking this opportunity, by directing this group, to attempt to bring the mechanism of this Government to a complete stop, causing confusion and chaos in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina pointing out to the House and to the country the evidence he has presented today. It is important that all sides of this so-called Poor People's

March be made known to the American taxpayers who will eventually spend several million dollars to protect the demonstrators and clean up after them. I have seen some estimates that if the camp-in continues through the summer as it is expected to, the total cost to the taxpayers will be some \$15 to \$20 million.

I do not have any direct evidence that there is any massive Communist infiltration of this demonstration. But in the past, Communist sympathizers have been attracted to such demonstrations, and always manage to make their presence felt. This was true in the Selma to Montgomery march, in the recent peace demonstrations at the Pentagon, and other peace demonstrations and civil rights demonstrations across the country.

In a recent article written by Washington Reporter Paul Scott, it was pointed out that student militants were being recruited in New York by Robert Collier, a disciple of the Cuban Communist revolutionary Che Guevara. Collier was convicted of a plot to blow up the Statue of Liberty, the Washington Monument, and the Liberty Bell. He has been working closely with officials of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in planning this march. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has said that there is evidence the recent student uprisings on many of our Nation's college campuses are Communist oriented. Now many of those leaders are planning to come here to join the camp-in in Washington.

Many of those who participate in the demonstrations such as we are witnessing here are probably not Communist sympathizers. But they unknowingly help the cause of the Communists by their actions. Although the leaders of this demonstration at times claim to be nonviolent, they nevertheless encourage violence by their statements. Just this afternoon in the Evening Star, Reverend Abernathy, the SCLC leader, was quoted as saying that the demonstrations here would be, "more militant and more massive than have ever taken place in the history of this Nation." He went on to say that—

We're not going to burn it down, we're just going to straighten it out. What we are going to do is sleep at night out here, but we're going to raise hell in the daytime.

Statements like these certainly do not lend themselves to keeping the demonstrations peaceful.

Even without the explosive nature and the threatening attitude of these demonstrators, the camp-in would still be a sad and tragic venture. There is a fight on among the various civil rights organizations for leadership in this field. The poor people who have been brought here by promises of a new life are being used by those involved in the leadership fight. The leaders do not care so much about the poor people as they do advancing their own selfish causes. I believe Congress should make it explicitly clear that it does not intend to be threatened into passing massive welfare programs, and that no action will be taken until this monstrous demonstration ends.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

#### THE PUBLIC INTEREST REQUIRES RETENTION OF PRESENT PERCENTAGE DEPLETION FORMULA FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a most disturbing recurrence of demands for reduction or elimination of percentage depletion for income tax purposes, as applied to the production of oil and gas.

Such a development would be contrary to the public interest, as I shall undertake to demonstrate during the time allotted to me today.

It is understandable that many people are not aware of the harm that would result not alone to the industry but also to rank-and-file consumers throughout the land and those other industries which rely upon oil and gas as a source of energy.

Only recently a U.S. Senator, now a candidate for President, raised the issue by lumping percentage depletion with other alleged "loopholes" in our income tax laws. A number of ultraliberal organizations have joined the parade, along with Playboy and other magazines. In addition, it has become a popular pastime for certain columnists, more interested in selling script than in being factual, who find this a popular topic to belabor. And there are some who mean well but are simply uninformed.

It is apparent that most of these people either do not know or do not care about the reason and justification for this method of treating income taxes by those engaged in the oil and gas industry.

The fact is that even under present policies this industry is beset with many major difficulties today, and I am referring in particular to independent producers who do much of the prospecting for the industry. They would do more of it if they could afford to. Even though we are supposed to have a strict limitation on excessive competitive imports, the Government now permits the limitation to be exceeded by 390,000 barrels daily. This serves to undermine the program's objective of assuring adequate oil supplies for the American market.

Already there has been a 12-year slump in drilling operations. Many operators have been forced out of business. In 1957 there were 14,700 exploratory wells drilled; in 1967 only 8,620 were attempted—a 40-percent drop.

Despite this dilemma, the attack on percentage depletion has gained many converts, particularly among the gullible, the demagogues, and those who are always looking for a whipping boy. Let us examine the facts relating to percentage depletion in the oil and gas industry for a moment.

It is an easy matter to determine depletion or depreciation for an investment in a business property. A shoe factory, for example, which costs \$100,000, can be depreciated at the annual rate of 5 percent for 20 years because it represents a capital investment.

But in the case of an oil-producing property there is not the value of a plant to be recovered. Yet there is the capital investment. Recognizing that the discovery and development of minerals is unique, different minerals are accorded different depletion rates, depending upon the investments, the risks, and the cost of production. In the case of oil and gas, the producer is permitted to recover, taxwise, the value of the underground oil in productive wells. He would then be enabled to reinvest the recovery in another search for new wells.

While the operator can deduct up to 27½ percent of the gross revenue from each producing property, there is a limitation of 50 percent of net income derived from the property.

This concept of percentage depletion became law in 1926, applied to about 100 different minerals. It took the place of depletion based upon "discovery value," which had been adopted 8 years earlier as an incentive for new oil discoveries to fill a pressing need. The latter created an administrative nightmare because of the bickering over values. Hence the percentage depletion formula adopted in 1926.

#### WHY THE 27.5-PERCENT DEDUCTION?

Now, why the figure of 27½ percent as applied to oil and gas? The Treasury Department, after an exhaustive study, recommended more than 30 percent as a proper figure. And the compromise was 27½ percent.

It has been this percentage depletion which has enabled the oil and gas industry to meet the Nation's mounting peacetime requirements and the extraordinary demands in time of war.

It must be kept in mind that we are dealing with a wasting asset which cannot be planted, grown, and harvested. Nor can it be produced in a shoe factory. It is produced in uncertain quantities only after exhaustive search, fraught with uncertainty. Unlike other enterprises, its production is subject to the principle of diminishing returns and increasing costs because no producing well is inexhaustible. Indeed entire oilfields are gradually depleted and exhausted. As one saying has it:

When you find oil you start going out of business.

Thus, unlike the manufacturer who can measure his investment in terms of economic value, the oil producer has little or no way of assuring success commensurate with investment. He knows that when he pours a hundred thousand dollars into a well that the venture is fraught with risk. He can only hope for profits. He may get nothing.

Even with modern technological developments in this area—geophysical tools such as the gravity meter, the magnetometer, and the seismograph—there is simply no degree of certainty regarding discoveries. The only known way to find out is to spend and drill—and hope.

It is recorded that of every 100 wells drilled in unproven areas, an average of only three find enough oil or gas to recover the costs incurred.

Thus we can see the difference there is in discovering and developing a paying

petroleum operation and the investment that is made in an ordinary business venture.

We have behind us four decades of success in the application of this depletion formula for meeting our ever increasing demands. Oil and gas furnish nearly three-fourths of our Nation's energy. Today the United States consumes almost as much petroleum as the rest of the free world combined. And it is only by retaining this depletion concept that we can have any assurance of an abundant supply of energy for the future needs of our expanding industrial complex.

Under these circumstances it would indeed be a reckless gamble with our future for the percentage depletion, which has stood us in such good stead in the past, to be tampered with. It is a risk we can ill afford to take.

#### PERCENTAGE DEPLETION HAS PROVEN ITS WORTH

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to speculate on the worth of the present system. It has worked. The entire Nation has reaped the benefits of this phenomenal record of discovery and development of new oil and gas fields. Without them where would we be today? It has enabled prices to consumers to be held at a very reasonable level. It has enabled fuel costs to be reduced to a small portion of the cost of manufactured goods. Such costs to consumers are generally far below such costs in most countries of the world.

And the indisputable record reveals that the profits of the oil and gas industry has been in line with those of industry generally.

A 1962 report prepared by the National Fuels and Energy Study Group was made for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It contained the following:

The economy of the United States rests upon a small base of energy. National income originating in the energy industries is only about 4 per cent of the total national income.

Consumers, manufacturers, and government spend but a small proportion of their incomes in the purchases of energy—household consumers about 5½ per cent, manufacturers 1½ per cent, and government possibly 3 per cent. Despite the expanding use of energy these proportions have remained fairly constant.

It follows that the American consumers have a tremendous stake in maintaining a thriving oil and gas industry. As their troubles mount, the consumer's prices must go up.

Moreover, the degree of stability in this industry is directly interlinked with hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs. There are 300 refineries, 30,000 distributors, and 200,000 service station operators to think about—to say nothing of those who drill and maintain the wells, the pipelines, and allied suppliers and processors.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY IS DIRECTLY INVOLVED

As we consider this subject let us not overlook its relationship to national defense. We must think in terms of what is needed to maintain a powerful and adequate defense posture in a world of mounting dangers. It is from this source

that fuel is provided for planes, tanks, and ships. And petroleum gives us the basic ingredient of conventional explosives. We must never allow ourselves to forget the vital, if not decisive, role of oil in both major wars. It will be recalled that shortage of fuel grounded much of the German Air Force during those crucial periods of World War II, and served to curtail Hitler's ground forces. We cannot and must not assume that any part of future wartime requirements can be met by imports.

#### FUEL SHORTAGES CAN HAPPEN HERE

It should be remembered, too, that at the end of World War I there was widespread fear among knowledgeable people that future supplies of petroleum were alarmingly uncertain and precarious. Indeed in 1920 the U.S. Geological Survey predicted that at the then current rate of discoveries and consumption the United States would run out of oil by 1938. And a Senate committee report in 1923 warned that the price of gasoline to the consumer would likely soon reach \$1 per gallon.

But soon the Congress reacted, and by percentage depletion a favorable climate was created for more risks, more discoveries, more production to meet the urgent needs of the people and of industry.

#### WE MUST BE SELF-SUFFICIENT

Suppose that at some period in our immediate future we should find ourselves dependent upon the importation of oil from the Middle East fields, particularly during a national emergency. Already that source of supply is becoming increasingly uncertain. We got a taste of that only recently. More and more, the Arab countries are today playing footsie with the Soviets. Iraq and Russia recently signed an oil pact, giving the Russians their first foothold in the Persian Gulf.

This development adds to the importance of continuing to find and develop new oil reserves here in our own country. And the demands for domestic consumption are increasing every day. Energy demands by 1980 will be 50 percent higher than they are now. The Secretary of the Interior recently predicted that this country will consume 78 billion barrels of oil and 283 trillion cubic feet of gas during the next 14 years. This represents more oil and gas than was consumed in the previous 107 years of the petroleum industry's existence. And the population explosion will give us 300 million people by the turn of the century.

Our experts claim this oil and gas can be found. But that must be based upon the assumption that the present incentives to explore will be retained in our laws.

Mr. Speaker, percentage depletion as applied to mineral production is not a "loophole," as some contend. It is a carefully devised formula for applying simple equity to industries in that category. Now, of all times, it is imperative that for the sake of national security, in the interest of consumers and the labor force, and the enormous demands of a fuel-demanding industry, that we retain our present formula for treating the income for the most risky business in which one

can engage—the exploration for oil and gas.

#### STATEMENT ON PUBLIC OPINION POLLS—LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE DISCLOSURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely coincidental that my remarks should come on the same day of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio pertaining to the census, because I am going to speak on a different kind of a census, which is the public opinion poll, which I believe all of us now recognize as a major factor in American politics.

Public opinion polls are important because voters and public officials and newspapers and magazines have made them important.

Of course, polls are subject to use, and abuse, for political advantage. Of course, the expenditure of millions of dollars of campaign money rides on the pollster's tea leaves. This year, we even saw an announced candidate for President, a man from my own State, bow out of the race before the bell sounded for round 1. The polls did it.

Louis Harris once referred to election polling as "the glamour girl of social research." It certainly is. For better or for worse, election polling and polls on political issues seem destined to prosper and grow.

Who checks the accuracy of these polls? To some extent, the pollster himself does, for he has an obvious interest in establishing a reputation for accuracy. But does anyone else? I think not.

Polls are obviously capable of abuse by the pollster and by publications and by candidates.

The intelligent citizen who wants to know whether the polls do accurately reveal public opinion is quite helpless in the face of a lack of either verification or background information.

There is no way for the Congress or the voters to determine the accuracy or inaccuracy of polls.

I believe it is time to shed a little sunlight on pollsters and their polls.

I am not arguing against the existence of polls. I am arguing in favor of considering some safeguards against possible abuses.

In my opinion, polls are almost inevitably opinion forming as well as fact-finding.

I believe an impartial, low-key, objective congressional hearing on the methods and techniques of pollsters, their influence, their good and their bad, is needed.

Congressional hearings may well enhance the reputation of pollsters rather than diminish it.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation this week which would require public opinion pollsters to make certain disclosures as a safeguard against misrepresentations and misunderstanding.

My bill, named the Truth-in-Polling bill, would apply only to polls relating to elections, political candidates, and political issues which are published in news-

papers or magazines of general circulation. I am not including polls on such things as church attendance, clothing fashions, and the like.

The disclosure called for includes the name of the person who commissioned the poll, the method used in compiling the sample, the number of people in the sample, dates within which the polling was done, question content, the method by which the pollee was interviewed, whether by telephone, person to person, or by mail, completion rate, and numerical results of the poll.

Most people are fascinated by polls while retaining a nagging doubt about them. On the one hand, one's personal experience supports the belief that getting interviewed by a pollster is almost as rare as being struck by lightning. On the other hand, we are an impatient people who like to know in advance. We are baseball box-score addicts, and stock market watchers and public opinion poll readers.

The sampling of public opinion by privately conducted polls is a phenomenon that is largely American in origin and development. As political people, we Members of Congress know that such polls have become a fixture in our public life. They seem to satisfy the yen of the public, and of the politician, for "the inside dope."

I believe this is a legitimate area for congressional inquiry, with our attention focused on these questions: First. Are public opinion polls trustworthy? Second. Do public opinion polls guide opinion as well as measure it? Third. Is some public disclosure necessary as a safeguard against misrepresentation or misunderstanding?

Polls are obviously subject to use and abuse for political advantage. Does anyone doubt, for example, that political candidates circulate the results of favorable polls to convention delegates?

Political figures can be damaged by adverse polls for a "bandwagon" psychology may develop against them and campaign funds may dry up. Of course, counterarguments can be made to this proposition.

I know of no previous congressional investigation on polls. I am suggesting, therefore, that Congress collectively, in its investigative function, be at once a historian, a statistician, and a psychologist and build a bank of knowledge on the subject.

Hearings could determine to what extent polling is a science, or an art, or merely a rough measure of political gossip.

I realize that both political parties have at one time or another attacked the pollsters. Usually, the party figuring itself damaged makes the attack.

I hope that pollsters, academicians, and politicians will have a desire to testify at hearings. Pollsters, for one, have a vested interest in keeping their polls free from all possible cause for legitimate criticism.

Would "trade secrets" be jeopardized? I doubt that the practices, methods, and techniques are that secret. I would be surprised if pollsters would decline to tell Congress with complete candor, the methods by which they analyze and report public opinion.

Personally, I look forward to hearing from these gentlemen. We know censustakers have some difficulty in obtaining complete cooperation from citizens. Yet the pollsters' staffers, often part-time housewives and students, seem able to secure the most sacred opinions of people who allegedly form a cross section of the public. I look forward to learning how this miniature electorate is formed and how its opinions are extracted.

Politicians do not like to "fly blind." Historically they have sought to "feel the pulse" of their constituents by personal contacts arising out of regular trips back to their districts. Few can afford frequent polls of an extensive statistical nature. But all of us like to know what is going on in the minds of our constituents.

Of course, you cannot run a government if you have to take a poll every time you have to make a major decision. Nor do we. But polls do play a role from time to time.

Congress, and the people we represent have a right to know. I hope my colleagues and the pollsters will agree.

#### OUR MERCHANT FLEET

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, if ever the action of this House was proved justified I believe the passage by the House last year of H.R. 159 to establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration and its prior action of preventing the Maritime Administration from becoming a part of the Department of Transportation was thoroughly proven correct by Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd's statement of May 20, 1968, before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

We who supported H.R. 159 and opposed the takeover of the Maritime Administration stated at that time that such takeover would destroy our merchant marine and that it could only be preserved and properly expanded for the good of our Nation, if it were given its own spokesman.

Secretary Boyd's statement of May 20, setting forth the so-called new maritime policy proves the objectives to destroy our American shipping and make us reliant on foreign shipbuilding and supply.

When we are seeking to create a better balance of payments, how can we justify greater foreign shipbuilding?

History has proven the primary need for a strong merchant fleet and facilities for repairing and building. The new policy would not only further destroy our merchant fleet but would completely destroy our building facilities which, as proven by the destruction of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, can never be replaced in facilities as well as trained personnel. This not only directly affects our economy but would also directly affect our national defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative now, before any further deterioration of our merchant fleet, that H.R. 159 become law and that H.R. 13940, setting forth a

true, meaningful maritime policy, be reported out and passed and we continue to oppose any takeover by the Department of Transportation of the Maritime Administration as this would indeed be the death knell of our merchant fleet.

#### PROVIDING SAFETY REGULATIONS FOR CHILDREN'S SUMMER CAMPS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, soon 6 million American children will be leaving their homes for summer camp.

Perhaps many Members of this House are unaware that the old discredited rule of *caveat emptor*, let the buyer beware, prevails when you send your child to summer camp. For as a practical matter there are in too many States, no regulations governing safety qualifications of camp personnel or sanitation.

In order to correct this situation, I have introduced a bill in this House identical with one introduced in the other body by the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. My bill, H.R. 17131, provides for the establishment of minimum safety standards and grants to the States to effectuate these standards.

In order that each Member may know what, if anything, his State is doing in the area, I have asked the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, to prepare a summary of State legislation governing summer camps.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this report in the RECORD: [From the Library of Congress, American Law Division]

#### STATE STATUTES PROVIDING SAFETY REGULATIONS FOR CHILDREN'S SUMMER CAMPS

The following information is supplied in response to your request for a summary of any specific legislation enacted in the fifty states regarding safety regulations for summer camps for children. Due to the varied indexing systems employed in the State codes, it is possible that there exists legislation on this subject in some States not listed below. Likewise, since most 1968 session laws have not yet been made available for consultation, any recent enactments or amendments would not be included here. In those instances in which such legislation was located, the provisions were usually coupled with those relating to health regulations. Although it can be stated generally that there is of course some relationship between health and safety, only those sections, or parts of sections, of such laws concerning actual safety standards, or if the health requirement is so closely associated with a safety factor as to be nearly synonymous, are summarized. In addition, there are provisions in various States which could apply to children's camps, e.g., in Colorado (C.R.S. § 66-22-4) certain safety standards are prescribed for swimming areas, and in Washington there is a statute (RCWA 48.48.040) calling for minimum standards for buildings, for the prevention of fire and the protection of life and property. However, since no specific reference to camps is made therein, such enactments are not included here. Also, mere State enactments calling for the registration or licensing of any camp for children is not

included, e.g., Pennsylvania—35 P.S. §§ 3001 to 3004, and Rhode Island—R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. §§ 23-21-2, 23-21-2.

This survey was made only with regard to State legislation. It is possible that such regulations exist on a local level, i.e., county, school district, city or town, and in some States such local authorities are given specific authority to adopt health and safety codes, e.g., Mississippi (Miss. Code, § 3374-80) provides that any municipality within the State can adopt, in its discretion, any code dealing with public health, safety or welfare or a combination of same. Also, safety standards may be regulated to some degree on a voluntary basis. Many private camping associations seem to provide certain safety standards which must be met by their members.

#### ARIZONA

(A.R.S. §§ 8-551 to 8-567)

§ 8-554: Every children's camp shall be located on well-drained ground near an adequate safe water supply.

§ 8-555: The general layout of a children's camp shall be planned to lessen fire, accident and disease hazards.

Other provisions deal primarily with health rather than safety, e.g., toilets and disposal systems (§ 8-557), food storage and preparation (§ 8-558), and garbage (§ 8-559).

#### CALIFORNIA

(West's Ann. Health & Safety Code § 18897 to 18897.7)

§ 18897.2: The State Director of Public Health shall adopt and enforce such rules and regulations for establishing minimum standards and for regulating the operation of "organized camps" as he determines are necessary to protect the health and safety of the campers. The Resident Camp Standards of the American Camping Association are to be considered.

§ 18897.3: The State Fire Marshall shall adopt minimum fire safety regulations for "organized camps".

§ 18897.7: Violation of any such adopted rule or regulation is a misdemeanor.

#### CONNECTICUT

(C.G.S.A. § 52-557c)

§ 52-557c: Standard of care applicable to owners and operators of any school bus or any motor vehicle registered as a service bus transporting children to and from private or public camps or any other activities concerning the transportation of groups of children shall be the same as applicable to common carriers of passengers for hire.

#### ILLINOIS

(S.H.A. ch. 95½, § 239.11)

§ 239.11: Overloading of vehicles used in transportation of children, including in connection with day camps or summer camps; violation is a misdemeanor. Minimum personal injury liability insurance to be carried is prescribed.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

(M.G.L.A. c. 140 §§ 32A to 32E)

Among other types of similar businesses, overnight camps must be licensed by the board of health of the city or town in which it is situated. Although section (§ 32B) speaks only in terms of a sanitary water supply and disposition of sewage, and rules and regulations may be adopted to enforce section, a case annotation appearing thereunder states that "Power of town board of health to adopt rules to regulate trailers is not limited to health regulations. *Cliff v. Board of Health of Amesbury* (1961), 175 N.E.2d 489, 343 Mass. 58."

#### MICHIGAN

(M.C.L.A. §§ 325.601 to 325.620)

§ 325.602: Public swimming pools for parks, schools, motels, camps, etc.—"The department of health shall review the design and supervise the construction and operation of

public swimming pools in order to protect the public health, prevent the spread of disease and prevent accidents or premature deaths."

§ 325.619: Violation of any provision or any rule or regulation promulgated under this act is a misdemeanor.

#### MINNESOTA

(M.S.A. §§ 144.71 to 144.76)

§ 144.71, subd. 1: The purpose of this Act is to protect the health and safety of children in attendance at children's camps.

§ 144.72: Permits are required for the operation of children's camps.

§ 144.74: "The state board of health is authorized to adopt and enforce such reasonable regulations and standards as it determines necessary to protect the health and safety of children in attendance at children's camps." What areas may be included for such regulations and standards are set forth.

§ 144.76: Violation of any provision of the Act or the regulations or standards promulgated thereunder is a misdemeanor.

#### NEW YORK

(The State Sanitary Code, as amended to April 30, 1954, ch. 7. Camps)

Although this Chapter concerns health aspects of camps, certain parts thereof could be deemed as safety factors as well, e.g., Regulation 6(f) provides that any permanent buildings in which persons are housed shall be provided with ready exit in case of fire; Regulation 7(d) provides that walls, floors, and ceilings of kitchens and dining room shall be kept clean and in good repair; and Regulation 16 states that "No bathing at swimming pools and bathing beaches by children under eighteen years of age shall be permitted unless under the supervision of an operator or competent attendant trained in life saving procedure."

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

(Rules and Regulations, Organized Camps, pp. 167-169)

Section 2: No person shall operate or maintain any "organized camp", i.e., a camp for group living, unless he is the holder of an unrevoked permit from the State Board of Health.

Section 3: Among other things, the camp site shall be free of unnecessary hazards.

Section 6: All toilet and bath facilities shall be kept in a clean condition, in good repair, well lighted and ventilated.

Section 7: (a) All buildings used for sleeping quarters shall be constructed and maintained in a safe condition.

(b) All articles of bedding and furniture shall be kept in good repair.

(c) "Beds shall be spaced so as to meet the standards recommended by the American Camping Association."

Section 8: The floors, walls and ceilings of dining halls shall be maintained in good repair. Artificial illumination shall be adequate and evenly distributed. Badly chipped, broken or cracked dishes and glassware shall not be used.

Section 9: The floors of kitchens and walls up to splash line shall be kept in good repair. Adequate lighting and ventilation shall be maintained.

Section 11: The floors, walls and ceiling of all storage rooms shall be maintained in good repair. All food and drink shall be stored, handled and served in accordance with standard safety practices.

Section 12: (b) Swimming pools shall conform with rules and regulations of the State Board of Health.

(e) Bath houses shall be kept in good repair.

Section 13: "All natural hazards should be eliminated or reduced to a minimum before the camp is occupied."

The person in charge of the water front shall have a current instructor's certificate from the American Red Cross or other or-

ganization of equivalent standards. Practices and equipment for waterfront and boating should comply with Red Cross standards or those of other organizations with equivalent standards.

Fire arms and archery equipment must be used and stored under qualified supervision. Containers for gasoline and explosives must be plainly marked and stored in a locked building not occupied by campers or staff, and at a safe distance from program buildings and sleeping quarters. An adequate number of fire extinguishers of a type approved by the National Board of Fire Underwriters, kept in good working order and in an easily accessible location, shall be provided for each camp."

Section 15: The premises and immediate surroundings of camps shall be kept neat and orderly at all times.

#### TENNESSEE

(Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 53-3801 to 53-3806)

§ 53-3802: It shall be the duty of the commissioner of the Tennessee department of public health to adopt rules and regulations deemed necessary for the protection of the health of persons using "organized camps" or living adjacent thereto.

§ 53-3803: Valid permit required to establish or maintain an organized camp.

§ 53-3804: "The commissioner or public health officer is hereby authorized and directed to make inspections to determine the conditions of organized camps in order that he may perform his duty of safeguarding the health and safety of occupants of organized camps and of the general public . . . ."

§ 53-3806: Any person who violates any provision, rule or regulation, shall be fined not less than \$10 nor more than \$50 for each offense, each day of continued violation after conviction shall constitute a separate offense.

#### VIRGINIA

(Code of Virginia, §§ 35-43 to 35-53)

§ 35-44: Permit required for operation of summer camp.

§ 35-46: Upon an application for such permit, the State Health Commissioner shall cause an investigation of, among other things, the bathing and swimming facilities, and as to the general cleanliness of the buildings, grounds, and equipment.

§ 35-53: Violation hereof is a misdemeanor.

#### IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BILLS 7481, 14954, 16025, AND 16902; EXPANSION OF COMPENSATION AND MEDICAL AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of four bills which will adjust Federal veterans assistance in three major areas so that we may more adequately provide for the changing needs of veterans. These areas are: compensation for injuries incurred during service, medical aid and education assistance.

H.R. 7481 will provide for more complete veterans' nursing home care. Section 620, of title 38, United States Code provides that the Veterans' Administration will, under certain circumstances, pay for a veteran's care in a nursing home if such care does not exceed one-

third the cost of care furnished by a veterans hospital. Because of rising living costs, I believe that the one-third fraction of hospital costs today will not adequately meet sharply rising nursing home expenses.

H.R. 16902 would increase the amount which the Veterans' Administration pays States for hospitalization and nursing care received by veterans through State facilities or services. The Administration pays the States such amounts because the veterans in question are eligible for Federal assistance and would be cared for by the Veterans' Administration if they were not in State hospitals. The rates paid the States are presently \$2.50 per day for veterans receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care, and \$3.50 for those receiving care in nursing homes. Congress intended to defray 50 percent of the cost to the States when it established these rates. Needless to say, if the rates ever amounted to half the cost, they certainly do not today. H.R. 16902 would increase the rate for daily care of veterans receiving hospital domiciliary care to \$3.50, and the rate for nursing home care to \$5.

H.R. 14954 would spare disabled veterans the dilemma of having to choose between gainful employment and vocational rehabilitation. Under existing law, we provide between \$110 and \$175 monthly, depending on the number of dependents, to veterans disabled in service who undergo training for restoration of their vocational ability. Surely our Nation owes to veterans wounded and disabled in service the duty of helping to restore the earning capacity which their wounds impair. Yet many disabled veterans must forego restorative training because only full-time schedules are possible under current law. Therefore, the training is incompatible with concurrent employment. A disabled veteran may receive the allowance only if he trains full time. H.R. 14954 would provide allowances of lower rates for part-time trainees, so that veterans may both receive instruction and pursue employment at the same time. This is consistent with our provision of part-time veteran's educational allowances, a system which has been entirely successful. I submit that we have reason to expect the same success from provision of part-time training for vocational rehabilitation.

H.R. 16025 responds to the needs of student veterans and veterans' survivors. First, the bill would ameliorate the harsh rule which terminates a widow's benefits, such as pension or compensation, upon her remarriage. Under the present law, even if her remarriage ends by death or by divorce in which she is not at fault, the benefits she previously received by virtue of being a veteran's widow, are not restored. H.R. 16025 provides that upon termination of the remarriage, the widow will again receive the survivors benefits which she would have continuously received had she not remarried after her veteran-husband's death.

Second, the bill provides, under certain circumstances, hospitalization care for veterans' widows and children who cannot defray the expense. The Veterans' Administration presently provides hospitalization for veterans who cannot

bear the expense if space and facilities are available after admission of veterans who have been injured in service. H.R. 16025 would extend the same possibility of treatment to veterans' widows and surviving children who cannot afford the expense.

Third, H.R. 16025 increases from 36 to 48 months the possible duration of training or education assistance provided a veteran, or veteran's orphan if his father was killed or severely disabled in service. Entitlement to veterans' educational assistance accrues at the rate of 1 month per month of service. However, because of the 36-month limitation, a veteran who has served 4 years presently does not receive education entitlement for his last year of service. I see no reason why we should limit a veteran's college career to 3 years if he has served longer. It is only logical that we give veterans their full educational entitlement up to at least 4 years.

Finally, H.R. 16025 would very wisely extend the aforementioned orphan's educational assistance to widows of veterans who have died from a service-connected injury and wives of veterans who are severely disabled from the same cause. The reason which obligates us to assist veterans to readjust to civilian life by assisting with their educational careers, obligates us to likewise help provide for the adjustment of widows of soldiers who do not return. The widow's need for vocational training certainly is no less than that of returning veterans.

I most strongly recommend that we better insure that veterans' assistance be adjusted to their changing needs by enactment of the proposals here set forth.

#### GUERRILLA WARFARE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we do not have to call it guerrilla warfare. We do not even have to call it Communist. But no matter what we call it, there is an organized, terroristic, and skillful effort underway to destroy human freedom in the Western World, and let us not kid ourselves about it.

Too many Americans, including some in Washington, have been closing their eyes to this for years. Today this pretending is inexcusable, and downright dangerous.

If a wild man with a gun is rampaging through your house threatening your family you cannot simply ignore him and hope he will go away.

The guerrilla warriors cannot start their revolution by themselves. But they can prepare themselves to move in when trouble begins, and take it over. And this is what they are doing.

This is exactly what the Russian Communists did in 1917 when they took Moscow, even when Lenin thought his real revolution was still years away. And it is also what the Chinese Communists and Fidel Castro did.

When 30,000 students and teachers massed in Paris last week trying to disrupt the peace negotiations and the city itself, they were organized and directed by hard-core Communists.

The French authorities, for all their faults otherwise, were honest in this case when they said publicly, "We are faced with what is certainly a subversive operation."

The rioters in Paris, as well as elsewhere, do not really want the Vietnam war to end because then they would be deprived of their main issue which is agitation against what they refer to as the American "imperialists."

Students who organized the Columbia University takeover, and many of the college demonstrations around the country recently, are members of the Students for a Democratic Society who gathered at the University of Maryland last summer to plan their tactics.

When so-called students resort to physical destruction of university facilities, and when their insane violence only becomes greater when the university agrees to their demands, then clearly something is very, very wrong.

One thing wrong is that too many officials cannot get it through their heads that enemies of human freedom are working hard in this country under the protective cover of what is called "dissent and nonviolence."

A committee in the House of Representatives recently confirmed that leaders of five or six groups in this country are openly advocating guerrilla operations that "pose a serious threat to law and order and the security of the United States."

These people are either Communists or near-Communists following the teachings of Mao Tse-tung, Fidel Castro, and Che Guevara. They seek to build armed insurrection amidst hate, rumors, and a breakdown of normal community functions such as police protection, transportation, and communication.

Among their tactics are plans for setting fires and then blocking the efforts of firemen to reach the blazes, and creating diversionary riots to distract attention from their major objectives.

These tactics, and others, have been carefully rehearsed already in Detroit, Watts, Cleveland, Harlem, Washington, Chicago, and elsewhere.

One riot leader is quoted as saying, 2 hours before the destruction in one city started:

We will not be free until we smash this state completely and totally. Destroy and set up a new state of our own choosing and our own liking.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not revolution, then what is it?

How long can top Government officials pretend this is not happening? How long will decent Americans stand by helplessly and watch while chaos and insanity take control?

Americans are getting tired of seeing high officials make endless excuses for the professional agitators and roughnecks. The only sensible answers are to arrest the lawbreakers, expel students who only want to destroy their schools, and expose the revolutionaries for what they are.

## AMERICANS FOR DISRUPTIVE ADVICE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as early as 1961 I labeled the ADA and its followers with what I believe is a more appropriate rendering of their initials, that is, "Americans for Disruptive Advice." The results of their recent convention indicate that they are going from bad to worse.

The Washington Star succinctly titled their story of the convention: "ADA for Pot, Sex, Abortion," and added a kicker to the effect that there were few voices of opposition—barely a murmur, they said—to the radical recommendations that were adopted.

Author Robert Walters suggests in the lead paragraph that ADA, "has suddenly turned into something of a swinging organization." I would suggest that they were swinging for the far, far left-field fence and have succeeded in clearing it.

Among other things, ADA-approved resolutions said that unlicensed sale of marijuana should be no more than a misdemeanor but even so, "personal use and possession should not be a crime; and that, abortion should be legalized; and that, the sexual activity of consenting adults when conducted in private is not an appropriate matter for criminal or other governmental sanctions."

The article states that "the theme for the day's activities may have been sounded by" John J. Gilligan, the labor leader's choice for the Senate from Ohio. He said:

The people of this nation are beginning to question their faith in the free institutions of this country, in our ability to govern ourselves and solve our own problems.

I do not think so. The people of the Nation are certain they can conduct their own affairs, but then they seem to have an edge on the ADA: their edge being a firm grounding in morality which appears to be lacking within the ranks of ADA. I grant, however, that it would be easier for the "people of this Nation" to conduct their business and the business of their government if they were not so frequently interrupted by the rantings of such as the ADA.

One can only wonder where ADA will go next. It really does not make any difference, though, the Constitution and laws of this land on which the rest of us base our actions will continue to allow ADA to resolve whatever they choose.

The Sunday Star article follows:

No DISSENT, EITHER—ADA FOR POT, SEX, ABORTION

(By Robert Walters)

Americans for Democratic Action, that bastion of "establishment liberals," has suddenly turned into something of a swinging organization.

After regaling one another for years with detailed—and often boring—analyses of virtually every possible danger faced by mankind, the ADA members this year cele-

brated their 21st birthday by joining hands with youthful advocates of the "new politics."

With barely a murmur of dissent, the more than 500 delegates opened their ADA convention session yesterday by quickly approving a trio of resolutions which:

Said that the personal use and possession of marijuana should not be a crime and the unlicensed sale of "pot" should be no more than a misdemeanor.

Called for legalized abortion, stating that any woman has the right to such an operation as part of her sex's new-found emancipation.

Said, with no further comment: "The sexual activity of consenting adults when conducted in private is not an appropriate matter for criminal or other governmental sanctions."

The theme for the day's activities may have been sounded by a guest speaker, former Rep. John J. Gilligan, who recently scored an upset victory over Sen. Frank Lausche in Ohio's Democratic senatorial primary.

"The people of this nation are beginning to question their faith in the free institutions of this country, in our ability to govern ourselves and solve our own problems," Gilligan said.

"This is a time when all of us either get into the act or become part of the problem that the rest of the people of this country will have to try to solve. The times call for a new and unprecedented effort at every level of our society."

## GUARANTEED INCOME PUSHED

Following that address, the delegates plunged into consideration of a far-reaching "income distribution" resolution, drafted by several of the organization's younger and more radical members.

The resolution, approved by an overwhelming show of hands, proposed to end virtually all poverty in the country through these steps:

1—"Our government should make a firm commitment to reduce our unemployment rate to 3 percent before the end of 1968, to 2 percent before the end of 1969 and never again permit it to rise above the 2 percent level."

2—"Further, the government should assure employment opportunities in the chronically unemployed and under-employed through job creation and special programs and should raise the federal minimum wage "as soon as possible to at least \$2.50 per hour."

3—"The federal government should provide a guaranteed annual wage to workers now seasonally or intermittently unemployed," and should abolish the current welfare system, replacing it with automatic federal payments in the form of child allowances and a negative income tax.

The delegates then took a brief recess from their policy-making to hear a succession of Negro and white students from Ohio State University describe their takeover of the college's administration building several weeks ago. One girl said university officials had no cause for complaint "because we warned them ahead of time that we were going to take over the building at 1 p.m."

## A CHANGE

Delegates and observers who have attended past ADA conventions agreed that the organization was considered quite radical in the post-World War II years following its founding, but in recent years has tended to rely on traditional concepts rather than breaking new ground.

Many of the ADA members believe the change displayed during the current three-day convention can be traced back to the organization's endorsement last February of Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy, thus breaking a two-decade-long tradition of standing behind an incumbent Democratic president.

After that vote, a number of ADA's older and more tradition bound members angrily resigned from the organization, opening the way of younger members who have sought to reshape the organization in recent years.

One sign of that change came late yesterday when ADA's nominating committee submitted a proposed list of board members to serve during the current year. Included on the list were several younger Negro leaders, who will sit beside the white middle class suburbanites who long have dominated the ADA leadership.

Among those additions are Rep. John Conyers, Jr., D-Mich.; A. June Franklin, a member of the Iowa state legislature; Clarence Mitchell III, a Maryland state legislator from Baltimore, and Marian Wright, a young civil rights attorney.

## EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER BEFORE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have at various times referred to the annual statement by Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI before the House Appropriations Subcommittee which reviews the appropriations requests of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies. This testimony by the Director is especially important because it is the most authoritative and comprehensive treatment on the general area of crime and subversion made public each year. Reviewed are the principal objectives and responsibilities upon the basis of which FBI funds will be used. These classifications include domestic intelligence, coordination, and dissemination of security data, specialized security programs, identification functions, scientific crime detection, uniform crime reporting, and the National Crime Information Center.

It must be remembered that the wealth of information which the Bureau collects in its 58 field offices is supplied to the Justice Department and is not available to Congress. Therefore, it is quite evident that statements by the Director as the head of the most qualified agency on crime and subversion are of especial interest and value.

Again this year, on February 23, Mr. Hoover made public through the subcommittee's hearing much valuable information which should be digested thoroughly by all citizens concerned about this Nation's security from both a domestic and foreign standpoint. The following are various topics of general interest which were treated by Mr. Hoover, with his comments on technical aspects of the FBI operation being omitted due to space considerations:

## EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS ON CRIME CRIMES SOLVED

Reports from the Nation's law enforcement agencies during the calendar year 1966 show that the police were able to solve 89 percent of the murders, 62 percent of the

forcible rapes, 72 percent of the aggravated assaults and 32 percent of the robberies.

In crimes against property, where the victim is generally not confronted by the offender, solutions are usually lower. On the average, police nationally solved 22 percent of the burglaries, 19 percent of the larceny thefts, and 23 percent of the auto thefts.

When considering all types of serious crime, the solution rate on an overall basis averaged out to 24 percent during 1966, a substantial drop of 8 percent when compared to the overall rate in 1965. There are a number of factors which may be contributing to the reduced solution of crime, such as a rising volume of crime itself, increasing demands for police services, both criminal and noncriminal, citizen apathy, restrictions on police investigative and enforcement practices by courts, and other authorities and the increasing mobility of the criminal offender.

#### YOUNG PERSONS ARRESTED

Arrests of persons under 18 years of age made up 23 percent of the total police arrests throughout the Nation in 1966. Young people were involved in 33 percent of the arrests in suburban communities, in 23 percent of those in the cities and in 20 percent of the arrests in the rural areas.

We find the arrests of persons under 18 years of age increased 59 percent during the period 1960 to 1966. This figure takes on added significance when it is considered that the population in the 10- to 17-year age group has risen but 19 percent during this same 7-year period.

With police arrests of persons under 18 years of age rising three times as fast as the population growth of this age group, we have a factor which is significantly influencing the progressive rise of crime in this country. Out of this emerges the grave prospect of a multiplying number of full-time adult criminals in the years immediately ahead.

#### POLICE OFFICERS KILLED

There were 57 law enforcement officers killed by criminals in 1966, bringing the number of such tragic deaths since 1960 to 335. Firearms, as usual, continued to be involved in nearly all police murders; 55 of the 57 killed during 1966 died of gunshot wounds, handguns being the instrument of death in 75 percent of the cases. Since 1960, 77 percent of all police officers killed were victims of offenders using a handgun.

It is a sad commentary on our times that there were 14 individuals under 18 years of age who were arrested during 1966 for murdering a police officer, almost equaling the previous 6-year total for this particular age group.

The increasing tendency toward public disregard for law and order is also reflected in the fact that 12 out of every 100 officers were victims of attacks in 1966. Some will be incapacitated for life.

#### CRIMINAL REPEATERS

The program we began in 1963 to follow on the criminal and prosecutive histories of a group of known offenders through their fingerprint records is swiftly documenting the fact that a hard-core group of repeaters is contributing heavily to our crime counts year after year.

Of nearly 18,000 Federal offenders released to the street in 1963, some 55 percent were arrested for new crimes within 30 months. This ranged from 65 percent for youths under 20, to 34 percent for those 50 and over.

As to mobility, of those released in 1963, 52 percent were rearrested in some other State within this 30-month period, including 74 percent of the auto theft repeaters, 48 percent of the robbers, 46 percent of the burglars and 45 percent of the forgery repeaters.

A total of 194,000 individual records had been entered in the continuing Careers in Crime program study by the close of the calendar year 1967. An analysis of 41,733

offenders arrested in 1966 shows that over one-half of these repeaters had been the recipients of leniency in the form of parole, probation, suspended sentence, or conditional release on one or more occasions in their criminal careers.

Mr. ROONEY. This becomes highly interesting.

Mr. HOOVER. There are some very flagrant cases in that group that are shocking as to the repeater-type criminal.

Mr. ROONEY. Of 41,733 offenders arrested in 1966, over one-half of these repeaters had been recipients of leniency in the form of parole, probation, suspended sentence, or conditional release on one or more occasions in their criminal careers?

Mr. HOOVER. That is supported by documentary proof.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish I had had this data when we had that California gentleman who appeared for the parole board.

Mr. HOOVER. I think it clearly shows the fallacy of the contention that you should be soft and easy in handling criminals, when so many, more than half of them, are repeaters.

Mr. ROONEY. What are we going to do when we have a chairman of the Parole Board more concerned with getting them out of prison faster? A gentleman who says that his predecessor, whom I thought was one of the finest and ablest persons I knew. Mr. Richard Chappel, that he did not know what he was doing when he was chairman of the Parole Board.

Mr. HOOVER. I have always said there are three factors I believe that will put a brake on crime: First, prompt apprehension; second, prompt trials and elimination of delays such as postponements and plea bargaining; and third, substantial sentences commensurate with the type of crime committed. I feel that within these crimes, there are many that are very vicious, yet the subjects have been released on parole or probation.

There is before the American Bar Association a recommendation of one of its committees that the sentences for most criminal violations be reduced and that criminals not be sent to the penitentiary for as long as they have been in the past. Instead they contend that we should use the probation and parole systems more.

It has been proven that probation and parole just do not work in many cases. Maybe they do not have competent or enough people in the system, I have always contended I believe in the principles of parole and probation provided the system does not turn loose on the streets of this country the type of criminals that commit crimes over and over again. There are some cases of individuals who are released on probation or parole who commit the same identical crime they were incarcerated for in the first instance.

In contrast, I think Congressman Bow will recall that in Miami, Fla., this last December there was a series of robberies and murders in the three districts where the Negroes live. The chief of police there ordered that they develop a hard policy of carrying shotguns and utilizing police dogs.

Statistics released by the Miami Police Department show that 71 robberies were committed in the Negro districts in January 1968, compared with 188 in December 1967, a drop of 62 percent in 1 month.

It also showed that for January 1968, the first full month the policy was in effect, robberies throughout the entire city declined by 45 percent from 299 in December to 163 in January. It is also interesting to note the same article reporting the statistics mentioned the fact that many of the Negroes in the Negro section of Miami are heartily in favor of the tough policy. Their lives and their businesses are safer as a result of this policy.

I submit that as proof of the fact that a strict policy in the enforcement of laws works, whereas some of the theoretical socio-

logical policies that are advanced and urged just do not work.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

At the time Chief Headley announced that hard policy down there, all the do-gooders were screaming and having hearings and trying to get rid of Headley because he was going to get tough.

Mr. HOOVER. He had a regular storm break on him.

Mr. ROONEY. It turned out that the bulk of the people all over the country were overwhelmingly in support of the position he took.

Mr. HOOVER. This article states that Chief Headley reported that he received about 8,000 letters and telegrams from people all over the country, and only 22 opposed his stand.

#### PAROLE, PROBATION, AND CLEMENCY ABUSES

Even without considering statistics such as I have just cited, no alert and thinking citizen is unaware of the crucial battle for survival currently raging in the streets and communities of our Nation. One need but refer to the daily news reports to learn of yet another vicious criminal depredation by that brutal minority of our population that spreads terror among the great bulk of America's law-abiding citizenry.

As the crime rate surges ahead incessantly, becoming an ever-more dangerous threat in not only urban centers but in suburban and rural areas as well, it is absolutely essential that sound procedures for handling criminal repeaters are followed. Realistic parole and probation policies must be impartially employed in all sections of our country and among all segments of our society if we ever hope to stem the onrushing waves of lawlessness. Unwarranted leniency, which means justice and rewards evasion of legal responsibility, poses a deadly threat to the very heart of our Nation. Undue consideration for the rights of repeating offenders and overindulgence in legal technicalities and evasions, of benefit only to the law-breaker, degrade the very ideal of equal justice for all citizens. The rights of the law-abiding majority must be afforded at least equal respect and consideration if the future of America is to be as glorious as our past.

It is, therefore, not difficult to understand why rational-minded, law-abiding citizens are gravely concerned when they ponder some typical recent cases.

In 1963, a 17-year-old Washington, D.C., hoodlum with a long and awesome history of arrests for crimes of violence since the age of 13, viciously assaulted and robbed the wife of a former U.S. Congressman while burglarizing the couple's residence. The thug, who threatened to kill his victim with a pair of scissors and did break her wrist, was subsequently sentenced to an 8-year jail term as a youthful offender.

In August, 1966, shortly after being released from serving part of his 8-year sentence, this individual was arrested for the vicious knife-point rape and robbery of a 42-year-old woman. At the time of this attack he was also being sought for an additional assault committed on a young mother a month before and as a suspect in other recent rape cases in the same area.

Through a series of technical delays and legal maneuvers, this man had still not been tried for all of these offenses, well over a year after the latest charges against him. The oft-quoted maximum that "justice too long delayed is justice denied" would appear to be appropriate in this instance, relative to the rights of the law-abiding public.

Many citizens were even more perplexed in June, 1967, to read of the violent death of a 24-year-old parolee, killed by gunshots as he fled from an armed robbery at a Washington, D.C., store. Particularly significant in this case was the report that the slain bandit was then on parole for auto theft, was additionally free on bond on a November, 1966, robbery charge, was also still on probation for house-

breaking, and, furthermore, had been set free on \$2,500 bond the day before his death on a charge of shooting a high school student who tried to eject the hoodlum and others from a school when the gang barged in and shouted obscenities at girl students. So bewildering was this criminal's unincarcerated status that one Washington paper posed editorially the frightening question of how many more such individuals are loose on the city's streets.

In Tennessee, in 1967, a Kentucky prison parolee, released after serving only 9 years of a life sentence for armed robbery, was tried for the savage rape and attempted murder of a young mother he had accosted in a shopping center parking lot and forced to drive to a remote woods. After the vicious attack, committed 6 weeks after his parole, the assailant strangled his victim into unconsciousness and left her for dead.

During the month and a half between his release and the Tennessee assault, the parolee was discharged from two jobs for making obscene remarks to female employees and had reportedly assaulted two other women. His record while incarcerated was equally sordid, with some 140 prison rule infractions credited to him. It is thus again difficult to understand what qualified this hardened criminal for favorable consideration as a worthwhile candidate for parole.

Another Washington case merits attention, as it illustrates the extent to which individuals charged with crimes are afforded solicitous consideration for their legal rights. Washington, D.C., police arrested a 19-year-old alleged housebreaker in May 1967. A review of his record reflected he was then free on bond in six unrelated criminal cases which had occurred during the previous 10 months. The first of these, resulting in convictions for attempting housebreaking, petty larceny, and destroying property, netted him a 1-year jail sentence but also saw his release on \$500 appeal bond. An attempted housebreaking and petty larceny the following month, for which he was subsequently convicted, resulted in a 6-month sentence, upon conviction, but ultimately featured his release on \$1,000 bond, pending appeal. During the same month he was indicted for housebreaking but released on personal bond.

Five months thereafter he was charged with committing an armed robbery, was indicted and released on \$5,000 bond. Three months later he was charged with a house-breaking but after arraignment was released on \$2,000 bond. Another arrest, during the same month, on charges of larceny from the mails and attempted housebreaking, saw him released on \$2,000 bond pending trial. Upon his arrest on the seventh charge, a \$10,000 bond was set and he was ultimately jailed with an indeterminate sentence as a youthful offender.

In California, in August 1966, a 67-year-old widow was beaten, robbed, and murdered by a convicted rapist who was free on bond awaiting trial on another rape charge. Despite a history of vicious assaults and sex crimes, initiated in 1960 with the rape of a 16-year-old mentally retarded girl, and notwithstanding the conclusion of a psychiatrist that he was a sexual psychopath, this individual, who was briefly confined in a mental institution, was repeatedly given lenient sentences or was released on parole or probation. He was thus unrestricted by any meaningful legal restrictions on the night of the elderly widow's murder, a crime for which he has been sentenced to death.

Two examples of recent paroles in Washington, D.C., illustrate a deplorable apparent tendency to release repeating offenders just to "get rid of them," even though efforts to rehabilitate these individuals have obviously failed. One 42-year-old man paroled in 1967 was serving a sentence of 4 to 14 years on two counts of robbery with a gun. This man also has a record of auto

larceny and larceny. He was paroled in July 1960, but this was revoked in August 1961, after he had violated the terms. Again paroled in March 1963, he again violated his parole and was returned to confinement 2 months later. Once more, in October 1965, he was paroled and was again returned to prison in March 1966, after he again violated parole terms. Despite his long record of parole violations he was again set free on parole.

In a second Washington, D.C., parole case, a man who had served 4 years of a 4- to 12-year sentence for assault with intent to kill was granted a parole despite a record of assault with a dangerous weapon and carrying dangerous weapons and five previous jail terms at the same penal institution.

It could well be a logical conclusion by a rational-minded person that if some authorities responsible for the incarceration of repeating offenders are unable or unwilling to make the proper decisions to keep such predatory creatures under adequate control, the same officials have at least an unavoidable obligation to alert the public to the risks and dangers represented by these individuals who stalk our streets today.

It was an encouraging sign, therefore, to note the comment of a Maryland judge (Robert B. Mathias, Prince Georges circuit court) as he levied a 30-year prison sentence on a 20-year-old man who pleaded guilty to participation in the murder of a 67-year-old taxi driver. "Folks like you must be removed from society," the judge remarked, and, when a defense attorney pleaded for leniency on the grounds that his client had been in correctional institutions much of his youth, the judge told the defendant, "Some judge didn't give you a long enough incarceration."

More such forthright handling of criminal repeaters is sorely needed today if our citizens are to feel secure in their homes and safe in our streets. Clemency policies and procedures that are firm but fair, as well as impartially applied, are absolute necessities.

Only with fervent adherence to law and order can our communities return to their traditional law-abiding character and thus avert a tragic submersion to a state of crime and chaos.

There is no question but that the crime problem facing the Nation today is greater than at any time in the past. As a result, the law enforcement profession is sorely pressed and is in need of all possible support and assistance to return our communities to their traditional law-abiding character. This requires an all-out effort on many fronts. No conscientious citizen denies the need for long-range programs to alleviate and correct conditions which breed crime. Improved law enforcement equipment, facilities, training, techniques, and the like also play a part. The assigning of an adequate force to meet crime where it is occurring is also a matter of good police administration.

But the need for the safety of the man, woman, and child on the street today is the thing that is of immediate concern to our citizens, and strict impartial law enforcement coupled with the elimination of crime's huge profits and soft justice most certainly are immediate factors which I and many others believe can lead to a reduction in our spiraling volume of crime. And by justice I mean that type of justice which keeps the balance true and affords the law-abiding public an even break. We need justice that moves quickly, surely, and convincingly. This means, as I have often pointed out, quick arrest, prompt prosecution, and substantial punishment for the guilty lawbreaker.

#### COMMUNIST PARTY-U.S.A.

Mr. HOOVER. I will now turn to the Communist Party-U.S.A. and other subversive groups which are so active throughout the Nation today.

The Communist attack comes from a number of directions. First, there is the Commu-

nist Party-U.S.A. along with its front groups, such as its youth organization, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. This is the pro-Moscow faction. Then there are the Socialist Workers Party and its youth affiliate, the Young Socialist Alliance, the Trotskyite wing of communism. In addition, there are the pro-Chinese Communists, the Progressive Labor Party. While the factions may differ as to theory, the achieving of a communized America is most certainly a common objective.

The 18th National Convention of the Communist Party-U.S.A. in June, 1966, marked that party's emergence into more open activity in an attempt to widen its influence on the American scene and to undermine our way of life in this country. While there has been an increase in the tempo of party activities, its objectives have remained the same—to destroy faith in the American system, to shake confidence in its leadership, and to subvert the ideals of its younger generation.

#### FOREIGN POLICY

Winding as a thread through the whole fabric of the party's program is its unwavering opposition to the war in Vietnam. It has interjected the Vietnam war into almost all issues with which it has come to grips and from this position it has taken a stance which attacks practically all phases of our economic, social, and political life. At the same time, the party has devoted much effort to promote a united front of opposition.

The party's position was clearly outlined by party leader Gus Hall before a meeting of his national committee in June 1967, when he outlined the party's contribution to the peace struggle in these five points:

1. The primary ideological task is to expose the "imperialistic character" of the war in Vietnam.

2. The interrelation between the war and domestic problems in the United States must be stressed.

3. The party must convince the partisans of peace that there can be victory in the struggle for peace if they see this relationship and the necessity to broaden their scope to include struggles for civil rights, against higher taxes, higher rents and prices, and the overall struggle for democracy.

4. The party must take steps to organize a mass movement in defense of youth who have refused or will refuse to be drafted.

5. The party must take all action which will insure the broad mobilization of all forces of protest.

Hall stated the party's position even more clearly during his visit to Russia in November 1967, where he led the Communist Party-U.S.A. delegation to the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the great October revolution held in Moscow on November 7, 1967. While there, he made speeches lavishing praise upon his hosts and criticizing the United States. During one speech, he said that the Communist Party-U.S.A. will continue to regard the struggle against U.S. imperialism as its primary task until every last U.S. warship, tank, plane, soldier, and corporation have been removed from foreign soil.

#### PARTY LINE

The policies of the party in this country are, as always, a determined effort to follow a party line as dictated by its Soviet masters. The rigidity with which the Communist Party-U.S.A. follows the Moscow line was well demonstrated in the position taken by the party after the Middle East crisis in the summer of 1967. Despite the hue and cry of many of its members with Jewish backgrounds, the Communist Party-U.S.A. faithfully followed the Moscow line in branding Israel as the aggressor and the tool of "American imperialism." So enraged were some of its members with Jewish backgrounds that despite party discipline, they collected funds and even donated blood for the Israeli Government.

## POLITICAL ACTIVITY

In carrying out its program of mobilizing the forces of protest, the party has been increasing the pressure on its membership to develop a movement for an independent presidential ticket in 1968. The party realizes that it will require a great deal of effort to bring about an effective independent ticket. In a resolution submitted to the membership by the national committee in June 1967, the party asserted that the realization of the goal of an independent ticket in 1968 would require the full and irrevocable commitment of the whole party.

## CIVIL RIGHTS

It was inevitable that the Communists would act to link civil rights protests with antiwar protests. This is something which the party has advocated for several years, but the move definitely came to the forefront during 1967. If it can be effectively accomplished it will enable the Communists to create one massive movement which they hope will ultimately change our Government's policies, both foreign and domestic.

Actually, the party can point to some progress as the past year has witnessed more civil rights leaders issuing the same call for joining the two issues in that these leaders have begun to advise Negroes to refuse to fight in Vietnam and to choose prison instead.

The emergence of the black power concept in the civil rights movement has placed the Communist Party-U.S.A. in a quandary. On the one hand, it cannot wholeheartedly embrace the concept of black power for to do so would alienate it from conservative Negro groups. On the other hand, there is a strong pro-black current in the lower echelon rank and file of the party and it can be said that the Negro composition of the party leans toward the black power prophets. As a result, party leaders are forced to walk a "tactical tight rope" concerning black power.

In October 1967 Gus Hall, the party's general secretary, publicly stated in a press interview, "The party still believes in integration and supports black power only as a means of improving the Negroes' lot." This is indicative of the Communist Party leadership attempting to "ride two horses" in an effort to please both sides. Despite this quandary, however, the party continues to attempt to accrue political gain from racial unrest and speak out against law and order.

Along this line, Herbert Aptheker, a frequent public speaker for the party, delivered a speech before an audience of 500 persons in a Los Angeles church in March 1967. During this speech, he called for a mass uprising and revolt by Negroes to achieve the social revolution he deemed necessary for the Negroes to achieve complete equality. Aptheker maintained that the riot in the Watts area of Los Angeles in August 1965 was a step in the right direction, but it was not nearly enough.

At its mid-June 1967 meeting, the Communist Party National Committee approved "An Open Letter to President Johnson and an Appeal to the American People, Black and White." It printed 50,000 copies of this communication in the form of a full-page spread in the party publication, "The Worker," and distributed it to all of its districts with the instructions that it be given the widest possible circulation, particularly to opinionmakers in every city and State. This communication asserted that "nothing less than the ending of the war in Vietnam and using the billions wasted in destruction and death for life and construction will make possible meaningful solutions of the critical problems of the Negro people, particularly those living in the ghettos."

## YOUTH

During the past year, the party has continued its drive to win the younger generation. As far as garnering new youthful members is concerned, the party has not been too successful though actual membership has

never been a real measure of party influence. If, on the other hand, its insidious propaganda can gain the attention of the young people, the party will have achieved its objective.

Believing that one of the most important issues facing youth today is the draft, the party has focused particular interest upon this issue. It realizes that the draft is a particularly sensitive issue to young men of draft age as well as to their parents. The party feels that here it can capitalize on the frustrations of the young by supporting and encouraging a defeat-the-draft movement. In this way, two ends will be served. On the one hand, the party will garner youthful support, while on the other, by discouraging enlistments and hampering the draft, it will be detracting from the Vietnam effort.

In the hope of merging this antidraft program with its anti-Vietnam drive, the party published a directive to its membership in which it specifically pointed out a continuation of the struggle to end the draft would

be a great contribution toward the struggle to end the war in Vietnam. The directive went on to state that a mobilization of the masses of youth opposing the draft, even if they were not yet consciously against the war, was obviously a pressure for peace.

## PARTY SPEAKERS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

The party has continued its program of having Communists travel the length and breadth of the land to fulfill speaking engagements on college campuses. During the academic year 1966-67, 54 such appearances were made by leading Communist representatives.

I submit a list showing the public appearances of party leaders on college campuses during the school year 1966-67.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection, we shall insert at this point in the record this exhibit regarding the public appearances of Communist Party leaders on college campuses during the school year 1966-67.

(The exhibit follows:)

## PUBLIC APPEARANCES OF PARTY LEADERS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES, SCHOOL YEAR 1966-67

School	Speaker	Date
College of Marin, Kentfield, Calif.	Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil	Sept. 27, 1966
Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.	Fred Bassett Blair	Sept. 29, 1966
St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pa.	Herbert Aptheker	Oct. 4, 1966
California Western University, San Diego, Calif.	Dorothy Healey	Do
Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N.Y.	Herbert Aptheker	Oct. 10, 1966
City College of New York, New York, N.Y.	do	Oct. 20, 1966
DePaul University, Chicago, Ill.	Louis Diskin	Oct. 25, 1966
Chicago Teachers College—North, Chicago, Ill.	do	Oct. 27, 1966
Pitzer College, Claremont, Calif.	Dorothy Healey	Nov. 14, 1966
City College of New York, New York, N.Y.	Arnold Johnson	Dec. 1, 1966
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.	Art Shields	Do
Clark University, Worcester, Mass.	Herbert Aptheker	Dec. 5, 1966
Long Island University, Brooklyn, N.Y.	do	Dec. 16, 1966
Rice University, Houston, Tex.	Mortimer Daniel Rubin	Jan. 8, 1967
St. Edward's University, Austin, Tex.	do	Jan. 9, 1967
Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.	Herbert Aptheker	Jan. 10, 1967
University of Texas, Austin, Tex.	Mortimer Daniel Rubin	Do
Franconia College, Franconia, N.H. Do. <sup>1</sup>	Herbert Aptheker	Jan. 24, 1967
University of Western Ontario, London, Canada <sup>1</sup> Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	Feb. 17, 1967
University of Illinois, Circle Campus, Chicago, Ill. <sup>2</sup>	do	Do
State University of New York, Buffalo, N.Y.	do	Feb. 27, 1967
University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn.	do	Mar. 1, 1967
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio	Arnold Johnson	Mar. 3, 1967
Everett Junior College, Everett, Wash.	Herbert Aptheker	Mar. 5, 1967
University of Wisconsin, Waukesha Center, Waukesha, Wis.	Milford Adolf Sutherland	Mar. 7, 1967
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.	Fred Bassett Blair	Mar. 14, 1967
San Francisco State College, San Francisco, Calif.	Henry Winston	Mar. 15, 1967
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.	Herbert Aptheker	Do
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.	Robert Heisler	Mar. 16, 1967
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.	Michael Zagarell	Mar. 21, 1967
California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif.	Louis Diskin	Mar. 23, 1967
Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.	Dorothy Healey	Mar. 27, 1967
University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.	Herbert Aptheker	Apr. 4, 1967
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.	Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil	Do
Santa Monica City College, Santa Monica, Calif.	James Kennedy	Apr. 5, 1967
University of Illinois, Circle Campus, Chicago, Ill.	Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil	Do
University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.	Louis Diskin	Apr. 6, 1967
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.	Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil	Do
Pasadena City College, Pasadena, Calif.	Louis Diskin	Do
Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.	Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil	Do
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.	do	Apr. 7, 1967
California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif.	do	Do
California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.	do	Do
University of California, Riverside, Calif.	do	Apr. 11, 1967
State University College at Geneseo, Geneseo, N.Y.	Herbert Aptheker	Apr. 13, 1967
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio	Gus Hall	Apr. 19, 1967
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.	Arnold Johnson	May 9, 1967
College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio	Herbert Aptheker	May 11, 1967
Loyola University, Los Angeles, Calif.	do	May 15, 1967
University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.	do	May 16, 1967
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.	Michael Zagarell	May 17, 1967
Portland State College, Portland, Oreg.	Donald Hamerquist	May 24, 1967

<sup>1</sup> 2 separate appearances on same day.

<sup>2</sup> Outdoor lecture center; stopped when threatened by Clabaugh Act.

Mr. HOOVER. Among other things, the party hopes to capitalize on the radicalism of the so-called new left movement. The basic purpose, however, behind the speaking campaign, which has been pursued with vigor since the early 1960's, is to gain recognition for and acceptance of the Communist Party-U.S.A. as a legitimate political party on the American scene. The party considers that college campuses offer an excellent opportunity to reach the youth who will be the leaders of tomorrow. The Communists also know there is a certain amount of prestige attached to a speaking engagement at educational institutions and that the party gains

just by reason of the appearance of the Communist speaker on the campus.

These speakers make much of the fact that freedom of speech and related freedoms in this country give them the right to deliver the Communist message. However, the speakers do not tell the true story of communism, what it is really like in the Soviet Union and other Communist nations, of the Communist ambitions for world domination, and the like. Since the true Communist aims are concealed, the Communist speakers make no significant contributions within the academic community to the pursuit of truth through the acquisition of knowledge. When

considering the Communist appearances on the campuses of numerous colleges on balance, the academic community has gained less in the knowledge of communism than the Communist Party has in notoriety and propaganda.

#### MEMBERSHIP

As to party membership, Gus Hall in October 1967 estimated that there were 13,000 actual party members and he has previously estimated that there were another 100,000 "state of mind" members, meaning those individuals who, although not actual members, are in sympathy with the programs and objectives of the party and assist it in any way they can.

#### FINANCES

The party can look forward to additional financing as a result of a campaign they began several years ago. I have pointed out in the past that for some years the Communist Party-U.S.A. has encouraged and solicited bequests to the party from its members and sympathizers. It now appears that the campaign has begun to pay off handsomely.

In December 1966, Harry Herman Kaplan, a wealthy retired Brooklyn builder, died leaving an estate valued in excess of \$2,600,000. His will provided that half of the estate should go to his widow while the remaining half would go to three "friends" who were named as executors. The three "friends" were Herbert Aptheker, Lement Harris, and Philip Foner. All three are trusted members of the Communist Party. They are expected to realize in excess of \$700,000 after taxes and expenses which will be turned over to the Communist Party-U.S.A.

Other bequests have been received by the party in the past year.

#### PARTY PUBLICATIONS

One new undertaking of the party which will require a substantial amount of money is the reestablishment of a daily Communist newspaper. A new printing press along with auxiliary printing equipment has been purchased.

Every effort is being made to steer away from the dull, propagandistic type of organ that the now defunct "Daily Worker" published. The party's goal is a fresh, revitalized paper, plagiarizing the format of the daily publication by the Communist Party of Great Britain, the "Morning Star." That paper was renovated when formed as a daily and this greatly increased its circulation.

If the party is successful in launching a daily propaganda organ, it will attempt to surround its teachings with articles concerning sports, women's features, labor, youth, and comics. In this manner, the party is hopeful of obtaining a wider circulation and thus secretly influence the masses in the Nation. The successful attainment of such a goal is priceless to the international Communist movement.

#### TROTSKYITE ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMUNISTS SPINTER GROUPS

Earlier I mentioned that other subversive groups active in the country today include such groups as the Socialist Workers Party of the Trotskyite wing of communism, and the Progressive Labor Party.

Briefly, Trotskyite organizations are militant revolutionary groups based on the theories of Marx Engels, and Lenin as interpreted by Leon Trotsky rather than Joseph Stalin. Like the Communists, the Trotskyites call for the revolutionary overthrow of "capitalism" and the establishment of socialism. Splinter groups are those which have broken away from the mainstream of the Communist Party-U.S.A., usually over the interpretation or implementation of basic Communist ideology. While the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin form the base for the programs of these groups, they vary as to the interpretation of these teachings and in the

manner in which their objectives are to be reached.

**Socialist Workers Party:** The Socialist Workers Party was the first major group to oppose the Communist Party-U.S.A. for the right to lead an American Communist revolution. It is the largest Trotskyite organization in the United States, and has been designated pursuant to Executive Order 10450 and is a basic revolutionary group.

The youth affiliate of the Socialist Workers Party is the Young Socialist Alliance which was created in 1957 and became a national organization in April 1960. This organization has established chapters throughout the United States and through this group the Socialist Workers Party has taken advantage of every opportunity to expand its influence on the campus and among the youth of the Nation.

Factionalism in the Socialist Workers Party has been responsible for the formation of other subversive groups which follow the teachings of Trotsky but differ over the means by which the goal of worldwide communism is to be attained. Among the offshoots of the Socialist Workers Party are the Johnson-Forest Group, the Workers World Party, the Workers League formerly known as the American Committee for the Fourth International, and the Revolutionary Committee of the Fourth International, also known as Spartacist League.

**Progressive Labor Party:** One of the most militant of the Communist splinter groups in existence today is the Progressive Labor Party, a pro-Chinese Communist group. This organization was formed in 1962 by a group of individuals who had been expelled from the Communist Party-U.S.A. because of their pro-Chinese sympathies.

Recognizing the tremendous potential for agitation inherent in the current racial discontent, the Progressive Labor Party has established a Black Liberation Commission headed by William Epton, militant Negro vice president of the Progressive Labor Party. Epton's activities in connection with the 1964 Harlem rioting resulted in his arrest by New York authorities and he was subsequently found guilty of conspiracy to riot, advocacy of criminal anarchy, and conspiracy to advocate criminal anarchy.

The Progressive Labor Party, through its official publications and pamphlets distributed by the Black Liberation Commission, constantly exhorts the Negro to revolt and carry on a "ceaseless struggle" against the U.S. ruling class.

#### DEMONSTRATIONS PROTESTING U.S. INTERVENTION IN VIETNAM

There has been no abatement in the wave of demonstrations protesting U.S. policy toward Vietnam, which began in August 1964, when American aircraft attacked selected targets in North Vietnam following torpedo-boat assaults against American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. Since the outset, the Communist Party-U.S.A. and other subversive groups have actively supported and participated in the demonstrations.

During the early part of 1967 the party's "peace movement" focused on massive demonstrations at New York City and San Francisco, Calif., on April 15, 1967. A group now known as the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam and another group, the Student Mobilization Committee, joined in sponsoring the demonstrations. Both groups include members of the Communist Party and Socialist Workers Party.

The two groups held separate conferences in Washington, D.C., and in Chicago, Ill., in May 1967, to discuss strategy and, among other things, mapped plans for a march on Washington, D.C., for the fall of 1967.

Over 700 individuals registered for the conference of the National Mobilization Committee in Washington. Over 300 were members of the Communist Party, the Socialist

Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs of America, or Youth Against War and Fascism. Numerous pacifist groups were also represented.

Among the series of workshops formed during the conference was the fundraising workshop. It was led by Hunter Pitts O'Dell, an inactive member of the Communist Party-U.S.A. National Committee. The strategy and tactics of nonviolence workshop was led by the Reverend Mr. James Bevel, national director of the National Mobilization Committee and an official of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Officials of the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party participated in the series of workshops.

Some 500 individuals attended the Student Mobilization Committee conference in Chicago, including representatives from the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America and Students for a Democratic Society.

The National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam sponsored its previously announced demonstration at Washington, D.C., on October 20-22, 1967. The primary goal of the demonstration was to confront the "warmakers" and to "shut down the Pentagon."

On October 20, 1967, approximately 400 individuals marched to the Department of Justice Building where they had previously announced they would turn in hundreds of draft cards to the Attorney General. The demonstrators carried signs urging resistance to the draft. Eleven of them, including Dr. Benjamin Spock, who has been an outspoken critic of the War in Vietnam; the Reverend William Sloane Coffin, chaplain, Yale University; and Gary Rader, leader of the Chicago Area Draft Resisters, met with a representative of the Department of Justice. They attempted to leave with the Justice Department representative a brief case which they claimed was filled with draft cards; however, he refused to accept it. The delegation left it in the building.

When the contents were subsequently examined, a total of 357 Selective Service documents made up of 185 registration certificates and 172 notices of classification were found. Since some concerned the same individual, the total persons involved numbered 256. Also included in the material were such things as facsimiles and copies of selective service cards as well as some antidraft cards and protest letters. I will go into detail later regarding the turned-in draft card problem when I discuss our growing volume of Selective Service work.

Several individuals, including Ron Young, a member of The Resistance, an antidraft organization; Sidney Lens, a former official of the Revolutionary Workers League, which has been designated as subversive pursuant to Executive Order 10450; and Jane Spock, the wife of Dr. Benjamin Spock, spoke to the demonstrators. All the speakers urged an end to the war and called for opposition to the draft. Draft resisters were described as "courageous individuals."

On October 21, 1967, demonstrators from throughout the United States gathered in the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial for a rally prior to their march to the Pentagon. Speakers included David Dellinger, national chairman of the committee; Clive Jenkins, a representative of the British Labor Party; Dr. Benjamin Spock; the Reverend Mr. Coffin; Dagmar Wilson, a leader of Women Strike for Peace, a pacifist group; and Fred Davis, a representative of Students for a Democratic Society. Dellinger is the editor of the "Liberation" magazine, a pacifist publication. He has described himself as a Communist, although not of the Soviet variety.

Dellinger in October 1940 refused to register for Selective Service claiming to be a conscientious objector. He was indicted in the southern district of New York in Novem-

ber 1940 and after a plea of guilty was sentenced to serve a year and 1 day for violation of the Selective Service Act. Upon his release from prison he registered for Selective Service. In June 1943 he was charged with failure to report for a physical examination and upon a plea of guilty was sentenced on August 30, 1943, to serve 2 years in a Federal prison.

All of the speakers were highly critical of the war in Vietnam and demanded an end to the draft. The United States was described as an aggressor. Communist publications were distributed during the demonstration.

Negroes present at the demonstration were urged to break off and hold their own rally. As a result, approximately 300 Negroes broke off from this demonstration and attended a rally in another section of Washington. Speakers at this rally included officials of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, a militant civil rights group; the Mau Mau, a militant black nationalist group; and the Revolutionary Action Movement, a militant pro-Chinese Marxist group. Speakers denounced the war in Vietnam and condemned the white man. Negroes were urged to refuse to be inducted into the armed services.

At approximately 2 p.m., October 21, 1967, participants in the demonstration at the Lincoln Memorial began their march to the Pentagon. Committee spokesmen estimated the crowd to be over 200,000; however, observers from various law enforcement agencies estimated it to number between 30,000 and 60,000. At the Pentagon groups of the demonstrators attempted to force their way into the Pentagon and one small group succeeded in entering one door; however, they were promptly removed from the building.

Numerous members of the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the Progressive Labor Party, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, and Youth Against War and Fascism were observed among the demonstrators at the Lincoln Memorial and the Pentagon. These included such individuals as Arnold Johnson, chairman of the Peace Commission, Communist Party-U.S.A.; Michael Zagarell, chairman of the party's National Youth Commission; and James Jackson, chairman of the International Affairs Commission of the Party. These individuals were included in the approximately 125 members of the Communist Party who participated in the demonstration.

The Socialist Workers Party was represented by over 75 members which included George Novak, the national chairman, and Paul Boutelle, the party's vice-presidential candidate. In addition, over 25 young people were there as representatives of the Young Socialist Alliance, the Socialist Workers Party youth group.

Approximately 200 persons marched under the W. E. DuBois Clubs of America banner. Also marching under its own banner were about 25 members of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, an organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General. Other groups having representatives at the demonstration were the Spartacist League, a splinter group of the Socialist Workers Party, and the Trade Unionists for Peace, an organization in the trade union movement set up by the Communist Party.

A large group of young people representing college campus chapters of the Students for a Democratic Society, which party leader Gus Hall describes as an organization that the party has "going for us," was also present.

At 7 p.m. the demonstrators began leaving the area of the Pentagon to return to their homes; however, a few hundred remained in the vicinity of the Pentagon during the night, continuing a demonstration marked by a scandalous display of obscenity and immoral behavior. On October 22, 1967, approximately 400 individuals continued to demonstrate. Shortly after midnight authorities

cleared the area. They were forced to arrest over 200 demonstrators who refused to move, bringing the total arrests during the Pentagon demonstration to more than 600.

During a press conference in the afternoon of October 22, 1967, committee officials described the demonstration as a tremendous victory. David Dellinger said that the demonstration marked the birth of a "new movement" which will be more militant, more persistent, and more insistent.

Sympathy demonstrations were held throughout the United States and in many foreign countries on October 21, 1967.

#### PLANNED DEMONSTRATIONS AT THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, 1968

Recently, various new left groups, militant civil rights activists, and subversive organizations have formulated plans to stage a massive demonstration in August 1968 at the National Democratic Convention in Chicago, Ill. Dr. Benjamin Spock, the noted pediatrician and anti-Vietnam war critic, has said that the aim of the demonstration will be to gather 100,000 adults and 100,000 teenagers outside the International Amphitheater during the convention who will "descend upon the National Democratic Convention in Chicago as a final reminder to the delegates of the strength of the opposition."

During the early part of February 1968, representatives of the Students for a Democratic Society, the National Conference for New Politics, and the Communist Party-U.S.A., met in Chicago to make plans for co-ordinating both black and white groups into united activity at the National Democratic Convention. This group discussed plans to set up an office in Chicago, with full-time personnel, and to include representatives who will travel across the Nation to make the mobilization at the convention successful.

Communist Party officials have indicated that they are willing to supply funds toward the establishment of this office and will furnish funds to Negro representatives to allow them to travel to Chicago for the purpose of attending planning meetings.

The National Conference for New Politics was formed in June 1966 for the reported purpose of enabling those who work for peace, civil rights, and an end to poverty to register the greatest impact by concentrating money and manpower on direct political action. In 1967 its national council contained former members of the Communist Party and the Revolutionary Workers League, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

#### STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

The new left student movement in this country has so captured the attention of the Nation in the past several years as to merit hundreds of articles in the news media and to initiate a broad range of speculation about its future role in our country.

It is many-sided. It is political theory, sociology, and bitter protest. It is linked with civil rights, the fight against poverty, the American war in Vietnam. It involves students, faculty members, writers, intellectuals, beatniks, most of them being quite young. The mood of this movement, which is best typified by its primary spokesman, the Students for a Democratic Society, is a mood of disillusionment, pessimism, and alienation. At the center of the movement is an almost passionate desire to destroy, to annihilate, to tear down. If anything definite can be said about the Students for a Democratic Society, it is that it can be called anarchistic.

A national leader of the Students for a Democratic Society during the summer of 1967 claimed a membership of 30,000 for the organization. "New Left Notes," a weekly publication of Students for a Democratic Society, in its issue dated June 26, 1967, stated there was a recorded membership of 6,371 with a total of nearly 250 chapters, mostly on college campuses. Of the 6,371 members, only 875 had paid dues since January 1,

1967. The organization is infiltrated by Communist Party members and Party Leader Gus Hall has described the organization as part of the "responsible left" which the party has "going for us."

In late June 1967, the Students for a Democratic Society held its national convention on the campus of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. In continuance of past programs, the organization called for acts of civil disobedience when necessary. It called for continued demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam, radicalizing the student power movement by connecting it with radical off-campus issues, and the taking over of the colleges and universities by the students.

The Students for a Democratic Society is opposed to conscription in any form and if it has any one program at this time, it is draft resistance. It called for the formation of antidraft unions and the utilization of such tactics as disrupting the Selective Service System apparatus by demonstrations and civil disobedience. It advocated agitation by those men in uniform and urged members of the armed services to desert and go "underground."

In keeping with its past course of action and to put into practice its programs that were outlined at the 1967 national convention, the Students for a Democratic Society has seized upon every opportunity to foment discord among the youth of this country.

Student dissent and behavior are not what really concern perceptive citizens today. Student unrest and dissatisfaction have been erupting through the centuries and dissent is an integral part of our American way of life. What is of concern in the new left movement is its alienation from our democratic thought, processes, and ideals; the open hostility of these students to law and order, to civilized behavior and the concept of liberty under law.

The new left identifies itself with the problems of American society, such as civil rights, poverty, disease, and slums. With its anarchistic bent, however, it refuses to cooperate sincerely with other groups interested in eradicating these same problems, and despite the new leftist's protestations of sincerity, he is not legitimately interested in bringing about a better nation. On the contrary, he is dedicated—in his bizarre and unpredictable ways—to cut the taproots of American society.

The new left should not be arbitrarily equated with the traditional old-line left. Although they become prey to the superior organizational ability and talents of the old-line subversive organizations, such as the Communist Party-U.S.A., the Socialist Workers Party, and the like, to simply identify them as Moscow or Peking Communists would be missing the point. To put it bluntly, they are a new type of subversive and their danger is great. In a population which is becoming increasingly youthful, the new left can be expected to find wider fields of endeavor and to try to do all that it can to infect the rising generation with its anti-American prattle.

#### W. E. B. DUBOIS CLUBS OF AMERICA

Since it was organized in June 1964, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America has been the Communist Party's main spokesman to the youth of our Nation. This Communist front continues to receive practically all of its financial support from the Communist Party. Many of the organization's members have "gone up" to membership in the party; however, they still work closely with the DuBois Clubs to carry out programs and activities which are initiated by the party.

The DuBois Clubs, because it is made up of young Communists, has been utilized by the Communist Party to work with the new left movement, particularly on the campus, and influence it toward its line of thinking. This organization, hand in hand with the primary spokesman of the new left, the Stu-

dents for a Democratic Society, has encouraged youth to resist the draft and subject the Selective Service System to harassment and agitation.

#### WHITE HATE GROUPS

There are a number of small hate-type groups having a total estimated membership of about 350 whose membership is confined exclusively to the white race. These groups parade under the guise of patriotism, anti-communism, concern for the destiny of the country, and peaceful change in our form of government. Under this mantle, however, is an ever-increasing hatred for Negroes, members of the Catholic and Jewish faiths, and our Government leaders. We have penetrated these organizations and keep the local and Federal agencies appropriately advised, including the Secret Service.

One such organization is the American Nazi Party, now known as the National Socialist White People's Party, whose self-styled leader, George Lincoln Rockwell, was assassinated in August 1967. The group at that time numbered about 100 members. It is presently being led by Matthias Koehl, Jr., who was second in command under Rockwell.

Formed by Rockwell in 1956 as a "national socialist" movement and based on the German Nazi Party headed by Adolf Hitler, the American Nazi Party espoused a line of hatred against the Jews and Negroes. Rockwell hoped to attain power through the votes of the millions of people he believed he could convert.

In this regard, Rockwell had been invited to and spoke at various colleges and universities throughout the country. He received upwards of \$100 for each speech. This, coupled with small contributions, dues payments, and income received from the sale of publications, allowed him to spread his venom throughout the country. I mention this to illustrate that although an organization may be small in actual members, through publicity and propaganda it can often achieve influence that is entirely out of proportion to its membership.

Another group is the National States Rights Party. Based in Savannah, Ga., with an estimated membership of 125, it is led by Dr. Edward R. Fields, who serves as its information director and editor of its publication, "The Thunderbolt." This group is composed of former members of Klan-type organizations as well as notorious anti-Semites. Its activities consist of meetings, speeches by Fields and the vice president, J. B. Stoner, and demonstrations by members urging segregation and white power.

#### CLAN-TYPE ORGANIZATIONS

Currently, there are 14 Klan-type organizations in the United States with an estimated total membership of 14,000 hard-core Klansmen. There are thousands of sympathizers. The Klans have their largest representation in the States of North and South Carolina and to a lesser degree in Virginia. There has been a decrease in Klan membership in the previously hard-core areas of Klan violence, such as Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama.

The FBI's intelligence operation, which includes penetration of Klan organizations with informants, not only assists the Bureau in the investigations of violation of laws within the FBI's jurisdiction, but also enables us to disseminate information regarding Klan activities to interested Federal agencies.

The FBI regularly furnishes to State and local authorities information regarding violations over which they have primary jurisdiction and, working closely with local authorities, the Bureau is able to advise of activities such as rallies and demonstrations which could lead to violence and other civil disturbances.

A vital part of our Klan program includes a constant development of racial informants in an effort to thoroughly infiltrate the Klan

at all levels, giving us a constant flow of current intelligence data regarding Klan strength, organizational efforts, and Klan-terrorist activities.

#### MINUTEMEN

We continue to follow the activities of the Minutemen organization and keep other agencies, including the Secret Service, advised of the results of our investigation of the organization and its individual members. This is the outfit which claims its primary purpose is to prepare its members to overthrow the Government of the United States when and in the event the Government is taken over by the Communists.

Although boasting of thousands of members, there are actually less than 500 persons in the group, and recent information indicates that there are less than 50 persons upon whom Minutemen leaders can call for overt action. The headquarters remains at Norborne, Mo., and despite Robert DePugh's release of information last year that he was turning the operation of the organization over to an alleged secret "executive council," he still is its self-proclaimed leader and spokesman.

DePugh has stated that the Minutemen as an organization does not buy and store arms but that individual members maintain whatever arms and ammunition they purchase with their own funds. On the other hand, DePugh furnishes plans for the manufacture and assembly of a machinegun to any of his subscribers who donate \$20 or more to his so-called "defense fund." Further, early in the summer of 1967, DePugh advised his members to hide their weapons in secret caches as he believed they would be subject to many raids later in the year.

Thus there is a penchant for weapons permeating the entire organization and our investigations have shown this obsession extends to all types of armament, including machineguns, rifles, handguns, explosives, and the like.

In January 1967, DePugh himself was sentenced in Federal Court to 4 years' imprisonment following his conviction for violating the National Firearms Act. He is presently free on bail awaiting an appeal of this conviction.

In April 1966, DePugh formed the Patriotic Party. This group was to be known as the political arm of the Minutemen and was to push conservative causes. Although still in existence, members of this group have expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of accomplishment of the party and have described it as merely a source of revenue for DePugh.

#### MILITANT BLACK NATIONALIST GROUPS

The activities of certain militant black nationalist groups have been undergoing a change and have added materially to our work. Some so-called civil rights organizations preaching hatred of the white race, demanding immunity from laws and advocating violence constitute a serious threat to our country's internal security. Violence is advocated by these militant black nationalist groups to further the concept of "black power." These groups are made up of militant all-Negro hate-type organizations.

#### Nation of Islam (NOI)

The largest of these black nationalist groups is the Nation of Islam (NOI) with a highly disciplined membership of approximately 5,500. The NOI is headed by Elijah Muhammad, self-styled "Messenger of Allah," and has its headquarters in Chicago, Ill. It is a semireligious organization which teaches violent hatred of the white race and non-allegiance to the United States. Members of the white race are "devils" in the eyes of the NOI and the group advocates the separation of the white from the black race.

#### Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM)

Organized in 1963 at Detroit, Mich., the Revolutionary Action Movement follows the

teachings of Robert F. Williams, a fugitive from justice who fled to Cuba and then to Communist China. Now also active in New York City and Philadelphia, Pa., its present leader is Maxwell Stanford of Philadelphia.

The group has approximately 50 members the majority of whom are in New York City. RAM is dedicated to the overthrow of the capitalistic system, by violence if necessary, and to its replacement by a socialistic system oriented toward the Chinese Communist interpretation of Marxism-Leninism.

Members of the group have been involved in a number of activities. Among other things, it formed a front organization for rifle training, the Jamaica Rifle and Pistol Club, Inc. Subsequently, several members of this club were arrested in New York City on June 21, 1967, by local authorities for conspiracy to advocate anarchy. They are awaiting trial.

In September 1967, Philadelphia authorities arrested four members of the RAM organization on charges stemming from information reported by an individual that he had been approached by a RAM member to join in an alleged plot to place poison in the coffee urns used by the local police. He turned over to the FBI a bottle reportedly left at his house by RAM. The bottle, upon examination, was found to contain a large quantity of deadly cyanide. The arrested individuals are awaiting trial.

Three other Philadelphia RAM members are awaiting prosecutive action on charges that they conspired to assassinate the mayor and police commissioner of Philadelphia, President Johnson, and myself.

A Peking-published pamphlet introduced into the United States during 1967 is an example of the interest the Chinese Communists take in adding to the racial strife in this country. Interestingly, this particular pamphlet is signed by Robert F. Williams, the China-based fugitive whose teachings are followed by RAM. The pamphlet gives tips on how to cause problems for the authorities by such acts as plugging sewer lines, starting fires and paralyzing traffic.

Along the same line, the official Chinese Communist news organization, the New China News Agency, has bombarded the Negro newspapers in this country with daily releases, many of which extol the efforts of racist extremists and indicate a strong support of Negroes in their "rebellion against racial oppression."

#### Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, formerly headed by Stokely Carmichael and now by H. Rap Brown, is the most publicized of the groups advocating Negro rights through violence. Formed in 1960 in Atlanta, Ga., as a civil rights organization, the group switched to advocacy of black power in 1966.

To Carmichael, black power signifies "bringing this country to its knees" and "using any force necessary" to obtain Negro goals. He maintains that "violence is inevitable in the struggle for Negro liberation," and he urges Negroes in this country to "prepare for a bloody revolution."

Carmichael couples his black power advocacy to the war in Vietnam. He refers to the war as a "white man's war" being "fought for racist reasons." On July 25, 1967, Carmichael arrived in Cuba for a conference of revolutionary forces before proceeding to Hanoi and other foreign countries. Upon his return to the United States in December 1967, his passport was confiscated by the State Department.

Carmichael was succeeded by H. Rap Brown as national chairman of SNCC in May 1967. Brown has traveled this country calling for "rebellion by any means."

Black nationalist groups that preach this kind of violence and revolution are increasing and their teachings become more violent each day.

## FOREIGN INFLUENCES IN BLACK NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

Although at this time no evidence has been developed which would show that the black nationalist movement in the United States is either under foreign control or direction, it must be recognized that real opportunities for foreign exploitation have and do exist and present a definite threat to our internal security. In fact, as evidenced by the following, data has been developed indicating varying degrees of foreign participation, influence and/or involvement among black nationalist groups and individual militants.

## Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)

The actual as well as the potential extent of foreign involvement and participation in the black nationalist movement is highlighted by the recent foreign travels of Stokely Carmichael, former chairman of SNCC. In addition, numerous other SNCC members have traveled abroad seeking support for their cause. In 1967 they visited such far-flung countries as Cuba, England, France, Sweden, Norway, Cambodia, North Vietnam, Tanzania, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. John Tilman represented SNCC at an anti-Vietnam conference held in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, in September 1967, which was attended by representatives of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. Five SNCC members traveled to Cuba on January 1, 1968, reportedly to attend a "cultural" conference in Havana to be held January 4-11, 1968.

Indications are quite clear that SNCC is attempting to obtain international recognition. It has appointed a director of international relations, James Forman, who is stationed in New York City.

## Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM)

There is evidence of an existing line of communication outside the normal channels of communication between Robert F. Williams, the leader in exile of RAM who now resides in Red China, and RAM members in the United States. There are also allegations of Red Chinese financial support of RAM, although these have not been substantiated.

## Communist Party (U.S.A.)

The Communist Party-U.S.A., has always had strong international ties with other Communist parties throughout the world. Moreover, it has actively supported the black nationalist movement in the United States and solicited funds for SNCC.

In October 1967, the party formulated a new position paper which included the following statement: "We as Marxists have always affirmed that oppressed people have the right to forcibly overthrow an oppressive regime when the channels for democratic change are closed to them. This right is affirmed in the Declaration of Independence. Therefore, there can be no question of the right of black people in the United States to use violence to achieve change."

## COVERAGE OF MILITANT BLACK NATIONALIST GROUPS

The revolutionary stand taken by many members of militant black nationalist organizations such as those listed above represents a distinct threat to the internal security of the Nation. This situation has made it necessary for the FBI to intensify its intelligence operation in this field through penetration of these groups with informants and sources in order to be kept aware of their plans and objectives. This penetration has been made at all levels, including the top echelon of these extremist groups.

As a result of our efforts, a large volume of intelligence data is developed and disseminated on a daily basis to interested agencies of the Federal Government, as well as to local authorities. This information is also of assistance to the Bureau in the investi-

gation of violations of law within the FBI's jurisdiction.

We have developed numerous sources in ghetto areas of our major cities where we are receiving vigorous support from law-abiding citizens in these areas. This has put us in a position to pinpoint areas of potential trouble and identify issues that could lead to violence. Such information is disseminated to State and local authorities to assist them in their handling of their responsibilities in this field.

## Stockpiling of weapons by Black Nationalists

Reports of the stockpiling of firearms and other weapons by black nationalist groups for use against the white man are of great concern. Such stockpiling is, of course, a distinct possibility in view of the ease with which firearms can be obtained in this country and in the light of the inflammatory urgings of such agitators as Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, and James Forman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. As recently as last weekend at a public meeting in Los Angeles, Calif., Forman told the audience that every Negro should be armed for the eventual revolution of the black people; Brown made the statement that power comes from the barrel of the gun and Negroes must obtain power and guns; and Carmichael exclaimed that all blacks must unite militarily.

Our reports on investigations of black nationalist extremists are replete with allegations that these individuals have obtained firearms and are encouraging residents of ghetto areas to obtain weapons. They have distributed newspapers and leaflets describing methods of making firebombs for use in riots. The "Inner City Voice," a newspaper in Detroit, Mich., with a claimed circulation of 10,000 and aimed at the ghetto reader, contains such information.

In a number of instances black nationalists involved in arrests have been found in possession of weapons. Fifteen members of the Jamaica Rifle and Pistol Club of New York City, an affiliate of the Revolutionary Action Movement which is a black nationalist extremist group oriented toward the Chinese Communists, are presently under indictment on charges of criminal anarchy and possession of dangerous weapons which included six handguns and 35 rifles, shotguns, and carbines. These individuals who were arrested on June 21, 1967, allegedly were plotting the murder of Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young, prominent civil rights leaders.

On May 2, 1967, 24 members of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, an organization which advocates the use of guns and guerrilla tactics to end the oppression of the black race and the drafting of Negroes to fight in Vietnam, invaded the Assembly of the State of California which was in session. The invaders were armed with rifles, shotguns, and pistols and they were there to protest a gun registration law. A leader of this organization is presently under indictment for murder in connection with the killing of an Oakland, Calif., police officer in October 1967, during a routine traffic arrest incident.

On Wednesday of this week, approximately 600 Negroes who were attending a memorial program for Malcolm X, deceased black nationalist leader, which was held at a public school in East Harlem, New York City, were urged by black nationalist extremist Herman B. Ferguson to obtain weapons to arm themselves for "self defense" against the whites.

With respect to H. Rap Brown's appearance in California over the weekend of February 17, 1968, it is noted that he was possibly in violation of bail restrictions placed on him by a U.S. district judge in the eastern district of Virginia and by a U.S. district judge in the eastern district of Louisiana which placed limitations on Brown's travels. U.S. District Judge Robert R. Merhige, Jr., of Virginia has ordered Brown to

appear before his court to show cause why his bail should not be revoked. This bail of \$10,000 was set in connection with an appeal of an extradition order from Virginia to the State of Maryland where he is charged with inciting to riot and inciting to commit arson. The Louisiana bail of \$15,000 was in connection with Brown's arrest for violation of the Federal firearms statute in that while under indictment for a felony, he illegally transported a firearm in interstate commerce. Federal Judge Lansing L. Mitchell of the eastern district of Louisiana on February 19, 1968, preliminarily revoked his bail and issued a warrant for his arrest.

Brown was arrested in New York City on February 20, 1968, by a U.S. marshal assisted by local police and agents of the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Tax Unit of the Treasury Department; however, at a hearing on the same date, he was released to the custody of his attorney with the provision that he would appear in Federal court in Richmond, Va., and New Orleans, La., on the dates to be set by the courts.

Brown was ordered to appear in Federal court at New Orleans on February 21, 1968. At the conclusion of the hearing \$5,000 of the \$15,000 bond was ordered forfeited. Bond was reset at \$50,000 which he did not make and he was held in custody. The court also ordered Brown removed to Richmond, Va., to appear there on February 23, 1968, in connection with the order of the Virginia court to appear and show cause why his bail should not be revoked.

During the recess of the Louisiana hearing on February 21, 1968, Brown threatened a Negro special agent of the FBI who was present as a witness for the hearing. Brown was arrested at the conclusion of the hearing then in progress on charges of violating the assaulting of a Federal officer statute. He was arraigned on this latter charge on February 22, another bond of \$50,000 was set and he was remanded to the custody of the U.S. marshal.

## RACIAL DISTURBANCES

The summer of 1967 witnessed the most violent rioting in the history of our Nation, rioting which was marked by murder, arson, looting, and wanton destruction. These disorders which have broken out in the many cities during the past several summers are grim evidence that in any urban area mob violence can suddenly and explosively erupt.

I want to make clear the FBI's responsibility in civil disorder matters. Basically, it is confined to the development and dissemination of intelligence information to the Attorney General, being alert, of course, to any violations of Federal law over which we have jurisdiction. Appropriate State and local authorities are also kept informed of pertinent developments.

The FBI does not have jurisdiction for the protection of persons and property nor does it have responsibility for the policing or controlling of riotous conditions. This is a matter for the local authorities.

While we scrupulously avoid encroaching on the authority of local and State agencies, we do provide continuing cooperative services and assistance, such as courses of training relating to the behavior of mobs and their control.

Since the fall of 1964, the FBI has, at the direction of the President, made riot control training available to law enforcement agencies. Thus far (February 1, 1968), we have extended such training assistance in 2,105 local schools attended by 81,351 people.

Along this same line, we published a training booklet entitled "Prevention and Control of Mobs and Riots." Thus far we have distributed nearly 60,000 copies to persons and agencies having a direct responsibility for prevention and control of riots.

The riots during the summer of 1967, as did those of other summers, almost invariably began in a similar way: the reaction to

a minor incident involving police action in a depressed Negro area; the gathering of a crowd; hostility toward and interference with the police; the fanning of the now already troubled situation by troublemakers, extremists, and subversives; overt hostile action toward the police, accompanied by wild charges of "police brutality"; and suddenly the tension and excitement boils over and explodes into blind, irrational mob fury and action with resulting street fighting, vandalism, arson, looting, and sniping.

This familiar pattern was evident, for example, in the riot at Newark which was triggered by the arrest of a Negro taxi driver for a traffic violation.

The summer of 1967, however, brought a new development in that tense situations have been further aggravated with the crowd taking violent action following the exhortations of extremists, such as black power advocates Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown. I have previously commented on some of their activities and statements.

Another problem in connection with many of the disturbances has been the involvement of criminal elements as the disorders grew and spread. Young Negro hoodlums have also been an increasing source of trouble and concern during the course of the disorders.

The heavy involvement of the criminal element is clearly evident from a statistical analysis of the fingerprint cards forwarded to our Identification Division by the local authorities as a result of arrests made during the course of the riots. Of 1,089 fingerprint submissions from Newark, 708, or 65 percent, white and Negro individuals were found to have prior records on file. About one-half of the overall fingerprint cards were of individuals in the 18- to 25-year-old age group.

As to the 1,060 fingerprint cards submitted by the Detroit authorities, 464, or 44 percent, of the white and Negro individuals arrested had prior criminal records, and the 1,060 prints received, 509 were of individuals in the 18- to 25-year-old group.

**Mr. ROONEY.** Were the riots of 1967 characterized by any particular pattern or cause?

**Mr. HOOVER.** Although the riots of 1967, as in prior summers, were characterized by spontaneous outbreaks of violence and no evidence has been developed to indicate the disturbances were part of any overall conspiracy, we should never overlook the activities of the Communists and other subversive groups who attempt to inject themselves into the turmoil once it is started, as well as the effect of such demagogues as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown who made so many inflammatory and vitriolic statements during the past summer.

Just as there is no single cause for the outbreaks we experienced during the recent summer, there is also no panacea which will bring them to a halt. However, it is my belief that lawlessness and violence must be met head-on by prompt detection of those violating the law, followed by prompt trial and realistic punishment.

#### *Penetration of subversive organizations*

Although there are a large number of individuals and numerous organizations involved, we have been able to follow closely and report on the activities of the Communist Party-U.S.A. and other subversive organizations such as the white hate groups. The assistance of our security informants has been invaluable in this regard. Through their use we have been able to penetrate the organizations at high levels, both locally and nationally. Also, these men and women in their informant capacity have enabled us to deeply penetrate the intelligence operations being conducted in this country by representatives of the Communist bloc, Cuba, and Red China.

#### **ESPIONAGE AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS**

The tempo of this multipronged espionage attack against this Nation continues to in-

crease. The concerted drive is evidenced not only in increased activity from the Soviets, their satellites, and other communist-bloc countries, but also in significantly stepped-up drives from Castro's Cuba and from Red China.

We must provide wide coverage of all these sources of espionage since all possible avenues available to them are being utilized in their efforts to penetrate the national defense interests of the United States. Spies on intelligence missions for their governments enter this country under every conceivable cover. They are found among the official diplomatic representatives of their countries. They enter as students, tourists, commercial representatives, and members of cultural exchange groups. They infiltrate with refugees and emigres.

Espionage against the United States may be directed from official establishments within this country or from countries outside our borders. The intelligence agent may be in this country on an official basis, as in the case of many of the representatives assigned to official establishments, such as the embassies, the missions to the United Nations and the commercial concerns; on the other hand, he may be the deep-cover spy with no apparent connection with any foreign government.

The main thrust of the attack, particularly from the Soviet bloc, continues to be through the personnel assigned to their official establishments in this country. Soviet policy as to world espionage has remained essentially unchanged throughout the history of the Soviet Union. Although the names of the Soviet intelligence services differ today from what they were 20 years ago when Joseph Stalin was Premier, the objective of world conquest by communism has never wavered. The change over the years has been not a change in objective but a steady intensification of the effort to reach that objective, the destruction of a capitalistic country.

Without question there has been an expansion of the Soviet effort. Over the years the number of official personnel assigned to this country has increased regularly. The great bulk of these individuals actually have intelligence assignments and these people, spies for the Soviet Union, are involved in more intelligence operations than ever before.

The number of official personnel of the Soviet bloc here on January 1, 1968, totaled 928. As I have indicated in the past, a Soviet defector has stated that approximately 70 to 80 percent of all personnel assigned to a Soviet diplomatic establishment are in the intelligence field. The 928 Soviet-bloc official personnel were accompanied by 1,260 dependents, some of whom also have intelligence assignments.

Mr. Chairman, I hand you a chart showing the total Soviet-bloc official personnel in the United States from July 1, 1962, through January 1, 1968. This chart does not include 1,514 other Soviet-bloc officials and dependents who were here temporarily, such as couriers and members of special delegations.

(Chart not printed in RECORD.)

**Mr. HOOVER.** The expanding intelligence activities of Cuba have required that we augment our coverage in this country.

Under the guise of Cuban United Nations officials, Cuban intelligence personnel are carrying out sophisticated operations in the United States with full diplomatic immunity. Experienced operatives utilizing Soviet tactics are actively engaged in a continuing program of recruiting Cuban agents in this country. The methodical, persistent, and highly specialized approach being used bears the indelible stamp of Soviet cunning and is geared to provide Cuba's intelligence service with the large pool of agents needed to fulfill its increasing demands.

The stepped-up Cuban espionage program has been able to draw from the large reservoir of Cuban refugees who between Decem-

ber 1965 and December 1967 have entered the United States at the rate of over 3,700 a month. Although the vast majority of refugees are disillusioned and disgusted with Castro's communism, the Cuban regime has redoubled its efforts to utilize this humanitarian refugee channel as a means of infiltrating trained agents into this country.

On a broader scale, Latin America continues to be a priority target for extensive Communist subversion directed primarily from Cuba, but also from the Soviet Union and Communist China. In carrying out Castro's stated objective of eliminating U.S. influence in Latin America through revolutionary violence, nationals from all Latin-American countries as well as Puerto Rico have received training in Cuba in the rudiments of guerrilla warfare. In addition, Cuba has served as the logistical base for arms and equipment needed for the support of clandestine guerrilla operations which are threatening the stability of this highly important area.

In its efforts to subvert existing governments in Latin America, Cuba has actively infiltrated guerrilla forces, arms, and equipment into various South American countries. Most significant was the sending of former Cuban Minister of Industries Ernesto "Che" Guevara to lead Bolivian Communist guerrillas. Guevara's death in the unfriendly surroundings of a Bolivian jungle resulted from mistrust and disillusionment within the rag-tag group of malcontents he was trying to lead.

Despite the circumstances of Guevara's death, Castro's propaganda machine has been presented with a situation which will be used as a rallying point for saboteurs and other subversives all over Latin America. A mystery during his warped and depraved lifetime, Guevara will be more so in death as the idol for those who ruthlessly subvert constitutional governments.

As another example of Cuba's infiltration efforts, during 1967 a Cuban fishing vessel was used in an abortive attempt to land a guerrilla force in Venezuela. In this regard, within the past 2 years the Cuban fishing fleet has increased at an accelerated pace and has operated on a wide scale in the Atlantic Ocean as well as in the Pacific. While no evidence has been uncovered indicating that the Cuban fishing fleet has been operated against this country in the landing of subversives and the like, we must be alert to any such effort in view of the attitude of Cuba toward the United States.

The fact that Communists are continuing efforts throughout the Western Hemisphere to foment disorder and violence has recently come to light. It has been learned that just prior to the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of Mexico, held from June 18 to June 22, 1967, at Mexico City, members of the party in that country arrived at the conclusion that a people's revolution would be necessary south of our border although the political climate was not then favorable to the success of an armed revolt. Nevertheless, clandestine plans were made to gather and store weapons and ammunition and to designate concentration areas for revolutionary elements in the event the people's revolution materialized. It is significant to note that one such concentration area was less than 150 miles from Laredo, Tex., and it is of further interest to note that the Communist Party of the United States was well represented at the Mexican Communist Party Congress in mid-June 1967.

#### *Communist China*

The intelligence activities of Red China have also brought about an increase in our work in carrying out our responsibilities in this area and the work can be expected to continue to mount.

The vociferous statements of the leaders of Communist China make it abundantly clear that the United States is considered

that country's No. 1 enemy. In one such statement, which serves as an outline of aggression, it was predicted that the defeat of the Western countries, and particularly the United States, would come about by first gaining control of surrounding smaller countries. This cannot be dismissed as just an idle threat when it is considered that in July 1967 the Mexican Government reported the arrest of several Mexican citizens who were conspiring to rebel against the Mexican Government with the financial aid of Communist China. Chinese Communist influence has also been evident in other Central and South American countries.

In the North, the New China News Agency, an agency of Communist China, maintains an office in Canada. Although posing as a legitimate newsgathering office, in every country in which it is established, its real function is to serve as a base for Chinese Communist propaganda activities.

In this country, Communist Chinese agents have mounted a concerted effort to obtain highly sensitive data for their homeland. This material goes to Red China by various means. For example, two individuals have been forwarding electronic components, which could be used in a multitude of military equipment, to Communist China through an intermediary in Hong Kong. Other Chinese in the United States have been furnishing strategic information to Communist China through individuals in European countries.

Another tax on our investigative resources stems from the amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act in the fall of 1965 permitting up to 20,000 Chinese to enter this country each year. Some 17,210 did enter during 1966 and while the vast majority presents no problem, it is well known that in this group lies the potential for Communist China to introduce Chinese Communist agents into the United States.

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE

There continued to be an increase in the volume of Selective Service Act violations referred to us during the fiscal year 1967, a total of 29,228 violations being received. This represented an average influx of more than 2,400 a month as contrasted to approximately 1,775 a month in 1965.

Convictions have also risen substantially, these having jumped from 243 in 1965 to 763 in 1967, resulting in an increase of 116 percent in 1967 over 1966 alone.

We have also had to undertake a great deal of added work because of a growing number of instances where draft cards were turned in or destroyed, and the like. Immediate investigation is made of all such instances.

As to the destruction or mutilation of draft cards, this was made a violation by legislation approved August 30, 1965. Since that time we have received 300 reports alleging draft card destruction or mutilation. Investigation confirmed the acts in 163 instances. To date, prosecution has been authorized by the Attorney General in 25 of these cases. Convictions were obtained as to 14 individuals, seven others are awaiting trial, and indictments on the remaining four have been dismissed.

The turning in of draft cards is a more recent development and reached a peak during the so-called "stop the draft week" in October 1967, which was a part of the concerted antiwar protest schemes being carried on over the country at the time.

While many of the youths noisily and brazenly advocated the burning and turning in of draft cards to demonstrate their claimed abhorrence of the Vietnam War, many just went through the motions with "phony" cards. For example, on October 16, 1967, a group of youths in New York City conducted a demonstration and tried to leave draft cards with the U.S. attorney, but they were not accepted. The group then mailed

the cards to the Attorney General. Of the 630 cards received, 433 were not actual draft cards. Although similar in size and appearance, they bore the caption "Selective Service System Anti-Draft Certificate."

This chart shows one of these cards. For comparison purposes, an official Selective Service card is also depicted.

Participants in "stop the draft week" activity in Washington, D.C., left 992 cards at the Department of Justice. There turned out to be less than 360 actual draft notices representing 256 individuals located in 38 States, the remaining material consisting of such things as facsimiles and copies of Selective Service documents and antidraft cards. We have located and interviewed all but a very few of the 256 individuals. The others, including those that have no permanent addresses as well as some youths whose whereabouts are unknown even to their parents, are being sought. Some are known to be out of the United States.

Included among donees of the aforementioned material are Daniel Thomas Fallon and Jeremy Hardin Mott who are members of Chicago Area Draft Resisters, an extremely active antidraft organization. A U.S. district judge in Chicago recently sentenced each of them to 5 years in Federal custody after conviction in separate trials for Selective Service violations. Fallon was found guilty of refusing to report for induction while Mott was convicted for leaving alternative civilian employment in a hospital to which he had been assigned after being classified a conscientious objector.

Cards have been turned in all over the country. As a result, considering the country as a whole, we have had to look into the circumstances concerning approximately 1,500 turned-in selective service documents. This, of course, adds greatly to our work. Also, draft calls during the fiscal year 1967 averaged 24,075 a month. The announced draft call of 39,000 for March 1968 is the largest monthly call since 1966, and indicates there will be no letup in the violations we can expect to receive.

Information developed during our investigations has been turned over to the Department which is following a policy of bringing the information to the attention of State directors of Selective Service, Federal prosecutive action being deferred pending completion of any administrative action by the Selective Service System.

Immediate investigation is conducted concerning those individuals who are involved in counseling others to take action in violation of the Selective Service Act. Upon completion of the investigation, the facts are promptly furnished to the Department of Justice for possible prosecutive action.

Our investigation resulted in evidence being presented to a Federal grand jury in Boston, Mass., and five individuals, including the nationally known pediatrician, Dr. Benjamin M. Spock, and Yale University Chaplain William Sloane Coffin, Jr., were indicted on January 5, 1968, for counseling noncompliance with the draft law. All five subjects pleaded not guilty upon their arraignment in U.S. district court at Boston on January 29, 1968. All were released on bond without surety. No trial date has been set.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS INVESTIGATIONS

A sustained upward trend in civil rights work continued to be evident through the fiscal year 1967 when an alltime high of 5,366 cases were handled. This represented an increase of 157 percent in the 5-year period since 1962, in which year there were 2,085 cases handled.

I offer to the committee a chart showing the volume of civil rights cases handled during the fiscal years 1962-67 and another showing a breakdown by States of the 5,366 cases in 1967.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall at this point in the record insert the table entitled "Civil Rights Cases Handled 1962-1967":

#### Civil rights cases handled, 1962-67

Fiscal years:	
1962	2,085
1963	2,692
1964	3,340
1965	4,389
1966	5,181
1967	5,366

<sup>1</sup> All-time high.

Mr. HOOVER. In addition to the individual civil rights cases, we have been called upon to investigate over 5,000 cases dealing with discrimination in places of public accommodation, public facility, public education, and employment under the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a total of 1,653 being in the fiscal year 1967.

Voting and election matters are closely related to basic civil rights, and possible violations of Federal statutes dealing with this area are investigated by the FBI upon specific authorization of the Department of Justice. The 226 cases handled during 1967 under the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 have brought to more than 700 the total volume so far handled under this recent legislation. An additional 109 alleged violations of the Federal election laws were also reported to the FBI in 1967.

All investigations of civil rights allegations and racial disturbances require immediate handling and place tremendous demands on our manpower, often requiring that we divert personnel from other important work. This is illustrated by the fact that during January 1968, it was necessary that a total of 1,310 special agents devote some of their time to this type of work so that we might keep abreast of the responsibilities in the civil rights field. During the summer of 1967 this assignment at times ranged upward to nearly 1,500.

#### Accomplishments

The Bureau's civil rights investigations have again yielded many positive results. Noteworthy are the following:

In June 1964 three civil rights workers were murdered near Philadelphia, Miss., and the FBI launched one of the most comprehensive and intensive investigations in its history. Total investigative costs exceeded an estimated \$815,000 and 258 special agents were assigned to this case at the height of the investigation.

On October 20, 1967, a jury in U.S. District Court, Meridian, Miss., convicted seven men of conspiring to violate the victims' constitutional rights. Those convicted included Cecil Price, a deputy sheriff in Neshoba County, Miss., and Sam Holloway Bowers, Jr., Imperial Wizard of the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan of Mississippi. On December 29, 1967, Cecil Price was sentenced to serve 6 years; Sam Holloway Bowers, Jr., was sentenced to serve 10 years; and the other five who were convicted received sentences ranging from 3 to 10 years' imprisonment. All seven are free on bond pending appeal. The case against James Edward Jordan, an additional defendant who testified for the Government, was handled by the U.S. District Court, Atlanta, Ga., where Jordan entered a plea of guilty on October 27, 1967. He was sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment on January 12, 1968.

The verdict returned in Mississippi and the sentences imposed by the Court serve notice on the Klan and others of similar ilk in that area that they can no longer expect the community to look the other way when racial violence occurs. Only a few years ago, many responsible persons would have considered the possibility of obtaining such a conviction to be highly improbable. Today, however, it is in keeping with the results

achieved in other similar cases investigated by the FBI in the recent past.

For example, three men were convicted of Federal civil rights charges at Montgomery, Ala., and on December 3, 1965, each was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment in connection with the March 1965 murder of Viola Liuzzo, a civil rights worker; in July 1966 two men were convicted on Federal civil rights charges at Athens, Ga., and each was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment in connection with the shotgun murder of Lt. Col. Lemuel A. Penn on July 11, 1964.

Sam Holloway Bowers, Jr., the Klan leader who was convicted on Federal civil rights charges in connection with the murder of three civil rights workers, is also one of 12 members of the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan of Mississippi awaiting trial on Federal civil rights charges at Hattiesburg, Miss., in connection with the shooting into and burning of the home of Vernon Ferdinand Dahmer, Sr., on January 10, 1966. Mr. Dahmer, who died the same afternoon, was a past president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Forrest County, Miss. The Federal charges against the Klansmen are based upon the results of comprehensive investigation by the FBI.

With the approval of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, the results of this Bureau's investigation were furnished to the local authorities and on January 24, 1968, a Forrest County, Miss., grand jury returned indictments against eight Klansmen charging them with murder and arson and also returned indictments against five other Klansmen charging them with arson in connection with the Dahmer incident. Trial is scheduled for the March 1968 term of court.

As a result of investigation being conducted concerning the shooting into and burning of the home of Mr. Dahmer, information was developed concerning the kidnaping of one Jack Watkins within the State of Mississippi. This information was provided to local authorities and as a result of this information, indictments were returned by the Jackson County, Miss., grand jury against Sam Holloway Bowers, Jr., and five other individuals. One of these, Billy Roy Pitts, a Klansman, entered a plea of guilty in State court to charges returned by the grand jury and on February 5, 1968, he received a sentence of 5 years. Another individual involved in the kidnaping, Travis Buckley, a Klan attorney, on February 7, 1968, was convicted in State court on charges returned by the grand jury.

In another pending matter the FBI conducted widespread investigation into various acts of racial violence in Rowan and Cabarrus Counties, N.C. These incidents, which were directed against both whites and Negroes, included shooting into homes, dynamiting business establishments, burning churches and residences, and making threatening telephone calls. On July 18, 1967, FBI agents arrested 12 men indicted on civil rights charges by a Federal grand jury. All 12 were then or formerly affiliated with the United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. One of those indicted entered a plea of guilty in U.S. District Court, Greensboro, N.C., on August 30, 1967.

Trial commenced January 8, 1968, in U.S. District Court, Salisbury, N.C. One defendant died during the trial, the court acquitted another defendant, and on January 19, 1968, the jury acquitted eight defendants. The jury was unable to reach a verdict concerning the 12th defendant and no date has been set for the retrial of this individual.

Intensive investigation was instituted by the FBI on June 7, 1966, when nine shots were fired into the home of a Negro family in Minden, La. The family had been active in civil rights matters and a son was the first Negro to graduate from the local high school.

On June 19, 1966, shots were again fired into the house and FBI agents obtained

signed confessions from seven persons, including two juveniles. The Department of Justice deferred Federal prosecution in favor of local action. All seven were thereafter convicted in juvenile or local court on charges connected with these shootings. Final court action was taken in March 1967. Four received jail sentences and the other three received probationary or suspended sentences.

The FBI conducted extensive investigation in March 1966, when a Negro Army captain, en route to Vietnam from Germany, was shot and wounded while using a public telephone in a Bogalusa, La., service station. It was determined that the shot had been fired by Thomas Bennett, who is white. The Department of Justice concluded that the facts did not warrant Federal prosecution and further action was deferred in favor of prosecution by local authorities. Thomas Bennett was convicted of attempted murder on February 8, 1968, by a local jury at Franklinton, La., and on February 23, 1968, he was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor. Two FBI agents testified at the local trial. This is only one of many instances in which we have cooperated with local authorities to assist in the ends of justice.

It is significant to note that members of the Ku Klux Klan have been involved in several of the convictions which I have discussed. These convictions certainly are evidence of the extensive informant infiltration and extensive coverage of the various Klan organizations which we have been able to achieve.

#### THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Director, again you made a very serious presentation on the threat of the Soviet Communist effort being done in our country through cultural exchanges, trade missions, and other groups. Every year, it seems to me, that the people of our country get more of a feeling it is not important any more. A kind of euphoria exists in our country.

Mr. HOOVER. That is true.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. When people try to warn or inform our people that there is still this danger, that communism has not changed, that the threat is still there, it is frowned at.

Is there any way that information such as you have presented to this committee can get to the people and make them aware of it? It seems our Government policy is, that we do not talk about it and so people just put it out of their minds.

Mr. HOOVER. I think your conclusion as to apathy and lack of knowledge is certainly justified. There is a growing apathetic attitude toward communism, its danger to this country and also toward the activities of the Soviet Government. This is not a question of supposition but it is a fact. We know the people who are threats to our country, what they are doing in this country and what their goals are.

Every now and then someone will be declared persona non grata by the State Department. He will go back to his country and be replaced by someone else to engage in the same kind of activity. There is not very much publicity given to persona non grata actions when they occur in our country. In contrast when anything occurs in Russia, when they find some American they claim engaged in espionage, a big public trial takes place and it is given great publicity throughout the entire world. For some reason what we do abroad is down-graded by certain segments in this country and those of us who speak out in support of our position are viewed as alarmists who are seeing things which are not true.

The FBI on a very limited basis has representatives of the Bureau speak to student bodies at colleges and universities giving the true facts about communism. On the other hand, during 1966-67 top-level officials of the Communist Party made 54 appearances as

speakers on campuses of colleges and universities throughout the country.

These top-level Communist officials were invited by the schools or by groups on the campuses. I do not feel this should be permitted as I do not think the students should be confronted by individuals who are liars. These Communist speakers always try to portray that communism is nothing but a political philosophy, such as the Republican or Democratic parties. That is a falsehood.

We know what Communist instructions are and where their dedication lies. I have put in the record a list of where they appeared and the names of the speakers. You may want to look at that list.

Mr. ROONEY. We had this last year, did we not?

Mr. HOOVER. Yes, but this is a new list. The list reflects the wide variety of colleges and universities where these Communist speakers have appeared.

With our limited staff it is only possible to have an FBI representative appear and speak on the subject of what communism really is at only a small number of colleges and universities. We are proud of the fact that we have been able to have a representative appear regularly at West Point, at Annapolis, at the Air Force Academy and at the Army and Navy War College in Washington, D.C. During these appearances our representative presents the topic of subversion in its true light.

The great need today is for the right kind of speakers at the local level to present communism in its true light. Unfortunately, into the anti-Communist ranks have filtered some individuals who are emotionally unstable or regarded as extremists.

#### COMBATING CRIME AND SUBVERSION

Congressman Lipscomb, in your district, the city of Monrovia, Calif., has created a crime prevention commission. This commission is directly concerned with alleviating the crime problem, but it could well be used to expose communism for what it is. Such an effort could go a long way in enlightening the citizens at the local level.

There has been great apathy about subversion and crime in this country and nothing will be done about it until we get most of the citizens of this country to realize it affects them. It is all right to have official commissions formed and various statements made by authorities at the Federal and State levels, but you must deal at the local level to get our citizens interested in combating crime and subversion by the exposure of it.

I regret what is going on in the high schools by inviting such people as H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael to speak to young students. Carmichael appeared at a school in Washington, D.C., just a few days ago. The idea of inviting him to a public school paid for by the taxpayers of this country, a man who has gone the length and breadth of the world damning the United States, saying its Government should be overthrown, saying people should get guns to use against "whites"; that is inexcusable. They invite an individual of that kind to talk before a public high school composed of youth not at the age yet to properly evaluate what he says. He is enough of a rabble-rouser in the so-called ghettos of the country that like to hear him expound but to have him spew his venom in the schoolrooms is wrong, I think.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I want to thank you for recognizing the city of Monrovia. It is a fine city.

Mr. HOOVER. If more communities would do what they did, Mr. Lipscomb, there would be an awakening as to what crime is doing to this country. The commission there intends to know what is going on, what the police department is doing, and what can be done to help the law enforcement officer.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. They are dedicated in this effort. Mr. Hoover, again, this year I want

to command you and your associates for all that you are doing. I wish that more people had the occasion to have this kind of information and testimony presented to them. It is factual, it is clear, concise. You are doing a great service for our country and always have. It is a privilege to be here and to be a member of this subcommittee.

Mr. HOOVER. Thank you very much indeed.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Director, you have commented regarding our internal security problems as being affected by those from outside our country who are dedicated to the destruction of our country. I am concerned about another threat that I believe is a genuine threat, and that is the question of organized crime. It threatens the lives and security of our individuals, it upsets our domestic tranquility, and yet I see a hampering by courts in denying you the tools to effectively deal with organized crime by denying the use of devices essential to deal with organized crime. I rather imagine this requires an additional amount of personnel on these cases when these devices are denied you in combating the criminal. We all want these things used judiciously and sensibly and under the right kind of surveillance, but do you find a problem here now?

Mr. HOOVER. We have a very definite problem, Mr. Congressman, in that regard. As I said in replying to Congressman Lipscomb's query, there has been great apathy upon the part of the civilian population of the country. They are not sufficiently interested in combating crime and they rarely go to the help of a police officer if he is attacked or maligned. The decisions by the courts have no doubt in some instances handicapped effective law enforcement, particularly at the local level where they are dealing with the type of crime that does not permit a long and complicated investigation, but where they have a need for immediate information in order to be able to solve their cases on the street.

It is true that at the Federal level in our jurisdiction we have to use more personnel to handle our cases because of certain restrictions on us in regard to the use of electronic devices. We want to apprehend the violators of the law but it cannot be done unless we obtain the evidence. If we cannot get the evidence by legal electronic devices, then we have to utilize a larger staff of special agents to make the investigations.

A recent opinion by the Supreme Court surprised me. They ruled a microphone we had installed on the outside of a public telephone booth in Los Angeles was illegal. We had the microphone not inside the telephone booth, not on the telephone itself, but on the outside of the booth. We were able to hear only one end of the conversation.

We knew a prominent gambler went to this phone booth to get and place bets throughout the country in violation of a Federal statute. The Court held that the use of the microphone was illegal and that the evidence so obtained could not be used.

The Court added a statement that under proper circumstances if we had sought court authority to put the microphone on it might have been an entirely legal procedure, which gives at least an indication that if Congress sees fit to pass a statute authorizing the use of electronic devices under proper controls, the Supreme Court might approve their use.

(Discussed off the record.)

HERBERT APTHEKER

Mr. BOW. Will you insert in the record something on the background of Herbert Aptheker, who spoke at the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio?

Mr. HOOVER. Yes. And his daughter is just as much of a Communist as he is.

(The information follows:)

HERBERT EUGENE APTHEKER

Herbert Eugene Aptheker was born in July, 1915, at Brooklyn, New York. He attended Columbia University in New York City where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in 1936, a Master of Arts in 1941 and

a Doctor of Philosophy in 1943. He received a Guggenheim Fellowship for history for the period 1946-47.

"Aptheker served in the United States Army from February, 1942, until April, 1946. He was discharged as a Captain and his position in the Army was Staff Intelligence Officer.

"Aptheker is married and maintains his residence at 32 Ludlam Place, Brooklyn, New York.

"At the trial of the eleven members of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, in August, 1949, Aptheker appeared as a defense witness. At that time he stated he knew all the defendants and that he had been a member of the Communist Party for approximately ten years. He admitted teaching in Communist Party schools during 1940, 1941, 1946 and 1947.

"Aptheker has served as the Editor of 'Political Affairs,' which is the monthly theoretical organ of the Communist Party, USA. He is currently the Director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies, 20 East 30th Street, New York City. Aptheker organized the American Institute for Marxist Studies in 1963, which he said would eventually legalize the Communist Party, USA. The stated purpose of this organization is to promote the studies of Marxism on college campuses in the United States. Aptheker has stated that the American Institute for Marxist Studies was formed to operate in such a manner so that it could legally bring Marxist material and opinions to the attention of American scholars and the general public.

"Aptheker is currently a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, and has made numerous person appearances as a spokesman for the Communist Party in the United States and Canada. Most of these appearances have been on college campuses. He has also traveled extensively in foreign countries. During these travels, he has made speeches which were very critical of the United States policy in Vietnam.

"Aptheker was a candidate for the United States Congress from the 12th Congressional District in Brooklyn, New York, in the 1966 elections but was defeated.

"On February 6, 1966, Aptheker and his daughter, Bettina Aptheker Kurzwell who is also a member of the Communist Party, USA, appeared on a television program in Los Angeles, California. During this program Aptheker stated that if the United States were to bomb Communist China and become involved in a war with Communist China, he would do his best to oppose it. During this appearance, Aptheker stated, 'I am a Communist and have been for 26 years.'"

Mr. ROONEY. We thank you, Mr. Director, for a highly interesting and informative session. It was at some length, but every minute of it was worth while and indicates the great work that you and your associates of the Bureau are doing.

Mr. HOOVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1968

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 66 years ago today Gen. Leonard Wood, the U.S. Military Governor of Cuba, transferred the authority of the Cuban Government to Tomá's Estrada Palma, the first duly elected President of a free Cuba, and the sovereign and independent Republic of Cuba came into being. The raising of the single-star flag over

the island nation was the culmination of more than 75 years of struggle by her people to free themselves from four centuries of Spanish colonial domination.

The history of Cuban independence is a history of a people's heroic and often bloody struggle and infinite self-sacrifice against an alien rule, as they sought to establish their rightful place among the world community of nations. In the early 1800's, when a revolutionary wave swept all of Spain's new world colonies, the Cuban people also felt the desire to establish themselves as a sovereign nation. Emissaries were sent to Simón Bolívar, the great liberator of Latin America, to request his aid in freeing Cuba. But Cuba's insular position and the presence of strong Spanish garrisons prevented Bolívar's forces from intervening.

The first revolt was planned in 1823, when Spanish colonial rigors became insufferable, but the leaders were discovered and exiled before they were able to initiate the revolt. Between 1848 and 1851, a series of uprisings were planned at the initiation of Narciso López, a native Venezuelan who had settled in Cuba and embraced the revolutionary cause. After his first plot was discovered, López fled to the United States from where he organized three invasive expeditions before he was overwhelmed and executed by the Spanish forces in Cuba. Although his efforts to foster a full-scale Cuban revolution failed, López's exemplary courage, determination and inspired loyalty to the cause of a free Cuba provided a renewed impetus to the Cuban people and promoted the revolutionary spirit to flare with renewed vigor.

Some 20 years later, the first military effort was inaugurated, resulting in the 10 years war. The war began on October 10, 1868, when a group of lawyers and wealthy planters met at Yara Plantation and drafted a declaration of Cuban independence. The force that began a war which was to endure in bitter struggle for 10 years consisted of 147 officers and men armed with less than one gun apiece and relying principally upon their machetes for weapons. By the end of that year, the handful of men had grown to 26,000 men under arms from all walks of Cuban life. The 10 years war was one of the longest, bloodiest and most destructive in the history of the Americas, involving a loss of 200,000 lives and hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage. It ended in 1878 in a recognition of exhaustion on both sides; but for the Cuban people, who now had totally committed themselves to the cause of independence, the resultant treaty was only a temporary truce.

The final effort of the Cuban people, the Revolution of 1895, was initiated by José Martí, called the Apostle of Cuban Independence by his adoring people, who won the respect of the entire world as a master journalist, translator, literary and art critic, orator, and Cuban patriot dedicated to the freedom of his people. We in the United States feel a special closeness to José Martí, for it was in New York City that he lived and labored for 14 years, organizing the final revolutionary movement and rallying his people both at home and in exile. Martí's beliefs in the dignity and equality of man parallel

those of all citizens of the United States and the free world today, and we share with Marti his often voiced precept that "the general happiness of a people rests on individual independence."

Marti gathered together the veteran heroes of the 10 years war and struck the final blow for Cuban independence early in 1895. Soon after his landing in Cuba, he was killed in a skirmish with a Spanish patrol, but his cause had been served. Of Marti's death, a Cuban historian wrote, "José Marti died, but a people was born." The loss of their beloved leader fused the Cuban people into an adamant struggle for their freedom.

Throughout the Cubans' struggle for independence, the people of the United States had exhibited much sympathy for the Cuban cause, and popular opinion on behalf of aiding the Cuban people had swelled. However, it was not until the U.S. battleship *Maine* was mysteriously sunk in Havana Harbor that the U.S. Government suspended its neutral policies and international obligations to Spain, and embarked in the Spanish-American War. The war ended after 4 months, and resulted in U.S. possession of Cuba in a protectorate status until such time as the government and control of the island could be left to its people. During the following 3½ years of U.S. military occupation, the Cuban people worked fervently to restore and rehabilitate their war-torn land. On May 20, 1902, they inherited control of their beloved country under a constitution and government which they had labored to create. The dawning of their independence day was ushered in with fireworks and wild rejoicing as the village and city streets were filled with jubilant Cubans awaiting the fulfillment of a long-cherished dream.

It is easy to understand why freedom and independence meant so much to the Cuban patriots. It is easy to understand why the Cuban people endured three-quarters of a century of hardship and struggle to win their sovereignty, and why so many thousands of Cuban people gave their lives that their descendants might live in freedom and with dignity. It is not so easy to understand why Fidel Castro, pledging his loyalty to a free Cuba, has been able to establish a dictatorial state which perpetuates its power by a reign of terror. Fidel Castro has betrayed his people and the very spirit of liberty and individual dignity which won for the Cubans their independence 66 years ago.

On this anniversary of Cuban independence, we of the United States rededicate ourselves to the principles for which the Cuban patriots fought and died, and it is our deepest hope that the spirit of independence and the will to freedom which dwells deep within the hearts of the Cuban people will inspire them to triumph over the tyranny which binds them.

#### CLEAN AIR

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the State of California is still getting along with the same old automotive air pollution regulations it had back in 1966. It has not changed them one bit.

You may recall—I know I certainly do—that last fall, when this House debated 1967 amendments to the Clean Air Act of 1965, I was denounced from one end of California to the other as a villain who wanted to poison the air, kill off babies and old people, and prevent the residents of California from enjoying clear sunshine and invigorating, un-spoiled breezes.

Friends, who know my lifelong love of the great outdoors and my constant efforts in this body in behalf of clean waters, pure air, waste disposal, and conserving nature's wonders for the enjoyment of all Americans, were astonished at the attack.

It came about because I espoused an amendment to the clean air bill of 1967 which differed from a provision in the bill as it came from the other body. The Senate bill provided that the State of California could propose regulations to control automotive air pollution in California and, if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare approved them, could enforce the regulations. Elsewhere in this land regulations promulgated by the Federal Government would apply.

My amendment proposed that the State of California could propose California regulations and, if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare approved them, the Federal Government would carry them out.

That is all the difference there was—State administration or Federal administration. The automobile industry was willing to have special regulations apply in California because the smog there is perhaps thicker than anywhere else, because Californians had taken the lead in demanding controls, and because the State of California is big enough to prove out improvements in controlling automotive emissions. Improvements which succeeded in California could then be extended everywhere, especially if they had been administered in a manner compatible with nationwide application. Controls which did not work could be dropped.

In the end the House went along with the State enforcement plan. What happened next is what I want to talk about today. The story would be comic if it were not, really, rather tragic. Promptly after the Congress passed the 1967 measure, and before it was signed by the President, the executive officer of the California Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board applied to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for a waiver of Federal controls in favor of California control and enforcement.

HEW called a hearing on California's proposals for January 15. However, effective November 8, 1967, the California Air Resources Board, which had been

created by the State legislature in August, replaced the old motor vehicle pollution control board.

There was delay in assembling the new board. Gov. Ronald Reagan did not appoint the new chairman and members until early in January, and it was February 8 before any public meeting of the new board took place.

HEW, naturally, wanted to know what authority the new air resources board had to propose controls and enforce them. The record at the waiver hearing left grave doubts whether the board possessed the necessary authority to qualify for the waiver.

This caused a good deal of confusion, naturally, and the California spokesman asked for a 90-day delay. Finally, at the request of the attorney general, the California Legislature passed an enabling act in order to clarify the situation. Governor Reagan signed it into law during the last week in April. On May 1, the California Air Resources Board, armed with its new authority, submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a revised waiver request. That occurred 6 months after the former motor vehicle pollution control board had filed the original request.

So there was 6 months wasted. Had the amendment which I proposed in this House last fall been adopted and had it become law, none of this delay need have happened. The Federal Government would have had authority to accept California's proposals and enforce them in California for the benefit of the people who live in California.

I do not want to be sarcastic, Mr. Speaker, but it does seem to me that I am entitled to say something in the nature of "I told you so" considering how things have worked out. I told the House that keeping administration in the hands of the Federal Government would be the better way, and I think I was right. And I think events have shown that I was right.

The May 1 proposals of the California Air Resources Board present no novel problems to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. California proposes, first, to apply to 1969 models of heavy trucks in California the same standards of pollution control which HEW plans to apply generally to the 1970 models of heavy trucks. This would be an application of the testing ground principle which the automotive industry has long accepted. It would be a good thing, perhaps, to try out the truck regulations in California and if something proves wrong it can be changed.

California proposes, secondly, to apply to 1970 model passenger cars the evaporation emission controls which HEW contemplates requiring on all 1971 model cars. Originally HEW planned these controls for 1970 model cars, but it has been persuaded that makers of automobiles in West Germany, France, England, Japan, and elsewhere abroad cannot supply them before the 1971 model run. To insist on them too soon would, in effect, close the American market temporarily to certain foreign makers. HEW will reconvene the continued hearing in Los Angeles on June 5.

Perhaps it might be helpful to explain at this point what evaporation emission controls are. When automobiles are parked in hot sun some gasoline evaporates into the air from the carburetor and the fuel tank. This evaporation in bright sunshine is one of the causes of smog. If a can of charcoal is placed under the hood, and if suitable pipes and valves are arranged, the vapor will collect in the charcoal, condense, and drain back into the fuel system. The "plumbing" is pretty involved, however, and getting ready to install it takes time.

Seventeen percent of the cars purchased in California are of foreign make, and HEW will have to decide whether it is reasonable to require foreign makers to supply evaporation emission controls on 1970 model cars sold in California.

The California Air Resources Board proposes, thirdly, to apply the Federal passenger car standards for 1969 models, with the proviso that all test models submitted must pass. So there will be practically no difference in that respect between 1969 California standards and 1969 Federal standards.

One thing California might attempt, is to require smog controls on the 7 million pre-1966 model cars now in use there. Installing these would cost about \$200 per car, according to current California Legislature proposals, and I predict the move would prove politically very unpopular. But most automotive smog in California today comes from these old cars and not from the newer models. Twenty percent of all automotive vapors come from crankcases, a source 100-percent controlled in today's new cars. Sixty percent comes from exhausts, a source now 70-percent controlled. The evaporation emission controls will do away with 90 percent of the vapors from that source. Seven out of 10 cars in use in California are of pre-1966 vintage and do not have the exhaust and evaporation emission control improvements, and it is they which cause most of the automotive smog there.

Another way to control the evaporation emissions from old cars would be to control fuel composition. To my knowledge, this has not yet been considered by the California Legislature.

**LARRY S. YAEGER, WINNER OF ESSAY CONTEST ON "WORLD TRADE—AN INSTRUMENT OF PEACE"**

**MR. PEPPER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

**THE SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

**MR. PEPPER.** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that today, in observance of World Trade Week proclaimed by President Johnson, Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith awarded his Department's certificate of appreciation to Larry S. Yaeger, 18, a senior at Hialeah, Fla., High School, which I have the honor of representing, for his first-place achievement in an essay contest on "World Trade—An Instrument of Peace."

The contest among social study students in Dade County-Miami high schools was sponsored by the South Florida Regional Export Expansion Council in cooperation with the Miami Field Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The council staged the essay competition to stimulate interest among high school students in international business.

Secretary Smith, during a ceremony in his office cited Larry Yaeger for showing "a mature appreciation and comprehension of the many advantages and opportunities available to nations as well as to individuals in the peaceful pursuit of international trade."

In his prize-winning essay Yaeger wrote:

Because of trade, there is more intermingling of the peoples of the various countries involved, or their representatives, which results in a better understanding between the participating countries of each other's basic customs and beliefs. People from the various nations taking part in trade meet and learn more from each other about other countries' cultures, leading to a more informed and understanding populace and, therefore, a less prejudiced one. Once more, trade can be seen to have a favorable effect upon world peace.

First prize in the contest consisted of an expense-paid trip to Washington for Larry and his social studies teacher, Paul Tripp. In the Nation's Capital, special tours were arranged for them to visit the White House, the Capitol, the FBI, and other places of particular interest.

Also here for the presentation ceremony were R. Leslie Cizek, Jr., chairman of the South Florida Regional Export Expansion Council and vice president of Parker & Co. of Florida, Inc., Coral Gables, and Adm. Rafael Benitez, assistant dean of the Law Center of the University of Miami, representing the four-member panel of contest judges.

In his presentation remarks Secretary Smith commented:

I am delighted with the initiative taken by the South Florida Regional Export Expansion Council in sponsoring a high school essay contest on the theme "World Trade—An Instrument of Peace". The council is to be commended for its long range efforts to promote U.S. trade with our partners abroad and particularly for undertaking to develop an active interest in this vital area among today's high school students.

It is gratifying and typical of your sincere personal interest that you—Chairman Cizek—and you—Admiral Benitez—have come to Washington to join with us in this World Trade Week ceremony. I am sure it is also a proud occasion for you—Mr. Tripp—to participate as Larry's teacher in today's event.

Larry Yaeger in accepting the award from the Secretary gracefully expressed his appreciation and said that he hoped that international trade would receive increased emphasis in high school curriculums everywhere.

Larry is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Yaeger, Jr., 669 West 63 Drive, Hialeah, Fla., and will be graduated in June among top-ranking seniors. He will be class salutatorian. He is a member of the National Honor Society, was a National Merit Scholarship finalist, received a \$6,000 scholarship, and participated in the accelerated mathematics program at the University of Miami,

sponsored by the National Science Foundation, upon the recommendation of his high school.

The essay contest, in which four other student winners shared \$200 in U.S. savings bonds, was the first sponsored by an export expansion council. The South Florida Council is one of 42 such voluntary groups of local businessmen throughout the United States who work closely with the Department of Commerce in promoting U.S. export trade. Some 1,400-member businessmen comprise the groups nationally.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to insert at this point in the RECORD Larry's essay on "World Trade—An Instrument for Peace." I urge all my colleagues to read this with keen interest:

**WORLD TRADE—AN INSTRUMENT FOR PEACE**  
(By Larry S. Yaeger)

"... what we and other industrialized countries do in the world economic arena during 1964 may go far to determine the mature and extent of the political and military crises of later years."<sup>1</sup>

G. Griffith Jones, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, made the above statement early in 1964, yet, in essence, it holds as true today as it did when it was first stated. A strong and free system of international economic intercourse could be an important and effective factor contributing towards world peace.

An economic system in which free international trade was practiced, and where countries manufactured those goods in which they had a comparative advantage, would be a strong deterrent to war. In such an economy, the possibility of war would be not nearly as high as in another economic system, involving regulated trade, through tariffs and quotas, or one in which international trade was not practiced. A system involving world trade, especially free trade, tends to make the involved nations more dependent upon one another, while a system without trade, or with heavily restricted trade, tends to make these countries independent of each other. A country which must depend upon other countries for many of its goods would be much more reluctant to go to war than would a country that was completely independent, economically, from other nations. Since trade tends to make each and every country involved dependent upon other nations, at least partially, it can be seen that trade may act as an inhibiting towards war.

It is a known fact, and therefore unnecessary to argue, that international trade will lead to better economic conditions in the various participating countries. Trade, in this way, has a desirable effect upon the world situation, and can help in the fight for world peace in different ways.

Firstly, it has been shown throughout history, that the "have-not" nations, those with poor economic conditions, have been some of the major instigators of war in the past. Since each country's economic conditions may be improved through international trade, it follows that trade is an aid to the installation of a lasting world peace.

Secondly, frustrated citizens, not well off, economically, can be lead, through standard propaganda methods, into false beliefs much more easily than could a populace consisting of fairly "well-to-do" citizens, who were satisfied with the existing economic system. So, since trade can help to produce favorable economic conditions, benevolent towards each individual, again, it follows that trade can be an effective instrument for peace. From A

<sup>1</sup> Johnson, G. Griffith; "A Perspective on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development"; Dept. of State Bulletin; March 16, 1964.

*Study of War*, by Quincy Wright, comes the following quote concerning one of the various causes of war:

"... the influence of depression of the masses as a war-engendering factor has increased with the progress of democracy and the expectation of continuing economic improvement. Motives of escape from domestic depression, coupled with dubious theories concerning the economic value of protectionism and of the political control of markets and sources of raw materials, have created demands for Lebensraum, colonies, and conquest."<sup>2</sup>

Such demands, together with rising barriers to international economic intercourse, become an important factor when considering the causes of war. This particular motive for war can be partially avoided by a strong system of international trade, to better economic conditions in each country.

Economic cooperation leads to military and political cooperation. Business, or trade, is flexible, and is not necessarily rendered immobile by conflicting political views. J. Paul Austin, President of the Coca-Cola Company, an organization of international scope, made the following statement:

"Business has proved itself able to meet new and changing conditions—It has not been frozen by the complexities of political differences or economic protectionism....

I believe, also, that the ability of business (trade) to innovate can forward the cause of peace."<sup>3</sup>

Because of trade, there is more intermingling of the peoples of the various countries involved, or their representatives, which results in a better understanding between the participating countries of each other's basic customs and beliefs. People from the various nations taking part in trade meet, and learn more from each other about other countries' cultures leading to a more informed and understanding populace, and therefore, a less prejudiced one. Once more, trade can be seen to have a favorable effect upon world peace.

Recently, great strides have been taken in economic cooperation between the East and the West. Combined efforts towards a stronger trade link between these two world powers are desirable for various reasons. Here, from an article entitled, "The Changing World Economy," in *Current* magazine, is a statement concerning these new steps in trade cooperation:

"In the first place, it has so enormously increased the potential output of goods and services through the normal processes of economic activity, that it makes any possible gains from the use of force seem trivial by comparison...."<sup>4</sup>

Here, from an economic point of view, at least, trade has helped, and will continue to help, decrease the possibility of war and strengthen the foundations of peace. This same article also points out, that through this new trade arrangement, the political systems of each country, as well as the economic systems of each, are being brought closer together, creating, at least, a weak bond between the nations involved. With diminishing political differences, the bond is strengthened, and another step has been taken towards international peace.

It has been shown, that trade affects the world peace situation in various manners, and in each instance, the effect has been one which contributes to the establishment of a lasting world peace. It becomes obvious, that more attention needs to be paid to the world's economic situation, and its influences

upon all of society. Used with care and diligence, international trade can be a strong and effective force for world peace.

#### EFFECTS OF H.R. 2158 ON STATE REVENUES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, since it was announced that H.R. 2158, the proposed Interstate Taxation Act, is to be debated this week, I have received a number of inquiries from various Members concerning the specific effects of this measure on the revenues of the individual States.

In this regard our subcommittee has conducted a 5-year study analyzing the tax structures of all of the States, the revenue effects of various proposals, and the actual compliance and enforcement practices. The study occupies four full volumes and, is, of necessity, replete with details.

To further supplement the study and provide a simplified source of information concerning the effect on each State, we have compiled the following summary of revenue effects which I introduce into the RECORD at this point:

#### EFFECTS OF H.R. 2158 ON STATE REVENUES

Following is a summary of the estimated effects of H.R. 2158 on the relevant taxes of each of the states. The estimate for each tax is described as a percentage of gain or loss of the state's total revenues from all of its taxes. The estimates are based on an evaluation of: data on revenue described in Chapters 16, 19, 29, 32 and 36 of the four-volume study published by the Committee; data on compliance and enforcement described in Chapters 10, 24, 31 and 36; hearings held in 1961, 1962, and 1966; on subsequent correspondence with officials in some states, and on the most recent publications of the Bureau of the Census.

In the Income Tax area it is assumed that each state will apply the formula in Title II of H.R. 2158 to all of the corporations covered by that title.

In the Sales and Use Tax area a number of states will realize insignificant losses. However, for purpose of comparison and evaluation, 0.23% of sales and use tax revenues is considered to be the maximum loss possible. This figure is based on a study conducted by California's tax officials, and on their anticipated loss for the first year under current business practices. Since California has the most extensive administrative facilities, and maintains large audit staffs in other states, the relative loss to California would obviously be greater by far than that of the other states—most of which currently maintain no auditing staffs beyond their own borders, and do not have a vigorous enforcement program comparable to that of California.

In evaluating the "losses" set forth in the following estimates, it should be kept in mind that no consideration has been given to the increases in revenues realized as a result of the economic growth which will be stimulated by the removal of the trade barriers currently impeding interstate commerce. Likewise, no consideration is given to increases in state revenues realized as a result of the greater ease of enforcement and compliance which will be obtained under the uniform standards established by H.R. 2158.

#### ALABAMA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### ALASKA

Corporate income tax: 0.12% loss.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### ARIZONA

Corporate income tax: 0.07% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### ARKANSAS

Corporate income tax: 0.06%.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### CALIFORNIA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Sales and use tax: 0.07% loss.

#### COLORADO

Corporate income tax: 0.07% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

#### CONNECTICUT

Corporate income tax: 0.13% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.

#### DELAWARE

Corporate income tax: 0.3% gain.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### FLORIDA

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### GEORGIA

Corporate income tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### HAWAII

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.

Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### IDAHO

Corporate income tax: No effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### ILLINOIS

Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.

#### INDIANA

Corporate income tax: 0.08% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### IOWA

Corporate income tax: 0.18% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

#### KANSAS

Corporate income tax: 0.02% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### KENTUCKY

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

#### LOUISIANA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant effect.

#### MAINE

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### MARYLAND

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

<sup>2</sup> Wright, Quincy; *A Study of War*; Chicago, Ill.; 1965; P. 284.

<sup>3</sup> Austin, J. Paul; "A New Force For Peace"; *Vital Speeches of the Day*; July 15, 1964; P. 605.

<sup>4</sup> Benoit, Emile; "The Changing World Economy"; *Current*; June, 1966; P. 22.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Corporate income tax: 0.04% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.04%.

## MICHIGAN

Corporate income: No significant loss.  
Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.

## MINNESOTA

Corporate income tax: 0.08% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

## MISSISSIPPI

Corporate income tax: 0.02% loss.  
Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

## MISSOURI

Corporate income tax: 0.05% loss.  
Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

## MONTANA

Corporate income tax: 0.16% loss.  
NEBRASKA

Corporate income tax: No significant loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.

## NEVADA

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

This State does not impose any of the taxes covered by H.R. 2158.

## NEW JERSEY

Corporate income tax: 0.06% gain.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

## NEW MEXICO

Corporate income tax: 0.01% loss.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

## NEW YORK

Corporate income tax: 0.1% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Corporate income tax: Loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Corporate income tax: 0.04% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

## OHIO

Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## OKLAHOMA

Corporate income tax: Loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

## OREGON

Corporate income tax: 0.1% loss.  
PENNSYLVANIA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain of less than 0.01%.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

## RHODE ISLAND

Corporate income tax: 0.03% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

## TENNESSEE

Corporate income tax: 0.02% loss.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

## TEXAS

Capital stock tax: 0.25% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

## UTAH

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain of less than 0.01%.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## VERMONT

Corporate income tax: 0.06% gain.

## VIRGINIA

Corporate income tax: 0.01% loss.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

## WASHINGTON

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Corporate income tax: No effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

## WISCONSIN

Corporate income tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No loss.

## WYOMING

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## WAKE UP, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

MR. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

MR. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, apparently the only time the Interstate Commerce Commission stirs slightly in its somnolence is to sanction the discontinuance of more passenger trains. I have been greatly encouraged that the outcry of the public against this cynical policy of railroad management is now rising to a new crescendo. The roar of protest is now so loud that the Interstate Commerce Commission may even be forced to give up its apparent intention to beat Rip Van Winkle's record of 20 years of uninterrupted slumber.

Today I wish to call particular attention to a cogent editorial from the pen of William D. (Bill) Evans, editor of the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times. Editor Evans eloquently expresses a wish many of us hold—that something must be done to shake the Interstate Commerce Commission out of its apparent belief that it was created to serve the freight-hauling

portion of railroad activity. The editorial follows:

## THE ICC DOES IT AGAIN

While most people were preoccupied with yesterday's primary election, the Interstate Commerce Commission quietly permitted the removal of three more crack railroad passenger trains. The Santa Fe will discontinue its "Chief" between Chicago and Los Angeles while the Chesapeake & Ohio was given authority to drop the "Fast Flyin Virginian" and the "Sportsman" on the Washington-Cincinnati run.

In the C&O case, the only commissioner to dissent from the majority opinion was Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown of West Virginia, the first woman member of the ICC and now its vice chairman. In her separate opinion, she rather aptly declared that "the passengers didn't leave the trains—the trains left the passengers."

Chairman Paul J. Tierney rather typifies the attitude of the ICC, a body of 11 members with a constantly changing makeup and chairman and with few fixed policies save that of protecting the railroads. It is regarded as the sleepiest and most ineffectual regulatory body in the vast Washington bureaucracy.

Tierney recently described passenger train service as "already outmoded" and "chronically ill." Because Rep. Ken Hechler felt that the chairman, by his statements, had revealed his closed mind and had prejudged the case, he asked Tierney to disqualify himself. Tierney not only declined, but led all but one of his colleagues into concurring with him.

The C&O, which owns and runs the Baltimore & Ohio through this part of West Virginia, now provides one passenger train a day through that part of the state between White Sulphur Springs and Huntington. West Virginia's state capitol has a single train each way, one of them passing through Charleston at an ungodly early hour of the morning.

But the C&O is still big business. It can haul West Virginia coal and freight to its heart's content, reap a rich reward from this service, and tell the passengers to go to hell.

Several weeks ago, a courageous ICC examiner named John S. Messer had the gall to fling down the gauntlet before the 11 commissioners. In a remarkable set of recommendations, he told the ICC that it has the power to arrest the disintegration of passenger service and he has suggested several ways in which it ought to exercise that power.

Declaring that there is a future for railroads in passenger traffic beyond commuter service, Messer added that human traffic has about reached rock bottom. "With the facilities and service what they are today," he told the ICC, "it is reasonable to conclude that the level of patronage on the nation's railroads has reached bedrock. Only the desperate and obstinate remain. Further decline in passengers can only be brought about by further train discontinuance. There are many expatriots who would joyfully return to efficient passenger service."

Such a conclusion, of course, is at variance with the ICC attitude. The railroads see utterly no future in passenger traffic except for commuter trains and the long-awaited high speed operations in the northeast corridor between Washington and Boston via New York.

To reverse the downward spiral of fewer passengers, lower-quality service, fewer passenger, still lesser service, Messer has recommended that the ICC assert jurisdiction to establish minimum standards for passenger trains. Such standards would include things like meal service, sleeping-cars, speed, air-conditioning, and cleanliness. To pay for this, he suggested that the railroads be authorized to sell their stations to cities or counties, who would operate them and lease back ticket office space; if a city or county did

not agree to this, he would authorize the railroad to cancel its stop there. Beyond this, Messer recommended that states re-examine their taxing policies towards railroads (which are generally assessed at a percentage far higher than that applied to other property), that the railway labor unions re-examine their contracts (which, in the case before him, meant that a fireman and an engineer got a day and a half's pay for a run scheduled at 3 hours and 16 minutes), that federal tax relief be given to railroads that, under better bookkeeping operations, still incur losses in passenger services, and that the ICC get into the business of creating a National Rail Passenger System.

The scope of this challenge should have been sufficient to arouse the ICC from its long comatose slumber. It must be met if the passenger train is not to follow the stagecoach into oblivion.

But instead of awakening to the realistic approach suggested by its courageous examiner, the ICC (with the exception of Mrs. Brown) made its customary bow in the direction of the petitioning railroads, approved further passenger service abandonment and then turned over and went back to sleep.

A fellow who could promise, as President, to do something to shake the ICC out of its belief that it was created exclusively for the benefit of freight-hauling railroads would find a ready ear here as he sought our vote.

#### DON'T YELL AT US, WE DIDN'T DO IT!

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been whiplashed by the President and the people regarding the proposed tax increase now in conference.

One of the most succinct editorials written on the sensitive topic appeared in the Iron Age on May 9, 1968. Mr. Kurt H. Schiffleger, president of Walworth Industries, Inc., of Elkhorn, Wis., brought the article to my attention, and I must say that editor in chief Gene Beaudet of the Iron Age has placed the problem in its proper perspective. I include it in the RECORD at this point so that I might share it with my colleagues:

#### DON'T YELL AT US, WE DIDN'T Do It!

The way the American people are being scolded, threatened and bullied because they are not exactly wild about putting their necks on the Internal Revenue chopping block is really something.

Some examples:

Arthur Okun, the President's economic adviser, likens the current state of the economy to a "fat woman munching candy." The implication is he means us.

Now, not only is this offensive to anyone who has put on five or more pounds since getting his Social Security card, it just isn't true.

Only in recent weeks has the American consumer shown any sign of spending near his ability to spend. Rather, as any savings bank will tell you, the consumer has been salting away his money at a hefty rate.

On this basis, it's hard to picture the American people gorging themselves on all sorts of durable and nondurable goodies.

Next, we have Mr. Martin of the Federal Reserve Board. He says unless something is done about taxes the country faces "the worst financial crisis since 1931."

Not only is this far from so, but it is pressure and intimidation of the worst kind.

It raises all sorts of fears dredged from a 37-year past when most people thought beef meant hamburger meat. It stops all those who were over six in 1931 right in their tracks. It relates now to then—when the two periods are nowhere comparable.

And just last week President Johnson chided Congressmen for not standing up like men and giving him a tax increase. They have stood up like men. But not the way he wanted.

Messrs. Johnson, Okun and Martin have as much right to mount their hustings in search for a tax increase as we have to disagree with them.

But we do resent all the talk from tax-hike advocates that the average citizen and business must pay for their "transgressions," even if only to show those abroad we are serious about tackling our country's financial problems.

But in all the scolding:

Not much is said about government spending policies and its free and easy attitude toward money supply that are the real base of our present problem.

Not much is said about the copper strike which went on and on to bring our trade balance to a sad unbalanced conclusion in the first quarter.

Not much is said to critics abroad who lecture us on financial responsibility and at the same time do an Oliver Twist in asking for more.

Not much is said about restrictive government policies which have hampered the real growth of the American economy by uneven, unfair and unsound attitudes toward the growth of American business and the economy.

Not much is said about the top economists who believe a tax boost could be another overkill on the part of government.

This much can be said, though.

Before the government starts bawling out and scaring the American people for munching too many Almond Joys, it should look at its own follies and excesses.

Despite all the yelling in the world, it can't hide the fact that this is where the problem lies.

#### IN THE MATTER OF GOLD

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members of the House and others who are interested in international monetary affairs, I am placing in the RECORD a story by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., from the May 20 edition of the New York Times.

I am also enclosing extracts from a statement by Dr. N. Diederichs, Minister of Finance, of the Republic of South Africa.

After a careful reading of Dr. Diederichs' statement of April 8, 1968, before the House of Assembly of the Republic of South Africa, I think one can quickly realize the importance I attached to receiving the assurances on the two-tier gold arrangements referred to in Mr. Dale's New York Times story. Obviously, they key to the March 17 agreement is the clear understanding by those former gold pool members who participated that there is no longer any need for central bank purchases of newly mined gold.

Although the price of gold on private gold markets in recent days has reached a new high. I am still confident that the nonmonetary price will fall when newly mined gold is sold to the private markets. In this connection, I am also placing in the RECORD an article that appeared in the May 11, London Economist.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1968]  
WEST SHUNS NEWLY MINED GOLD—TAX DELAY  
AVERTS CASH CRUNCH—CENTRAL BANKS IN ACCORD

(By Edwin L. Dale Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—The leading central banks of Western Europe are standing by an agreement, never formally announced, to buy no newly-mined gold from South Africa.

According to unimpeachable sources here, this state of affairs has been confirmed by two recent developments.

First, the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, Frederick L. Deming, after talking in Europe earlier this month to most of the central bank chiefs in the former London gold pool, told Representative William B. Widnall, Republican of New Jersey, that no newly-mined gold would be bought.

This occurred May 10. Mr. Widnall, in a House debate on the new special drawing rights of "paper gold" plan that same day, said:

"I am pleased to state that I have been informed today by top officials of the Treasury Department that as a result of recent consultations with those who participated in the March 17 meeting [in Washington of the gold pool countries], there is absolutely no reason to expect the resumption of newly-mined gold purchased by the central banks of former gold pool members."

Second, the central bank members of the Bank for International Settlements met last week in Amsterdam and reportedly confirmed the agreement.

No public announcement has been made mainly because the central banks are inclined to let their actions speak for them. They are normally averse to issuing communiques or public statements.

The gold pool members are the United States, Britain, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Switzerland. Many other central banks are also cooperating in the new policy, but the exact number is not known.

The Washington communiqué of March 17 said only that the seven central banks no longer found it necessary to purchase gold in the open market.

The issue of newly-mined gold was left fuzzy, though participants in the meeting said it was the universal understanding that this was covered as well.

The issue is crucial to the future of the free market price of gold. If there is no central bank demand for newly-mined gold, South African supplies must be sold on the free market. When such sales begin, they will have a depressing effect on the price.

It is widely assumed that at some point South Africa must resume selling gold because some 40 per cent of her imports are paid for with the earnings from sales of gold.

Subsequent to the Washington meeting, Canada, Australia, Japan, and the United States have taken steps to push their own newly-mined gold into the free market.

#### GOLD

(Extracts from a statement by Dr. N. Diederichs, Minister of Finance, before the House Assembly of the Republic of South Africa, on Monday April 8, 1968)

If ever there was a time when the monetary authorities of the world and we as the greatest gold producer of the world had to act sensibly and responsibly, it is now, for it does not concern the well-being of individual

and single countries, but the interests of the world as a whole, for the present and for future generations.

South Africa as the greatest gold producer of the world is intensely affected by decisions taken in the past, particularly in the most recent past, concerning gold and by developments in the monetary field which may follow in the future. Though we, South Africa, were not consulted in these decisions, we are prepared to approach this matter with the greatest measure of responsibility and with a will to co-operate, well knowing that our well-being is most closely connected with the well-being of the world as a whole.

I realize that wrong handling of the question of gold and of international liquidity could lead to a world disaster in the monetary field, and because we with our open economy shall not be able to escape the consequences of chaos and disorder in the monetary field, it is in our interest as well as in the world interest that this question be approached in a responsible manner in order to find a satisfactory solution. I know that there are those who accuse us in South Africa of being irresponsible because we constantly maintain our advocacy for an increased official gold price. But we can today state here in all honesty that our pursuit of a higher official gold price is not born only of a desire for national advantage, but that South Africa is sincerely convinced that an increased official gold price will also be in the world interest. It is regrettable that political considerations apparently are beginning to play a part also in this purely monetary financial matter. There are now international political considerations partly because South Africa and partly because Russia are the greatest gold producing countries. But internal political considerations also play a part in some countries in this connection. If ever there was a time when such political considerations should be set aside to save the world from monetary danger, then it is now.

Under the present circumstances, the gold price question is most closely tied in with the problem of retaining the dollar and sterling as two important international reserve currencies. On our side and according to our views we should gladly assist to preserve the strength of these currencies in relation to the other currencies because if one or both of them collapse and if uncertainty and crisis conditions arise as a result in the international payments system, it could be disastrous for the whole world and also for ourselves. Our aim in South Africa is not to gain a sudden benefit to ourselves which could come as a result of a forced raising of the gold price, possibly accompanied by monetary disorder. Such an event could be disastrous for the whole world and therefore also for ourselves. South Africa has always endeavoured to attain her goal in an orderly manner and in a form that would be of benefit to the world economy as a whole.

To me it seems rather inexplicable that certain countries appropriate the right for themselves alone to decide on these questions, particularly the question of gold, with the exclusion of other countries who have as much interest in it and who are also competent to make a contribution. South Africa, though not one of the ten richest countries in the world, is still one of the dozen or so most important countries in the field of international trade, and for this reason the question of the world's currencies is of the utmost interest to us. We are not one of those countries who contributed to the gold pool, but we are nevertheless the greatest gold producing country in the world. I stand convinced that South Africa is able to make a valuable contribution to these discussions.

In an effort to find a solution to the world's monetary problems, and especially the problem of the pressure which was exerted on the dollar and the pound sterling, it was recently decided in Washington to set

up the so-called two-tier market system, the two-price system for gold. As is known, there will now be two markets for gold, first an official market where gold will be traded between monetary authorities and institutions at an officially determined price of 35 dollars per fine ounce and, secondly, an open, free market for gold at fluctuating prices where the price will be determined by the forces of demand and supply.

The intention of this arrangement is to prevent monetary gold from flowing, as the case has been in the past, out of official reserves into private ownership where it is held for industrial, hoarding or speculative purposes. Gold flows in this direction, from monetary gold to private gold, because the price in the free market is higher than the official price. Where measures are now being taken to prevent monetary gold from seeping to the private, free markets, it is hoped that the total volume of monetary gold will be maintained at the existing level, though the distribution of that gold between countries may vary from time to time. If the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States of America persist, their gold assets will decline and those of the surplus countries will increase, but the total volume of monetary gold should remain the same. Naturally, quantities of new gold could always be absorbed into monetary reserves. But underlying this scheme there may also be the idea of allowing gold on the free market to find its own price level, in order to find a criterion or an indication of what the actual price of gold should be. Also, there may be an endeavour to use the free market as a means of forcing down the price of gold to 35 dollars or lower, in order to knock the bottom out of reasons for a higher gold price.

Whatever the express or implied intention of the scheme may be, one fact remains certain. We do not believe, and I accept that most of its founders also do not believe, that it is an enduring solution to the world's monetary problems. It is but a temporary palliative, a "gimmick" as it is today called in high financial quarters in Europe and America. It does not solve any basic problems. Practically it will be extremely difficult in the long run to prevent a leakage of gold from the official market to the private market, particularly if the price in the latter is higher. A system of two prices for one commodity has never succeeded in the long run. It may perhaps temporarily assist in subduing speculation against the dollar, but that in itself cannot save the dollar or the pound sterling.

Both in the United States of America and the United Kingdom, measures have been announced and partially implemented to redress the disequilibrium in their balances of payments. The world is waiting in suspense to see whether they are going to succeed. The world is no longer satisfied with words and promises; it now wants to see deeds and results. The coming months are decisive in this connection, and in many quarters doubt prevails as to whether, for example, the United States will be able to bring its house in order. If the United States does not succeed in reaching this goal, the artificial nature of this two-price system will be very clearly evident.

The only real value of this system is, first, that it gains time. It may gain time to create an opportunity for seeking after new and more enduring solutions. Secondly, that it is a recognition of the fact that the fixing of all gold for such a long period at one price has been wrong. Thirdly, that it is a step in the right direction, in the direction of a general revaluation of gold in relation to other currencies.

Another question now arises. Supposing that the United States does succeed in bringing its balance of payments into equilibrium, the following problem would again threaten. To the extent that the United States brings its balance of payments into equilibrium, to

the same extent would dollars be withheld from the rest of the world, and to the same extent would the dollar source of international liquidity run dry, and that again might lead to a worsening of the condition of international means of payments.

Our answer to this problem as South Africans is that an increase in the official gold price presents this solution, that it will supply the needed replenishment of international reserves. Other nations, particularly the United States of America, will not hear of this and because of this the International Monetary Fund recently proceeded to decide on a new artificial creation to replenish international reserves, by means of this creation called "Facilities for Special Drawing Rights".

I do not propose today to go into the details of this new facility. I only wish to say that, though the system may bring temporary relief, it also can present no enduring solution to the world's basic monetary problems. It particularly presents no solution to the problems of the United Kingdom and the United States, unless it is created in such quantities again as to cause world inflation, inflation which will be far worse than may accompany an increased gold price. For the "Facilities for Special Drawing Rights"—the S.D.R.'s—are but a form of creating credit without the underlying discipline of gold. As long as the United States and the United Kingdom cannot solve their balance of payments problems, the S.D.R. system will bring no escape. It further seems to me that this system will place a premium on countries who cannot control their international financial obligations, at the expense of those countries who do succeed in putting their houses in order.

The success of any international means of payment is based on the confidence which the world reposes in it and this confidence depends, I believe, on the extent to which it is coupled with gold. At the moment, world confidence in paper money is particularly low. It is practically nil in a time of comparative peace. In times of international unrest and war even this measure of confidence will wholly disappear and the world will take its refuge away from S.D.R.'s again to gold.

If one wishes to test the value of this system of Special Drawing Rights, one can but pose the question: If I had to choose between two countries, one country having all her reserves in S.D.R.'s and the other country having all reserves in gold, which country would I choose?

It is alleged that the United States of America might proceed wholly to demonetize gold, that is to say, wholly to detach the dollar from gold, or wholly to detach gold from the dollar. It is suggested that such a thing, if it were to occur, would pose a mighty threat to gold. I cannot imagine that the United States would ever take such a thoughtless measure, because it could in fact cause international disruption and wholly destroy confidence in paper money. One of the reasons why the United States is against an increased gold price, is because it believes that it would mean a devaluation of the dollar and that it would shock confidence in the dollar and would be a breach of faith. What about those countries possessing large dollar balances and who took these up because they believed that these dollars would always be convertible into gold? Do you believe that those countries would passively accept such a system and that they would continue holding dollars if they expected such a thing?

When the U.S.A. had much gold, it could have considered something like this, but since its gold has been decreasing and since the gold assets of other countries are increasing more and more, it would be a great shock to international confidence. Something like this would lead to two monetary blocs in the world, on the one hand those coun-

tries in the world ranged on the side of gold, monetary units coupled with gold, and those countries ranged on the side of the United States of America with their monetary units coupled to the dollar.

The dollar would then have a floating value which would have to be established daily, which again would lead to uncertainty in the exchange rates and to an impairment of world trade. I cannot believe that something like that could ever happen. For how long have efforts been made to demonetise gold? They were not successful. Gold did quantitatively lose its relative share in international reserves due to the low price of gold, but gold cannot be supplanted as a measure of value. Qualitatively gold is not to be demonetised.

I must state that I find it inconceivable that the United States of America could ever proceed to a demonetisation of gold, but if it were to happen, if the inconceivable should occur, what then?

Gold would perhaps, just as now, decrease quantitatively in the total volume of monetary reserves, but as for its qualitative significance as a measure of value for the world's currencies—I cannot foresee how that could ever be abandoned. Gold still remains the best means of mutually determining the relative value of currencies. I cannot imagine that under present circumstances another currency, for instance the dollar, could become the criterion of the world's monetary units. This would subject the world to the economic vagaries and the political decisions of one particular country. It is not impossible that the demonetisation of gold, if it came, could cause a distinct shock to the free gold market, thus causing the price of gold temporarily to decline. But in the long run I believe that gold will maintain its value and that its price will have to increase nonetheless. That will be a result of the intrinsic qualities of gold. There will always be those who have an indestructible faith in gold, apart from its monetary significance. As prices rise and as paper money without gold cover increases, there will always be those who seek the security of their future in gold.

In other words, whatever may happen in the monetary field, I have no fear for the long-term future of gold. It is on this basis that South Africa must determine her practical policy for the future. First, we are indeed fortunate that we find ourselves financially in a very favorable position today. We are economically strong. Our balance of payments is sound. Great quantities of money flow into the country. Our gold and foreign currency reserves have attained record heights and are increasing steadily. Our foreign debt is minimal. It is not necessary for us to sell gold. We now also do not sell any gold. We shall also not be obliged in the foreseeable future to sell gold. Our foreign exchange assets are presently adequate to meet our foreign commitments. We are therefore in the happy position that we are not obliged to take any forced measures which may be to the future disadvantage of our economy and of our gold mining industry. Because our position is strong and because we have confidence in the future, we are prepared to forego any profit which may be of a temporary nature if we can thereby assure our long-term future as a gold producing country. I am glad to state that the Government and the Chamber of Mines are at one in this connection.

If the free market price of gold at present is not much higher than the official gold price it does not disturb me. In the artificial conditions existing today the two-tier system does not lend itself to determining the true price of gold. It is further known, and this is important, that a great volume of speculative gold is today being bought and sold on the free market. It may even be the case that there is today 2,000 tons of gold bought for speculative purposes and which may have to

be sold now or in the near future on the free market. It is self-evident that this gold must have a depressing effect on the free gold price. This factor apart, I also believe that there are certain unseen powers using other means to press down the price of gold. It must be expected that the free market price for gold will have to remain low for a while. How long this period may be would be difficult to foretell. We must assume that the market will one day absorb this speculative gold. Immediately this happens, the price of gold should again rise.

I have already mentioned that all means of payment can only be good if they repose on confidence. Confidence is the basis of all money, nationally and internationally. The task of the monetary authorities of today is to find international means of payment in which humanity has confidence, otherwise they will not succeed in their endeavours. But we now find the disturbing and absolutely incomprehensible fact that leading countries of the world are today engaged in weakening and eliminating also that part of the international means of payment which still enjoys universal confidence.

Of all the international means of payment gold today still comprises the greatest share. Gold today still commands the greatest confidence. Not sterling or the dollar, but gold. Gold is the anchor to which humanity through the ages, in the most uncertain times, tied and still ties its hope and confidence. For this very reason it is incomprehensible that responsible authorities should endeavor to cut the ties with this anchor of confidence, namely gold. Humanity would rather have expected, in this time of uncertainty and of a striving for international stability, that the financial leaders of the world would above all hold fast to that which gives rise to enduring confidence, an element of confidence which is already there. One would have expected that they would make it their point of departure and further build on it. Now we see the startling and incomprehensible development that responsible authorities are doing exactly the opposite. They are endeavouring to destroy the confidence which still exists—confidence which is itself a part of our international payments system.

[From the London Economist, May 11, 1968]  
PRESSURE ON PRETORIA

It is becoming slowly clear that a growing number of central banks are co-operating in an increasingly determined effort to try to make the two-tier gold price stick. South Africa is therefore coming under more pressure to off-load gold on to the heavily-stocked private markets, where new supplies would threaten to depress the price. Latest developments have to be seen against the background of what went before. First, in their communiqué of March 17th, the seven central banks of the former gold pool announced in Washington that "the existing stock of monetary gold is sufficient . . . (and) they no longer feel it necessary to buy gold from the market." They added also that they "would not sell gold to (other) monetary authorities to replace gold sold in private markets."

The second step came with testimony given last month by Mr Deming, the under-secretary of the American Treasury, to the international finance sub-committee of the House of Representatives' Banking Committee. In this testimony, made public only at the end of April, Mr Deming went a step further by implying, without actually saying so with absolute clarity, that (a) the central banks were actually refusing to buy newly-mined gold and (b) that some 60 central banks had joined in this policy.

Our latest information is that what Mr Deming merely implied (even though he did imply it strongly) has actually come to pass. That is to say, a number of central banks

have now actually informed the South African Reserve Bank not just that they do not need to buy any more newly-mined gold, but that they will not buy any as a matter of policy.

This means that South Africa's big marketing option has been very largely pulled from under its feet. Ideally, South Africa would have liked to sell any gold it could not hang onto to central banks rather than increase still further the supplies on the currently very heavily stocked private markets. But with a large number of central banks positively refusing to buy any more newly mined output, for the time being anyway, and with South Africa's reserves rising at a rate that threatens to create another inflationary domestic spiral, South Africa cannot afford to hang onto its growing gold reserves indefinitely.

As yet, however, South Africa still seems to be holding its hand; so far as is known, newly-mined gold from South Africa has not yet started to flow direct to the private markets. Obviously it stands to gain from waiting: crises can blow up overnight, as is known only too well. But it could be a mere question of time, and there have been reports from Paris of discussions with the South African authorities for free market sales there. Meanwhile, in the past week, the price of gold reached a new peak since the reopening of the London free market on April 1st, rising to \$39.70 on Thursday, despite a small fall on Tuesday after news of the progress of the American tax bill. But dealers do not attribute too much significance to this on a relatively modest average daily turnover this week of around three to four tons in London and a shade more in Zurich.

#### ADDRESS BY HON. SOL M. LINOWITZ, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN STATES, BEFORE THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Sol. M. Linowitz, U.S. representative to the Organization of American States, was recently invited to address a joint meeting of the members of the General Court of Massachusetts—Massachusetts State Legislature—on May 15, 1968. Ambassador Linowitz delivered a very informative and eloquent address on that occasion, which address I am pleased to include in my remarks.

As the U.S. representative of the Organization of American States, Ambassador Linowitz is rendering outstanding service. In view of his choice as the Ambassador of our country to the Organization of American States, the views of Ambassador Linowitz are worthy of deep consideration.

The address follows:

#### ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR SOL M. LINOWITZ, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, BEFORE A JOINT CONVENTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE LEGISLATURE, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 15, 1968

I am deeply honored to be here today, and to pay my respect to a great State which has done so much to make all Americans proud.

Your prime concern is, of course, the business of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

But I know you also have a concern that extends far beyond the borders of your State, one that encompasses the state of our nation and the state of our world.

For you recognize that the future of all of us is inextricably involved with the wider community of mankind; and that you cannot, with wisdom and circumspection, plan for the future of this State without taking into account the fundamental question of whether the nation is to live in a world at war or at peace.

So I am grateful for your invitation, and pleased to have this opportunity to report about United States policy in Latin America. I do so at a time when the foreign affairs spotlight is focused not on this hemisphere, but on events in Southeast Asia and, of course, the talks relating to them that are now underway in Paris. But it is my *deep conviction* that our stake in Latin America is vital to our future, and that what happens there is directly related to the overriding challenge of our day—the attainment of a lasting peace with justice everywhere.

Today Latin America literally stands at the crossroads. Either it will yield its poverty and underdevelopment to the constructive forces of peaceful revolution and change or they will ignite the violent revolution and chaos that are their inevitable successors. This is the great truism of our hemisphere—a hemisphere in which more people go to bed hungry every night than those properly nourished; in which more people rise to meet a hopeless dawn than those with opportunity, no matter how small.

There was a period not too long ago when Latin American policy was a makeshift affair, when our chief foreign policy interests focused on virtually every area of the world except the one closest to us geographically, historically and traditionally. Today, in facting up to harsh reality, our policy is no longer a stop-gap action, a hurried response to an explosive situation, but a policy that has taken its place among this nation's most vital commitments. For we know that by helping Latin America to modernize and become economically stable and viable, we help ourselves and the entire cause of freedom and democracy. Latin America is our testing ground not for tomorrow but today, and it is my conviction that we are now in the right place, at the right time, and with the right program.

But precisely what is our policy in Latin America? I can think of no better answer to that question than to read to you the Charter of the Organization of American States. Its goals, its hopes for the present, its aspirations for the future express fully all we strive for today in the Americas—a hemisphere in which all people respect their neighbors and share in the blessing of plenty that is the heritage of the New World.

Obviously the OAS will not, in and of itself, guarantee such a future for the hemisphere. But it does point the way. And because it does, the United States' commitment to it is deep and irrevocable. It is a commitment consistent with our over-all international aim, one that bespeaks our belief in peaceful cooperation and change among all men and nations, no matter what their hemisphere.

The OAS is the instrument of this international aim in the Western Hemisphere; and as such, our membership in it well serves our national interest regionally even as our membership in the United Nations serves our national interest universally.

In a few days—on May 18th—a distinguished international statesman and civil servant, Dr. Galo Plaza Lasso, a former President of Ecuador, will be sworn in as the new Secretary General of the OAS. He brings to one of the most important posts in all international organization a staunchly independent spirit and belief in the future of the Americas.

He takes office at a time when the OAS stands on the threshold of its greatest opportunity to serve the Americas. For only recently the President, with the consent of the Senate, signed the United States ratification of several amendments that streamline and strengthen the OAS Charter, thereby giving the OAS great new impetus for the tasks and challenges ahead.

The work of the OAS does not stop with the defense of the Americas and the efforts to strengthen the peace. It is work that also advances the economic and social well-being of its members—work that runs the gamut from industrial planning to farming, from education to public health, from child welfare to Indian affairs, from culture to human rights, from science and technology to jurisprudence.

Twenty-two members of the OAS are today cooperating to build a better hemisphere. One country is not. We cannot ignore that one country; its threat is too real. But neither can we permit it to divert us from the basic job at hand—the work of peace and social justice that will be remembered long after Castro has been forgotten.

Even Castro must realize by now that extremism is not the way of the future for the rest of the hemisphere. So it would be a grave mistake for us to focus on the Cuban problem to the exclusion of all others in Latin America—or to equate the main challenge of Latin America with that of stopping Castro. Our main job in Latin America is to stop poverty, to stop inequality, to stop hunger, to stop disease, to stop illiteracy—to stop all conditions that create a climate of despair in which a Castro or a Batista can flourish.

Our main job in Latin America—indeed, our policy in Latin America—is a constructive one, a job of building, a job of hope, one that does not believe in the force of arms but in the force of mutual cooperation. The Alliance for Progress gives voice and form to that policy. It is not aimed against any people or regime, but it reaches out to all the people of the Americas. It seeks not to dominate, but to share; and the willingness to share is its only qualification.

And we hope the Cuban people will someday share in it too. The progress of the hemisphere is a vast program in which every nation has its own part to play, the Cuban nation along with all the others. For it is progress that will meet the just yearnings of the great mass of people in Latin America.

It is in these yearnings for economic and social justice that the Alliance for Progress has its roots; and in the final analysis our policy in Latin America will be judged by how closely and successfully we identify ourselves with them. These are the yearnings of democracy—of a people yearning to live in freedom and in dignity—yearnings so well understood by President Kennedy when he launched the Alliance for Progress in 1961 as a bold new effort to confront history with reaffirmations and not despairs.

As both President Kennedy and President Johnson have made clear, we do not want Latin America to become a carbon copy of the United States. The fact remains, however, that there is a distinct parallel to some of the problems facing both of us—problems we can see clearly enough here in America merely by looking at our cities. The problems faced by Boston, New York, Chicago and Los Angeles differ perhaps in degree only from those confronting the large cities of Latin America in housing, public services, educational facilities—to mention a few of the more obvious. And many of our associated crises depend for their solutions upon what we can learn from each other.

The United States, for example, has reached a high level of industrialization, and there is much we have learned over the years in this area that will be of value to the countries of Latin America in their

effort to build a firm and diversified industrial base. At the same time, we in the United States can learn much about race relations from our neighbors in Latin America. What I am saying, in short, is that the welfare of this continent is a continental problem in which we all have equal responsibilities and none a claim to superiority.

But the cry of John Donne, "Send not to ask for whom the bell tolls," echoes even deeper into our consciousness when we see in our own cities those desperate citizens who have bypassed the democratic process as they seek other avenues to bring their plight to public attention and action.

The great lesson for us all is that time is not on our side—that desperate acts demand a firm response in upholding the law, but they demand equally firm measures to correct the causative ills. For if we want to see democracy fulfill its destiny, then we have a responsibility to see to it that conditions are created that will allow it to flower.

Viewed in this framework, the struggle of our neighbors in Latin America to bring about social justice and create viable democratic regimes sensitive to the needs of the people is readily understandable. Even as all too many of our citizens live outside the mainstream of our society, masses of Latin American people are really not part of their nations' lives, and, therefore, they play no part in the democratic process.

In assessing the progress made by the Alliance, we must, therefore, understand that the average citizen—the man who will ultimately decide the future of the Alliance and of the continent—will not become an ardent supporter of democracy because of any statistics of monthly car loadings or rising figures on a graph. What he wants to see is improvement in his life and in his neighborhood.

The great question, of course, is whether he is seeing this improvement.

It is certainly true that Latin America is not yet reaching the Alliance goal of a 2.5 percent increase in per capita gross national product each year. The available data indicates the figure was 1.8 percent for last year.

The real point, however, is that gross national product statistics in themselves are a poor measure of development. Figures in this area are mere abstractions which do not reflect whether the mass of people is better or worse off than before. In the United States, for example, our per capita gross national product increase last year was 1.8 percent.

What is the measure of such improvement in Latin America? To me it is the extent to which Latin American nations are helping themselves in creating a viable climate for development. Take government revenues. Since the start of the Alliance, nearly every government of Latin America has reformed and strengthened its tax structure. With only three exceptions, government income is substantially above pre-Punta del Este levels. In some cases, the increases are above the increases in gross national product.

Furthermore, investments in social services, the human sector, of course, do not produce the spectacular results infrastructure investments do. Nor are they reflected in present gross national product growth figures. But they are the surest guarantee of continued development in the years to come. And they do reinforce the deeply significant fact that the development of Latin America is greater than its growth.

There is another measure I should mention—the participation by the countries of Latin America themselves. In the past seven years the gross investment in Alliance programs has totalled \$115 billion. Of this amount, 88 percent has been invested by the Latin Americans, while the United States' share has come to 6.7 percent—with the rest coming from other sources.

The self-help feature of the Alliance is

stronger than any program of assistance anywhere in the world; and it is designed to bring about sweeping changes in the basic institutions of Latin society.

There is no question that the Alliance has a long way to go before it accomplishes its goals. Potential for violent revolution still exists in the sordid slums in Latin America, in the backward villages where the heritage of centuries of neglect remains greater than the effort to overcome it. It is this effort that the Alliance must now inspire with increasing urgency.

It is an effort that demands searching social and economic changes—changes that may create temporary dislocations. We must learn not only to live with this kind of change—peaceful change—but to encourage it to its fullest expression. Only as its tempo increases will the potential for violence decrease.

The future of the Alliance will depend not on the politicians or government officials from North or South America. It will depend on the little man, particularly the young man and the young woman. Three-fifths of the people of Latin America are under 24 years of age, and their numbers keep growing. They are intensely proud of their countries and they do not need to be told how important it is for them to build democratic societies that insure their people the greatest degree of freedom, individual dignity and opportunity. They are determined to do so—with or without us—for these are the people who are searching to express themselves in a revolution for social justice. The Alliance must take root in their hearts and in their minds. It must become their personal revolution. It must become the Alliance of the People. Then, and only then, will it succeed. We owe it to the future to help them achieve this goal.

All in all, I believe that the progress made this past year by the Republics of the American Hemisphere since President Johnson's meeting with the other American Presidents at Punta del Este bodes well for the future. We know more about each other and understand each other's inter-continental problems far better than we ever did before—a knowledge and an understanding we gained by working together to advance the Alliance and to find common solutions to our common problems.

The Western Hemisphere is now in the midst of an exciting and far-reaching experiment in the effective application of multilateral diplomacy. A Common Market . . . road and harbor and telecommunications projects . . . regional programs in education, science and technology . . . a Latin American educational television network . . . new approaches to old population problems . . . pioneering agricultural programs . . . all these and more are now the manifestation of multilateralism in hemisphere affairs—a development that is certainly one of the most promising in the whole area of internationalism since the establishment of the United Nations. It can chart the way to the future.

The Charter of the Alliance for Progress states that it is established "on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations." It is not going too far to say that the future of the Alliance will, to a large extent, therefore, depend on the capacity of progressive democratic governments and their leaders to realize the full potential of this development in multilateral cooperation.

The road ahead remains difficult. How successfully we negotiate it will depend entirely upon the ability of all the Americans—North and South—to overlook the petty grievances and keep our eyes focused on the goal that must be our mutual hope—a hemisphere in which economic and political freedom is not a promise of the future but a reality of the present.

President Kennedy was reported as having said that the struggle for democracy and freedom "is going to be won or lost right here in Latin America."

What he meant, I think, is that if we cannot, through the Alliance for Progress, win the battle for men's hearts and minds in the countries of this hemisphere where we share common ties of history, geography and tradition, then it is unlikely that democracy can fare better in other parts of the world.

But all indications are that we can win, and that we will win. If we reject the recipes offered by the cynics and do-nothings—and the know-nothings—if our actions are guided by our faith in democracy and in the power of international cooperation—then I am confident that we can move forward toward a brighter tomorrow in a hemisphere and in a world free from war and free from want.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT THREATENED BY EXCESSIVE RESTRAINT IN DEALING WITH RIOTERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the controversy that has sprung up as the result of orders to the police to exercise "restraint" with looters and arsonists has centered around the spurious issue of which is most sacred, life or property. Posed in such a manner, the options presented miss wide the mark.

The real issue, and the one that has been completely ignored, is which is most important, preserving the physical safety of a law violator or the preservation of our form of government.

Those that take the simplistic view, as does Attorney General Ramsey Clark and most civil- and not-so-civil-rights leaders, argue that the physical safety—even of a lawbreaker—is more sacred than a \$50 suit and that when faced with such a choice, the police must refrain from taking firm action if the life or physical safety of the looter is threatened by such action. Few can seriously disagree that a human life is more sacred than a suit of clothes or a television set or even a whole building. But is this really the issue?

Since the formation of our Republic, thousands of American soldiers have given their lives or suffered injury in vivid attestation to the fact that life is patriotically sacrificed when the preservation of our freedoms and of our form of government is challenged. For our form of government, with all its respect for human life, places the highest premium on safeguarding itself and thus the individual freedoms of all of its citizens.

Thus, whenever our freedoms have been threatened, men have even gone to war to protect them.

We often talk about the importance of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and yes, freedom to peaceably assemble. And properly we should for these are basic freedoms which our men have fought and died for in war

after war. But these are not the exclusive freedoms enjoyed by Americans, protected by our Constitution and laws, and for which Americans have given their lives and fortunes.

There is also the freedom to own and enjoy private property, a freedom many would have us forget.

Economically, the legally protected right to own private property is largely responsible for the type and quality of life we enjoy. Indeed, it is largely the knowledge that we can own both real and personal property and thus improve the lives of ourselves and our families that encourages us to expend our time and labor. And it is this drive, this initiative to work hard, that has produced for all citizens the highest standard of living the world has ever known. Generated by the expectation of gain, this notion has been able to produce the goods and services which allow us to successfully compete in the world's markets, feed a generous portion of a hungry world, maintain our own economy, assist less fortunate nations, help the sick and elderly in America and elsewhere, and maintain our own high standard of living—and to emerge as the leading Nation of the free nations of the world.

Even the Soviet Union, aware that private ownership produces the greatest dividends, has begun to permit certain of its citizens the right to own limited means of production and retain some of the fruits of labor spent.

The desire to possess is a basic human trait as was crassly attested to by the mere observance of looters in action, with arms, cars, and even trucks loaded down with ill-gotten goods.

To allow the fruits of one's labor to go unguarded and unprotected as was the case in Washington, D.C., and other cities during the most recent outbreak of riots, and to add insult to injury by requiring the owners of the remains of this property to clean up and remove the debris under penalty of law as is being required in Washington, has the self-defeating effect of encouraging further looting and discouraging the further expenditure of private capital for business enterprises. While the immediate effect of this means fewer payrolls and more public welfare, the ultimate result can produce a system too risky to invest private capital—private enterprise system devoid of willing, noncoerced private enterprise.

The Attorney General has argued that police action which endangers the lives of the looters and arsonists will cause an escalation of the riot itself. The facts clearly disprove this contention. In Washington, the looters were given free reign for 15 hours. Police were ordered to stand by while looting went on under their noses highly publicized through television news coverage thereby encouraging further looting in its truest escalatory sense. Not until Federal troops were brought in and the police eventually given the authority to make arrests were the fires brought under control and order restored. Had this action been taken immediately, I am convinced that fewer than the 14 lives would have been lost and significantly less injury than the \$30 million to property and persons and

the loss of over \$40 million in decreased business during the 5-week period following the riots would have resulted.

There is in America today a dangerous, and—in this administration, particularly—prevailing philosophy which has the effect of condoning rioter's holidays in the name of the goal being sought—economic and property betterment. The philosophy appears to embrace the disturbing suggestion that a civil riot to acquire more property is a civil right and that those engaged in the riot—regardless of the harm they are causing—are themselves entitled to nonarrest even while they are engaged in the riot and the stealing of other peoples' property. The obvious danger inherent in this permissive crime philosophy is that it gives encouragement to individuals to riot and loot and burn whenever they get the inclination or, as appears to have been the case in Washington, receive the encouragement and the instructions to do so from rabble rousers such as Stokley Carmichael.

Once the fear of physical injury and/or jail is eliminated, there is nothing left to deter such activities. The less obvious danger is to diminish, if not entirely eliminate, the sanctity of the right to ownership of private property if demands on our free enterprise and individual initiative system is to continue.

In the final analysis, civil disorders accompanied by looting and arson pose a direct threat—not only to the persons whose property is being ravaged—but to every American who is concerned about preserving our system of government. For it is our system of government that is being challenged today and the soldiers of disorder who are bringing battle, anarchy and rebellion to the streets of America must be prepared to accept the consequences of their action. Swift and forceful action by those vested with the authority to maintain law and order—the police—should be the expected consequence of law violation, particularly when such violation poses an obvious danger to persons and property.

Certainly this view would prevail among the thousands of families mercilessly burned out and the survivors of the cremated innocent persons whose most precious right—to life itself—was snuffed out by the rebellious rioters. Is not the right to police protection to preserve one's person and property from harm a civil right?

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of death in the family.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 22, 1968, and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the immediate family.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FISHER, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEDZI, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MESKILL) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUCHANAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RIEGLE, for 15 minutes, May 22.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NICHOLS) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ADDABBO, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. DINGELL, for 30 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DORN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI in four instances and in one instance to include remarks made by the Postmaster General.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SCHWENGEI to revise and extend his remarks made earlier today to be placed in a special order granted to Mr. BETTS of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MESKILL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. ASH BROOK in two instances.

Mr. REINECKE in two instances.

Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. BATES.

Mr. McCLOY.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. HUNT in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in three instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. BUCHANAN in two instances.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. SCHWENGEI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NICHOLS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. JACOB.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. DADDARIO in three instances.

Mr. PODELL in three instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. RARICK in six instances.

Mr. RESNICK in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. IRWIN in three instances.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. WHITENER in two instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. ADAMS in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. SHIPLEY.

Mr. BOLAND in three instances.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. BRADEMAS in six instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. ABBITT in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in six instances.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2276. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to contract for the construction of works of improvement upon request of local organizations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, 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. 15131. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15364. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15822. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the Robert S. Kerr Memorial Arboretum and Nature Center in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15863. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the name of the Army Medical Service to the Army Medical Department; and

H.R. 16409. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to provide salary increases for teachers and school officers in the District of Columbia public schools, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 561. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore;

S.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Cary P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. William A. M. Burden as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 22, 1968, 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:

1864. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposal for a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1968 to support our military operations in Southeast Asia (H. Doc. 315); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1865. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposal for supplemental appropriations for civilian and military pay increases in the Federal Government for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1866. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations of the Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the immunity from taxation in the District of Columbia in the case of a communications satellite system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1867. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to improve the management of aeronautical repair parts manufactured at naval air stations of the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1868. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting proposals for 32 projects selected for funding under section 200(a) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, pursuant to section 200(b) of the act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1869. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes to provide a new maritime program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1870. A letter from the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a visiting scientist and scholar program in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1871. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define the terms "widow," "widower," "child," and "parent," for servicemen's group life insurance purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1872. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 16 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended by Public Law 81-566; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 13366. A bill to exempt certain vessels engaged in the fishing industry from the requirements of certain laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 1399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 16127. A bill to increase the limitation on the number of officers for the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 17024. A bill to repeal section 1727 of title 18, United States Code, so as to permit prosecution of postal employees for failure to remit postage due collections, under the postal embezzlement statute, section 1711 of title 18, United States Code (Rept. No. 1401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 8953. A bill to amend the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 773), providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority; with amendment (Rept. No. 1402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1178. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14907, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act (Rept. No. 1403). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1179. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2349, an act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 17401. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 17402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for employers who employ members of the hard-core unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 17403. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 17404. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Establishment of an African Institute for Cultural and Technical Interchange; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 17405. A bill to create a marine resources conservation and development fund, to provide for the distribution of revenues from Outer Continental Shelf lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 17406. A bill to repeal Public Law 90-203, approved December 15, 1967, which prohibits certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 17407. A bill to create a marine resources conservation and development fund, to provide for the distribution of revenues from Outer Continental Shelf lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 17408. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the United States Code to remove the prohibitions against importing, transporting, and mailing in the U.S. mails articles for preventing conception, and advertisements with respect to such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 17409. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 17410. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. LENNON, Mr. COWGER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. BUSH, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. UTT, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 17411. A bill to protect the freedom of choice of Federal employees in employee-management relations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 17412. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. ULLMAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mrs. MAY, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. WYATT, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 17413. A bill to authorize the addition of certain Federal reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest to participate in assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MATHIAS, of Maryland, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. SISK, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 17414. A bill to provide for the prevention and control of air pollution in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 17415. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in private pension plans, to establish minimum standards for vesting and funding of private pension plans, to provide an insurance program guaranteeing plan termination protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 17416. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself and Mr. WHITENER):

H.R. 17417. A bill to prohibit extortion, or

