

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 11, 1968:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Edward E. Archer, to be a Foreign Service officer of class

6, and ending Miss Evelyn A. Wythe, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 14, 1968; and

The nominations beginning Alexander Akalovsky, to be a Foreign Service officer of

class 2, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America and ending Daniel R. Welter to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 27, 1968.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 11, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Walter W. Flaherty, Our Lady of Assumption Church, Green Harbor, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Almighty Father, as the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives again assemble to conduct the legislative business of the Congress may they be guided by the Divine Counselor in their deliberations and judgments. With contrite hearts we humbly confess in our humanity our bafflement by the mysteries and dilemmas, strifes and struggles, tragedies and tribulations of this life, and beg You to give the Members of this House of Representatives the strength and courage to walk worthily in the vocation of responsibility and service to which they have been called. We ask You to hear us and inspire us through Jesus Christ, Your Son, our Lord, who lives and reigns with You in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God forever, and ever. 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. Bradley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13154. An act for the relief of Dr. Santiago Jose Manuel Ramon Bienvenido Roig y Garcia;

H.R. 13912. An act for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou; and

H.R. 16874. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes.

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. 15856. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15856) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SMITH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1999. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public Education Act; and

S. 2349. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges.

The message also announced that the Senate receded from its amendment to a bill of the House (H.R. 4919) entitled "An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12639) entitled "An act to remove certain limitations on ocean cruises."

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Distribution of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 68.14.

THE REVEREND WALTER W. FLAHERTY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a beautiful and expressive prayer offered by the Reverend Father Walter W. Flaherty, who is the Acting Chaplain of the House of Representatives today.

Mr. Speaker, Father Flaherty's presence here today in offering prayer in this Chamber and to the Members is a source of great official pleasure to me as well as a personal pleasure to both Mrs. McCormack and myself. The reason for this is that Father Flaherty was one of my secretaries for the period of 7 years, serving me in my office in Washington. So, Mr. Speaker, Father Flaherty is back in familiar territory, but in a different role.

Mr. Speaker, Father Flaherty was or-

dered to the holy priesthood only a few weeks ago, on May 11, 1968.

During the years he was associated with me as one of my secretaries, he always manifested the atmosphere, temperament, and the feeling that he had a calling and the vocation to the holy priesthood.

Some 3 or 4 years ago a great churchman and a great spiritual leader, Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, established a seminary for delayed vocations. This gave Father Flaherty, then Walter W. Flaherty, one of my secretaries, the opportunity to carry out his ambition and vocation, and he was one of the seminarians in the first class of the Pope John 23d Seminary in Boston.

As I said, Father Flaherty was ordained on May 11, 1968. So I know the Members of the House join with me in my official happiness, and with Mrs. McCormack and myself in our personal happiness, in welcoming my former secretary, Walter Flaherty, today as the Acting Chaplain of the House, now Father Walter W. Flaherty.

And, Walter, or Father Flaherty, or Father Walter, we welcome you back, and we hope you will visit us on many occasions in the future.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, I share the pride and the pleasure of the distinguished Speaker in welcoming to this Chamber his former employee, now Father Walter Flaherty. When Father Flaherty was employed by the Speaker, no one evidenced more kindness or consideration or more courtesy or greater interest to the people who visited the Speaker's office at that time than did Walter Flaherty.

So he comes to the priesthood with a great deal of experience, unusual experience, in that he has met in that busy office on Capitol Hill some of the most important people in the world, and in performing his chores for the Speaker in a most remarkable manner.

I know that this experience has given to him the kind of training, the kind of temper, and the kind of personality that will make for a great priest—and I know Father Walter Flaherty will make a great priest.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend and colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished Speaker, and my distinguished colleague from

Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], in expressing our great gratification at the appearance of Father Walter Flaherty here today.

I had the pleasure of attending his first Mass and the reception held in Dorchester, Mass., where thousands of people turned out as a manifestation of their great friendship and admiration for this fine young man. Our prayers go with him, and we hope his work will be fruitful from now on.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to welcome Father Flaherty back to the Capitol. Certainly we are all very proud of him.

Being an ex-seminarian, I take particular pride in his accomplishments for I am well aware of the vigorous and extensive training which he has successfully completed and can, therefore, fully appreciate the greatness of his accomplishments.

I left the religious life to enter the political life. Father Flaherty did the reverse: he left the political life to enter the religious life.

The experience which Father Flaherty gained while serving with Speaker McCORMACK in his office here in Washington will no doubt greatly add to the talents he will bring to his priestly work.

His experience will enable him to better understand the problems which beset those people with whom he may come in contact and will, therefore, enable him to lend greater assistance to these people as they travel the hard and perplexing road of life.

Walter Flaherty is also a pioneer worthy of great praise for he is a member of the first class to be ordained from Pope John XXIII National Seminary for Delayed Vocations—a unique seminary in Weston, Mass., that trains men for the priesthood who have received their call in the 11th hour of their lives.

I am sure that Father Flaherty will continue to cut new trails leading toward the betterment of mankind.

It is a great honor to be identified with him and a great honor for this House to have one of its ex-employees numbered among those called to serve God in the priestly vocation.

I thank our distinguished Speaker for yielding.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my dear friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, we have reason to be happy today. I can recall some 4 years ago when Walter Flaherty left our midst, and now he has come back as Father Walter Flaherty.

I believe, as the Speaker has said here this afternoon, that the wonderful experience which he has gained here in our midst will stand him in good stead as he preaches the Gospel from the pulpit in the years ahead.

I have been led to say on many occasions when I have heard many members of the clergy speaking on matters

of national importance that they had never really been exposed to the realities of the situations as we see them, and as Father Walter Flaherty has experienced them here in Washington.

So I think he can give a fresh and experienced point of view to his parishioners as he preaches to them.

I want to say, too, Mr. Speaker, that with the tragedy and violence, and controversies of recent days and months it is a restful and a beautiful thing to have someone like Father Flaherty come back, in the atmosphere in which he has, and offer the prayer before this Congress here today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I join with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and with other Members who have spoken of the unique privilege that we in the House of Representatives have had today in having the invocation offered by Father Walter W. Flaherty.

Like most Members of the House, I was privileged to work with Father Flaherty when he served in the office of the Speaker of the House so ably in the years before his vocation. I know him well and am proud to know him.

Father Flaherty has brought to his vocation the extraordinary experience, understanding, and education in public affairs which he acquired under the tutelage of the Speaker.

I am confident that that experience, in combination with his theological education, will serve him well, and his parishioners as he does God's work in the years ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know that Father Flaherty will always treasure his being with us today and offering prayer and his associations with the Capitol and with Government and with me in my office. I know he will always treasure the very proper and very fine and very generous remarks about him spoken by the several Members who have participated in expressing their deep friendship and high regard for him. I know I express the sentiments of all Members, without regard to their religious convictions, in hoping that God for countless years will continue to bestow upon Father Flaherty an abundance of His choicest blessings.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ROADS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Roads may sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee and of the full committee and have they agreed to this?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, it has been cleared.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16489, TREASURY, POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 16489) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

SNIPERS SHOULD BE SHOT BY TEAM OF MARKSMEN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Charles L. Southward, the commander of the District of Columbia National Guard testified before a Senate appropriations subcommittee yesterday on the use of the National Guard in the Washington riots.

To protect the city against violence he suggested several changes in the Guard operations in case of future Washington riots.

One proposal was that a team of marksmen be assigned to each unit with orders to shoot any sniper or other persons threatening lives. The last time the Guard was used in Washington no man could load his weapon and fire without clearing the decision with higher authorities. This proposal by General Southward to have marksmen teams available makes sense to me.

During the riots and looting the philosophy of the Government officials was to protect the law violator and show no concern for the property owner and merchant.

Until we start using force on the law-breakers here in Washington and across the country, we will continue to have looting and burning. It is refreshing to see someone in Washington in authority speak out and say, "Let's get tough here."

FBI DESERVES HEARTY CONGRATULATIONS IN APPREHENSION OF JAMES EARL RAY

Mr. SMITH of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, decent citizens everywhere owe a vote of appreciation to the FBI for the thorough and relentless investigation which resulted in the apprehension of James Earl Ray in London last week.

Starting with nothing more than the dim silhouette of the gunman who killed Martin Luther King, the FBI succeeded in uncovering the phantom figure of Eric Starvo Galt—and then identified Galt as escaped convict James Earl Ray. With miraculous speed, the FBI located the many hiding places used by Ray in Georgia, Alabama, and California, as well as in Canada and Mexico, since his escape from the Missouri State Penitentiary in April 1967. So intense was the heat of this investigation, and so strong was the respect which Ray had for the FBI, that he fled to Europe in the hope of evading detection and arrest.

It is a genuine tribute to the smooth-working relationship which exists between the FBI and British and Canadian authorities that Ray was tracked down in England last Saturday morning. I know that I voice the sentiments of colleagues in both Houses of Congress when I express to J. Edgar Hoover and the men and women of the FBI hardy congratulations on another job well done.

FBI CONGRATULATED ON APPREHENSION OF JAMES EARL RAY

Mr. DEVINE. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the news of the capture of James Earl Ray, suspect in the slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King, in London made headlines on last Saturday, June 8. I would like to take this occasion to congratulate the efficient men and women of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover. The excellent working relationship with the British and Canadian authorities has been well demonstrated. The prompt identification of the suspect and his location—in the face of great odds and in spite of countless arduous miles of flight—have come to be expected performance on the part of the FBI. At least to the law-abiding citizens, it is reassuring indeed to know that the FBI, with its quiet competence and dedication to the security of the Nation, is standing by. It is hoped that the desperate but futile flight of suspect James Earl Ray will not only be another victory for the FBI over the criminal but will serve as a deterrent to other would-be assailants.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be absent on June 6 when rollcalls 170 and 171 were had in the House. I would like the Record to show had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both rollcalls.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROCUREMENT, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ADDABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Procurement of the Select Committee on Small Business may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform us whether this has been cleared with the minority side and with the full committee as well?

Mr. ADDABO. It has been cleared with the full committee and with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE TO COMPEL THE ATTENDANCE AND TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES AND THE PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1298) authorizing the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 1298

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Commission" means the Commission created by the President by Executive Order 11412, dated June 10, 1968.

(b) The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. The Commission, or any member or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production

of such evidence may be required from any place within the jurisdiction of the United States at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person under subsection (b), any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be treated by said court as a contempt thereof.

(d) Process and papers of the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either upon the witness in person or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpoena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture (except demotion or removal from office) for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(f) All process of any court to which application may be made under this joint resolution may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served is found or resides.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, assuming that this is the usual request for subpoena and other powers to a commission appointed by another allegedly coequal branch of Government, would it be in order, if objection were heard by the Chair, for it to be brought back for more deliberate consideration through the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if objection is heard, then the matter will not be considered at this time.

Mr. HALL. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. By what technique would it be brought back to the floor of the House and how soon could this be accomplished under other than an objection to unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to answer that question. There are several methods. The Chair supposes the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary could confer with the gentleman from Missouri and satisfy the gentleman from Missouri and, assuming the gentleman from Missouri is the only one who might object—I am not saying that the gentleman will—then a unanimous-consent request could again be submitted. Otherwise the resolution would have to be introduced and referred to a committee and committee action taken thereon.

Mr. HALL. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Further reserving the right to object, I would ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if in this resolution, which has not previously been made available to the Members and which we therefore have not had a chance to study, peruse, or ponder over, or render prudent judgment on, before granting a unanimous-consent request; if there is anything in this resolution submitted by the gentleman from New York that would give even the remotest tacit consent to the approval of the Commission appointed by the Chief Executive?

Mr. CELLER. No; there would not be. This is simply giving the Commission the right of subpoena power.

I want to say to the gentleman prior to making my unanimous-consent request I communicated with the ranking Republican member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], who offered no objection and approved of it. This was exactly the procedure that was followed in connection with the granting of subpoena power to the Warren Commission concerning the assassination of the late lamented President Kennedy. It is exactly the procedure that was followed in connection with the Kerner Commission on civil disorders.

There is no departure whatsoever from precedent on that point.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, assure the Members of the House that the language is identical to the language granting such powers to other commissions?

Mr. CELLER. The language is identical. I have the two resolutions right before me. One was Public Law 90-61 and the other was Public Law 88-202.

Mr. HALL. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York is in effect assuring the Members of the House of Representatives that this resolution does not establish a precedent, and indeed that there is precedent therefor in the legislative body for granting all of these powers to Presidentially appointed commissions where we have authorized other and similar commissions in the past?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. This is the first time I have seen the resolution, but I note it provides for the payment of witness fees, mileage, and other costs of one kind and another.

Where is it proposed to get the money with which to pay the cost of this brand-new Commission, the second or third such Commission to deal with violence and disorders? Where is it proposed to get the money? The resolution apparently is silent on that point.

Mr. CELLER. That would be a matter for the Committee on Appropriations to make some allowance for the expenditure of these funds. The amount would not be large; it could not be large.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not too sure about that. However, the gentleman referred to it as being similar in vein to the Warren Commission in response to a question which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] propounded.

This resolution is open ended as to finances. Would the expenses be paid out of the President's contingency funds or one of his contingency funds?

Mr. CELLER. Is it possible that that is so. I will say to the gentleman that those who have been appointed to the Commission are representative of both sides of the aisle, and I do not think there would be any extravagance whatsoever. I am quite sure that it would represent a situation such as was represented with the Warren Commission and with reference to the same situation on the President's Commission on Civil Disorders.

Mr. GROSS. This resolution is entitled "Authorizing the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence to Compel the Attendance and Testimony of Witnesses and the Production of Evidence."

Is this limited to, and what is meant by "violence?" Is it proposed that this Commission also go into civil disorders, riots, and that sort of thing? What is the purpose of the Commission?

Mr. CELLER. We have a great deal of evidence of violence that has been committed throughout the length and breadth of the land and in my opinion it is incumbent upon the Government itself, the executive branch and the legislative branch of the Government, to address themselves to this violence. It covers, undoubtedly, civil disorders and the widespread use of firearms. I will state further to the gentleman from Iowa that in my opinion the resolution or, rather, the appointment of this Commission was more or less triggered by the dreadful act which we had just this past week involving the assassination of the junior Senator from New York and other acts of violence such as those in connection with the death of Dr. Martin Luther King as well as the two marines to whom the gentleman from Iowa referred the other day. It would be directed toward those acts of violence. I am quite sure that we cannot remain apathetic until we have the root causes of these acts of violence established. If we can ascertain the root causes, then we might get at something

in the nature of a cure—not only the prevention of such acts of violence but the cure thereof and what is causing this dreadful scourge of violence that is plaguing the country. I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa has no doubts concerning the fact that these acts of violence are affecting the whole Nation and that something must be done concerning these matters.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that we had a commission, I have forgotten the specific title, headed by the Governor of Illinois. And if I remember correctly it produced—I am sure at a very substantial expense to the taxpayers of this country—a voluminous report on civil disorders and riots, and so on and so forth. Must we create a new commission? Do we not have a Department of Justice? Do we not have agencies of the Government already established and staffed, that can go into these matters? Why, every time we turn around and run into a problem, should we organize a brandnew commission to go into something?

Mr. CELLER. I believe the gentleman from Iowa does well to point out these situations, but in my humble opinion—and it is very humble—the Commission on Civil Disorders was strictly limited to the disorders which sprung from racism and race difficulties. This is a commission that is to look into a situation that is far wider and deeper; namely, violence—and violence encompasses a great deal of evil—much more evil than was involved in the other commission.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I hope that the day will come when the facilities of Government already established will go into these matters. We have committees in Congress that can go into these matters if they were so disposed, rather than creating brandnew commissions at a very substantial cost to the taxpayers. Moreover, it seems that nothing ever happens as a result of these commissions that are so easily established by the President, or by Congress at such a high cost.

Mr. CELLER. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that, as a result of the work of the Commission on Civil Disorders, and on which my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] was a very prominent member, that a number of bills have emanated from the Committee on the Judiciary, and we are very hopeful that the final effect of those measures will be to dissipate the causes or some of the causes referred to in the report of that Commission.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. GROSS. What is the regular order?

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from

Ohio has demanded the regular order, and the regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution 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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. 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. 174]

Abernethy	Farbstein	Long, La.
Anderson, Tenn.	Flynt	McMillan
Andrews, Ala.	Foley	Mailliard
Annunzio	Ford	Mayne
Ashbrook	William D.	Murphy, Ill.
Ayres	Gallagher	O'Hara, Ill.
Baring	Gardner	O'Neal, Ga.
Battin	Gettys	Pelly
Bell	Giaino	Pool
Bolton	Gilbert	Price, Tex.
Bow	Green, Oreg.	Pucinski
Bush	Hagan	Rees
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Resnick
Cowger	Hardy	Rivers
Daddario	Harrison	Ronan
Dawson	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Derwinski	Helstoski	Rostenkowski
Diggs	Herlong	Teague, Tex.
Dingell	Holland	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	Karsten	Whalen
Dorn	Kelly	Whitten
Dulski	Kluczynski	Wright
Evins, Tenn.	Kornegay	Zwach
	Kyros	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). On this rollcall 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

ADVERTISING IN PROGRAM OF NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17325) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to advertising in a convention program of a national political convention, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object, because I favor the enactment of this legislation—I do so in order that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means may give us an explanation of the legislation. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself because of the interest that had been expressed to both of us by the Republican and Democratic National Committees in the matter of defraying the cost of conducting the two conventions this year. Present law denies a deduction for an amount paid or incurred for advertising in a convention program of a political party. This limitation presently applies whether or not the amount paid or incurred might otherwise be deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense. Thus, the existing section 276(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides in part that:

No deduction otherwise allowable for income tax purposes shall be allowed for any amount paid or incurred for advertising in a convention program of a political party.

The bill would change that provision so as to allow a deduction for the cost of this advertising under certain limited circumstances. An amount paid or incurred for advertising in a political convention program which is not deductible under this bill is not deductible under any circumstance. The basic limitation of existing law which denies a deduction for indirect contributions to political parties produces this result.

The bill allows a deduction for an amount paid or incurred for advertising in a political convention program only if the convention is one held to nominate candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. In addition, for the deduction to be available, the proceeds from the convention program must be used solely to defray the costs of conducting the convention—or a subsequent convention of the party held for the same purpose. Finally, under the bill, an amount paid or incurred for advertising in a political convention program is deductible only if the amount is reasonable in light of the business the taxpayer may expect to receive, first, directly as a result of the advertising, or second, as a result of the convention being held in an area where the taxpayer has a principal place of business.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there are so many safeguards contained in the bill that I question the necessity of having all of them listed therein. I feel it would have been sufficient had we merely said that these amounts are deductible when so expended, so long as the proceeds from the convention publication are used solely to defray the cost of the convention. But we took additional steps in order to safeguard against any possible abuse.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is highly desirable by both of our political parties for use in the upcoming conventions and

we felt we should pass it now, because of the necessity of both of our parties proceeding as rapidly as possible in the developing of the publication and the consideration of the advertising that would be in it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

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

H.R. 17325

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 276 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain indirect contributions to political parties) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as (d), and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) ADVERTISING IN A CONVENTION PROGRAM OF A NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTION.— Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid or incurred for advertising in a convention program of a political party distributed in connection with a convention held for the purpose of nominating candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, if the proceeds from such program are used solely to defray the costs of conducting such convention (or a subsequent convention of such party held for such purpose) and the amount paid or incurred for such advertising is reasonable in light of the business the taxpayer may expect to receive—

“(1) directly as a result of such advertising, or

“(2) as a result of the convention being held in an area in which the taxpayer has a principal place of business.”

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to amounts paid or incurred on or after January 1, 1968.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out all down through and including line 8, and insert in lieu thereof:

“That subsection (a) of section 276 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain indirect contributions to political parties) shall”.

And on page 2, line 15, strike out “amendments made by” and insert in lieu thereof “first section of”.

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.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. MAHON. 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. 17734) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ques-

tion is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 17734, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

This is the seventh general appropriation bill that has been before the House this session—two supplementals for the current fiscal year 1968 and five regular bills dealing with fiscal 1969.

BILLS FOR 1969

I believe the Members would be interested to know that on the five bills for fiscal year 1969 we have thus far adopted in the House, we have reduced the new budget obligational authority requests by \$5 billion-plus, in consequence of which, according to our best tentative estimates, we have reduced budgeted 1969 expenditures by about \$1.125 billion.

Members, of course, are also interested in the timing of the remaining regular annual bills for 1969. The public works appropriation bill, a bill involving some \$4.9 billion in new requests, is scheduled to be before the House next week.

The legislative branch appropriation bill is scheduled to be before the House the following week.

The appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, is also scheduled at this time for the week after next.

There is yet no authorization bill enacted for major portions of the Defense appropriation bill, and it is impossible to tell when this, the largest of all the appropriation bills, will be before the House.

The same can be said of the military construction bill. The authorization bill for military construction is not yet enacted.

It will probably be about 2 weeks before the Transportation appropriation bill will be before the House of Representatives.

The District of Columbia bill must await the authorization of certain revenues before it can properly be presented to the House.

And as you know, the foreign assistance appropriation bill is dependent on an annual authorization bill, which neither House has yet passed.

In addition to those measures, it will be necessary to have a final supplemental for fiscal 1969 before Congress finally adjourns, to take action on various items deferred from the regular bills for lack of authorization, and otherwise.

THE PENDING SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

The bill before us would provide some \$6.255 billion in new budget (obligational) authority, and about \$2.674 billion through release of reserves established against previously appropriated funds under authority of Public Law 90-218 of the last session. It will be discussed at some length by other members of the committee and of the House as we take up the various chapters.

But in summary, the bill before us is below the President's budget requests by nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars—more precisely, \$762.3 million. This is a reduction in fiscal 1968 appropriation requests—not fiscal 1969—and we have been pointing more and more toward fiscal 1969.

The major items in this bill, dollar-wise, are for defense, for increased pay costs for military and civilian government workers, and for grants to states for public assistance.

On page 2 of the committee report—and I commend the reading of the committee report to the Members—there is a breakdown of the principal sums included:

In new funds for Southeast Asia military requirements, \$3.8 billion, in addition to release of some \$2.345 billion of reserves under Public Law 90-218.

For grants to States to meet increased costs of medicaid and other public assistance programs, \$1,135 million. That is the second largest item.

For pay increase costs, \$1,009 million.

Then, \$373 million for increased medicare costs and the unexpectedly larger number of older Americans who are now benefiting from the program.

For military assistance to the Republic of South Korea, \$100 million. We have to strengthen the defenses of that country and increase their capacity to deter aggression especially from the Communists to the north.

To cover the costs for fire and flood damage to Federal property, \$55.9 million.

For veterans pensions and compensation, \$47.5 million.

To pay claims and judgments against the United States for loss or damage to life and property, \$16.7 million.

I think the first paragraph on page 3 of the report will be of some interest to you. It is only a few lines and I shall read it:

The committee is advised that, as of a recent date, the grand total reserves established under Public Law 90-218 aggregate approximately \$6.1 billion, against funds available for obligation in fiscal year 1968. The committee bill proposes release of approximately \$2.7 billion of this amount.

In other words, last year beyond our regular bills—in what was known as House Joint Resolution 888—we provided for additional reductions in obligational authority for fiscal year 1968. Some of these funds are proposed to be released, as indicated in this portion of the report. But the larger portion of the funds have not been released.

I would say, speaking generally, that the \$762.3 million reduction was about the best that the committee could do under all the circumstances. We are

aware that the House anticipates voting—probably next week—on a combined expenditure cut and tax bill. We tried, in our general approach to this bill, to keep in mind the necessities of the present budget crisis and the severe reductions in spending which will be necessary if the conference agreement on the tax bill is adopted. Some items could have been increased; additional items could have been included but this would have been out of step with what seems to be the mood of the Congress and the country to hold spending to some more reasonable level at this time of great fiscal stringency.

I believe this is all I will have to say at this time and as the debate progresses in the 2-hour period, other aspects of the pending bill will be presented.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from the report summarizing more precisely and in some greater detail what I have undertaken to highlight:

SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee considered requests for new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 1968 aggregating \$6,716,514,679. In addition, the Committee considered requests for release of funds reserved pursuant to Title II of Public Law 90-218 aggregating \$2,976,051,100. Estimates for items pertaining to the Senate are excluded as is customary. The requests are contained in House Documents numbered 254, 255, 274, 315, 316, and 317. The requests for funds for unemployment compensation for returning veterans and Federal employees in House Document 254, for Federal-Aid Highways in House Document 274 and for claims and judgments in House Documents 254 and 258 were handled in separate measures (H.J. Res. 1229 and H.J. Res. 1268) and are excluded from the amounts set forth above. H.J. Res. 1229 was approved on April 12, 1968; H.J. Res. 1268 passed the House on May 9, 1968, and is pending in the Senate.

The Committee bill totals \$6,255,318,924 in new budget (obligational) authority and \$2,674,902,800 in releases of reserved funds pursuant to Public Law 90-218. The bill has been set up under three titles, title I dealing with the estimates contained in House Documents 254, 255, 274, 315, and 317 including some amounts for pay increases; title II, the increased pay costs contained in House Document 316; and general provisions under title III.

The supplemental appropriations recommended in the accompanying bill are required, in major part, for the conduct of the war in Southeast Asia and for carrying out provisions of legislation enacted during the last session of Congress. The remainder of the amount carried in the bill is primarily for workload and mandatory increases under previously authorized programs.

The following list sets forth some of the more significant programs and amounts recommended therefor in the accompanying bill:

\$3.8 billion for Southeast Asia military requirements.

\$1,135.0 million for grants to States to meet increased costs of Medicaid and other public assistance programs.

\$1,009.0 million for military and civilian pay increases and related costs.

\$373.0 million for increased Medicare costs and the unexpectedly larger number of older Americans who are now benefiting from the program.

\$100 million for military assistance to the Republic of Korea to help strengthen her defenses and her capacity to deter aggression.

\$55.9 million to cover the costs of fire and flood damage to Federal property.

\$47.5 million for veterans pensions and compensation.

\$16.7 million to pay claims and judgments against the United States for loss or damage to life and property.

Details of the the Committee's recommendations are set out in the several individual chapter explanations.

APPROXIMATE EFFECT ON 1968 BUDGET TOTALS
(In January 1968 Budget)

New budget authority.—All of the amounts of new budget (obligational) authority in the bill—with the exception of the \$3.791 billion for the Southeast Asia emergency fund—are encompassed within the total shown for fiscal 1968 in the 1969 budget of last January, either as specific line item amounts or in the general lump-sum contingency provision. Thus, with the one major exception, the 1968 new budget authority totals are not breached. The committee is recommending reductions—aside from \$108.9 million in the Southeast Asia item—of \$352.3 million. Of this amount, \$78.1 million is in title I, and \$274.2 million is in title II relating to increased pay costs.

Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves.—In connection with the many provisions for release from reserves established against 1968 funds pursuant to Public Law 90-218 (H.J. Res. 888), the committee considered release estimates of \$2,976.1 million, consisting of some \$2,629.6 million associated with additional special Vietnam costs and some \$346.5 million otherwise. The committee recommends reductions of \$301.1 million in such requests for releases—\$284.6 million against the special Southeast Asia item (allowing release of \$2.345 billion) and a net reduction against such release requests otherwise of \$16.6 million (allowing \$329.9 million of such releases otherwise).

The committee is advised that, as of a recent date, the grand total reserves established under Public Law 90-218 aggregate approximately \$6.1 billion, against funds available for obligation in fiscal year 1968. The committee bill proposes release of approximately \$2.7 billion of this amount.

The releases of reserves under Public Law 90-218 involve previously appropriated funds that would not, in the absence of congressional action in this or some other bill, be available for use in fiscal 1968. These funds are, in all instances except perhaps some indeterminate portion of the special Vietnam item, proposed to be released for 1968 expenditures that were encompassed within the fiscal 1968 budget expenditure totals shown in the budget last January.

In summary, the \$6.1 billion placed in reserve pursuant to Public Law 90-218, together with the \$5.1 billion reduction in obligations made as a result of actions in the regular 1968 bills last session, brings the total reduction in obligations originally budgeted for fiscal year 1968 to some \$11.2 billion. Thus the release of some \$2.7 billion of reserves proposed in this bill reduces this total to about \$8.5 billion.

1968 Budget expenditures.—Generally in respect to estimated budget outlays (expenditures) shown for fiscal 1968 in the 1969 budget, the President indicates (H. Doc. 315 of May 21) that the military situation in Asia calls for increased expenditures of \$2.5 billion in fiscal year 1968. Some of this increase stems from accelerated expenditure of available funds, some from the funds provided in this bill for the Emergency Fund, Southeast Asia. The effect of the committee action in reducing both new obligational authority and releases of reserved funds for Southeast Asia will probably result in a decrease in the order of \$100 million in the estimated increase in expenditures.

With respect to the probable impact of the amounts recommended in this bill on estimated 1968 budget outlays (expendi-

tures), it is estimated that committee reductions in new budget authority and releases of reserves (other than for the special Southeast Asia costs) will result in 1968 budgeted expenditure reductions of approximately \$294 million.

TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS

This title of the bill deals exclusively with additional funds required for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law for military and civilian employees in all three branches of government and the District of Columbia. The specific requests are contained in House Document 316.

Title I of this bill, which deals primarily with additional funds required for program or workload increases, also includes funds for pay increases for those agencies which have both workload and pay increase requirements.

The total estimated cost of pay increases for fiscal year 1968 authorized by or pursuant to law, and dealt with in both titles, amounts to approximately \$1,468,100,000. This amount includes \$680.2 million for civilian personnel under Public Law 90-206, \$635.6 million for military personnel under Public Law 90-207, \$135.9 million for wage-board employees, and \$16.3 million for civilian personnel under other laws and actions.

Of the \$1,468.1 million total estimated cost of pay increases for fiscal year 1968,

\$239.4 million is being absorbed through administrative action of the departments and agencies;

\$224.3 million is provided in Title I of this Bill by appropriation of NOA and by releases of reserves pursuant to Public Law 90-218;

\$784.7 million is provided in Title II by appropriation of NOA, by releases of reserves pursuant to Public Law 90-218 and by transfers between appropriations;

\$219.7 million has been cut from the budget requests, requiring further absorption by the departments and agencies.

Additional details concerning increased pay costs will be found in House Document 316.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sections 301-303 are technical provisions of language necessary to facilitate the payment of such increases as may be granted to civilian employees under the provisions of Public Law 90-206 and to military personnel under the provisions of Public Law 90-207, to become effective July 1, 1968. These provisions are necessary, in part, to comply with the Anti-Deficiency Act and will permit appropriations to be apportioned on a deficiency basis to the extent necessary to meet such pay increases.

The 1969 Budget did not include, in specific appropriations, the amounts necessary for the July 1 increase even though an estimated overall sum of \$1,600,000,000 was included in the Budget totals.

By authorizing deficiency apportionments rather than providing specific amounts for 1969 pay increases at this time, it is expected that considerable amounts can be saved by forcing absorption to the fullest extent possible.

The following table summarizes the budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill:

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

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
TITLE I				
I	Agriculture: (Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	(\$20,510,000)	(\$18,786,000)	(-\$1,724,000)
II	Defense:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	4,095,412,000	3,945,827,000	-149,585,000
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	(2,629,600,000)	(2,351,600,000)	(-278,000,000)
III	District of Columbia: New budget (obligational) authority.....	6,170,800	6,020,800	-150,000
IV	Foreign Operations: New budget (obligational) authority.....	105,500,000	100,000,000	-5,500,000
V	Independent offices—HUD: New budget (obligational) authority.....	91,065,000	86,340,000	-4,725,000
VI	Interior:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	47,126,000	44,381,000	-2,745,000
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	(25,378,000)	(25,368,000)	(-10,000)
VII	Labor—HEW:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,519,268,000	1,508,028,000	-11,240,000
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	(62,862,000)	(10,775,000)	(-52,087,000)
VIII	Legislative: New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,025,160	1,375,000	-650,160
IX	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	27,576,000	16,484,000	-11,092,000
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	(681,000)	(1,431,000)	(-750,000)
X	Treasury—Post Office:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	15,354,000	14,089,000	-1,265,000
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	(19,421,000)	(19,421,000)	-----
XI	Claims and judgments: New budget (obligational) authority.....	16,687,049	16,687,049	-----
	Total, title I:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	5,926,184,009	5,739,231,849	-186,952,160
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	2,758,452,000	2,427,381,000	(-331,071,000)
	Total, title II:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	790,330,670	516,087,075	-274,243,595
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	2,217,599,100	2,247,521,800	(+29,922,700)
	Grand total, titles I and II:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	6,716,514,679	6,255,318,924	-461,195,755
	(Release of Public Law 90-218 reserves).....	2,976,051,100	2,674,902,800	(-301,148,300)

¹ Language proposed providing release of indefinite amounts reserved under title II, Public Law 90-218, to offset special Vietnam costs (currently estimated at \$2,629,600,000).

² Excludes transfers of funds not reserved pursuant to Public Law 90-218.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if I am accurate in this summation of the cost figures in this legislation.

The committee bill totals \$6,255,318,924 to which there is added \$2,674,902,-

800 of reserve funds, for a total of \$8,929,221,724.

Is that the correct total of this bill?

Mr. MAHON. Is the gentleman referring to page 5 of the committee report?

Mr. GROSS. I am referring to page 1 of the committee report.

Mr. MAHON. The same figures appear on page 5 also. Yes, the gentleman is ab-

solutely correct. The bill contains new budget obligational authority in the sum of \$6.255 billion. But it also makes available, from funds heretofore appropriated, by releasing certain sums which runs the total, overall, to approximately \$8.9 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and that is the total of this bill?

Mr. MAHON. That is actually the total of this bill. In previous Congresses we appropriated, of course, a substantial portion of the amount.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman—there is a report that there may be \$2 million in this bill—and it is purely hearsay—\$2 million to pay for some of the costs of the so-called city that has been established on the Mall—or for expenses in connection therewith. Does the gentleman know of any \$2 million in this bill for such purpose? I will say frankly I searched and I could not find a line item to that effect.

Mr. MAHON. I know of no such amount. The committee is seeking to ascertain what additional costs may have arisen. Those studies have not been completed. We do not at the moment know, and will not know until later, what additional costs may have been incurred. But the encampment down near the Lincoln Memorial was not to have been a cost of any kind to the Federal Government. It was, supposedly—I assume by all measurement—financed from sources other than the Federal Government.

It probably would be possible to trace certain expenditures of the District of Columbia and of the Federal Government eventually to this. But we do not have those figures. We know that there is additional police service required there, and other items, but, generally speaking, I do not know of any large amount of money involved.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from what source come the funds to pay the costs for the 15,000 troops that were used in Washington early in April. Do we find any of that expense in this bill?

Mr. MAHON. The military people who are on the payroll, regardless of where they may be, are still on the payroll; but there was additional operation and maintenance costs as a result of the lawlessness in Washington. The military services have large sums for operation and maintenance, and while it would not be possible to trace every dime, a reasonably good estimate would be possible. But I do not recall what the estimate would show. It was a considerable expense to bring those forces into Washington for that use.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, there would be quite an increase in the cost as a result of flying them up from Fort Bragg; would there not?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I am just trying to find out where the costs may be.

Mr. MAHON. Those costs, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, would be taken from the general costs which are budgeted for operation and maintenance. The operation and maintenance appropriations cover a vast amount of predictable, and some unpredictable expenditures in any 1 given fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Was there any representation made to the committee when additional funds were requested for the Department of Defense that it was necessary for any part of those funds to be requested because of the use of Federal troops in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, in the bill which is before us now there is an item entitled "Emergency Funds, Southeast Asia." These funds are for the increases that are necessary in that area.

The operation and maintenance charges as a result of the riots in Washington and other places would come out of the regular bill that was previously passed by the House for fiscal year 1968. As far as I know at this time there is no record, at least before our committee, of the total overall cost of these activities to the Department of Defense. Without doubt it cost additional funds, but there are no funds in this bill, so far as I know, for those particular activities.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not know where to go to get those figures. It would be my hope that the Appropriations Committee, in the regular appropriation bill, if not in this bill, would be able to provide a statement of those costs.

Mr. MAHON. The committee will provide those figures in more detail in connection with the regular defense appropriation bill for 1969. At the moment, informally, I am told that costs of the April civil disturbances—to the Department of Defense—were about \$5.2 million, of which \$2.2 million is attributed to the Washington, D.C. riots.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman agrees with me that the public is entitled to know what this sort of thing is costing them.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman one or two other questions? Is there any money, to his knowledge, in this bill to finance a new Senate Office Building, or the purchase of land for a new Senate Office Building?

Mr. MAHON. The items for the other body would not be included in the House version. It would be up to the other body to place those items in the bill when the bill goes to them.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to do a little adding in order to find in one place exactly what is involved in this bill. We are today taking two separate approaches in providing funds for the executive branch of the Government. One is the ordinary and regular way of granting new obligational authority, and the other approach is by releasing funds that were placed in reserve by action of the Congress last year. So it would be a mistake to consider only the new obligational authority in this bill, because of equal effect and importance on the fiscal situation is the release of funds we thought had been reserved and had counted as a savings.

For example, last year in regular bills

for fiscal year 1968, Congress made cuts in new obligational authority of \$5.1 billion. Then late in the session, as a substitute for the various Bow amendments that had been adopted in this body throughout the session, a compromise was agreed on with the other body, which came to be known as House Joint Resolution 888, under which we placed \$6,100 million in reserve and provided that it could not be spent without further affirmative action by the Congress.

It is by adding those two items that we came up with the sum of \$11,200 million, which many of us have been claiming throughout this calendar year that had been saved the taxpayers by action taken in Congress last year.

Now, it turns out that we have got to march down the hill, after having marched up the hill last year and arrived at that \$11.2 billion cut. And when we get through with this bill today, if it is passed without any changes, we will have eliminated all of those cuts except \$2.2 billion. This is so because this bill before us today grants \$6.3 billion in new obligational authority and \$2.7 billion of funds are being released out of reserves. If we add those two together, we come up with \$9 billion. This has to be subtracted from the \$11.2 billion referred to previously, and when that is done it develops that we will be coming to the end of the fiscal year having undone all the good work we did last year on cutting the budget, and are down to \$2.2 billion in reductions.

Actually, what the administration requested in this bill was \$9,692,000,000 in new spending authority, of which \$6,700,000,000 was new obligational authority and \$2,900,000,000 was requested to be released from the reserves. So we started off in our deliberations under this bill considering requests of \$9,692,000,000 in new money to be made available for spending.

The bill contains \$8,930,000,000, of which \$6,255,000,000 amounts to new obligational authority and \$2,674,000,000 amounts to releases from the reserves.

Stating that another way, the committee has reduced new obligational authority requested by \$461,000,000 and has reduced the request to release funds from the reserves by \$301 million.

This is a combined cut in the two items of \$762 million. While that sounds like a large reduction, it actually amounts to less than 1 percent—\$762 million is a lot of money, but when compared with \$8,930,000,000 it is not as large as it seems at first glance.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, how we expect to cut \$6 billion out of the spending program for next year if we do not do any better job of having our cuts stand up than we are experiencing in connection with this bill.

I know a lot of items in this bill are mandatory. There are some pay increases and some other mandatory increases. But almost every item in a budget is alleged by some to be a mandatory item.

I asked the previous Director of the Bureau of the Budget to list some priorities, to give us some guidelines, and he said, in effect, that every item in the budget is of equal priority, and they are all absolutely essential.

Somebody somewhere along the line

is going to have to use some real courage and to have the determination to stand by and protect these cuts we are making in the regular bills, because it will be ridiculous for us to go ahead and proceed to cut the regular bills, as the chairman indicated has been done by \$5 billion so far, and then turn around toward the end of the next fiscal year and restore most of the money previously cut. That is not making real progress.

I hope we will all come to realize, from what is happening in regard to this supplemental bill, the importance of standing a little firmer by the cuts once they are made, instead of restoring them.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], chairman of a subcommittee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the gentleman from North Carolina who just spoke that the items in the Interior bill which are carried here are those items which are customarily paid at the conclusion of work which has been done. The single largest item in the supplemental for our part of the bill is that for firefighting, the amount of which we have no knowledge at the time the regular appropriation bill is passed. Other items also provide for fishing disasters and flood disasters in areas, which also are completely unexpected and were unbudgeted.

I urge support of this bill and will now review chapter VI which relates to the Department of the Interior and related agencies and provides for a total appropriation of \$69,749,000. Of this total amount, \$44,381,000 represents new obligation authority, and \$25,368,000 is to be provided by the release of reserves created pursuant to the enactment of Public Law 90-218.

I shall not dwell at length on the details of funding included in this chapter, but I would like to make a few remarks concerning the largest item of cost in this portion of the bill. I, of course, am referring to funds provided in this bill to cover the cost of fighting forest fires during the past year. Of the total amount provided in the bill, \$53,835,000, or a little less than 80 percent of the total funds provided, are for fire fighting and rehabilitation costs resulting from the most severe forest fire period we have experienced in many years.

The bill provides \$40,985,000 for the Forest Service in this connection. The national forests and grasslands of the West were threatened in 1967 by fire crises unmatched in recent times. Critical burning conditions coupled with repeated severe dry lightning storms produced disastrous fire situations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. This situation required bringing hundreds of supervisory personnel from other regions and organized crews from throughout the West.

The fire control effort in 1967 was the largest in Forest Service history. During the peak of fire activity in August and September, 2,500 fires occurred, burning a total of 105,000 acres. More than 15,000 firefighters led by 1,500 supervisory and specialist personnel were on the fire lines. Thousands of volunteers were em-

ployed from local areas. Hundreds of bulldozers, groundtankers, pumps, and many miles of hose were used. The use of aircraft in support of the ground attack was the largest ever. Through November 30, aircraft of all sizes, from large modern jets to small helicopter and reconnaissance planes, delivered thousands of men, 6.5 million gallons of chemical retardants, and tons of equipment and supplies. Job Corpsmen fought many fires and valuable assistance was provided by a 6th Army military task force, Montana and Idaho National Guard and Reserve units. During the period January through November 11,754 fires burned 208,679 acres in national forest protection areas. Of these fires, 4,891 were man caused, a significant reduction from the 5,387 experienced in 1966, and the previous 5-year average of 5,221, especially in light of the severity of the fire season. Though a serious loss, the 1967 burned acreage is well below that of even recent much less severe years. It demonstrates the great savings of valuable resources which can result from a modern, well trained and equipped, fire control organization.

The following table indicates the severity of Forest Service fire losses in 1967 compared with several previous years:

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

Calendar year	Number lightning fires	Number man-caused fires	Total fires	Acres burned
1962	6,301	5,193	11,494	85,457
1963	6,471	6,269	12,740	127,571
1964	4,617	5,132	9,749	183,154
1965	5,243	4,123	9,366	75,765
1966	5,858	5,387	11,245	332,921
Total	28,490	25,104	54,594	804,868
5-year average	5,698	5,221	10,919	160,974
1967 estimate	5,866	5,300	11,166	209,000

The bill provides \$9,000,000 for rehabilitation and firefighting costs incurred by the Bureau of Land Management. The total cost involved was \$9,300,000, but the cost to the Federal Government in this instance was reduced by the contribution of \$300,000 by the State of Alaska as its share of the cost. During the 1967 calendar year fire season for the Bureau of Land Management, 1,187 fires burned approximately 268,000 acres which resulted in substantial fire suppression costs in Alaska, Montana, Idaho, and Oregon. Of special significance was the China Creek fire complex in Idaho which included about 22,000 acres and was declared a disaster area.

Fire suppression and rehabilitation costs incurred by the Bureau of Indian Affairs was \$800,000. The 1967 fire season in both the Northwest and the Southwest was the worst in over a decade on Indian lands. Temperature and other weather factors combined to make fuels exceedingly dry and explosive. Although most Indian lands were fortunately spared the unusually severe lightning storms that sparked the disaster fires, control efforts were costly because of the need to maintain emergency standby personnel and equipment during extreme periods, and in providing more intense response to reported fires.

Funds provided in this bill also include

\$3,050,000 for fire suppression costs of the National Park Service. The most serious fire experienced by the National Park Service occurred at Glacier National Park, Mont., which resulted in firefighting costs of \$2,717,000. These fires were caused by dry lightning storms which began on August 11, 1967, involving 30 fires which burned 12,391 acres of forest land.

It is most regrettable and unfortunate that our valuable timber resources are destroyed in this manner, but it is an ever-continuing threat that those responsible for the administration of our national forest lands must face each year. It is encouraging to note the Forest Service experience, that notwithstanding the fact that fires were more extensive this past year, actual loss of timber was less than occurred in previous years when the number of serious fires were fewer.

At this time I wish to commend all those individuals who worked so strenuously and efficiently to contain these fires, frequently at the risk of their lives. From the reports I have received, the coordination was superb and it was due to the efforts of these men that our timber losses were not much more severe. It is because of this constant threat of fire loss that I continually support accelerated research in fire prevention and suppression, and that I continue to insist that our forest-fire crews have a sufficiency of the best equipment available.

There are further items in this bill that I want to commend to the House for support.

These are the items proposed in the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the repayment of flood damage in Alaska during the Chena River flood.

Amounts were reduced because it seemed to the committee that work done here should be done on a family-to-family basis, and that figures given the committee reflected much more than supplemental necessities.

The entire Indian housing problem in Alaska is serious and it is hoped that the \$424,000 here will serve as a model for the future through the manner of expenditure demonstrated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There is also \$683,000 in the bill for assistance to the Alaskan natives to assist them because of the fishing disaster last summer in Alaska. By disaster I mean that Alaska fish runs were so drastically reduced that native incomes were far below support levels.

As I have pointed out repeatedly to this House, the problem of our fishing resources is a major must for breakthroughs in upgrading it. If this industry and this source of food and income is not to perish, we must accelerate our efforts in the exploration of finding answers in the conservation and fish development field. A large segment of humanity is dependent upon our efforts.

You will note further there is \$1 million provided for the Federal Government's share of the prototype desalting plant in California. All of us are seeking answers in this water field, and this can well be an important part of those answers.

In conclusion, I would like to call at-

tention to the members of this committee that every cent in the Interior and related agencies supplemental items is for the well-being of America and will meet problems of preservation of our natural and human resources.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, a very important and significant part of this second supplemental appropriation bill, 1968, H.R. 17734, now before the House, is the additional new obligational authority in title 1, chapter 2 and title 2 which provides for the Department of Defense—military—a net total of \$4,290,842,000.

This amount includes funds to cover the military and civilian pay increases, increases in retired pay, postal rate increases, and defense claims. The largest item is for additional funds for military operations in Southeast Asia.

The supplemental budget estimates for fiscal year 1968 for the Department of Defense, military functions considered by the committee totaled \$4,626,811,000. The amount of new obligational authority recommended in this bill represents a decrease of \$335,696,000 below the estimate.

The gross amount recommended for the Department of Defense for military and civilian pay increases is \$630,007,000. Of this, \$470,107,000 is for military pay and \$159,900,000 is for civilian pay. These increases were authorized during the last session of Congress in Public Law 90-206, the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and Public Law 90-207, increasing the basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

To offset the total amount of new obligational authority that would otherwise have been needed for pay increases, reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-218, title 2, are being used. That law required that controllable programs for fiscal year 1968 be reduced below the President's budget, and it provides that amounts unused because of the limitation shall be used only for purposes prescribed by acts of the second session of the 90th Congress. This bill provides that \$136,558,000 of such reserves will be released to apply against military and civilian pay, which places the requirement for net new obligational authority in this bill at \$493,449,000.

Further releases of Public Law 90-218 reserves are also applied to offset additional Southeast Asia requirements and these will be discussed later.

Funds in the amount of \$4,293,000 are provided in the bill because of the postal rate increase which became effective January 1, 1968. There are funds in the bill for an additional \$8 million for the appropriation entitled "Claims—Defense," which reflects an additional requirement for fiscal year 1968 for non-contractual claims. This amount is transferred from the appropriation account entitled "Contingencies—Defense" which contained sufficient uncommitted funds; \$75 million is included for increased requirements for retired pay and an item of \$2 million for higher per diem payments to Reserve personnel as required by a law passed last year,

Public Law 90-168, the Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act.

The largest single item recommended is for additional new obligational authority in the net amount of \$3,791,100,000 to support our military operations in Southeast Asia.

Overall, however, the action contained in this bill actually represents a channeling of \$6,136,000,000 in additional appropriations for Southeast Asia operations. The total is made up of the \$3.79 billion in new obligational authority and \$2,345,000,000 as a release of reserves held pursuant to title 2 of Public Law 90-218.

As a result of this legislation the original request of the President for fiscal year 1968 of \$20.6 billion in appropriations for Southeast Asia requirements is increased to \$26.7 billion.

The additional Southeast Asia requirements in this supplemental appropriation bill are urgently needed for several reasons.

First, the original fiscal year 1968 budget as requested by the President was known to be inadequate when it was before the Congress last year. Further, the increased offensive actions taken by enemy forces has required us to respond with greater manpower and resources. The Tet offensive and the *Pueblo* incident have made it necessary to strengthen our defense posture in these areas and our operational readiness in general.

The additional requirements of \$6.1 billion, financed in part by releases from reserves, it is believed will cover the needs for the balance of this fiscal year 1968.

It provides for deployments overseas of additional military personnel and military units and their associated equipment.

Ground combat and combat support units from the Army and Marines as well as Air Force and Marine Corps tactical air units are to go, or have gone, to Vietnam.

A substantial number of aircraft and associated personnel and equipment were deployed to South Korea as a result of the *Pueblo* incident, and continue to be based there.

Army, Navy, and Air Force units from the Reserve Forces have been called to active duty. In total, approximately 39,500 personnel have been included in these Reserve Forces callups. Most of the units called up are intended to help replenish the Army's strategic reserve and the active Air Reserve held in the United States. However, some reservists now on active duty are for deployment to South Vietnam or will help offset deployments of regular units to Vietnam.

The procurement actions provide: equipment, and consumables for U.S. and allied ground forces; aircraft and helicopters to replace losses as well as to meet additional aircraft requirements; increased ammunition consumption for ground, naval, and air units; expediting procurement of items such as electronic countermeasures and surveillance equipment.

There are also funds to provide for higher aircraft maintenance requirements, including spares and repair parts,

a greater number of naval, air, and ground equipment overhauls, and transportation requirements which are now of considerably higher tonnages than previously estimated.

Actions are being undertaken to improve base storage facilities in Korea; replace various structures destroyed in Vietnam; and to increase our ammunition production base.

Members of the House of Representatives should recognize that it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain the exact total cost of the Southeast Asia military operations.

Members of the Subcommittee on Defense and the committee staff who have spent long hours and days, and who have followed the budget activities closely over all the months, are confronted with many difficulties.

This has been especially so as regards the current fiscal year.

To date the fiscal year 1968 Defense budget has been subjected to almost 150 official reprogramming actions, and additional internal transfers. The use of laws which permit exemption from the apportionment process, and exemption from authorizations and specific appropriations by Congress, and outright budgetary manipulations. This has created a situation which, in my opinion, unnecessarily inhibits the Congress from following the Defense budget in the detail that is necessary.

Recognizing those conditions, the committee has examined this request and the funding requirements as now stated in this bill in our opinion are needed.

In fact, most of the request is already obligated and being used. Our action today therefore is, to some degree, action after the fact.

To set the record straight, congressional action on this bill will authorize actions which the Department of Defense for the most part has already undertaken. The Department's actions were undertaken in accordance with reprogramming procedures or pursuant to the provision of certain laws which it felt compelled to use until this bill becomes law.

I believe it would be well to review some of the events of the past year in order to gain a more complete understanding of the contents and significance of this bill now before us.

Just a year ago, June 9, 1967, the Appropriations Committee report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968—Report No. 349—pointed out that the funding request for Southeast Asia was low. It stated:

The committee is, however, of the opinion that funds over and beyond those carried over from previous years, and those included in the pending bill, will probably be required for fiscal year 1968. The tempo and cost of the war in Southeast Asia are on an upward trend. If additional amounts are subsequently requested, they will of course be given a high priority.

On June 13, 1967, when the fiscal year 1968 bill was being debated here in the House of Representatives, I made the following statement about this problem:

Although the administration estimated that about \$20.6 billion of the budget will

be required for the war, the question properly asked: Will that be enough? The actual costs could well be running to a magnitude of \$25 to \$30 billion or more per year. . . . Recent statements by administration spokesmen, including the President, made after our hearings had concluded, indicate to me that the administration may have once again delayed a decision to realistically fund the war effort. . . . the President and the Secretary of Defense should submit such estimated funding needs before action on this bill is completed by the Congress.

From these statements it can be seen that members of the Appropriations Committee were already clearly of the opinion back a year ago that the administration had probably underestimated or understated to the Congress the fiscal year 1968 funding requirements for operations in Southeast Asia.

Furthermore, from such statements, it can be seen committee members called upon the administration 1 year ago to submit the known necessary funding needs to the Congress and to do so prior to the date that the Congress would complete its work on the fiscal year 1968 Defense appropriation bill.

The administration was aware of its understated Defense funding needs and was aware prior to the time the Congress completed action on the fiscal year 1968 Defense budget. On August 17, 1967 the President in his summary review of the 1968 budget described briefly the situation in regard to Defense expenditures and said that we must be prepared for additional expenditures in support of our combat forces. He said at that time changes could "increase defense expenditures in fiscal 1968 by up to \$4 billion."

Though the President made that statement August 17, 1967, 6 weeks before the fiscal year 1968 Defense appropriation bill was signed into law, no requests to the Congress were made by the administration for additional new obligatory authority to adequately finance Southeast Asia military operations.

By November 1, 1967, because the administration failed to correctly state Defense needs to the Congress, former Secretary of Defense McNamara was forced to notify the Congress that the operation and maintenance accounts for all the services had, on October 27—4 days previously—been exempted by the President from the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended—31 U.S.C. 665.

This exemption was a device whereby the Department was able to obligate funds that would normally have to be apportioned in such manner as to assure their coverage of requirements for the entire fiscal year 1968. Still no additional new obligatory authority was requested at that time.

In a letter to me of November 25, 1967, Assistant Secretary of Defense Anthony elaborated on the administration's October 27 exemption action. In part he said:

During the latter part of October, it was ascertained that the amounts in the accounts, as appropriated, were inadequate and accordingly a request was made by the Secretary of Defense to the President for an exemption of these accounts from apportionment. The additional funds required in the Operation and Maintenance accounts are primarily due to expenses being incurred in-

cident to the activities directly related to Vietnam.

It was obvious only 30 days after the 1968 fiscal year bill passed that the Department of Defense was short of funds.

On February 12, 1968, the President sent a proposed "Revisions of Department of Defense Appropriations, 1968"—Document No. 255—to Congress. This revision, as former Secretary McNamara testified on February 14, 1968, was not a request for additional funds but a transfer of funds between accounts. This was 3 months after the civilian and military pay bills were passed, 3 weeks after the *Pueblo* seizure on January 23, 1968, and about 2 weeks after the Tet offensive had been underway. Each of these clearly indicated the need for additional funding.

On March 5, 1968, section 3679, Revised Statutes was again employed when the Director of the Bureau of the Budget notified the Speaker of the House that section 3679 was to be used because funds for the military and civilian pay increases had not been included in the fiscal year 1968 budget. Again no supplemental request.

Finally on March 11, 1968, a supplemental request—House Document No. 274—which included \$167.4 million in obligatory authority for the Department of Defense, was sent to the Congress. It provided for some civilian pay increases and an \$8 million request to cover increased claims. However, it should be noted that no funds were requested at that time to provide increases in military personnel accounts which were required by the military pay bill.

Culminating the delaying and stalling tactics, on May 13, 1968, the Department of Defense resorted to the most unusual and, in my view, the most drastic of actions. The Deputy Secretary of Defense authorized deficiencies to be incurred in the operation and maintenance accounts of the four services for fiscal year 1968 military appropriations under the provisions of a law which dates back over 107 years. In other words, the Department authorized the use of funds in those accounts without specific authorization and specific appropriation by the Congress.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense, Nitze, on that date, May 13, 1968, sent a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in which the Speaker was told "you are hereby notified" of the action. The Speaker was thereby notified that the Deputy Secretary was invoking a provision of a seldom-used law.

It is a law which was originally put on the statute books March 2, 1861, and as far as I have been able to determine this is only the second instance in the past 20 years in which this authority has been invoked. This law reads:

REVISED STATUTE 3732, AS AMENDED
(41 U.S.C. 11)

11. No contracts or purchases unless authorized or under adequate appropriation; report to the Congress.

(a) No contract or purchase on behalf of the United States shall be made, unless the same is authorized by law or is under an appropriation adequate to its fulfillment, except in the Departments of the Army, Navy,

and Air Force, for clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, transportation, or medical and hospital supplies, which, however, shall not exceed the necessities of the current year.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall immediately advise the Congress of the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) of this section, and shall report quarterly on the estimated obligations incurred pursuant to the authority granted in Subsection (a) of this section. As amended October 15, 1966, Pub. L. 89-687, Title VI, Article 612(e), 80 Stat. 993.

By May 13, therefore, an official in the Department of Defense had authorized deficiencies to be incurred in fiscal year 1968 operation and maintenance appropriations for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force.

In addition to the above cited actions, there were several emergency reprogramming actions approved by the cognizant committees of Congress prior to and pending the enactment of this supplemental request which is before the House today. These reprogramming actions temporarily diverted resources from previously approved non-Southeast Asia 1968 programs. The funds which were used in this way are to be restored to those programs with passage of this bill.

The main content of the Department of Defense funds requested in the bill now before the House was sent to Congress on May 21 and was among the three communications involving Defense funding which the President addressed to the Congress in the 2 days, May 21 and May 22. Therefore, it was not until May 22 that the total additional estimated fiscal year 1968 Defense funding needs were requested.

The Department of Defense in order to get funds to meet our commitments in Southeast Asia, has stretched out, cut back, changed or canceled other non-Southeast Asia programs vital to our future security.

For an example, the Office of Secretary of Defense required the Army to cut \$100 million of fiscal year 1968 funds from R.D.T. & E. programs which had been previously justified to and appropriated by the Congress.

On February 21, 1968, when the Army's Chief of Research and Development was before the subcommittee I said to him that certain of the cuts in programs appeared to have been very arbitrary, just to find some money. To that General Betts replied:

Indeed we did just have to find some money. What we did was to go through the Army research, development, test and evaluation program totally, studying many possibilities, discussed them with Dr. Foster and his staff, and eventually came up with this distribution of items that made up the \$100 million total. (P. 670, pt. I, fiscal year 1969 hearings.)

The Congress realizes the necessity of giving the Department of Defense certain funding flexibility because world events do affect Defense needs. Emergency funds and other fiscal authority therefore has been granted by the Congress to the Department of Defense in order to provide flexibility to meet unbudgeted and unanticipated events, and to permit the executive and legislative branches the time to react to such events. This flex-

ibility is particularly required for emergencies when the Congress is not in session. However, the present administration has used this authority in the broadcast context and even while the Congress was in session.

The Department of Defense and the military services have thousands upon thousands of fiscal officers. The Department of Defense also has been provided with, and has access to, the world's largest concentration of electronics computers, including the most sophisticated.

Huge costs are incurred by the Department when it assembles essential budgetary data. But when fiscal resources are employed for budgetary juggling purposes, just to make ends meet, it can result in an utter waste of time and energy and funds. I know of no tabulation of the Defense resources which have been dissipated in such manner but in my opinion such waste must have been considerable and again adversely reflects on Defense management as practiced in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone to some length in discussing the actions by the officials in the Department of Defense. The reason I have done so is to point out how desperately the Department of Defense needs these funds. The requirement for additional funds is before us today because the administration has refused to face up to the necessity to make adequate and timely appraisals of the defense needs of our Nation, not only just for our operations in Southeast Asia but for our worldwide commitment now and in the 1970's.

The record shows it has taken the administration many months to request the required additional funds which it had known months ago would be needed. But the administration seems to have used almost every device at its disposal in order to avoid making a full statement of Defense funding needs for fiscal year 1968.

The record points up the financial manipulating that has been going on and draws attention to the quality of the fiscal leadership that is being provided in the Department of Defense. It is in need of improvement.

The record does show the administration needs the additional funds to meet our commitment in Southeast Asia as provided in this bill H.R. 17734.

To me it is clear that the Congress should have long ago been requested to provide these funds in order to provide a better administered Defense program.

The defense of the country should not be based on short-range, patchwork, fiscal planning.

Sound military plans and decisions cannot be based on unsound budget decisions or on indecisions.

Our military forces are performing valiantly and effectively. Our support of this bill will finance the equipment and supplies they require.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me address myself to that part of the bill H.R. 17734

which is really the overwhelming part of the bill, relating to Southeast Asia. As I calculate the amount of money proposed in this bill for military operations in Southeast Asia, it amounts to two-thirds of the total amount of the bill.

The bill itself provides, according to the statement of the distinguished chairman, for approximately \$9 billion. That is \$8.930 billion, and out of that the amount to be allocated for Southeast Asia is a total of \$6.1 billion. That is \$3.791 billion for the emergency fund for Southeast Asia, and \$2.345 billion to be released from Public Law 90-218 reserves, making a total of \$6.1 billion. Therefore, two-thirds of this supplemental appropriation is for the war in Vietnam.

It is regrettable that the real crux of this request is not presented to us as a single proposition, instead of being tied in with requests for supplemental appropriations for other agencies, and for some very important social programs.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the proposition that this is basically a bill to appropriate \$6 billion for the escalation of the war in Southeast Asia.

I was interested to read at page 737 of the hearings that, although the planned total of military personnel for Vietnam had been understood to be 525,000, it is now the intention of the administration to increase that to 549,000, and, as a matter of fact, to have in place by June 30 in Southeast Asia 517,000.

So it is perfectly clear that our commitment of manpower is increasing at the very time we are engaged in negotiations in Paris.

Mr. Chairman, for 4 years this war has steadily escalated. For 4 years its cost has been underestimated, and for the fourth time in 4 years the administration is before the Congress with a request for supplemental funds.

This happened in 1965, 1966, 1967, and now again in 1968.

Because of the unpopularity of this war, an American President, who was elected 4 years ago by a great landslide, made the decision to withdraw as a candidate for reelection. This act, which he characterized as "taking the quest for peace out of politics," in a very real sense took the continuation of the war out of politics. By removing himself from the political arena as a target for dissatisfaction with the war, the war itself has been insulated from criticism.

But men continue to die, the devastation of those we would save persists, the domestic budget continues to be drained. It is as if the Vietnam war has become a permanent and inevitable fixture in American life, like the interminable, remote warfare predicted in Orwell's 1984.

Although the critics have lately gained a measure of respectability as events bear out their predictions and lipservice is paid to their concerns, the war continues to grow. We have seen the effect of this war on the fragile East-West detente which achieved a beginning in 1963. We have seen how massive American violence, visited on a small nation, has lost us the respect of many of our friends. We have seen the war's divisive effect on our own citizens and the growing scar-

city of funds for domestic needs; this at a time when our problems at home reach crisis proportions. And perhaps too few of us have recognized the brutalizing effect of this war on our own consciousness—the subtle implementation of the idea that violence may be viewed as a "solution."

How can one justify raining greater bomb tonnage than was dropped on all theaters during World War II on a nation the size of Vietnam? How can one justify rendering millions of civilians lifeless or homeless? Nothing justifies the demented logic of the statement "we have to destroy the town to save it," which has become the symbolic essence of our presence in Vietnam.

Beginning in the early 1960's the military strategists embraced a theory known as flexible response or limited war. It replaced an older theory of massive retaliation. It was the presumption of this theory that the Pax Americana could be threatened by brush-fire wars in which the threat of massive nuclear retaliation would be neither viable nor credible. Therefore, reasoned the theorists, under the umbrella of the nuclear deterrent, limited wars would be fought for limited objectives, at limited cost. Escalation could be carefully controlled, and force would be applied only to the extent required to put down the brush fires.

This theory held a tragic and fatal flaw—it overlooked the military mind which does not think in terms of political goals—it assumed that the United States could defeat any conceivable foe under any circumstances—it failed to consider what would happen if we faced military stalemate.

The outcome of this policy and of our shortness of vision is Vietnam—a war where issues and realities are obscure, where our allies have virtually no popular following while the adversary has substantial support. Each infusion of force has been parried, and we have responded with new escalations "so that these dead shall not have died in vain." The architects of the flexible response theory failed to consider the political and military consequences of stalemate; an endless series of incremental escalations with the constant assurance that the next increment will turn the tide.

Thus, each year, the scope and cost of the war has increased. Each increment is viewed as limited and tolerable, like the losing poker player who will risk a little more in hope of winning back what he has lost. When the poker chips were Vietnamese peasants, the game was dismal enough, but now in addition the stability of our own society is at stake. There is increasing alienation and unrest among young and old in America. The war has created an economic drain that has seriously jeopardized our international monetary position and forced the administration to accept major reductions in its own domestic programs while burdening its citizens with an additional and regressive tax.

Today, the administration is requesting an additional \$6.1 billion for Southeast Asia—\$3.8 billion through a supplemental appropriation and \$2.3 billion through a transferral of funds pursuant to Public Law 90-218. The additional \$6.1

billion represents an increase of more than 25 percent over the \$23.7 billion which the Congress already appropriated for military operations in Southeast Asia for fiscal year 1968. The amount by which the administration underestimated 1 year's cost of the Vietnam war is more than three times what we spend to eradicate poverty, and more than twice what we spend on housing and urban development. It is greater than the total estimated cost of a national guaranteed income program.

For the fourth time in 4 years the House, faced with an appropriation request for specific earmarked funds to permit escalation of the Vietnam war, has an opportunity to vote on the administration's policy.

Each year I have urged the House to seize the opportunity—the only effective opportunity to make its views known.

In 1964 I urged a specific strategy for the neutralization of Southeast Asia to avoid the broadening of the developing conflict. But the conflict was broadened. In 1965 I argued against the Americanization of the war and the adoption of the policy of escalation. But the war was Americanized and escalated. In 1966 I tried again to point to the policy choices confronting us. But the choice of continued escalation was made. In 1967 I called again for renewed diplomatic efforts and an end to the bombings in the north. But diplomacy was not our policy and military efforts and the bombings continued and intensified. Throughout it all I urged that we seek a negotiated political settlement. But the pursuit of a pure military victory continued increasingly to dominate our efforts.

Last year I voted against the entire defense appropriation bill because it was so heavily laced with funds for continued escalation of the war. My position was the same this year. Yet, even though more have joined me in this effort through the years, and although the national opposition to the war has clearly intensified, it has had little or no effect on the administration's policy.

Only this morning General Westmoreland for the first time admitted that a military victory could not be achieved in the classical sense.

I would hope that, when the bill is open for amendment under the 5-minute rule, there would be support for an amendment which would strike from this bill the \$6.1 billion for Southeast Asia. I understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] will offer such an amendment. If that does not prevail, then I intend to offer a motion to recommit to eliminate those funds from the bill if I have the opportunity.

Only through the appropriation process can we have any kind of leverage on foreign policy in the House of Representatives.

If we are concerned with the continuation of this war—if we are concerned with its continuing escalation—if we are concerned with the fact that we have not achieved any semblance of peace so far through negotiations, then it is time to call a halt through the power of the purse which after all is the only way that Members of the House of Repre-

sentatives can express their opinion on foreign policy.

That is why during the past 4 years I have opposed supplemental appropriation bills for military operations in Southeast Asia. We again have the opportunity. A lot has happened in this country since we last voted on the question of escalation in Southeast Asia, all of us are aware of it—and now is the time to take action.

If the parliamentary situation does not permit a separate vote on this issue, then I am prepared to vote against the entire appropriation since two-thirds of it is earmarked for Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that in addition to the major thrust of this supplemental appropriation bill, which provides funding for escalation of the war in Vietnam, that there is included in the bill additional routine funding of various domestic programs, which domestic programs I, of course, support.

If these domestic program funding items were in a separate bill, as they normally are and should be, I would vote in support of this supplemental bill—but such is not the case.

Mr. Chairman, as I did on May 5, 1965, again on March 1, 1966, and again on March 2, 1967, I must once more rise in opposition to a request for supplemental funds to pursue the war in Vietnam. All that I have said before on these occasions could be repeated and reaffirmed now. It is true now and it was true then, that "we pursue a futile attempt to achieve, by force of arms, solutions to problems which are not primarily military but essentially political, economic, and social."

The cost in lives, in human sacrifice and suffering, in dollars which could be more wisely and humanely spent and in terms of the almost irreparable damage we do the fabric of our own free society, must cause us to reassess the role we have assumed, for whatever reason, in Vietnam.

At a time when this Nation, mourning the tragic death of one of its vital, young leaders, seeks answers to the causes of violence within our society, is it not apparent to all but those who dare not see, that this war bears great responsibility for the atmosphere in which we find ourselves? By our conduct, we have affirmed that in the affairs of nations, war and violence are acceptable instruments in solving differences. Is it any wonder that in the affairs of men, resorting to violence becomes more frequent?

Do we not collectively bear some responsibility for demeaning the value of human life by our actions, which in the first 5 months of this year cost 8,342 Americans, 8,645 South Vietnamese and 107,941 Vietcong and North Vietnamese lives? Are we not as a people and as a society brutalized by so gigantic a slaughter of humanity?

The numbers continue to rise. U.S. casualties for the period 1960 through 1964 were 255 fatalities, an average of approximately four per month. In 1965 they rose to 1,365 or about 114 per month.

1966 saw 5,008 deaths, average 417 per month. In 1967 the toll rose to 9,378 averaging 781 per month. Through May of this year, U.S. fatalities totaled 8,342—an average of 1,668 American deaths per month.

Even as we have moved to the conference table the scale of the war we wage continues to escalate, to become more brutal. As negotiations commenced in Paris on May 13, U.S. combat deaths for the period May 12 to June 1 were 1,409 and 8,339 wounded in that same period.

In a war that General Westmoreland just this week said could not be won in the classic military sense, we continue to sacrifice our youth and brutalize our society.

In a decade which opened with hope and promise, we have seen, in large measure, that hope give way to despair and promises remain unfulfilled as more and more of our resources were drained for war.

The efforts to rebuild our cities have been diminished as moneys are spent to destroy cities and the countryside of Vietnam.

The efforts to relieve suffering and the ravages of poverty in our own society have been subjected to curtailment and cutbacks as the drain of dollars for the war has taken its toll.

We can know the direct Defense Department expenditures on the war but the additional costs of this policy are incalculable; 1965 saw \$103 million spent on the war, 1966 \$5.8 billion, 1967 \$20.1 billion, and conservative estimates for 1968 project an expenditure of \$28.1 billion, which many believe will be as high as \$30 billion.

Troop strength reflects this same escalation. On May 5, 1965, when I voted against the first supplemental appropriation, we had 42,000 men in Vietnam. At the end of 1965 we had 165,000 men committed in Vietnam. There were 389,000 in 1966. There were 486,000 in 1967 and 533,000 as of June 1, 1968.

American wounded figures reflect this same continuing upward spiral; 6,110 wounded in 1965, 30,093 wounded in 1966, 62,004 wounded in 1967, 50,470 wounded during the first 5 months this year.

Yet with this continuing expenditure of money, increasing commitment of troops, the wounding of more and more men, the loss of more and more lives, we continue to sink deeper and deeper into this conflict. Even now as negotiations take place we are asked today to vote more funds for war.

Can we hope that negotiations will be fruitful in the face of this action?

Let us pause and reflect on the course that we pursue, the price we have already paid, and the apparently open-ended commitment we are repeatedly asked to supplement.

Is it not time to say let us disengage?

Is it not time to act in such a way as to deescalate the conflict?

How much more of the lifeblood of this Nation must be shed?

How many more needs of our people must go unmet and promises of a better life go unfulfilled?

How long must we wait before we heed

the voices of men and women of good will who across this Nation call for peace?

It is my conscience and their voice which I respond to today in once again voting against funds to pursue and extend this conflict.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, the one point I want to make is that those of us who favor Medicaid—who favor salary increases for military and Federal employees—but who do not favor the war in Vietnam, are embarrassed by the combination in this bill of appropriations proposed to be made for all of these diverse programs.

I merely want to say that, if I have the opportunity, I will certainly vote for Medicaid payments, and for military salary increases and other benefits provided in this bill. But I have some reservations—considerable reservations—about voting to encourage further military activity in Southeast Asia, and for that reason I intend to offer an amendment which will eliminate from the bill those funds provided for Southeast Asia.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, in this bill is the sum of \$3,101,000 to cover the additional meat inspection costs incurred during the present fiscal year as a result of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, which authorizes the Department to provide technical and financial assistance to increase the quality of State inspection programs and to extend Federal inspection to certain establishments previously exempt from Federal inspection, and to improve surveillance of foreign plants exporting meat to the United States. This will bring to a total for the fiscal year 1968 something, in a rounded-off figure, of \$60 million for meat inspection.

On Monday, May 27, I happened to be tuned in to the well-known commentator, Mr. Chet Huntley, who had some very appropriate remarks to make with respect to the so-called Wholesome Meat Act. To begin his remarks on that particular evening Mr. Huntley quoted Dr. Oscar Sussman, doctor of veterinary medicine at Rutgers University, the State university of New Jersey, as follows:

The "Wholesome Meat Act of 1967" is a fraud. It is an expensive, unproductive extension of Federal and State bureaucracy, an unnecessary and perhaps institutional invasion of States' responsibilities and rights. Most important the Act is misleading to the consuming public, if the objective is to prevent disease transmission and thus promote the public health.

Another quote from Dr. Sussman which Chet Huntley used, was as follows:

In recent weeks Betty Furness and Ralph Nader, two self-styled protectors of the "public weal" have led a bandwagon of mob psychologists and public relations experts in clobbering one of the major food industries of the U.S. most thoroughly.

Further quoting from Dr. Sussman:

The worst aspect of the situation caused by Mr. Nader and Miss Furness is that the public has been lulled into a false sense of security. The U.S. housewife now believes

"U.S. Inspected" meat and poultry products are free of disease and harmful bacteria. This is false.

Then Mr. Chet Huntley went on to say—

That's where the deception lies. U.S. inspectors are now descending upon new segments of the meat trade and the public has been sold the false notion that "U.S. Inspected" is a guarantee of cleanliness. What the housewife must know is that anything could happen to a piece of meat after it is inspected. So this whole new inspection program is a farce in an attempt to guarantee cleanliness at only an early stage of meat distribution.

Further, there was no need for the Federal program's extension into new areas. As Dr. Sussman said, there is no evidence of any untoward results from having eaten non-inspected, locally-inspected, or State-inspected meats in this country.

Further quoting Mr. Chet Huntley:

Now, meat wholesalers in New York and other cities are being thrown out of business because their buildings or equipment cannot meet the arbitrary standards demanded by Federal inspectors whose rules have not even been established. But there they are, forcing small houses out of business.

Here is one of their arbitrary rules: no sawdust on the floors for certain types of establishments. If a side of beef should fall off a hook the Federal inspectors demand that it fall on a greasy floor rather than into harmless sawdust.

In New York, this reporter knows, truck drivers and other employees of the wholesale district are now quitting their jobs to become Federal inspectors and they talk openly of the "fringe benefits". The fringe benefits are monies under the table in return for that misleading inspection stamp.

This is what the Wholesome Meat Act has turned loose on the country, at a cost of millions of dollars.

I certainly would have to agree with the observation relative to the cost of millions of dollars for this program.

The National Observer, under date of Monday, May 20, published a very interesting article entitled "Flimflam and the Federal Man—Tainted Meat and Tainted Evidence," in which they ran a rather extensive inquiry of those meat inspectors that had been asked to hurriedly gather up, within a 24-hour period of time, or 30 hours, all the information they could gather that would goad Congress into moving swiftly on expanding meat inspection as we did last year.

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, having taken the lead from that article, I used it as a base for a line of interrogation of witnesses in support of this supplemental request. This will be found beginning on page 660 of the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill. I will ask later for permission to insert the complete article in these remarks including a devastating memorandum that I should like to refer to now.

It was just completely shocking to members of the subcommittee to find that this kind of memorandum from a public official could be so written. Let me give you just a few excerpts from it. It was supposedly a memorandum conceived by one of the district directors in the Dallas

compliance area. He issued a memorandum titled "Special Project Q.Q. & C.—Quick, Quiet, and Confidential." In other words, it meant, get all the information you possibly can quickly, quietly and confidentially, so that we can communicate it to Washington to get to the individual Members of Congress and tell them how drastic a need there is for this legislation.

Quoting from this memorandum:

Effective immediately, we are to discontinue all other C. & E.S. work and devote full time (plus any overtime necessary to effectively complete this assignment) . . .

The information we will gather at non-federally inspected (NFI) plants in this effort is to be used at congressional hearings now being held in connection with the proposed amendment (H.R. 6168) to the Meat Inspection Act.

Quoting from another section:

You are to gain entrance into NFI plants under the guise of (a) meeting local inspection personnel to gain cooperation in our normal C. & E.S. work, (b) discussing our denaturing and decharacterizing requirements with management, (c) etc. This should be done quickly and quietly in such a manner that no one is aware of the real purpose of your visit. This will require a very discreet approach and may tax your imagination.

Then another sentence in that memorandum says:

Plants selected for this survey will be those in which you would expect to find the most discrepancies. In other words, look for "horrible examples."

In other words, they were to look for "horrible examples."

A further reading from another section of this memorandum is as follows:

In your reports of plant "surveys" it is suggested you use dramatic, graphic terms with impact, such as cancer eye, pus, manure, disease, excreta, cockroaches, rats, flies, loose paint, cobwebs, . . .

And so it continues.

I found out in the interrogation of the witnesses that instead of just four inspectors being detailed to this work, there were 27 in total. These surveys were to be conducted in 35 States within a 24-hour period. I asked that the record be complete with all the names of the plants that were visited and what they found wrong with those plants to arrive at some of these conclusions.

Our subcommittee felt in all fairness to these plants that have been listed among the 203, that we would not include them in the RECORD at this point until we have had an opportunity to go back and afford them the courtesy and privilege of responding to our inquiry as to just what kind of inspection was made of their particular plant. I have been advised within the last day or two that of the 203 plants that were supposedly investigated, and about which all these scurrilous things were said and repeated without any foundation on the floor of the House, only five violations were noted in all this investigation through 35 States. Bear in mind we are talking about a total of 15,000 processing and meat slaughtering plants throughout the country.

The country and this Congress were indeed flimflammed by this hasty "survey" of a mere handful of plants.

It seems to me this is a very appro-

appropriate time to bring this out in the open. I would call the attention of all Members particularly to those pages in the hearing record beginning with page 660, and ask you to read for yourselves how this Congress can be flimflammed, as we were, by the executive branch using their snoopers at taxpayers expense to build a case for public consumption.

Mr. Chairman, I place the article and memorandum previously referred to in the RECORD at this point:

[From The National Observer, May 20, 1968]

TAINTED MEAT AND TAINTED EVIDENCE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Agents of the Federal Government fanned out across the nation last July under urgent and explicit instructions from Washington to gather examples of horrid conditions in meat-processing plants not under U.S. Government control.

Swiftly and often with calculated deception, the Federal men got what they were ordered to get. Their findings, which were widely accepted as factual and unbiased Government inspection reports, painted a picture of widespread filth in meat handling. These reports were later to be used as undisputed authority for scare stories that frightened the public and helped stampede Congress into passage of a new and tougher Federal meat-inspection law—the Whole-some Meat Act of 1967.

What can now be confirmed is the nasty fact that the "evidence" gathered last July was deliberately biased, that the tainted reports were used to mislead Congress and the public, that they put a lie in the mouth of President Johnson, duped a large number of well-meaning people, including Ralph Nader and Betty Furness, and did a superb con job on much of the nation's press.

FINDINGS CHALLENGED

The stench of the filthy-meat survey began seeping out belatedly early this year when state and industry officials challenged the authenticity of some of the inspectors' findings. An investigation by this newspaper revealed that U.S. inspectors had, indeed, fudged on some facts [The National Observer, Jan. 29, 1968] and that other reports were doctored in Washington to make them sound even more damning than they were [The National Observer, Feb. 12, 1968].

The Observer's inquiry uncovered the fact that a written memorandum with explicit instructions to field inspectors did exist. Officials in Washington admitted as much but refused to release it. After months of determined efforts, including legal action, by this newspaper, the Agriculture Department finally agreed last week to give a copy of the memorandum to The National Observer. The contents of this remarkable document, which the Agriculture Department admits reflects the substance of its orders to field inspectors, are published in full on Page 12.

The memorandum was written by Wilbur F. Michael, officer in charge of the Dallas area compliance and evaluation staff, which is the investigative arm of the USDA's meat-inspection service. It was to serve as a guide for the activities of three field inspectors: John Halverson, based in Dallas; Joseph J. Barrett in Denver; and Matias Ramos in San Antonio.

Entitled "Special Project QQ&C (Quick, Quiet and Confidential)," the memo instructed agents to use guile in entering plants not under Federal supervision, to select plants "in which you would expect to find the most discrepancies," to look for "horrible examples" of unsanitary conditions in those plants, and to describe them "in dramatic, graphic terms with impact, such as cancer-eye, pus, manure, disease, excreta, cockroaches, rats, flies, loose paint, cobwebs, rust, grease, overhead dripping sewer lines, toilet facilities, mice, flour, excess water, chemicals, excess fat, etc., instead of other more acceptable terms."

A sense of urgency was emphasized because, as the memo put it, the information "is to be used at Congressional hearings now being held. . . ." The memo, dated July 27, 1967, which was a Thursday, instructed the agents to get into plants in five states—Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Colorado, and Arkansas—write their reports, and send them directly to Washington. By Wednesday, August 2.

The compliance officers complied—swiftly and predictably.

Out of Oklahoma flew reports of seven inspections by Mr. Barrett. A random, not untypical sample of the report on one plant: "Stagnant water stood in bloody puddles all over the place. The walls were covered with grime grease and mould. One beef carcass had an infected brisket and another had a large knee joint which appeared to be arthritic. A butcher was boning out a beef round which had sour bone and the meat near the bone was greenish colored."

In addition to covering plants in Oklahoma, Mr. Barrett managed in the brief period to hustle through inspections of nine plants in Colorado and file reports of a similar nature on each of them.

REPORTS FROM TEXAS

Out of Texas came reports of five inspections by Mr. Ramos. A random, not untypical sample of the information in one: "Edible meat drums were very dirty, contaminated with rust and the inside showed a very poor job of washing. Some of the lips were broken with meat imbedded in. The paint on all walls is flaking off, some was evident on hanging beef foreshanks. Hair, bruises, and kill dirt was also noticed on these carcasses. Flies were swarming on the back door. Spitting on the floor by an employee was noted."

In addition to covering plants in Texas Mr. Ramos managed to file similar inspection reports on conditions in three plants in Louisiana.

Inspector Halverson sent in reports on inspections in four Arkansas plants. Sample: "Large numbers of flies in processing room. No coverings over the mixers. Knocked down boxes were placed and piled on floor, toilet rooms were in an unsanitary condition; no ventilation in toilets."

A FLOOD OF REPORTS

And so it went. All told, the order from Washington rapidly produced reports of inspections with derogatory comments of one sort or another on 183 plants in 38 states. Nobody made much effort to tell Congress or the public that these were plants specially and hastily selected to prove a point. On the contrary, the implication was floated time and time again that the findings of the "survey" were generally representative of conditions in the 15,000 meat plants not under Federal supervision. Indeed, even the astute and knowledgeable Rep. Thomas S. Foley, Washington Democrat, referred approvingly in Senate hearings to the USDA report as "current and comprehensive." And he was by no means alone in believing this.

The reports themselves, all of which have now been made available to The Observer, vary widely in length and quality. Some are little more than brief, generalized statements. Others run on at some length in a chatty, informal manner with a high content of irrelevancies. One for example, offers the unexpected information that breweries do not knowingly permit females during the menstrual period to enter certain phases of the brewing procedure. "How do I know?" rhetorically asks the writer. "I had a friend who was a salesman for a brewery, and he told me so."

The actual names and locations of the plants inspected have been deleted by the department. While this is standard practice in many regulatory agencies of Government, it imposes a difficult detective job on anyone outside the agency who might have doubts about the accuracy of reports and seeks to

check them out independently. Thus they have the aura of anonymous authority, offering no opportunity for the accused or the skeptic to dispute the findings.

Mr. Michael's written instructions, of course, went to only three field inspectors. In a letter accompanying the release of the memo to The National Observer, Rodney E. Leonard, administrator in Washington of the Consumer and Marketing Service, states that the memorandum "was issued by a subordinate field official, and that certain parts of it did not represent the policy or instructions of this Service."

But in an interview here last week, Mr. Leonard acknowledged that the memo did, in fact, reflect the "substance" of instructions telephoned to all field officers from Washington.

"The men were told," he says, "to arrive at the plants unannounced, ask for permission to enter without stating their purpose, and, if admitted, to record their factual observations. We are satisfied that they carried out this mission and accomplished this goal without any improper conduct, without any substantive inaccuracies, and without being underhanded about it."

DIFFERENCES IN STANDARDS

The standards that Marketing Service officials set for judging conduct, inaccuracies, and underhandedness are, of course, their own. But there's ample evidence to conclude that those standards are not widely shared, especially by those people who were being slyly investigated.

It should be noted, first off, that Federal inspectors had no jurisdiction last summer over state-inspected packing plants. (They do now, as a result of the law signed last Dec. 15.) Nonetheless, Mr. Michael's memo clearly directs Federal inspectors "to gain entrance into non-Federally-inspected plants . . . under the guise of (a) meeting local inspection personnel to gain co-operation in our normal C&ES work (b) discussing our denaturing and decharacterizing requirements with management, (c) etc."

The fact that an inspector sometimes could not get into a plant did not deter him from submitting a report anyway. For example, Mr. Barrett reports thus on a locked-up plant in Oklahoma: "The exterior of the premises was filthy and stinking. I moved a meat barrel containing meat scrap and a rat jumped out and nearly knocked my hat off. I noticed that the rat entered the rear of subject plant."

Included in the batch of current reports last summer was one about a Colorado plant that, it developed, had been closed at least nine months earlier. The inspector later explained that he had been told it was all right to include plants he had inspected in the "recent" past. He said his inspection of that particular plant had been made in November 1966, a year before his findings were published in the Congressional Record by an obviously impressed congressman.

The managers of some plants cited in inspectors' reports insisted that they did not even know a Federal inspector had been on their premises. And, in at least one instance, an inspector conceded that he stayed in his car and did not enter a plant that his report later criticized. He said he had been in the plant a week earlier and so knew the conditions there.

During The Observer inquiry last February, it was discovered, too, that field reports from some inspectors had been edited by a ghost in Washington who deleted complimentary passages and thus made reports sound more critical than they really were.

All the reports flowed into Washington just as a House Agriculture subcommittee was completing work on a milder version of what later became the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. Predictably, the reports began filtering out in a manner calculated to make headlines. News accounts giving

stomach-turning details of the "survey" were published and broadcast as gospel. There were, again predictably, cries of outrage by housewives, consumer groups, labor organizations, and editorialists over the fresh evidence of filthy meat. Lost in the furor were protests by many state officials that the reports were grossly exaggerated, misleading, unfair, and that some were outright fabrications.

"Nobody had any idea of the explosive impact these reports were going to have," Mr. Leonard asserted last week. "Our goal was simply to demonstrate that despite all the new state and local meat-inspection laws that had been enacted there was relatively little improvement in actually enforcing those laws."

There is no dispute among people with knowledge of the meat industry that unsanitary conditions do exist. Nor with the contention that the American consumer deserves to be protected against the health dangers that may lurk in filthy meat products. There is a basic philosophical and practical disagreement, however, over whether the meat-inspection job can be done better by a corps of Federal inspectors with Federal powers and authority rather than state and local officials. These arguments, however, have been made rather academic since the passage of the new law. What is not academic, at least in a democratic society, is whether the means adopted to obtain Federal inspection justify that end.

When the House version of the meat-inspection bill came to the floor for debate late in October, the House Agriculture Committee's report carried long excerpts from the quickie July investigation. These excerpts appeared in the "supplemental views" of five committee members, led by Representative Foley, who contended the bill had to be strengthened in view of the bad conditions revealed by the reports.

In the debate on the House floor, speaker after speaker rose to support the bill, citing the fresh Federal reports again and again. The White House, silent up to then on the bill, sent Miss Furness on a speaking tour to plug the Administration's consumer-protection legislation, including the meat-inspection bill. Both she and Mr. Nader, the safety consultant, repeatedly cited the USDA reports as evidence of the need for mandatory Federal meat inspection.

THE HEART OF THE BILL

On Oct. 31, the House passed its meat-inspection bill by a vote of 403 to 28. The heart of that bill provided mainly that Federal matching funds would be made available to the states to encourage them to upgrade their meat-inspection systems.

But by the time a Senate Agriculture subcommittee began hearings on a similar proposal on Nov. 9, Administration leaders and their allies on Capitol Hill decided to push for a much stronger measure. During four days of hearings, witnesses and senators referred to the USDA's July survey no fewer than 35 times. One of the witnesses was Mr. Leonard of the Consumer and Marketing Services, who thoughtfully brought along three staff investigators who had participated in the summer survey. The kindly questioning, mostly by Sen. Walter F. Mondale, Minnesota Democrat, elicited from each of the investigators generalized comments on what they had found. The questioning, for example, of Edward Chizek, a compliance officer brought in from Omaha, went like this:

"Senator Mondale. Now, in your studies and surveys, you found instances of practices that fell substantially below the Federal meat-inspection standards in these intrastate plants; is that correct?"

"Mr. Chizek. Yes, sir.

"Senator Mondale. Would you give a few examples, if you will?"

"Mr. Chizek. I did not visit any slaughtering plants. These were basically processing plants that I visited in 1967 and so the defi-

ciencies there were mainly in the nature of additives and poor sanitation.

"Senator Mondale. Would you give a few examples?"

"Mr. Chizek. More specific than that?"

"Senator Mondale. Yes.

"Mr. Chizek. This was in the summer months—in July. And some of the screenings were off these buildings, flies were abundantly present, mold and slime present on the ceilings and walls of various coolers, debris and trash lying freely about in some of the operating areas as well as storage areas.

"Employees not being required to wear any type of washable clothing. Equipment left to sit overnight at room temperatures, or perhaps even longer periods without any adequate sanitation procedures—to be used again the following morning."

A TOUGHER PROPOSAL

The bill that emerged Nov. 27 for debate on the Senate floor was tougher than the House-passed version. It required the states to match Federal meat-inspection standards, and enforce them, within two years or face Federal take-over of the state inspection job. Matching funds to help the states improve their own systems were authorized. Involved were all 15,000 plants not then subject to Federal meat-inspection regulations because they weren't engaged in interstate commerce.

As Mr. Michael's memo indicates, inspectors also had been told to get samples of non-Federally inspected meat products on sale in retail food stores. These samples, it has been learned, were sent to USDA meat-inspection laboratories for analysis. A total of only 162 samples collected from around the land were tested. Of these, 39 products met all Federal meat-inspection standards. The other 123 samples were said to show a total of 259 violations of Federal standards due to excessive water, excess nonmeat fillers, and use of various additives such as ascorbate, phosphates, and nitrites in products where they are prohibited by Federal standards.

"A DEEP SENSE OF OUTRAGE"

Senator Mondale in a long speech in the Senate seized on this sampling as a major point in his argument that "... The revelations of the last few weeks, and information received in the hearings, have provoked a deep sense of outrage on the part of consumers. . . . Mr. President, well might we insist upon immediate Federalization [of all plants under state control]. . . ."

During Senate debate on the bill, Senator Mondale inserted into the Congressional Record enough of the investigators' reports, set in small type, to cover seven pages. There was little substantive debate; the Senate completed action on the measure in two days.

A joint House-Senate conference committee quickly convened to try to reconcile the milder House version with the stronger Senate bill. What emerged was, essentially, the Senate bill. Both Houses approved the conference version on Dec. 6. Nine days later, President Johnson signed the law.

In the ceremony at the White House, Mr. Johnson read these words taken from one Federal inspectors report: "... Beef was being broken on an open dock, by a dirt road, in 95-degree weather. There were flies in the meat. Drums of bones and meat scraps were covered with maggots."

Subsequently, John P. Orcutt, Colorado's commissioner of agriculture, identified the plant that Mr. Johnson had referred to and stated the conditions cited were not so. He said the dock is located adjacent to a paved street—not a dirt road—and that the plant's owner flatly denies there was any truth in the inspector's report. He quotes the owner as stating: "Beef is not broken (cut up) on our dock and never has been. . . . If this so-called inspector saw any meat scraps or bones in drums, he must be a contortionist, as our bone barrels are stored bottom side

up." Mr. Orcutt says the plant owner insists the Federal inspector never entered the processing area of the plant and so he couldn't have seen the barrels in use.

A diligent effort to determine precisely how and why the quickie survey came about turns up no definitive answers. It is known, however, that many congressmen were not impressed by the results of an old USDA survey made in 1962. Though it was an extensive and serious study of meat-inspection operations, the facts in it were well-dated by the summer of 1967. This, incidentally, did not discourage publicists, public and private, from dramatically citing those stale findings to marshal support for fresh legislation last year.

The man in the Agriculture Department who initiated the survey was Rodney Leonard.

"Mr. Purcell [Rep. Graham Purcell, the Texas Democrat who is chairman of the House Agriculture subcommittee] asked us to update the old survey made in 1962 showing that many of the non-Federally inspected plants were in bad shape," Mr. Leonard says. "We knew that many states had passed new meat-inspection laws and had strengthened old ones. But we also knew, through our compliance and evaluation activities, that actual enforcement of good sanitation and good meat inspection wasn't much better than it was in 1962."

Mr. Purcell says he may have asked Mr. Leonard to update the old survey at the request of some of the other subcommittee members. "Representative Foley, perhaps, and others," he says. "I personally thought we had a good bill and that additional surveys weren't needed." Indeed, the new survey's timing and effect were peculiarly unsuited for Mr. Purcell's purposes. The furor the survey caused torpedoed the mild meat-inspection bill that emerged from the House subcommittee, which was basically the bill Mr. Purcell himself had introduced.

Mr. Leonard continues: "I told Bob [Dr. Robert K. Somers, chief of the meat-inspection service] to try to make the survey. I did it. I should have been more specific about how to handle it."

Dr. Somers relayed Mr. Leonard's request to Berlin H. Rorem, acting director of the compliance and evaluation staff. It was Mr. Rorem who telephoned the C&E's field offices and got matters rolling.

On July 27, Mr. Michael wrote his memo. When the National Observer called his office last week to talk with him, a reporter was told he was sick at home. Mr. Leonard says Mr. Michael explained recently that he wrote the memo in such explicit form because some of his staff members were new to his office and he wanted to make sure nobody misunderstood what was expected. Mr. Michael has been in the meat-inspection service for more than 20 years.

Mr. Rorem says his memory is dim as to precisely what he said in telephone calls to the C&E's six field offices in Dallas, Kansas City, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Atlanta. He does deny he told anyone to call it "Project Quick, Quiet, and Confidential."

"I certainly didn't tell anyone to look for 'horrible examples,'" Mr. Rorem says. "I didn't have to. Those men are experienced inspectors. They knew where to go, what to look for, and how to write their reports."

It might be added that they also know how to follow orders.

JOE WESTERN.

[U.S. Department of Agriculture, Consumer and Marketing Service, Compliance and Evaluation Staff, Dallas, Tex.]

U.S. GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM
(Administratively Confidential, Top Priority, Rush Project)

To: All Dallas Area Compliance Officers.
From: Wilbur F. Michael, Officer in Charge.
Subject: Special Project QQ&C (Quick, Quiet and Confidential).

Date: July 27, 1967.

Effective immediately, we are to discontinue all other C&ES work and devote full time (plus any overtime necessary to effectively complete this assignment) to "Project QQ&C." Overtime will not be authorized for travel.

The information we will gather at Non-Federally Inspected (NFI) plants in this effort is to be used at Congressional hearings now being held in connection with the proposed amendment (HR-8168) to the Meat Inspection Act.

For the purpose of this project, the following areas of responsibility are assigned: Barrett—Colorado and Oklahoma; Halverson—Arkansas; and Ramos—Texas and Louisiana.

We have been designated to make this "survey" since our presence in NFI plants would attract less attention than any other USDA personnel, as we are normally in and out of these plants.

This project consists of 3 parts, as follows:

1. You are to gain entrance into NFI plants (slaughter and/or processing) under the guise of (a) meeting local inspection personnel to gain cooperation in our normal C&ES work, (b) discussing our denaturing and decharacterizing requirements with management, (c) etc. This should be done quickly and quietly in such a manner that no one is aware of the real purpose of your visit. This will require a very discreet approach and may tax your imagination. Other approaches used to gain entrance to NFI plants are: (1) requesting management's permission to check their freezers for product bearing Federal Marks of Inspection that might be forged or counterfeit, (2) explaining to and showing management how Federal Marks of Inspection must be obliterated before used containers are filled.

The sole purpose of your visit is to observe, and for each plant visited, submit a written report direct to B. H. Rorem, Acting Director, C&ES, USDA, South Agric. Building, Room 2614, Washington, D.C. 20250, (copy to me), listing any deficiencies noted that indicate a need for tighter inspectional controls. You are not to limit your observations to the following, but examples of things to be checked are: (a) *Plant Facilities*—window and door screens, drainage, types of floors, ceilings and walls, lighting, welfare facilities, equipment, etc., (b) *Environmental Sanitation*—Availability of sterilizers for equipment used on diseased or contaminated meat, hand washing facilities, cleanliness of employees and their clothing, spitting on floor, cleanliness of equipment (describe type of dirt or filth, stipulate amount only if excessive), etc., (c) *Inspection Procedure*—lack of or inadequate ante and post mortem inspection, temperature of cooked product containing pork, labeling controls, etc., (d) *4-D type Animals Held in livestock pens for Slaughter*—Cancer-Eye, downers, deads, cripples, (e) *Plant Operations Procedures*—meat and/or product in contact with floors, contamination of carcasses with manure, pus, dirt, etc., in dressing operation, deceptive packing, etc.

Plants selected for this survey will be those in which you would expect to find the most discrepancies. In other words, look for "horrible examples."

2. In 1963, Dr. M. R. Clarkson prepared a report concerning a comprehensive fall and winter survey made in 1962 by MID of intrastate meat packers and processors in 48 states. Their report showed there was widespread use of false or deceptive labels or packing and that much intrastate meat contained diseased tissues and spoiled, putrid, filthy materials.

Please submit a report to me stating what each of the states you are concerned with, has accomplished in the way of corrective measures (as new laws, etc.) since 1963.

3. You are to each collect a minimum of five retail samples of NFI produced meat food product. If time permits and you find additional products you feel should be sampled,

feel free to do so. It is expected that most of this sampling will need to be done on Saturday and Sunday. This will leave the weekdays through next Wednesday for your survey of NFI plants. Incidentally, all of this work must be completed by Wednesday, August 2, 1967.

The samples are to be air mailed to the Meat Inspected Laboratory, U.S. Court and Customhouse Building, 1114 Market Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63101. You should select product you believe might be violative. Be sure you get labels if available. Labels should be attached to the 6th copy of the MI-322, which will be mailed directly to Rorem. You keep the 7th copy and mail 5th copy directly to me. Original and all other copies should accompany the sample. If hamburger is sampled, be sure it is produced in a meat plant and not ground by the retail store. Purchase and use dry ice you feel necessary to pack with your sample. Contact your nearest MI office for sample mailing containers, bags, etc.

Attached is a specimen copy of MI-422 to be used as a guide in their preparation. Be sure all information shown on the specimen is included. In block #3, show "Non-Inspected-1" for your first sample, "Non-Inspected-2" for your 2nd sample and so on.

Use the attached chart to determine the particular analyses you desire laboratory to do. Desired analyses not printed in blocks on the MI-422 should be written in the "other" blocks.

Also attached for your use is a paper listing "Analysis Which the MI Laboratories are Able to Perform," including species determination and coagulation tests to determine highest temperature attained in cooked products. Suggest this analysis be made on smoked sausage to determine if possible live trichinae have been destroyed.

In your reports of plant "surveys" it is suggested you use dramatic, graphic terms with impact, such as cancer-eye, pus, manure, disease, excreta, cockroaches, rats, flies, loose paint, cobwebs, rust, grease, overhead dripping sewer lines, toilet facilities, mice, flour, excess water, chemicals, excess fat, etc., instead of other more acceptable terms. Of course, you must be factual in your reports. Try to find evidence of contaminants on the meat if possible.

Please keep in daily contact with this office and give us telephone contact points, etc., where you might be reached.

Enclosed are pre-addressed "franks" for the St. Louis Laboratory.

I am to phone Mr. Rorem next Monday to report our progress.

A HOAX OVER MEAT

There is more involved than an indiscreet Government memo; there is more involved, even, than the problem of adequate meat inspection. What is involved is no less than the proper functioning of the democratic process.

It is now painfully clear, from reporter Joe Western's story beginning on Page One of this newspaper, that the U.S. Department of Agriculture conducted a biased quickie "survey" and prepared doctored reports in a high-pressure effort to push a new meat-inspection law through Congress. If this were not appalling enough, officials now try to justify what they did by saying they already knew that conditions in non-Federally inspected meat plants were poor, and that they were simply complying with congressional requests for fresh "evidence."

In other words, they already knew what was good for the public; the Agriculture Department needed no new studies nor current evidence, but would supply vivid facsimiles of both if that was what Congress wanted. After all, the good end would justify the fraudulent means. Surely none would speak of a hoax.

Yet there is no other word for it. Further, the same thing can happen again, in the

Agriculture Department or in any of the other, and powerful, bureaucracies that have been set up to serve, not deceive, the public.

In a democracy, the public should be able to trust its elected and appointed government officials—trust them to tell the truth, and trust them to enact and enforce the laws without bias. If these officials choose to divorce themselves from the public, to lie to the public, they deceive themselves as well by pretending they serve the public interest. They do no such thing.

It is now up to Congress, through its appropriate committees, to open a formal investigation into "Special Project Quick, Quiet, and Confidential"—to keep the Federal bureaucracies honest, and to show the people that the lawmakers do not like being taken in by hoaxes.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding at this time.

The gentleman from Illinois has made an outstanding contribution to the Members of the House in bringing this situation to our attention today.

I should also like to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, 2 weeks ago, asking for an explanation of this memo. Up to date we have received nothing. Of course, we are cognizant of the fact that correspondence coming from the Secretary's office is usually pretty slow, and in this instance we do not look for a reply at all.

Mr. MICHEL. May I say to the gentleman, the other Members of the subcommittee were distressed that this kind of thing could go on. I am sorry to say the witnesses before the subcommittee could not really answer forthrightly how this came about, with supposedly no written memorandum ever, just telephone conversations, except for the poor fellow down at the local level whose neck was way out on a limb by having to write this memorandum, or put it in writing.

Mr. SCHERLE. I wonder if perhaps tomorrow, when we get to the "dirty chicken" bill, we will have available from the USDA more information and at that time be cognizant of where the information came from and the reliability of same.

Mr. MICHEL. That is quite possible. I will tell the gentleman that our committee has proposed we have an investigation of the investigation, so that we can come up with all the facts.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 was finally passed last year after a good many Members of Congress had changed positions about as many times and to as great an extent as has ever occurred on any bill. While the spokesmen for the processing and packing industry at first had voiced outright opposition and indicated it was unneeded, they then admitted some changes were needed. Later,

they admitted that no State was up to Federal standards and they finally, in the main, supported the final bill. Even the majority in the industry said in the end that the bill was needed; that mislabeled products has been sold; and that the consumer's interest had not been properly protected. In spite of this great shift and these admissions, there are a few determined individuals who either want to justify the extreme minority position that they once took in opposition to legislation or who, for financial reasons or otherwise, hope to create kind of a smokescreen behind which they may find an excuse to prevent implementing the act. Under the act, the States have 2 years in which to come up to Federal standards and, with the public spotlight upon many of these processing plants, many of them have decided that it is no longer profitable to risk losing some customers in order to continue to bilk the rest of them by selling them inferior meat products. Members of the House and the consuming public should be aware of these new and desperate attempts to claim that the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 should not have been implemented. I find that the opposition is largely centered in three areas:

First. Persons who have a financial relationship with the dirty meat peddlers;

Second. Persons who are willing to accept the theory of one Dr. Sussman to the effect that meat inspection is not necessary because diseased and dirty meat and filth can be sterilized and pasteurized well enough that it may not hurt the consumer, and;

Third. Those who avoid the merits but merely say that some of the reports of agriculture inspectors were gathered too quickly, too quietly, and did not record all the good things the inspectors saw.

Let us deal with these three, one at a time. With regard to the agriculture report complained of, it should be kept in mind that those who are complaining because a 1967 quick survey was made are the same ones who complained that other surveys being used were 3 or 4 years old and therefore, they said, outdated. It was as a result of their complaints that the Agriculture Committee of the House requested the Department of Agriculture to make a quick and quiet survey. When the Agriculture Department made a quick survey, it was for a committee of this Congress. The inuendo to the effect that the Department wanted to find something to use as a basis for passing a stronger bill than they had originally proposed is ridiculous on its face because they were not supporting the strengthening Smith-Foley amendment. If their report was to be prejudiced, it surely would have been prejudiced the other way.

Let us consider the extensive quotation from an article by one Dr. Sussman for which I assume he received and I would have expected him to receive reasonable remuneration for writing along the lines that the Nations Business magazine would want. Also, Dr. Sussman happens to have spent a great deal of time as a state veterinarian and of course might not like it because it came to light that such state officials had done a very poor job. Some of them quite properly pointed

out that they were operating under inadequate State laws but there were a few who liked it that way and opposed the bill. Dr. Sussman's main theme seems to be that a carcass by carcass inspection program and the ante mortem inspection requirements, which are designed to prevent the use of dead, dying, diseased, and ill animals and to protect those who work with and handle the meat as well as the consumer, is not necessary because such diseased and dirty meat and filth could be pasteurized or exposed to such an extreme heat that it might not hurt the consumer. Meat inspection cost the American consumer less than 50 cents per person a year and I doubt that very many consumers want to give up the right to order medium-rare steak or a particular cut of meat that tastes different to them in order to save the cost of meat inspection. Subjecting meat and meat products to such intense heat might prevent humans from becoming sick from eating the product even when it included filth; but surely we do not have such a shortage of food in this country that we would have to eat that kind of meat or protein product in lieu of steak, roast beef, chicken, or other specific cuts of meat.

In fiscal 1967—about 113,000,000 animals received Federal inspection. The Federal inspectors condemned around 265,000 carcasses in their entirety. More than 10½ million carcasses were held for various abnormalities—carefully checked, trimmed, and/or primal parts condemned and removed before being permitted to go for food. Nearly 4½ million parts were condemned. Close to 20 million livers were condemned because of abscesses, parasites, and so forth. Many thousands of animals that were dead or dying when brought to meat plants were condemned and their handling closely supervised to assure their destruction for food purposes.

Without carcass-by-carcass inspection much or most of what has been listed would have been a part of the food supply for this country's consumers. There is no sampling procedure that will accomplish what carcass-by-carcass inspection will—it gives you a picture of the population, but it cannot tell you what you will or will not find in the way of abnormality or disease in a carcass that you have not looked at.

In Dr. Sussman's view, this was not very important because by his "scientific" approach, if diseased tissue is properly cooked or sterilized—nobody's going to be hurt by it. But, apart from this, there is another point of view that must be considered—that of the public at large. Is the consumer willing to accept something because the scientist expresses that it will not be harmful to health? Is the consumer willing to eat meat from animals that have died, animals affected with cancer, abscesses containing quantities of pus, tuberculosis lesions, systemic infections, and so forth? Does the society of this country have the right to reject such materials from their food supply? I submit that they do—and have—through the medium of the legislative process that produced meat and poultry inspection laws. Call it esthetics or decency or unscientific—the consumer through his elected representatives is

saying—we want our meat produced in clean plants and we want the best assurance possible that we are not eating meat from diseased or dead animals. We make no claim that federally inspected meat is sterile. We do make the claim that it is clean, sound, and without visible evidence of disease processes.

Dr. Sussman and those who are quoting him as justification for not having a full meat inspection program are also ignoring the importance of adequate labeling. Inadequate labeling, the inclusion of nonmeat material and inferior substance in processed meats without warning the consumer, the sale and excessive amounts of liquids and chemicals without warning to the consumer and other forms of inadequate and misleading labeling have cost the consumers of this country billions of dollars that they thought they were spending for wholesome meat products. It may very well have been costing close to \$1 billion per year for inadequate labeling alone.

Dr. Sussman also says that even if the meat has been properly inspected, the housewife may not handle it properly. Of course, that same thing could be said for the pasteurized meat he proposes. At least the housewife or consumer has some control over that.

One of those persons who has been anxious to quote Dr. Sussman and to even go further is NBC Commentator Chet Huntley. In a broadcast over the NBC network on May 27, he called Betty Furness and Ralph Nader "two self-styled protectors of the public weal" because they joined in advocating the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. He failed to reveal that his desire to become a self-styled opponent of the Wholesome Meat Act is the position of a person whose relationship to meat is not merely that of a consumer. Betty Furness and Ralph Nader openly proclaimed that they were representing the consumer's point of view, but Mr. Huntley did not reveal on this broadcast his corporate and financial relationship with persons affected by the Wholesome Meat Act.

One of the firms which came under the Federal inspection following passage of the Wholesome Meat Act is Edmund Mayer, Inc., 565 West Street, New York City. According to reports filed with the Secretary of State of Iowa, Chet Huntley is a director in a corporation engaged in the production of beef by the name of Group 21, Inc. Alfred Mayer, of New York City, is listed as president and Ludwig Mayer, of New York City, is a codirector with Mr. Huntley in this corporation. The Mayers are also associated with Edmund Mayer, Inc., which is a wholesale meat firm that avoided Federal inspection prior to the passage of the act.

Robert and Gerald Pearson, of Spencer, Iowa, are also officials or directors of Group 21, Inc., and are officials of the Spencer Packing Co. of Spencer, Iowa. Mr. Huntley has been quoted as saying that some of the Group 21 beef output is sold to the Spencer Packing Co. and it was also stated that beef from the Spencer Packing Co. is sold to the Edmund Mayer, Inc., in New York City.

I am not saying that Chet Huntley should not have any financial interest of

any particular kind but I do say that most of his listeners who heard his attack upon the Wholesome Meat Act would not have been aware of his relationship with this segment of the meat industry and were therefore not in a position to properly discount what he was saying or to assume that he might have been exaggerating.

As an example of Mr. Huntley's exaggeration, I quote the following from his broadcast:

In New York this reporter knows, truck drivers and other employees of the wholesale district (in New York City) are now quitting their jobs to become Federal inspectors and they talk openly of the "fringe benefits." The fringe benefits are monies under the table in return for that misleading (Federal) inspection stamp.

At my request, the Department of Agriculture has reviewed the file on Federal inspectors hired in the New York City area. Since December 15, 1967, when the Wholesome Meat Act became law, the Department informed me they have hired a total of only 21 meat inspectors in the New York City area, five of whom were previously employed in Federally inspected plants, and according to the Department's records, none of these 21 were truck drivers. So it is obvious that truck drivers have not been quitting their jobs to become meat inspectors.

Mr. Huntley's reference to "moneys under the table" is tantamount to an allegation of illegal activity on the part of the Federal inspectors, but he offers no facts to substantiate this serious charge. If some employer is paying his inspectors to permit the sale of unfit meat, it is in the public interest that this illegal activity be uncovered, and is a responsibility of any citizen knowing of it to report it. Since lay inspectors work under the supervision of a professional supervisor and several inspectors see the same animal during the inspection process, buying off inspectors would require cooperation and a conspiracy by several persons. If such a case is known, it is surely Mr. Huntley's responsibility to report it to proper authorities. While one such case was uncovered several years ago, it is obviously a situation that would seldom exist rather than being a common occurrence as one would assume by the editorial comment. I hereby challenge Mr. Huntley to come forth with information on one case of such payments. If he can, it will be an isolated case but I will be as strongly for prosecution as anyone.

I have written to Mr. Julian Goodwin, president of NBC, requesting that I be given the opportunity to reply to Mr. Huntley's editorials, and I have also written to the Federal Communications Commission asking for an investigation and for the answer to several questions involving FCC policy and ethics relating to commentators who editorialize on issues in which the commentator or persons influencing the nature of the editorial comment have a personal or economic interest or which involves the viewpoint of a firm of persons with whom they have a corporate relationship.

If Members of Congress want to join that 2 percent of the population which the polls reveal are opposed to the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 they, of

course, are free to do so, but they surely should have a better excuse than quotations from the articles in the National Observer or by Dr. Sussman or the comments of one Chet Huntley.

Copies of the letters to Mr. Goodwin and the FCC follow:

MEAT INSPECTION

JUNE 4, 1968.

Mr. JULIAN B. GOODWIN,
President, National Broadcasting Co.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. GOODWIN: On May 27, 1968, an editorial was broadcast over NBC stations by commentator Chet Huntley, a copy of which is enclosed. This editorial presents issues of public importance, and I disagree with the conclusions which he stated in the editorial. As the principal promoter of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, I believe the editorial makes inaccurate statements, does not present the subject matter fairly, and was a patently biased view.

I also believe that Mr. Huntley's editorial comments on this particular question should have been accompanied by information showing his corporate relationship with Alfred and Ludwig Mayer, who are associated with Edmund Mayer, Inc., 565 West Street, New York City, which operates a wholesale meat plant which was brought within the jurisdiction of the Federal inspection authority under the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967.

I hereby request a reasonable opportunity to present more complete information and contrasting viewpoints, and that such presentation be granted at a comparable time on all the stations which carried the editorial by Mr. Huntley.

Sincerely,

NEAL SMITH,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1968.

Mr. ROSEL H. HYDE,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HYDE: I am writing with regard to the policies relating to editorial comments. My questions are prompted by an editorial comment made by Chet Huntley on May 2, 1968, and broadcast by the NBC radio network. This editorial, a copy of which is enclosed, was carried on NBC's "Perspective on the News", and made certain allegations regarding the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. My office has made some preliminary inquiries regarding this matter with the staff of the Commission's Complaints and Compliance Division, but some questions remain unanswered.

I believe the editorial did not discuss the issue fairly and contained gross misstatements of fact. Mr. Huntley stated that "truck drivers and other employees of the wholesale district (in New York City) are now quitting their jobs to become Federal inspectors and they talk openly of the 'fringe benefits'." The fringe benefits are monies under the table in return for that misleading (Federal) inspection stamp." At my request, the Department of Agriculture has reviewed the file on Federal inspectors hired in the New York City area. Since December 15, 1967, when the Wholesome Meat Act became law, the Department informed me they have hired a total of only 21 meat inspectors in the New York City area, five of whom were previously employed in Federally inspected plants, and according to the Department's records, none of these 21 were truck drivers. So it is obvious that truck drivers have not been quitting their jobs to become meat inspectors.

Mr. Huntley's reference to "moneys under the table" is tantamount to an allegation of illegal activity on the part of the Federal inspectors, but he offers no facts to substantiate this serious charge. If some employer is paying his inspectors to permit the sale

of unfit meat, it is in the public interest that this illegal activity be uncovered, and is a responsibility of any citizen knowing of it to report it. Since lay inspectors work under the supervision of a professional supervisor and several inspectors see the same animal during the inspection process, buying off inspectors would require cooperation and a conspiracy by several persons. If such a case is known, it is surely Mr. Huntley's responsibility to report it to proper authorities. While one such case was uncovered several years ago, it is obviously a situation that would seldom exist rather than being a common occurrence as one would assume by the editorial comment.

I have written to Mr. Julian B. Goodwin, President of NBC, requesting that I be given the opportunity to reply to Mr. Huntley's editorial. A copy of my letter to Mr. Goodwin is enclosed.

I have established to my satisfaction that Mr. Huntley has a close corporate relationship with Alfred and Ludwig Mayer, both of whom are associated with Edmund Mayer, Inc., 565 West Street, New York City. The Mayer firm operates a wholesale meat plant which, under the provisions of the Wholesome Meat Act, came under the jurisdiction of the Federal meat inspection program on April 1, 1968. According to information filed on March 29, 1968, with the Secretary of State of Iowa, Chet Huntley is a director of Group 21, Inc., a firm engaged in beef production near Royal, Iowa. The President of Group 21 is listed as Alfred Mayer of New York City. Ludwig Mayer, also of New York City, is listed as a director of the firm. I have been advised that the New York City address of Group 21, Inc., is the same as for Edmund Mayer, Inc.

I am also advised that Robert and Gerald Pearson, both of Spencer, Iowa, are officials or directors of both Group 21, Inc., and the Spencer Packing Co., of Spencer, Iowa. The latest information on file with the Iowa Secretary of State lists both Robert and Gerald Pearson among the present directors of Group 21, Inc. In addition, Mr. Huntley has been quoted indirectly as saying that most of the Group 21 beef output will be sold to the Spencer Packing Co. It was also stated that some of the beef slaughtered at the Spencer Packing Co. is sold to the Mayer firm in New York City.

Because most of those who heard the attack on the Wholesome Meat Act would not know that he has such a relationship, and the NBC affiliates which carried his program would probably not be aware of this situation either, I believe Mr. Huntley should have revealed to his listeners in the course of his strong and patently biased May 27 editorial that he has a corporate and personal relationship with persons in the meat industry who have been required to meet the Federal sanitation and operating standards.

This entire situation, together with information that there has previously been some questions raised concerning other broadcasts, causes me to ask the following questions:

(1) What is the F.C.C. policy regarding such situations?

(2) What policy has NBC and other networks established with regard to editorializing by its commentators on public issues in which the commentator or persons influencing the nature of the editorial comment have a personal or an economic interest, or which involves the viewpoint of a firm or persons with whom they have a corporate relationship?

(3) Is there a code of ethics relating to substantiating assumptions used as facts, or using misstatements of fact, upon which conclusions in editorial comments are based?

(4) If there is such a code, how is it enforced, and if there is no such code, is one being developed?

I respectfully request that the Commission make an investigation of the situation referred to in the above letter and use it as

one example in answering the above questions.

Sincerely,

NEAL SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding this time to me.

I take this time merely to bring to the attention of the House what I consider to be an omission in this legislation.

I observed, for example, chapter 2 at page 9 a very, very substantial amount of money for the Department of Defense. Yet I observed that there are no funds whatsoever for funding school construction in federally impacted school districts.

I do not know whether any of the other Members are in the same position in which this Member finds himself, but two of the school districts located in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent are being deprived of almost \$1 million each by reason of the cutback on the part of the Executive of funds ordinarily appropriated and funded for school construction in impacted areas.

It seems to me the Members of the House must recognize why school construction is necessary. It is of course necessary because of the war in Vietnam. The reason we need more military personnel is because of the war in Vietnam. The reason why the children of military personnel need more schools in federally impacted districts is because of the war in Vietnam.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me inappropriate to select this particular field and to say this is not essential spending because it does not have anything to do with the defense of our country; of course it does.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that for a military man to have the knowledge that his dependents are being educated properly, that they are being housed satisfactorily is as important to him as any other facet of his military life. Schools are as important as the money which goes to his family by way of allotments or by way of any other grants associated with the military and, therefore, if in this appropriation bill we are going to allocate additional millions of dollars for the Department of Defense, it seems to me perfectly proper that areas that are suffering by reason of the tremendous increase in the military population and who, therefore, are required to construct and staff schools which they ordinarily would not be called upon to construct and maintain, must be assisted.

So, Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I shall propose an amendment which will provide some funds—not as much as are needed—but some funds for these areas.

I have been informed for example by the director of school assistance in federally impacted areas that \$87 million is required to fund all available school construction applications filed in fiscal year 1967 and that an additional \$80 million is necessary to meet applications

filed for school construction in fiscal year 1968. But despite this demand for \$167 million in funds, Congress appropriated \$52.9 million in fiscal year 1967, and appropriations for fiscal year 1968 were \$22.9 million.

This total of \$75 million was based upon Presidential budgetary requests, but even with this inadequate amount I would point out that none of it is available for federally impacted school districts under the strictures of Public Law 90-218. All appropriations are presently held in reserve until after the close of the current fiscal year with the exception of \$24 million. In other words, while there is need and demand for \$167 million, only \$24 million is available.

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, while an amendment, it seems to me, would be in order to suggest an amount of \$75.8 million, the amendment that I am going to propose would provide only an additional appropriation of \$40 million. And while that will not serve the needs it will at least keep this program going.

It seems to me so long as we have the war in Vietnam, as long as we have the increase in military population, this expenditure is part of our costs of national defense, and is essential spending, and therefore should be restored.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey. However, there is another area I believe we should touch upon and which should be brought into focus, for the same reasons as expressed by the gentleman from New Jersey, and that is the area of Public Law 874 funds for operational expenses of impacted schools. There are school districts in my congressional district that are contemplating triple sessions because of the lack of Public Law 874 operational funds that are being drastically reduced.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I am voting today for passage of the supplemental appropriation now before the House. One-half of the funds in this appropriation are for the Department of Defense and, because such appropriations are often misunderstood, I believe there are certain points that should be made.

The chairman has assured us that this appropriation will not provide funds for any manner of escalation of the war in Vietnam. On the contrary, it is clearly understood that there is no approval nor implicit endorsement of escalation contained in this appropriation.

Instead, a vote for this appropriation is consistent with good government by providing legal authorization for funds already committed and spent. Not to provide these funds would create havoc within the Department of Defense and could endanger supply lines to American servicemen.

As one who has repeatedly expressed his opposition to our policy of concentrating on a military solution in Vietnam, I wish to reiterate my firm belief, based on five trips to Vietnam and extensive study, that final resolution of the war in Vietnam cannot be achieved through military means alone. Thus, my vote for this appropriation is not an endorsement of the U.S. course of military action.

I do believe it is unfortunate that budget requests cannot be more accurate and supplemental appropriations are, in fact, necessary.

Finally, it is my fervent hope that the conversations now going on in Paris will lead to deescalation and peace in Vietnam. We need peace to pursue solutions to the urgent social problems that face us at home and abroad.

We must bend every effort in constructive design to defeat our common enemies of ignorance, hunger, disease, and want. This is our battleground and until we make a major offensive against these problems no amount of military activity will solve the world's problems nor bring about lasting peace.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1968, is being considered in response to a communication from the President of the United States, dated March 11, 1968. The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for its prompt action.

Among the items requested was \$20 million to help exterminate the rats that infest the slums. The President requested that these funds be appropriated and remain available until December 31, 1968.

Mr. Chairman, as you may recall, last year there was a proposal before the House to establish a program in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help cities and communities of the Nation develop and carry out intensive local programs of rat control and extermination. This proposal, H.R. 11000, failed to obtain a rule when it was presented to the House on July 20, 1967. I doubt that it is necessary for me to dwell on the public reaction that followed. I believe it would suffice to say that the Congress was severely criticized for such action.

On September 19, 1967, the House attempted to rectify what had happened in July by including such a program in the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as set forth in the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967. This program became a part of Public Law 90-174 on December 5, 1967.

The bill H.R. 17734, as reported, providing for appropriations for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 does not provide any funds for this greatly needed program.

The program would be carried out by HEW in cooperation with each State's program under comprehensive health

planning and services activities of the Department. The urgent need for this has been fully explained to the Congress on several occasions.

I am informed that many proposed programs have been approved subject to funding. The need to undertake a program of rat extermination is now. We should not let another summer go by without attacking this menace to the health of our people.

The Congress last year worked its will and expressly provided for the expansion of the comprehensive health planning and services to include a program of rat extermination. The committee report on H.R. 17734 in referring to the request for these funds states:

The committee has deferred action on the funds for program expansion until the regular bill for 1969.

It is unfortunate that the committee feels constrained to put this matter over for the regular HEW appropriations bill for 1969, which will probably not become law until late in the summer. Many of the proposed programs involve local participation. Now would be the time to set the machinery in motion which would not only undertake the extermination of this health menace, but could also place many of our unemployed in a constructive task.

It is hoped that the regular appropriation for HEW will contain the necessary funds for this program and that the bill will shortly be reported to the floor.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, here we go again. We have walked this road every year I have been a Member of this House. I have consistently opposed the weak policies pursued by the administration in its conduct of foreign affairs and in its no-win attitude in the conduct of the war in Vietnam. The policies of gradualism of reacting to enemy buildup and refusing to take the initiative and the no-win policy of asking the men in uniform to do enough to die, but not enough to win—are complete failures; and one would think that responsible men would learn by experience. I introduced legislation last February to have a congressional investigation of the conduct of the war. It is not too late to make such an investigation. Certainly the facts prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that rather than decreasing casualties, we are suffering increasing weekly casualties and deaths of American servicemen, even though we are meeting around the table with the enemy.

This supplemental appropriation bill includes \$6 billion for the waging of the war in Vietnam. Though we are opposed to the way the war in Vietnam is being conducted, to deny the appropriation of funds would be to abandon the brave young men in Vietnam, who are sent there by their government, most of whom did not volunteer. If we expect them to lay their lives on the line, we cannot, in justice, refuse to lay the dollars on the line to give them the tools to protect themselves. For Congress to abandon the men at their posts in Vietnam would be as serious a default on my mind as the abandonment of the captain and

crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. We cannot in conscience deny them needed support until this House accepts the responsibility for decisions concerning their fate. We have the choice either to supply them with the means of protecting themselves and/or to carry out the commands of the commanding officer of all U.S. forces, the President—or to wrest the authority from the President to continue to wage this war and make such decisions as will make this appropriation unnecessary. Since we are not ready to accept our responsibility in the decisions as to whether or not we should be engaged in war in Vietnam, we have no other choice but to vote for this appropriation.

This supplemental appropriation bill is just another indication of the poverty of leadership by this administration. We will continue to have these supplementals until the administration stops playing politics with the fiscal affairs of this Nation, and squares with the Members of this House and the American people.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of H.R. 17734, the second supplemental appropriation for 1968, I should like to make clear my position on this bill.

It contains several billion dollars for needed expenditures for medicare, medicaid, public assistance, increased Federal salaries, and veterans' benefits. It also provides for \$6.5 billion in increased military expenditures in Southeast Asia.

In voting for the bill I do so in the same spirit as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], when he points out that we are now in the process of seeking a political settlement in Vietnam. I have consistently voiced my objections and my distress over the war since 1965. I continue to oppose any escalation of the war in Vietnam, and my vote for the bill today should not be interpreted by our policy planners nor anyone else as constituting approval of any such policy. The negotiations going on with North Vietnam in Paris, and the statements by important persons in the executive, including General Westmoreland, that our involvement in Southeast Asia cannot result in a simple military victory indicate that the administration may have recognized the inevitability and the necessity of a political settlement. I therefore vote for the bill on the assumption that none of the funds will be used in any way to escalate the war or further compromise our stated objective which is to negotiate a ceasefire and an honorable peace. Like my colleague, Mr. FRASER, I believe we must assume, at least at this time, that under present conditions costs relating to Vietnam are merely to insure that we shall maintain more or less a posture that will help speed the negotiation of an end to the war.

I should also like to express my strong reservations about increased funds for military assistance for Korea and augmentation of our 50,000 troops in Korea. While I am aware of the delicacy of the present situation arising out of the *Pueblo* incident, I cannot accept indefinitely the notion that we must continue to have such a massive military presence in this country which we have done so much to make viable economically and militarily. With 19 Korean divisions trained by us

since 1953 the Koreans should surely be able to defend themselves from attack until help comes. If independence and self determination are to become more than empty, incredible words, it would seem that our presence and involvement on so large a scale should be carefully weighed and considered. If we continue on our present course I fear we are going to allow the Government of this small peninsula to further involve us in military operations at a time when we should be taking initiatives to reduce our presence in that part of the world. I will have more to say about Korea and Japan at a future date but I feel strongly that the Korean Government should not interpret our response to the present tension as a reason to expect that we will forever continue to maintain two American divisions in their country.

I am also pleased to note that the Budget Bureau proposed that \$284 million of ABM funds be deferred and reprogrammed in other defense purposes. For those of us who continue to have doubts about the merits of ABM deployment this was a significant release of funds. Yet the bill before us does not permit the transfer of these funds and I take this opportunity to express in the strongest terms my doubts as to the wisdom of this decision. I hope the Senate will carefully examine this item and permit the transfer.

This bill also calls for \$2.8 billion of obligatory authority for a variety of worthy activities. Over \$1.1 billion alone is for grants to States in order to meet increased costs of various public assistance programs.

There is an additional \$1 billion in this bill for various overdue pay increases.

There are additional amounts for increased medicare costs, to meet the demand of an ever-increasing number of older Americans who benefit from the program.

There are several other items of social benefit urgently needed and deserving of support of all who are conscious of these needs.

There is an amendment voted by the committee and later by the whole House calling for full funding of Public Law 874. These funds are urgently needed in fund-starved school districts, including those in my district.

So, in voting for this bill I do so in support of those vital items affecting our old-aged recipients, our children and our cities, and with the understanding that the administration will pursue with vigor and determination negotiations in Paris in the awareness of the reality that a military solution under present conditions is futile. Should we witness further unwarranted escalation in Vietnam, I am prepared to oppose this appropriation when it returns from conference, and to introduce amendments to the basic defense legislation if necessary.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased by House inclusion of funds in the supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 17734) for aid to schools in federally impacted areas. The additional \$90,965,000 which this bill authorizes will enable the Federal Government to meet its full commitment to every school district eligible for aid under the terms of

Public Law 874. This is extremely important to school administrators throughout the country who depend on these funds to meet their budget. Many are facing a severe financial crisis at this moment because earlier cutbacks in funds for the program came in the middle of the school year—after teachers had been hired, books purchased and other financial commitments made. If passed by the Senate, the supplemental appropriations bill will provide school districts with the funds they need to meet operating expenses incurred during the school year.

The need for such action is clear and pressing. Total entitlement for all States for 1968 was \$486,355,000; of this amount, \$395,390,000 was appropriated. This means that most school districts received about 80 cents for every dollar's entitlement. Areas which depend almost entirely on Federal funds for their operating expenses were especially hard hit.

The cumulative effect of the act has been even greater than annual appropriations would indicate. New Mexico's entitlements since the program's inception have totaled more than \$70 million. Our entitlement for 1968 was \$9,866,761, but unless the supplemental appropriation bill is passed, we will only receive \$7,912,906. A lack of nearly \$2 million will seriously handicap the State's efforts to provide quality education to all children residing within its boundaries. Many of these children are American Indians—members of a group which has already been denied many of the advantages accepted as commonplace by people in other parts of the country; a good education is of the utmost importance in their struggle for a better life.

Although I strongly support the House action on these funds, I regret that a supplemental appropriation is necessary. If school administrators cannot be assured that needed funds will be forthcoming, they cannot plan to utilize these funds in the most effective manner. Because the Federal presence in many districts places a very real burden on the schools, it is incumbent on us to see that districts receive the total amount to which they are legally entitled. The amount of funds to be made available must be announced well in advance of the school year and adhered to thereafter so that administrators may plan accordingly.

At the present time, there is a great deal of discussion going on over the necessity for budget cuts. And while such a step may be necessary to enable us to combat inflation or to meet foreign commitments, I believe that there are priorities which must be established, and that there are certain projects for which full support is always obligatory. School aid in federally impacted areas is one of these. Federal activities often reduce tax revenues and increase school enrollments to the point where the local district simply is unable to provide the quality education we expect for all of our children through its own resources. We have recognized and accepted this need for aid over the past 18 years. We have admitted to the Federal Government's obligation, and it is not only unfair, but unjust, to

provide funds equal to need in such a capricious manner. Such unreliable action puts a great onus on local administrators. It dilutes the quality of the education which the affected youngsters receive. Because we cannot deprive any child of a first-class education, the need for full funding under Public Law 874 is imperative.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further requests for time?

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION
ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Administrative and operating expenses", \$281,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved, under the appropriation for "Crop-land conversion program", Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, pursuant to Public Law 90-218: *Provided*, That the amount of \$4,000 reserved, under the appropriation granted under this head, pursuant to Public Law 90-218, shall be released for increased postage costs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to raise a question about the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I see an amount of \$281,000 set aside apparently for administrative and operating expenses of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I was under the impression that this program was some day to get on a self-financing basis with the premiums charged to farmers to be adequate to cover the costs and payments made out of the program, and yet every time we have an appropriation bill it seems to me we have an item for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

I wonder if anybody could shed any light as to why this amount appears in this supplemental bill?

May I put it this way—has the Corporation seen fit to raise premiums charged to farmers so that hopefully some day this can be on a self-financing basis? Or are we simply riding at anchor with the same premiums, and no adjustments in the light of experience in this program?

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

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

Mr. NATCHER. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that under the existing law that will not be permitted. There is no provision for it under existing law.

Mr. FINDLEY. It is not possible for the officers of the Corporation to raise the premiums to a level adequate to cover expenses?

Mr. NATCHER. The basic crop insurance law does not permit the inclusion of administrative costs in the premium rates. Therefore, to the extent that administrative expenses are financed from premium income, the reserves of the Corporation are impaired—and future appropriations eventually will be needed to restore such impairments. Since these items in this bill are pay and postage

costs associated with administrative costs, they should come from appropriated funds rather than from premium income to prevent further impairment of the Corporation's operating funds.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is a shocker to me and it seems to me we need to do something about it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 175]

Abernethy	Flynt	Mayne
Andrews, Ala.	Foley	Murphy, Ill.
Annunzio	Ford,	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashbrook	William D.	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashley	Gallagher	Pelly
Ayres	Gardner	Pool
Bell	Gettys	Price, Tex.
Bolton	Gialmo	Fucinski
Bow	Gilbert	Resnick
Bush	Green, Oreg.	Rivers
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Ronan
Cowger	Harrison	Rooney, N.Y.
Daddario	Hébert	Rostenkowski
Dawson	Helstoski	Skubitz
Derwinski	Herlong	Taylor
Dingell	Holifield	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	Holland	Thompson, N.J.
Dorn	Karsten	Udall
Dulski	Kelly	Ullman
Everett	Kluczynski	Vander Jagt
Evins, Tenn.	Kyros	Whitten
Farbstein	Long, La.	Wright
Fisher	McMillan	Zwach

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, 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. 17734, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 367 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose the Clerk had read through page 8, line 20.

Are there any amendments to be proposed? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$36,000,000, and, in addition, \$6,600,000 to be derived by transfer from amounts available for reserve pursuant to Public Law 90-218 under the appropriation "Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard".

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

Mr. Chairman, about 6 or 8 weeks ago we had something before us called the urgent supplemental appropriation. Despite the fact that the word "urgent" was in its title, I understand that it is still languishing in conference.

That particular bill has in it, from the work of the other body, an appropriation of \$75 million for a summer day camp program in connection with the antipoverty program. I would urge the conferees please to reschedule a conference, and consider this item favorably.

I have been approached by groups in two of the major cities in my district, clergymen groups composed of priests, ministers, and rabbis, who are willing to operate a day camp program for disadvantaged children through the anti-poverty machinery. They have, in fact, gone out and raised a great deal of the money themselves, and are asking only for a relatively small amount.

I was in New York last week on one of those oppressively hot days, and I saw kids there jumping around a fire hydrant, and it occurred to me that this was the type of care they may receive all summer long. They will be in the slums, in the streets, and in trouble. This must not be allowed. There is a program waiting through which they can be constructively taken care of, and we must not abandon them.

I know the Bureau of the Budget has not made a request but we run this House of Representatives, not the Bureau of the Budget, and I would urge that the conferees please consider this item at the earliest possible date.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from New Jersey is aware of the fact that when the urgent supplemental cleared this body it did not contain any funds for that purpose, the reason being that we did not have any budget request, and had not received any request from the administration for additional funds over and above those provided for this purpose last year. And this item of \$75 million, I believe it was, was put in the bill by the Senate.

We have insisted in conference on numerous occasions that conferees of the other body, who are insisting on this being agreed to in conference, get a budget request up here so we will have some justification, otherwise we will have exceeded the budget by that amount.

Mr. JOELSON. I appreciate that, and I mentioned it in my earlier remarks, but I do not believe we have to rely slavishly on the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I happen to have had a discussion with the gentleman from New Jersey last week about this very matter. It is not only the Bureau of the Budget that has not requested funds. The Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have not even made a request of the Bureau of the Budget for Headstart or for the summer program.

As much as we would like to blame the Bureau of the Budget, sometimes, and use them as a scapegoat, I do not believe that it is fair to accuse the Bureau of the Budget in this case. The Departments that are charged with the responsibility for these programs have not even transmitted a request to the Bureau of the Budget for supplemental appropriations in these areas.

Mr. JOELSON. I believe that is regrettable, but I also believe that the need is clear and evident. The amount of money involved is not a staggering sum, and I would urge the conferees to consider this item favorably, and at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield further to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. We cannot accept statements made on the floor by the very distinguished Member from New Jersey that these funds are urgent; we have to consider the testimony before the Committee.

Mr. JOELSON. I am sure that I can show the gentleman from North Carolina many occasions where this House has gone beyond what the Bureau of the Budget has requested, and has even appropriated items that the Bureau of the Budget has not requested. In fact, we may do so this very afternoon regarding aid to federally impacted areas.

I believe this one of those instances where we should assert our independence.

Mr. JONAS. But the point I am making is that the departments that administer those funds have not indicated that the need exists that the gentleman from New Jersey believes does exist.

So I would say that the gentleman's quarrel is with the departments involved. Apparently they do not recognize this need.

Mr. JOELSON. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we are living in a dream world indeed if we do not recognize the crying and urgent need which exists.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this second 1968 supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 17734).

I grant the bill contains several items I would willingly support. I might easily justify voting for it. And we all know it will be overwhelmingly approved here today.

But the dominant item in this "mixed bag" that is H.R. 17734 is new obligational authority of \$3.8 billion, plus release of \$2.345 billion and reprogramming of other Department of Defense funds, for a total of \$6.2 billion to be added to the price we are paying for our military involvement in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, my vote against the bill is a gesture of protest against that price we are paying for our Vietnam policy.

On March 2, 1967, I stated my reasons for opposing last year's huge supplemental appropriations to expand the Vietnam war. My statement is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, and now I reaffirm it.

I said then, and today I especially emphasize my conviction that the voting on these supplemental bills here in the House does not adequately reveal the full extent of unhappiness and disbelief of the American people concerning our military action in Vietnam.

Today there probably will be only a handful of us who will make the gesture of voting against this bill; but I suggest

we speak for a relatively far, far larger number of patriotic Americans who feel strongly that our Nation's best interests and our true national character have been tragically undermined by the nature of our intervention in Vietnam.

For some 4 years now it has seemed to me that our national leaders have been repeatedly self-deluded in the decisions by which they have expanded our role in the war, and thus they have deluded the American people.

These annual supplemental appropriation bills by which we are asked to catch up with the costs of Vietnam—more men, more weapons, more money, more escalation that only begets escalation by the other side—these bills symbolize for me more clearly than anything else how wrongly optimistic we have repeatedly been in the madness of this war.

Therefore, I repeat, I feel impelled to make this gesture of voting again against a Vietnam supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, the true costs of our Vietnam war are beyond comprehension. There is no way an accurate accounting can be made. But, I suggest this method of appropriating funds, piecemeal, as we do today, tends all the more to gloss over the terrible costs.

Let me only briefly and partially remind us again today of those costs:

First, there are our own casualties, more than 20,000 young Americans already killed in combat, plus thousands upon thousands wounded, many permanently maimed, plus the thousands upon thousands more who are victims of non-combat accidents and illness.

Consider the shattered lives, the disruption of family ties, and blighted careers.

There are also the countless thousands of Vietnamese civilians killed and injured, and their property destroyed.

There are the thousands of our military allies who are casualties in this war which we have chosen to dominate, to say nothing of the tremendous numbers of the enemy whom we have destroyed, and of enemy property destroyed.

Those human costs seem more important than dollars. But just focus for a moment on our money costs, some \$70 to \$80 million per day, 365 days per year, for the Vietnam war alone, in addition to all of our other billions for regular defense expenditure.

And how do you measure that war cost in terms of lost opportunities, the more productive ways those lives and those dollars might better be invested were it not for the war?

Consider also as costs of our war, the brutalizing effect of it on us as a Nation, the erosion of our moral position, the erosion of our national sanity, the effects of disillusion and cynicism, the tendency to alienate a whole generation of our young people, to shatter their beliefs.

And then, there is our loss of America's credibility throughout the world, the erosion of our influence everywhere, the new worldwide distrust of America's motives, the seeming contradictions between the ideals and principles we always have preached, as compared with our military actions in East Asia.

Mr. Chairman, those are just some of

the costs. And I regret to admit that to be honest with myself, with my colleagues here, and with my constituents in Ohio—to be really honest, I must say it seems to me there is no reason, no need, no goal, no prospect, no hope for our military action in Vietnam which warrants such costs.

Mr. Chairman, there is reason for hope in the negotiations now limping on in Paris. I certainly salute President Johnson for having taken that initiative, to try to deescalate the war, when he was under great pressures to further escalate it.

But let not Paris blind us to the fact that the war in Vietnam continues ferociously, and all the costs I have just enumerated continue to mount.

The war feeds ravenously on itself. This supplemental bill today really represents only the immediate cost in money of our reaction to the enemy's Tet offensive earlier this year, and to the *Pueblo* incident.

Today's bill symbolizes for me the fact that Vietnam seems an endless, bottomless pit into which we wrongly are dumping our resources, bankrupting ourselves in so many, many ways.

That is why I make the protest gesture of voting today against the bill, but even more against what it symbolizes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, a question, if I may have his attention.

I am quite concerned, Mr. Chairman, that by the passage of this bill we might be undoing some of the economizing that we did last year in the passage of Public Law 90-218.

Public Law 90-218 contained the cuts in appropriations and created a reserve of \$6.1 billion.

I observe in this supplemental legislation that you are releasing \$2.7 billion.

Now I realize that a great amount of that \$2.7 billion is for the pay increases which this body also passed last year. But the pay increases only amount to \$1.468 billion, and much of that was absorbed by administrative action.

I ask the gentleman as to exactly how much of this amount of the reserve is being released for the purpose of the pay increases, how much are for purposes that were cut by Public Law 90-218, and how much are new appropriations?

Mr. MAHON. The total new appropriations contained in the bill is \$6.255 billion.

As the gentleman knows, the great bulk of the funds requested, as shown on page 2 of the report, is for the military. The next largest categories are for the pay increases and for social security payments.

It is true that some of the funds withheld from obligation in the defense appropriation bill of last year are being released not for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated but for the purpose of meeting additional requirements. These are requirements which were not fully anticipated and

thus not provided for in the defense appropriation bill of last year.

Mr. ICHORD. Do I understand the gentleman correctly—that the funds are not being released for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is substantially correct—yes.

Mr. ICHORD. Then we are not undoing the action which we took last year in Public Law 90-218.

Mr. MAHON. As to the Defense Department these are for additional requirements which have arisen since that time.

The tremendous additional requirements—helicopter procurement accounts for more than \$500 million—had not been anticipated.

The gentleman knows from his experience in the field of defense that the Tet offensive brought about the climate for considerable additional funds.

And the gentleman knows very well, of course, about the cost of calling up the reserves. None of that was budgeted for and requested last year. We are releasing funds that were appropriated last year for other purposes, for the purpose of meeting these urgent requirements.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND, SOUTHEAST ASIA

For an additional amount for "Emergency Fund, Southeast Asia," \$3,791,100,000, and \$2,345,000,000 reserved from obligation by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with Public Law 90-218, is hereby made available, pursuant to section 206 of that law, for use in the fiscal year 1968 to offset special Vietnam costs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOW

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dow: In chapter II, page 10, strike out lines 10 through 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer to the supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 17734, calls for the elimination from the bill of the paragraph entitled "Emergency Funds—Southeast Asia." This paragraph carries an appropriation of \$3,791,100,000 for the military situation in Vietnam. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget says these funds "offset unanticipated additional requirements that have arisen in Vietnam." Also, my amendment would eliminate \$2,245,000, a transfer proposed from the reserve set aside in accordance with Public Law 90-218. That is the law requiring widespread reductions on a uniform percentage basis in expenses of the executive branch for fiscal 1968. The sum of \$2,345,000,000 reserved under the Public Law is likewise intended for Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, objections to the annual supplemental appropriations for Vietnam constitute a sad recurrence. Those objections raised by some of us Congressmen in 1965, in 1966 and in 1967 have gone unheeded. We pointed out the manifest mistakes of American policy in Southeast Asia. Going back in history, we have noted that even before World

War II, Vietnam sought to gain her freedom from Western domination. In the same period that Africa, India, Pakistan, and Indonesia, for example, were set free by the colonial powers of Europe, Vietnam suffered a contrary fate. A series of frustrations, and bloody ones at that, prevented her separation from French domination. After years of cruel warfare, the full realization of independence was frustrated by U.S. involvement. We erected there a local government showing all the earmarks of a colonial regime, for it is shot through by corruption, influenced by absentee landlords, continues inequitable taxes, and lies under military domination by those generals who once fought on the side of the French colonial power.

I hardly need to point out the cruel injustice of our grip on Vietnam. Only yesterday, I read a book review in the New York Times which has this to say about the author's description of Quang Ngai Province:

He further estimates that since the Americans arrived in force, there have been 50,000 Vietnamese civilian war casualties in the Province each year.

Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted, I cannot dwell on the countless proofs of the American mistake and the questionable assessments of the situation by American leaders. They rise up from our press in column after column and day after day.

Secretary McNamara and General Taylor, in a White House statement of October 2, 1963, were quoted, as follows:

Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965.

On May 31 this year in the New York Times, General Westmoreland is quoted to the effect that South Vietnamese forces had shown more aggressive spirit than in any time in his 4½ years in Vietnam. Yet, 2 inches away in the next column on page 2, the Times Saigon reporter described street fighting in Saigon by saying:

It was apparent that the Government troops were relying on American helicopter gun ships to drive out the Vietcong rather than attacking their positions.

In a Times editorial again that day, General Westmoreland is quoted as saying:

The North Vietnamese are strangers to the people of the South.

Yet the Times editorial goes on to this paragraph:

South Vietnam's Vice President, Nguyen Cao Ky, a Northerner himself, told cheering civil defense cadres only last week: "The entire world admires and reveres Ho Chi Minh and Ho Nguyen Giap. Who are they if not of Vietnamese descent like you and me?"

The Washington Post of May 23 enlarged on General Ky's address, quoting his additional words to the cadres as follows:

Why are they so popular? Why is the South unable to produce such figures? Isn't it because the entire leadership in the South is only a pack of slavish-minded and corrupt people?

Mr. Chairman, optimistic misreading

of the situation in Vietnam commenced with American leaders as far back as April 17, 1959, when Maj. Gen. Samuel L. Myers, deputy U.S. commander in Vietnam, told a Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

The Vietminh guerillas were gradually nibbled away until they ceased to be a major menace to the Government.

I believe that the generals of our Army are courageous, devoted, and heroic, but I must say that their dedication had led them to a degree of optimism that extends well beyond the call of duty.

In the meantime, our country is running a deficit close to \$30 billion which is the cost of the conflict in Southeast Asia. Our casualties, in spite of predictions of the enemy to collapse, are higher now than ever before. Everyone knows that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese have vastly more firepower, mortars, and missiles in South Vietnam than any they enjoyed before.

At home, racial problems are becoming tenser, the needs of our poor are becoming more apparent, the defections of religious leaders, intellectuals, students, minorities, and many people of good sense from their adherence to the course followed by American society today, are too apparent for us to feel comfortable.

All men of good will sincerely hope for a peaceful outcome for our Paris meeting with the North Vietnamese. Yet, the dark prospect that affairs may take a turn for the worse, is with us still, and remains persistently with us. There is no certainty that escalation is done, nor that peace will happen at Paris.

Mr. Chairman, the only true opportunity available to those of us who cry "Halt" to Vietnam, to make ourselves felt, is the annual occasion when the unanticipated appropriation for Southeast Asia comes to the floor. This is the regular occasion when we can make our protestations tangible. Most certainly, as devoted Americans who are thinking of what is good for America, let us protest again and vote down this Vietnam appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not belabor the issue before us. This is an amendment to strike from the bill all funds for the war in Vietnam which are, according to the witnesses who appeared before the committee, urgently needed.

This amendment does not involve a test as to one's basic views with respect to the war in Vietnam. We have more than 500,000 troops in Vietnam. The question here is that they are entitled to our support as long as they are there, regardless of our views otherwise.

Supplemental estimates for military needs in time of war are no new or recent innovation. Congress enacted many supplemental appropriation bills during World War II. Several large supplemental bills were enacted during the Korean war. The use of supplementals

provides for more frequent review and gives Congress better control of the purse.

The pending supplemental was, in fact, anticipated and announced last year.

To refuse to provide the funds to support these more than 500,000 American military personnel would in my judgment be unthinkable.

Our representatives are now meeting in peace negotiations, or in an attempt at peace negotiations, in Paris. If we should adopt this amendment and thus withdraw support of the war in Vietnam, we would undercut our negotiators at the conference in Paris and produce an unthinkable humiliation for the United States and greatly lessen the likelihood of a nonmilitary settlement of the war.

Mr. Chairman, in the circumstances, I ask that the House vote this amendment down.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

The reports from the battlefield in Vietnam in recent weeks indicate the fighting has reached a new level of intensity and that we have hit new records both in the numbers of Americans killed and the numbers of American soldiers wounded.

I wonder if the chairman could enlighten the House as to whether or not the increased tempo of the fighting is the result of increased military operations by the U.S. forces in Vietnam or whether this has resulted from increased efforts on the part of the National Liberation Front and on the part of the North Vietnamese Army.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has proounded a good question. According to the best information I have, the North Vietnamese are trying desperately to improve their position at the conference table and discredit the position of the United States. The North Vietnamese are striking harder and harder daily and pressing forward with additional infiltration of men and additional supplies. We are compelled to resist this increased tempo of war initiated by North Vietnam.

The escalation is not by the United States but by North Vietnam, in an effort to upset the Paris conference and to humiliate the United States at that conference. That, I believe, is a fair interpretation of the situation. If the North Vietnamese had subsided in their efforts and moved toward a peaceful settlement, that would have been one thing; but, while they agreed to go to the conference table, they are seeking military advantage as the conference proceeds.

This proud Nation of ours just must not do anything other than fully support our men who are under attack. Regardless of one's philosophic views on the war, we just must provide support for the 500,000 men who are in Southeast Asia upholding the honor and integrity of the United States and undertaking to help achieve

peace and security for this country and for the other peace-loving nations of the world.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Would it be the view of the chairman that the United States ought to exercise moderation with respect to the military effort and, except as it may be compelled to respond to increased attacks by the other side, that we should not at this time seek a military victory but instead should seek to maintain a relatively stable situation in order that the peace talks might progress?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, neither of us is authorized to commit our country in this regard, but I would assume that the escalation of the war would not have come about voluntarily by the United States. It is only done I would assume in defense of the U.S. position in Vietnam. If the other side will withdraw or diminish its efforts, then we can consider what action our country should take in these circumstances.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

I believe the colloquy which has taken place between the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] is interesting. Perhaps we have forgotten some of the simple facts.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] also made the same point some time ago that there has recently been an escalation of the war. I believe we ought to realize that the escalation which has taken place has been an escalation on the part of the enemy.

And it was our side, under the leadership of President Johnson, which voluntarily and unilaterally ended the bombing of North Vietnam north of the 19th parallel, on the 31st of March. In spite of the weeks that have gone by since then, and the efforts that have been made in Paris to turn that act of restraint on our part into some basis for a honorable and a decent peace in Vietnam, we have not yet seen a single bit of restraint from the other side. As a matter of fact, there has been, as the gentleman from Texas has already pointed out, increased military activity on the other side.

It is quite true that we have had greater American casualties since the peace talks began than we ever had in any single week before. But that is not because of our restraint. It is because of an intensification of the fighting on the other side.

In fact, information presented to our Committee on Armed Services would suggest that infiltration from North Vietnam has increased two or three or four times as much as before we restrained our bombing of the North. And the numbers of weapons that have been moved into South Vietnam from the north have been very greatly increased.

Certainly this restraint has resulted in the loss of lives of additional American combat troops. If the pending amendment were to be approved, we would be further undercutting the protection of

the lives of a half million American men out there.

I do not believe any Member of the House or any American President could vote to do a thing like that.

These funds are designed to pay for unplanned and unexpected military operations, such as our resistance to the Communist Tet offensive last February. Would the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow] suggest we should not back up the resistance which our troops made to that aggression at that time? Certainly not.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. It seems to me at a time when we have cut back our bombing in North Vietnam to a point below the 19th parallel, or whatever it is, the claim has been made that nevertheless the intensity of our bombing there has made up for the reduction in the geographic area. In fact, I believe the claim was made that on balance we are flying more missions in some days since the geographic limitation was set than ever before over all North Vietnam.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will think for just a moment he will realize that just is not true. If one has to stop a runner, let us say, it is much easier if he has a whole mile in which to pick the runner off than if he has only 100 yards left in which to hit him. That is the situation we are in now.

It may well be that there are as many or even more sorties being flown into the relatively limited area north of the DMZ where our combat planes are now permitted to fly. But any military man, I am sure, if he were free to speak his mind, would tell us that we could not possibly restrict these supplies moving in, if we can hit them only within this limited 100 yards, as effectively as we could restrict them if we had the whole distance down from Hanoi in which to try to stop them.

That, of course, is the reason why the enemy has been intensifying the fighting so effectively. He has been able to get more men and weapons into South Vietnam because of our restraint. In spite of our generous gesture, in spite of our restraint, we have not seen a single demonstration of any similar response on the part of Ho Chi Minh. I would hope that the gentleman from New York would address his amendment to Ho Chi Minh. I think that is where it properly belongs. If we can get some restraint on that side, then maybe we can get some meaningful and honorable peace in Paris.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STRATTON. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the time has come for somebody to get up here and point out, as is seen in the papers today, that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong are setting up mortars in the rice paddies just outside Saigon and are killing hundreds and hundreds of civilians—not enemy soldiers but civilians. Some here seem to think that is all right. But they protest loudly about our use of airplanes. All of us should be concerned on

our part to see that we do something about winning this war, or bringing it to an honorable conclusion. I am getting sick and tired of the way this war has been conducted and I say that as one who had nothing to do with getting us in it in the first instance. This is the darnedest way that I ever saw to run a war and try to win it.

As far as the present amendment is concerned, I am against it. I think to pull the rug out from under our boys over there would be the worst thing that could possibly happen.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I take this opportunity to question the chairman of the committee about this. On page 12 of the report it states "Costs related to the call-up of Reserves, increased deployments to South Vietnam, and revisions in troop deployment otherwise—\$400 million" is appropriated. Does that mean that we anticipate the use of this money for an increase over the 500,000-man limit that we now have in Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. We have in excess of 500,000 men in Vietnam. There is a certain schedule supposed to be achieved by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, and some additional men will be sent to Vietnam according to announcements made some time ago by the President.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I have already yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

Are you through?

Mr. WOLFF. I just wanted to get an answer to the question.

Mr. MAHON. I thought I did answer it. There are additional men being sent to Vietnam as per the announcements which have been made public.

Mr. WOLFF. That does not mean it will be over the estimates that have been made already?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. WOLFF. It does not contemplate any increase over the estimates already made?

Mr. MAHON. The number—549,000—that has already been announced. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a very simple amendment striking six lines from the bill. These lines are worth about \$1 billion a line, the total being slightly over \$6 billion. I point out to you that this is almost precisely the amount that we are going to be asked to vote on as a reduction in domestic expenditures for this country next week, when the 10-percent surtax package is brought up. I see some connection between these matters. I see us voting here today for a \$6 billion increase for Vietnam and we are going to cut our domestic budget next week by that amount.

Frankly, I feel that this is a wrong allocation of the resources of this great country and a wrong setting of priorities.

I do not think my view on the Vietnam war is any surprise to the Members of this House. The philosophy which has been so ably enunciated by some of those speaking in opposition to this amendment and in support of the Vietnam war are really not quite to the point, in my opinion, because they are based on the fallacy that we still can win a military victory in Vietnam. They are willing to continue to vote money for the war without being consulted with regard to the mobilization of our Reserves, or the increasing of our troop strength over there, or any other policy matter. They have the illusion that we can continue to add another 25,000 or 50,000 or 100,000 men to the men already there and thereby be able to maintain some sort of bargaining position which will allow us to win a victory for our political position. That is the illusion which has brought us to the point today where we have over 500,000 troops in Vietnam, have spent close to \$100 billion there since 1954, have lost 23,000 American lives, all in the hope that one more small step would bring something which we could call victory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the heart of this problem is the fact that our political position is wrong, and as long as our political position is wrong we can keep pouring as many billions of dollars as we want into the situation over there without winning a military victory.

Mr. Chairman, the political facts of life in Vietnam are still not recognized by this administration, insofar as I can tell by the proclamations and announcements which it has made and is still making. It still clings to the illusion that the corrupt and incompetent military regime in Saigon which we support has the backing of the people of South Vietnam. This is not true and as long as the people do not back their government we can never win a victory for them over the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong. It is true that the Army of South Vietnam has permitted the enemy to set up mortars in the rice paddies around Saigon which are able to bombard the heart of Saigon simply because the 750,000-man Army of South Vietnam is not competent, does not have the motivation, does not have the leadership to protect even its own capital. There is no question about this, and it will never have the capacity to protect its own citizens and its own country.

Mr. Chairman, if you have that type of situation you can continue as we have indefinitely and not achieve victory. We can continue to pour all of these billions of dollars and thousands of men into this bottomless pit and it will not do one bit of good.

Mr. Chairman, what needs to be done is for the President to order the immediate cessation of the bombing of all of North Vietnam. If we are to achieve any results at the Paris peace talks, based upon information from every reliable and responsible source, it is necessary for him to take that step. The only way in which we can produce fruitful negotiations is to stop the bombing of all of

North Vietnam. In that way we may be able to immediately move to the next issue, that of achieving a cease-fire in all of Vietnam.

None of these events are going to take place unless this administration, this Congress and the American people make it clear that we will no longer continue our efforts to force an unpopular dictatorship on the people of Vietnam by military means. Adoption of this amendment to day will be a major step in that direction. I urge its approval.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this debate is getting into a philosophical discussion of the war and the strategy of the war in Southeast Asia.

I would like to remind the Members of the House today that a good portion of the funds provided in this supplemental bill have already been obligated by the Department of Defense. We have been incurring these expenses over and above what has already been allocated since October 27, 1967, and at that time I say we started spending third- and fourth-quarter appropriations for the men that were needed.

Mr. Chairman, in the last session of this Congress when the Defense Appropriation bill was pending on the floor of the House, I reminded the membership at that time that the amount of money appropriated and requested by the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, was at least \$5 billion below the amount that would be required for fiscal year 1968. A large portion of the dollars that are made available for expenditure and for obligation in this bill merely will take care of the deficiencies that have been incurred in the war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, the question is whether the United States should be weaker in this year 1968 than it was in 1964 before the war was escalated in Vietnam. If we do not make this money available, we will be weaker this year than we were in 1964 as a result of the escalation of the war effort on the part of the Communists in North Vietnam and before we responded to that escalation.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that it is most important to bear in mind that we are not approving or disapproving of the activities with reference to the escalation of the war, but we are merely providing funds required because of the activities in Southeast Asia. All of the money being made available to the operation and maintenance appropriation, is to take care of those deficiencies incurred since October 27, 1967, when the Secretary of Defense notified this Congress that he was going on a deficiency basis.

Mr. Chairman, in 1969 the budget which we had submitted to us by the Department of Defense was already underestimated by at least \$5 billion for the next fiscal year, even if the war were to end within the next 60 to 90 days.

That statement will be borne out as we come back here next January and face another supplemental budget re-

quest to finance commitments that have already been made as far as Southeast Asia is concerned.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman as soon as I finish with my statement.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to make clear, however, that in this supplemental bill that we are acting upon today we are talking primarily about our deficiencies in the O. & M. account. We are, to a large extent, really replacing aircraft, ammunition, weapons, and helicopters that have already been destroyed. If we want the United States of America to at least be as strong as it was in 1964, this Congress can take no other action. If we are concerned about the situation in the Middle East, and if we are concerned about the situation in the Mediterranean, at least we have to replace the funds that have already been used.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I am now happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I would ask, is the gentleman suggesting that the incurrence of obligations by the executive department requires that the Congress should accept those obligations without any questions, and go blindly forward, passing an appropriation without any question whatsoever?

Mr. LAIRD. But when the money has already been spent, because expenditures have actually been made since the 27th of October, when the O. & M. account of the Department of Defense went on a deficiency basis. The expenditures have been made and the money for the third and fourth quarters have already started to be used.

Under the authority which has been given by the Congress to the executive branch this deficiency is currently being accumulated in the Department of Defense. The checks have been made, the checks have been paid, and therefore there is not much one can do.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we can get to a vote soon, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to have such a great understanding of the financial activities of our Government as the gentleman from Wisconsin, who spoke briefly before, but I am greatly surprised that Congress at

any time has ever been asked to appropriate money on the basis of a fait accompli, and that the horse is gone, and there is no alternative for us but to go along with something that has apparently been done before by action of the executive department.

Now, I want to make a note in answer to the gentleman from Indiana about the atrocities committed by the Vietcong. Just the other day I read a book review in the New York Times which had this to say about the author's visit to Quang Ngai Province in the northern part of Vietnam.

He estimates that since the Americans arrived in force, there have been 50,000 Vietnamese civilian war casualties in the province.

I do not think by any stretch of the imagination we can blame the other side to such an extent that we are left without guilt ourselves.

Further, I note, that the gentleman from Indiana calls on Ho Chi Minh to yield somewhat in his dealings with us. I think it is a desperate situation when we are depending on Ho Chi Minh to relieve our trouble here. And the Vietnam trouble has become our trouble in many parts of our American body politic. Apparently we feel that Ho Chi Minh owes it to us to help us settle not only the trouble in Vietnam but also the trouble that weighs on many families here at home in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I expressed objection to the limitation mainly because I think it is a little short of shameful that the House of Representatives has taken so little time since the Tonkin resolution to discuss the basic question of policy in Vietnam.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I do not think it is the way to get at the question of fundamental policy in Vietnam although I can understand why he would choose this course.

It was not too long ago that Secretary of State Rusk stated that one course open to the Congress in order to bring about a reappraisal in Vietnam was to cut off the money for the war.

That is hardly an appropriate way. I think we have a responsibility, one might say, as a supply sergeant to the military needs, but we also have a tremendous responsibility especially to the men in the field to deal with fundamental policy.

As I say, Congress has not met its responsibility.

There is pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a whole series of bills dealing with basic war policy. There is pending before the House Committee on Rules a resolution which is cosponsored by one-third of the membership of this House. It would call upon the appropriate committees to at long last deal with the fundamental question of war policy.

When will we act?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an appropriate amend-

ment because it is the only method that the House of Representatives has to deal with the question of policy in Vietnam.

Once a year, when the supplemental appropriation is before us, the House has an opportunity to vote upon policy in Vietnam, the administration having Americanized the war and pursued its objectives without consulting the Congress, except to ask for funds. As long as the funds are voted, the policy continues. Escalation begets escalation.

It is clear from the testimony on May 28 before the Committee on Appropriations that there is a planned increase in troop commitment from 525,000 which the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Nitze, said was authorized, to 549,000.

The plans now calls for 517,000 to be in place by the end of June. Hearings, page 737.

If we want to affect the policy and if we want to say it is time to call a halt to the escalation of this war and the time to concentrate on the negotiation process in Paris, then let's stop appropriating funds for a war which has reached a dead end and which must be resolved through diplomatic channels.

The fallacy that this war can be won through a pure military victory has been established.

It would be fitting for the House to act today to begin to decisively affect the policy and conduct of the war. So long as the Congress continues to rubber-stamp the war through the appropriation process, it is abdicating its responsibility for decisionmaking and rational appraisal of executive policy.

As long as the war may be financed in this fashion, with scarcely a murmur from Congress, the administration will continue to rely on the possibility of military victory. Two days ago, General Westmoreland again reassured us that the enemy is growing weaker while we are gaining. Presumably he was not within earshot of the Vietcong rocket attacks on Saigon. Yesterday he said a military victory in a classic sense could not be achieved.

Let us, through our votes today, draw the line. Let us say to the administration that, with all of the drastic problems here at home, our war effort must struggle along on a paltry \$24 billion a year, and not a penny more. This may provide the necessary incentive for a negotiated settlement.

It is ironic that, after voting \$6.1 billion for the war in Vietnam today, next week the administration will ask approval of a 10-percent income tax surcharge and a \$6 billion deduction in domestic programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT].

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to take this opportunity to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question concerning one of the items on page 12.

The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] had stated that the purpose of the bill was to put our forces in the same position that they were previously.

I would like, in that light, to ask what is meant by "d." on page 12:

d. General increase in operational readiness—\$357,000,000.

Does this mean we would then place ourselves in a stronger position than previously, for more extended operations in Vietnam, or does it mean we would merely replace or restore prior existing readiness?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has only a moment, of course. This is to provide the backup resources, such as additional ammunition production facilities required as a result of the escalation of the war by North Vietnam, and the additional demands on us to meet this threat. Additional equipment of various kinds and some specialized research and development are provided for to strengthen the country beyond what was anticipated to be necessary last year when the regular defense bill was before us. I would refer the gentleman to the narrative under "General Strengthening of the Defense Posture," appearing at page 743 of the hearings on the second supplemental bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I asked the chairman of the committee as to who is responsible for the escalation of violence in South Vietnam. It seems to me that this has a bearing on the question of what we should do with this supplemental appropriation for Southeastern Asia.

I have voted against earlier supplemental appropriation bills for Vietnam because I found it the only way I could effectively protest my dislike of and disagreement with the administration policy which led this country to spend over \$120 billion in South Vietnam over a period of some 13 or 14 years. Today the Vietcong are shelling the capital city of South Vietnam. This is a clear illustration of the bankruptcy of the United States policy in that country.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I have made it clear that I would take a different position whenever the United States decided to seek a political settlement. I think a political settlement must be had. I think if we get one, it is going to be unsatisfactory, but in the process of seeking a political settlement, it would be unwise for the United States to be in a deteriorating military posture. I think when the situation is unstable or deteriorating, you do not get a settlement. You postpone a settlement. It is for that reason that I expect that I will support this supplemental for Vietnam in the hope that this administration has fully appreciated the realities of that war and is prepared to enter into the kind of political settlement which is within our reach.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the money in this bill is vital and necessary—\$3.8 billion. I think we have to remember a few things.

First, the budget for fiscal 1968 was originally low in the amount of money authorized for South Vietnam.

Second, the aggressive actions of the enemy has caused an increase in our ac-

tivities which is demanding more manpower and resources.

Third, there was the *Pueblo* incident. Fourth, there was the Tet offensive. The President, was required to take actions necessary to protect our boys over in South Vietnam. Therefore, these funds are vitally needed.

As was pointed out a moment ago, the Department of Defense, in operation and maintenance accounts, has been operating on a deficiency ever since October 27, 1967. We need these moneys, and I think it would be the height of foolishness to support an amendment that would take funds away from our needs in South Vietnam at this time.

Therefore, I respectfully ask for a vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, we have a very clear-cut issue before us. First, the money which is contained in this bill has been spent or obligated in the war in Vietnam. If we were not to approve this request, it would mark the first refusal by Congress to stand back of the Nation's fighting men. It would mark a repudiation by the Congress of the efforts of every American in uniform throughout the world.

Much more is involved than the combat in Vietnam. It would mark a rejection of the principles for which 23,000 young Americans have died in battle in Vietnam. It would be a signal to Hanoi that we are preparing to abandon Southeast Asia to communism; that Congress now rejects every principle America has stood for in the free world.

These are strong words. I stand on them. We are behind our fighting forces, or we are not. This is war.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 4, noes 128.

So the amendment was rejected. Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope no one reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this last amendment will jump to the conclusion that the division vote denotes enthusiastic endorsement of present policies in Vietnam. There is ample evidence not only within the conversation of Members on the floor here today but also in the newspapers of the utter bankruptcy of what is presently being attempted in Vietnam.

There was never a more dramatic indication of this than the front-page news today of General Westmoreland's farewell statement. Quoting from the New York Times:

Gen. William C. Westmoreland said today that military victory "in a classic sense" was impossible in Vietnam because of our national policy of not expanding the war.

He also said: The only real military hope was to wear the enemy down through a process of attrition.

Is that what we are involved in here today—financing simply more attrition?

I think that is something we ought to

think about. Naturally, we are going to be the supply sergeant here today, as we should be, but I think we ought to look to our own conscience as to our responsibilities under article I of the Constitution, the warmaking authority, a responsibility to the men in uniform getting shot at.

Here is another indication of the bankruptcy of present policies. Did Members happen to note the rate of casualties last week: Exactly two more died in Vietnam than the total membership of the House. In the week before that, it was a slightly larger figure, and the week before that about the same. Last week's total of 3,000 American wounded men contrasted with slightly more than 1,000 wounded on the part of South Vietnam.

Is this the "more of the same" policy we are financing? Do we not have any responsibility as Members of the most representative branch of the Government to deal with the question of fundamental policy and to recognize that what we are now doing is simply not getting the job done?

It is all very well for us to back the men with supplies, but the burden ought to weigh very heavily upon your shoulder, as well as upon mine, because the men are there. They are in uniform by act of Congress. They are equipped by act of Congress. Most of them were called into uniform by act of Congress against their will.

This past week we have paid an eloquent and deserved tribute to one man who was killed by a bullet. We ought to remember that during the past week more than 400 men have been killed by bullets in Vietnam. They are there not of their own choice, or through their own election, but because they were told to be there, to go there.

It is incumbent upon this House to delay no longer in dealing with the question of fundamental policy, to realize that what we are doing there is not getting the job done, and to examine alternatives to the present course of action.

I believe it is disgraceful that we have been "sucked in," so to speak, to this gradualism policy which obviously leads nowhere but to deeper trouble and higher casualty rates.

I would hope that at long last the leadership of this body would see fit to release from the Rules Committee the resolution cosponsored by one-third of the membership of this House, which in turn would direct the appropriate committees to deal immediately with the question of fundamental policy. This gradualism policy is morally irresponsible and militarily self-defeating. The burden for this policy, even though not initiated by the House, nevertheless weighs very heavily upon the shoulders of us all.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER: On page 10, line 16, insert:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Executive order, or regulation, no part of the appropriations in this Act shall be available without the express authorization

of the Congress granted by statute enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act for any expense incurred in connection with (1) the maintenance of more than 525,000 members of the Armed Forces of the United States within the area designated by Executive Order 11216 (April 24, 1965), (2) an invasion of North Vietnam or any other nation in Southeast Asia by the Armed Forces of the United States, or (3) the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MAHON. I make a point of order against the amendment as legislation on an appropriation bill, requiring many additional duties, and further action by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is directly involved with the troops in Vietnam. It represents an escalation from 525,000 to 549,000 men. The restriction that I would place is of the same type frequently placed by the distinguished Committee on Appropriations, itself, on appropriation bills.

I believe the amendment is completely in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule.

A point of order has been made against the amendment on the ground that it imposes additional duties upon the executive branch and that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

In the 76th Congress, on January 18, 1940, an amendment was offered by way of limitation on a general appropriation bill that provided:

That no part of the appropriations made by this paragraph shall be available unless and until Congress hereafter by law provides that monies available for expenditures by the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be withdrawn from the Treasury only pursuant to accountable warrants for advances to the credit of an adequately bonded disbursing officer as determined by the Comptroller General of the United States or certificates of settlement issued by the General Accounting Office.

The limitation offered on that occasion was held by the Chair to be in order. The Chair believes that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] is similar in form and is an appropriate limitation within the rules of the House and therefore overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, The amendment I am proposing is designed to assure that the appropriations in the bill before us today are not used for an escalation of the war in Vietnam without congressional sanction. It provides that, absent the express authorization of the Congress, no part of these appropriations shall be used for an increase in U.S. troop strength beyond 525,000; for an invasion of North Vietnam or any other nation in Southeast Asia by U.S. forces; or the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam.

I was shocked to learn from the hear-

ings just made available to us that the supplemental appropriation we are considering provides for substantial escalation of the Vietnam war. The bill contemplates an increase in U.S. troop strength from the current 525,000 authorized to 549,500. In addition, this appropriation was stated in the hearings to envision stepped up bombing in both North and South Vietnam. Several additional Air Force and Marine Corps fighter/attack squadron have already gone to Vietnam or are earmarked to go in the near future. These are not replacement units, but additions.

According to the testimony of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, some \$268 million of this appropriation will be used in the few weeks remaining in this fiscal year to support, and I quote, "the larger B-52 bombing program now projected." The Defense Department has gone on record as stating that higher bombing sortie rates are already in effect.

Mr. Chairman, the \$3.9 billion requested for stepped up military activities in Vietnam clearly adds further stress to our economy and our international balance-of-payments situation. It will divert badly needed funds for urgent social needs here at home.

Even more important, this escalation undermines the credibility of the President's attempt to deescalate the war and commence meaningful negotiations toward peace.

On March 31, just a little over 10 weeks ago, the President announced a unilateral deescalation, a restriction of the bombing of North Vietnam, with the avowed purpose of inducing settlement negotiations. He was unequivocal and clear on this, saying:

So, tonight, in the hope that this action will lead to early talks, I am taking the first step to de-escalate the conflict. We are reducing—substantially reducing—the present level of hostilities. And we are doing so unilaterally, and at once.

The credibility of this statement is called into question, not only by this escalating appropriation, but also by the recent statements of our highest generals reiterating as if on a broken record their so often disproved themes: "We are at a turning point in the war—we see the light at the end of the tunnel—America's military position in Vietnam was never stronger—our troops can start returning within a year—the news media are distorting our military situation—just give us a few more American boys, a little freer hand, and the war will be won on the battlefield." How many times must these shibboleths be disproved in blood before we will turn from them?

Our credibility is further impaired by statements of our Secretary of State rejecting out of hand any settlement involving coalition with the National Liberation Front. The NLF is and always has been the main enemy fighting force in South Vietnam. It is just patently obvious that no settlement effort can be genuine that does not contemplate a role for the NLF. If the NLF is to be excluded from South Vietnam, it can only be by complete military defeat, an objective which even some of the highest generals now admit is beyond our reach on the battlefield.

Our credibility is still further brought in to question by the unwillingness of either our political or military leaders to recognize any deescalation gesture by Hanoi. If every North Vietnamese gesture is to be treated as a defeat showing weakness as cause for greater military pressure, and as negating the need to negotiate, how are we ever to achieve the mutual deescalation which Secretary Rusk says he sees as the most probably avenue for ending the war?

Why did the President bother to change his course, make a unilateral gesture of deescalation, go to the bargaining table, if he is unwilling to follow through with the realistic and fair compromises needed to achieve a settlement on the real facts in Vietnam? Was his gesture a mere sham to quiet the voices of dissent in America? In view of recent actions of his still prevalently hawkish military advisers, the doubt cannot but be raised.

It is long past time that we in Congress began to assert and exercise our responsibility to oversee and guide this Nation's foreign policy. We can no longer give the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the White House carte blanche to continue to expand discredited and dangerous policies or to lock us into a situation fraught with the peril of nuclear holocaust and an Asian land war with 600 million Chinese Communists. The amendment I am offering is a first step toward meeting that responsibility.

The game of international "chicken" in which we and the North Vietnamese are engaging in Paris would be ludicrous were it not engaged in at the expense of more than 500 American lives a week. We have seen a mutual escalation of the level of terror in Vietnam while each side jockeys for position in Paris as to which will make the first move toward peace. The North Vietnamese fully share the blame with their inhumane rocket and artillery attacks against the civilian population of Saigon, while we increase the bombing and our troop strength.

If we mean to achieve peace in Vietnam we must be willing to take as much initiative to pursue peace as we have taken to pursue war. There is no question about our obligation to support our fighting men in Vietnam. The committee bill contains funds both for support of existing troops and for escalation. My amendment seeks to eliminate funds for the increment above existing forces only. But this is vital if we are ever to bring this tragic war to an end.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States announced several weeks ago what our strength in Vietnam was and was planned to be.

A short time ago the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Nitze, appeared before the Committee on Appropriations of the House and outlined the situation which had been outlined before in the press and through the other news media.

Mr. Chairman, I read from page 737 of the hearings as follows:

The fiscal year 1969 budget and the fiscal year 1968 budget revisions transmitted to the Congress earlier this year are based on

the deployment of a total of 525,000 U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam with about 517,000 to be in place by June 30, 1968.

Now, in view of the increasing tempo of the war the President has announced an increase in strength beyond the 525,000.

I continue to read from the hearings:

The President has now decided to increase the total strength to 549,000—24,500 more than previously planned. One brigade of the 82d Airborne Division and the Marine Corps 27th Regimental Landing Team have already been deployed.

And, Mr. Chairman, other actions have been taken to strengthen our position as the North Vietnamese increase their forces and increase the tempo of the war.

Mr. Chairman, the President's statement of March 31, in which he outlined the program which is now the program of the United States, would be repudiated by the effect of this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

I say to you in all candor that it would be most unwise, it would place the President and this country in a very serious position, to undercut our men in Vietnam and to deny them—the men—what the military leaders had told the President they would have to have, and what the President had told them he would send.

Mr. Chairman, we have provided the funds here in order to strengthen, hopefully, our position at the peace conference in Paris. Not to do so would certainly be evidenced as weakness and would place us at a disadvantage. Perhaps we are moving toward some sort of peaceful settlement of the war. Certainly we all desire an honorable and just conclusion of this most difficult conflict.

The proposed action is wholly indefensible and unjustified, and I would appeal to the House to vote down the amendment. I believe that even the further discussion of the weakening of our position in Vietnam as peace talks are going on is damaging to the best interests of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we may have a vote on this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to take only a minute or two to say that in addition to the remarks I made earlier, it is my impression that the President of the United States on March 31 signified a turn in the road with respect to our policy in Vietnam. He signified the desire on the part of our Government to reach a political settlement. I only wanted to add that I have great confidence in the chief negotiator, and in the negotiating team which is in Paris. If I personally had to nominate any single American to represent the United States in the Paris peace talks it would be the Honorable Averell Harriman. However, Mr. Chairman, I want to add this thought: I am not prepared to go along the way we are going indefinitely. What lies at the heart of this matter is the question: What kind of a political settlement is the United States prepared to see take place in South Vietnam? If it is our idea that we are going to win at the negotiating table what we have been unable to win on the battlefield then this war is going to go

on and on, and the casualties are going to mount. If, on the other hand, the President has decided that there should be a settlement which will not be satisfactory, but will represent some kind of orderly disposition of that conflict, then this I believe is realistic, and in the best interests of the United States, and the people of South Vietnam.

But I cannot tell, and I do not expect that the President should tell us, what our minimum negotiating terms are. And this leaves me in the dark. It leaves, I am sure, most of us in the dark. This is inevitable. I do not believe we can expect the President to come down, or his representative to come down here and say: "These are our minimum settlement terms." But I am not going to support continued funding of our military activities in Vietnam indefinitely if it should turn out that our settlement expectations or settlement threshold are higher than realism would dictate.

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

Mr. FRASER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, because I agree heartily with his remarks. All through this Vietnam debate there seems to be one theme running, and that is any opposition or any reluctance to appropriate funds for Vietnam is interpreted as a failure to support the troops in Vietnam, and so we go along appropriating these amounts to support the troops in Vietnam.

I would like to say that those of us who have reservations about Vietnam feel that we are supporting the troops much more wisely by withholding the funds. This country has spent about \$30 billion in the past year to support the troops, and it seems to me that to spend another \$5 or \$6 billion to support them in following the present course would be fallacious. The kind of support that our troops in Vietnam truly need is wise statesmanship, good judgment, willingness to admit mistakes, and other high qualities of the sort that will help us to disengage ourselves from this monstrous error to which our country has committed itself, the worst in American history.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, since he referred to me in his remarks?

Mr. DOW. I do not have control of the time, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] has control of the time.

Mr. FRASER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin in a moment, but first I wish to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that my amendment does not in any way affect the existing troops in Vietnam, it merely goes to escalation, and the number of troops there be confined to the ones that are there, and to the use of nuclear weaponry without the consent of the Congress. There is nothing involved in here that would undermine our support of our existing troops.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York who referred to the remarks I made earlier that I am in agreement with him that we need statesmanship and leadership in this year of 1968.

The point I made, however, was that we have been obligating funds on a deficiency basis since October 27 in the operation and maintenance accounts of the Department of Defense. This bill covers the period until June 30 of this year only.

A major portion of this bill is merely to reimburse the drawdown of those accounts. The obligations have been made. The checks have been written. The Treasury has met the obligations and the payments have been made in the operation and maintenance accounts.

This is not the way to get at the subject matter that the gentleman has referred to, and I would urge him to appear before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT].

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question with respect to these funds having been committed.

I have now checked the item in the hearings on page 743 with respect to item "d" in the report. There it is stated:

To meet the higher ammunition requirements, we propose, to increase the overall production base at an estimated fiscal year 1968 cost of \$148 million.

The largest item involves the opening of five additional TNT production lines. How is this already committed?

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman did not listen to my remarks.

I was referring to the operation and maintenance account which went on a deficiency basis on October 27. The gentleman is now referring to the procurement account.

The operation and maintenance account is on a deficiency basis. The procurement account is being used in this bill largely to replace stocks and ammunition already used such as aircraft and helicopters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ECKHARDT] has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks so that I may answer in detail the question propounded by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, in my remarks I will confine myself only to one question addressed to the gentleman from Wisconsin who has just spoken.

I should like to ask the gentleman how in the future this House can prevent an occurrence of this spending in advance of appropriations and obligation in advance of appropriations, so that the occurrence will not be repeated.

Mr. LAIRD. That can be done by changing the basic law.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he has not introduced any amendment which would change the basic law.

Mr. DOW. What is the basic law that you are referring to?

Mr. LAIRD. The basic law is the Budget and Accounting Act which permits the apportionment of funds upon a deficiency basis in certain instances and upon notification of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate.

Mr. DOW. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a constructive effort to allow the Congress to take some positive action in terms of participating in the policy determination regarding Vietnam. It would merely take the limits established by the President—the policy purportedly established by the President, and say that these will be the limits which the Congress will approve.

It is not appropriate for Congress to give up its powers to the President, as we have in connection with Vietnam. I think that this amendment provides us the opportunity to correct that situation.

I might say that the Members of this Congress are lagging considerably behind the sentiment of the people of this country. I have campaigned in a dozen States for a candidate for President who proposes that we end the war in Vietnam. I would say that in all of these States the sentiment of the people is substantially ahead of the sentiment of this Congress, and I would urge that some effort be made to catch up by Members of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out, first, that this amendment has nothing to do about whether or not we have obligated our maintenance and operations accounts, which was the question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It has nothing to do with the obligation of funds at all. What it has to do with is the use of the funds appropriated to escalate further the level of violence in Vietnam. It puts a restriction on that to the level that was stated by the President in his speech on March 31. It says:

We genuinely will not, without further consideration by Congress, engage in further escalation.

I urge support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, under

ordinary circumstances I would say that the amendment of the gentleman from New York is an excellent amendment, and it has my sympathy. But I shall vote against it for these reasons:

First, I have every confidence that the President will not use nuclear weapons in Vietnam.

Second, I have every confidence that the President will not invade North Vietnam.

Third, as far as placing a ceiling on the number of our men there, with the peace negotiations going on in Paris at the present time, and with General Westmoreland having said that the North Vietnamese are making a last desperate venture in order that they may win better at the conference table, I feel that we should support the President in the limited numbers that he has expanded the ceiling over there.

For those reasons I shall vote against the amendment, and I urge the House to vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the motives of the gentleman from New York may be excellent, but I think the effect of his amendment, if adopted, would be mischievous and detrimental to our best interests. I think it would be against the best interests of our negotiators in Paris. I think it would be against the interests of our troops in the field.

As the chairman of the committee has pointed out, it would be against the best interests of our allies in Asia to tell the Communists, wherever they may be located in Asia, that, "You can be aggressive. We will take no steps to counter any additional invasions that you may make in Asia at this time," and even to tell them, "You can come in with nuclear weapons if you want to. We won't use nuclear weapons."

To give this kind of open door and invitation to additional aggression and additional violence on the other side at this time seems to me to be unthinkable, and I hope the amendment will be overwhelmingly rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will overwhelmingly reject the pending amendment. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISION

The amount of the limitation contained in section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1968, is hereby increased by \$2,500,000.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 4, 1968:

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; 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.

On June 5, 1968:

H.R. 15348. An act to extend the authority to grant a special thirty-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas.

On June 6, 1968:

H.J. Res. 1292. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Secret Service to furnish protection to major presidential or vice presidential candidates.

On June 7, 1968:

H.R. 14922. An act to amend Public Law 90-60 with respect to judgment funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe.

On June 8, 1968:

H.R. 14672. An act to amend the Act of February 14, 1931, relating to the acceptance of gifts for the benefit of Indians; and

H.R. 15224. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

On June 10, 1968:

H.R. 3299. An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain lands on the Spokane Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15004. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15271. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Spokane Tribe of Indians.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose informally to receive the message, the Clerk had read through line 20 on page 10. If there are no amendments to be proposed, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 17, after line 2 insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"For an additional amount for payments to local educational agencies as authorized by Title I of the Act of September 30, 1950

(Public Law 874, Eighty-First Congress), as amended, \$53,852,000: *Provided*, That \$22,-819,000 of this amount shall be for payments under the authority of section 3(a) of that Act, and not to exceed \$31,033,000 shall be available for payments under authority of other parts of that Act."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment should be withheld until we get to chapter VII, entitled "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it makes much difference. If the Chairman will facilitate the action of the House, it really does not make much difference. This is also a chapter dealing with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the chapter to which it is offered is chapter VI on Interior and it should be in chapter VII on Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, it is possible to recognize a person at this point for a HEW amendment.

The gentleman from Illinois did not want to lose his place.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to make a point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, if the gentleman will agree, that the amendment be considered as an amendment to chapter VII and that the gentleman be recognized.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois would have to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment, and then resubmit it, if that is what he wishes to do.

Mr. MICHEL. I make that unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the amendment has previously been read, I ask unanimous consent it be considered as having been read at this point.

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

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain to the Committee whether or not his amendment proposes to restore funds for school construction or merely for school maintenance?

Mr. MICHEL. It would be for maintenance.

Mr. CAHILL. Only?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of orderly procedure, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 17, after line 17, insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"For an additional amount for payments to local educational agencies as authorized by Title I of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-First Congress), as amended, \$53,852,000: *Provided*, That \$22,-819,000 of this amount shall be for payments under the authority of section 3(a) of that Act, and not to exceed \$31,033,000 shall be available for payments under authority of other parts of that Act."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have some very mixed emotions about offering this kind of amendment to increase this bill in this amount, for I have only one school district in my congressional district which would qualify for any kind of assistance, and that I believe in the total of some \$3,000, because of a little radar station in my district.

I have been critical of this program on many occasions because I believe it has gone far afield and gotten completely out of hand and has been misdirected from its original intent.

Much as I have opposed Federal aid to education programs, I have, in principle supported the proposition of legitimate Federal assistance to impacted areas as payments in lieu of taxes. A Federal installation, that takes property off the local tax roles such as a military base is a legitimate case.

Why, then, would I offer this kind of an amendment to this bill today? It is merely because I understand it is quite conceivable a substitute may be offered to practically double the figure which I propose here this afternoon. As I understand it, the substitute may call for a total of better than \$40 million more than my amendment.

What I offer here is a compromise. By the conference report vote some time ago we accepted in this House 98 percent of entitlement for category A and 81 percent of entitlement for everything else. That was on a rollcall vote on a conference report in this House. What I am offering now is something more than that, a good deal more than that. As a matter of fact, I am offering 100 percent of entitlement for all category A schools and 90 percent for all the others.

Let me give you just a few figures in capsule form by way of a very simple comparison. Last year for this program we appropriated \$416.2 million, which provided for 90 percent of entitlement across the board, for qualifying schools. Because there were some underestimations made by those charged with the responsibility for making the estimates, that figure actually resulted at the end of the year in only 86 percent of entitlement going to the school. Then, and over and above that, when we passed House Joint Resolution 888, Public Law 90-218, we reduced this another 5 percent. So, for

all practical purposes, the schools were getting this past year 81 percent of entitlement across the board, and that is all. Under my amendment, by adding this \$53,852,000 or a total now of \$449,242,000, A category schools, that is where the parents work and live on the base would get 100 percent of entitlement under this amendment and all other schools would get 90 percent. Bear in mind that in the urgent supplemental appropriation bill there was this first figure of \$22,819,000 which would provide 100 percent of entitlement to the category A schools, and that is it. However, bear in mind that the budget message which came up to us provided and signaled to all of the schools qualifying in this area that they were only to get 90 percent of entitlement and no more. We really cannot justify any more than that except as I have for category A schools where there is this real bona fide legitimacy, in my opinion.

As I indicated at the very outset of my remarks, I would prefer to get this impacted aid program back on its original track and intended purpose by adding nothing to the bill, but I am just realistic and practical enough to know that the temptation will be too great for too many Members of this House to add something for this program to this bill. I want to keep any increase down to a reasonable and a justifiable figure. That is why I would ask all of you to support my amendment in preference to any substitute that might be offered at a larger figure.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MINK

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MINK as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 17, after line 17, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"For an additional amount for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by title I of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, \$90,965,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, these are times when sacrifices are required in order to meet our commitments. Today I ask you to consider what are our commitments. We say these words without sometimes hearing ourselves speak. There is no doubt that budget cuts are in order. But I do not believe that it is good government to renege on a lawful, legitimate, longtime commitment and expect the people to understand that some commitments are more lawful and more legitimate than others.

I happen to believe that when we pass a law, it is not good government to refuse to fulfill its promises. If it is the belief of some that this law is bad, let them offer a bill to have it repealed; if it is the belief that this law is inequitable, let them offer a bill to have it modi-

fied. But let us not use the power of the purse to do indirectly what we have not yet done. I do not believe that such a practice is conducive to public confidence in the integrity of law. All of us are guilty of uttering pious words about law and order, and about the growing lack of regard for it. I believe that we contribute to this general malaise if we can, without due legislative process, smother a program by withholding funds which the law establishes by formula and which has become the expectation of thousands of school districts all over the country.

My amendment, which I have just offered, will restore all the funds needed to reimburse all of the school districts in accordance to 100 percent of their entitlement under Public Law 874.

For the fiscal year 1968, \$486,355,000 is needed to fully fund this program. Only \$395,390,000 has been appropriated. The deficiency is \$90,965,000, which is the amount that I propose to insert in this supplemental appropriation bill.

In many areas across the country reliance on 874 funds is considerable. This is not a question of budget manipulation. This is a question of the education of our children. Whatever we are required to sacrifice for our commitments abroad, let us not also sacrifice our children's education.

The key word is reliance. In law we honor a contract and we require payment in accordance with proof of reliance. Public Law 874 funds have been paid to school districts in its 17 years of existence in accordance to 100 percent of its entitlement each of the 17 years with only two minor exceptions; the first year, 1951, there was only a 96-percent funding and in 1955, the funding came to 99.5 percent.

Teachers have been hired, budgets approved, and the school year completed on the expectation that Congress would abide by its own law. Many Members have told me that unless they receive these funds, some of their schools next year will be required to close down, some classes will have to be discontinued, and some will have to operate only a 5- or 6-month school year, in order to make up this deficit.

This supplemental appropriations bill which fails to provide funds for Public Law 874 ignores our responsibility to these thousands of children whom the Congress has said are a Federal commitment.

Fifteen thousand children in Hawaii live on military bases and receive their education on base. How much of this cost is borne by the Federal Government? Under Public Law 874 each child receives from the Federal Government only one-half what it cost my State to educate a resident child 2 years previous. The State now makes up the difference.

Let us say the average per pupil cost in Hawaii today is \$700. For each child on the military base the Federal Public Law 874 support is not one-half of today's cost of \$700; it is but one-half of the cost 2 years ago which was approximately \$600. So instead of receiving \$350, one-half of today's cost of education, that military child, under the law, re-

ceives only \$300 Federal support, with the State making up the current difference of \$400 for each child living on base.

The failure to appropriate these additional \$90 million will further burden the State and local governments and boards of education. For Hawaii, instead of paying the \$300, the Federal Government is now saying I will pay only 86 percent of \$300 or \$258 per military child on base and the State will have to pay not \$400 but \$442 toward the education of each military child.

School districts do not derive any funds through payment of taxes from the presence of military families who live on base. Our military families buy their food and other necessities on base—no corner grocery store enjoys their business so that it could be said that at least the grocery store pays taxes on account of business with military personnel.

Hawaii's 15,000 children who live on military bases require \$10 million of current operating money for their education. That is what 15,000 children in downtown Honolulu require to be educated. Yet, under Public Law 874, the total allotment under both A and B category for Hawaii is only \$8,918,912. Without my amendment to provide 100-percent funding, Hawaii's share will drop to \$7,135,128, leaving the State a deficit of nearly \$3 million for the cost of education of only the on-base military dependent's children without considering at all the off-base federally connected children.

Not one dime of Public Law 874, A and B category, in my State, is spent for off-base children. Simply because the law does not provide enough as it is to pay for the cost of educating the on-base children.

Many school districts may soon be forced to refuse this growing burden, and as Public Law 874 now allows, to relinquish this obligation back to the Federal Government and require the Department of Defense to operate these schools totally with its own funds.

I would hope that this day shall not come. To this end I urge the passage of my amendment.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to urge support of the amendment which will add \$90,965,000 to the Public Law 874 program for the affected school districts.

Unless this amendment is accepted, California alone will lose an estimated \$15 million. Of that amount, the 33d Congressional District will lose approximately \$733,000 or 20 percent of its total entitlement—the total entitlement in San Bernardino County for 27 school districts is \$3,665,411.

As an example, one of my school districts, the Morongo Unified School District which serves the Marine Corps Base at Twentynine Palms currently has a total enrollment of which 43 percent of its pupil personnel results from Federal activities. Cutting approximately \$65,000 from the current appropriation will, of course, detract from the educational efficiency and quality for each individual student. They will have to cut elementary counselors or speech therapists as

well as curtail their purchase of goods and materials for classroom instruction—while at the same time increase class sizes. A 20-percent cut in Federal funds will mean raising the local property tax in 1968-69 by approximately 42 cents per \$100 assessed valuation in an effort to overcome the reduction in Federal assistance.

And, this is happening all over the country.

I agree that limitations in our Federal spending must be made. However, certainly the education of our young people is not the place to start—especially since there are plenty of other areas wherein nonessential and wasteful spending could first be cut.

Certainly the needs of our children must be met in order to better equip our young people with a more sound foundation as future citizens and leaders. And, I think you will agree that better education and increased skills are the answers to a reduction in our crime rate, a reduction in the number of citizens on welfare, and a reduction in many of the problems our poor people are facing.

The education of our young people must, I sincerely believe, have first priority, and for this reason, this amendment, which would fully fund impacted school districts must, by all means, be passed.

The following list includes those schools in the 33d Congressional District of California which would be cut back 20 percent of their estimated entitlement should this amendment not be approved.

San Bernardino County school districts, estimated entitlement, fiscal year 1967

Needles Unified.....	\$5,861
Victorville.....	104,121
Adelanto.....	424,342
Victor Valley Joint High School....	159,095
Wrightwood Joint.....	7,464
Upland.....	58,412
Ontario.....	137,649
Chino Unified.....	43,403
Chaffey High School.....	124,766
Central.....	7,858
Apple Valley.....	29,206
Fontana Unified.....	27,509
Morongo Unified.....	330,418
Hesperia.....	20,431
Oro Grande.....	3,405
Alta Loma.....	9,429
Barstow Junior College.....	23,295
Cucamonga.....	3,143
Victor Valley Junior College.....	43,286
Chaffey Junior College.....	28,835
San Bernardino Valley Junior College.....	223,131
Yucaipa Unified.....	29,649
San Bernardino City.....	653,876
Rialto Unified.....	167,807
Barstow Unified.....	804,278
Colton Unified.....	119,207
San Bernardino County.....	5,487

Total estimated entitlement. 3,665,411

I have been informed that the current entitlements for fiscal year 1968 would be approximately the same.

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

Mrs. MINK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Hawaii. I do this not only because it is vital to my congressional district, which it is, but also be-

cause I am opposed to shortchanging thousands of children in impacted area schools throughout the country. Unless we act now to provide the federally affected school districts with full entitlement under Public Law 874, the quality of education in these areas will be seriously hampered. In my judgment, that is not acceptable.

For several years, impacted area schools have planned their budgets in reliance upon obtaining Public Law 874 funds. They have come to depend on these funds to carry on vital educational programs which have, accordingly, upgraded the educational level of these schools. For example, last fiscal year the impacted area schools in my district received \$1,620,711 under this program. This year, with full entitlement these same schools would be getting \$1,878,404. However, due to the cuts made by the administration and congressional refusal to appropriate the amount needed for full funding, only \$1,502,723 will be received unless this amendment is adopted. This reduction of \$395,681 has forced cutbacks which will seriously impair essential educational projects. I think we have an obligation to restore these funds immediately in order that the children in these schools will not be cheated from obtaining the maximum educational services possible.

It may be that in light of experience, Public Law 874 needs amendment or revision. Perhaps some of the student categories now eligible for funding should be eliminated. In this connection, I would wholeheartedly support a thorough review of this law by the House Education and Labor Committee and would welcome the opportunity to present my views to the committee. However, until such time as changes are made, I do not believe we should reduce the funding level of this program merely because we recognize that some adjustments may be required. We must be ever mindful that we are not considering an item which can be deferred this year and funded next without any permanent damage. We are talking about children for whom this year will never come again. What is lost now may never be adequately replaced.

I share the view that we must reduce Government spending and I plan to support the conference report on H.R. 15414, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, when it is considered. However, I do not contemplate that education will be one of the areas affected, nor in my judgment should it be reduced. Other less essential programs should be either greatly reduced or even eliminated, if necessary, before cutting 1 cent from the education budget.

Accordingly, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 17734 offered by the gentleman from Hawaii.

Some days ago when the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was before this House, and we were considering whether

to accept the conference report on the urgent supplemental bill, H.R. 15399, I sought the vote by this House such that the House would have accepted the provision of the other body for school assistance in federally affected areas in the full amount of \$486 million. While narrowly defeated by 10 votes, this full entitlement would have increased the appropriation recommended by the House Appropriations Committee from roughly \$21 million to roughly \$91 million, just as the gentlewoman seeks to do.

Having a number of school districts in my congressional district that provide education for children of families working for Federal installations, such as West Point Military Academy, Stewart Air Force Base, Castle Point Veteran Hospital and still others, I am more than conscious of the need to fund the school districts in the amounts which they have, in good faith, budgeted for this fiscal year.

Actually, the amounts provided per pupil under the full funding that the gentlewoman recommends comes to \$334 for pupils in the most eligible category. Even this figure is about half of the cost of education as it is calculated in a typical New York State school district.

Mr. Chairman, one of the serious shortcomings in some of the recent Federal aid to education legislation, and in aid provided throughout the Office of Economic Opportunity, has been the uncertain and intermittent character of the funding which Congress has provided. It has been hit or miss. All of us have observed Headstart programs that have flourished and then faded because there was no continuity of funding. This intermittent and uncertain character of the funding for any such programs is one of the principal reasons why programs, such as OEO, have floundered, even failed, and have been subject to criticism.

It has been fortunate that most regular educational programs of normal school districts in the United States have, over the years, been able to budget with foresight. By suddenly and unexpectedly reducing the amounts allotted under the normal budgetary cycle to federally affected areas, we are subjecting the established educational function to this same uncertainty and unreliable support that have been a reproach to OEO and like programs.

On the occasion of the vote that would have instructed the House conferees on the recent urgent supplemental appropriation to accept the full funding desired by the other body, the vote was 186 for and only 196, or 10 more votes, opposed. To all intents and purposes, the sentiment in this House is, therefore, not too seriously opposed to funding of the impacted areas in the matter that they expected at the time when they prepared their budgets for the current year.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the

Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee ever since this Department was created. It is true what the gentlewoman from Hawaii has said regarding the payments made under Public Law 874 in each of the years up until last year. Each budget during the Eisenhower administration, during the Truman administration, during the Kennedy administration, and each budget during the Johnson administration, up until last year provided for 100 percent of entitlement for impacted school aid.

But when the budget was submitted to this Congress in January 1967, the President put on notice all school districts throughout the United States that in his budget there would be provided 90 percent of entitlement under the Public Law 874 program.

Now, it is true that partly due to underestimates and partly due to reservations made under Public Law 90-218, only 81 percent of entitlement was actually paid to the school districts during this fiscal year.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois brings entitlement payment up to the 90 percent that was promised at the time that the school budgets were originally submitted and discussed by the school boards. This is the commitment that was made by the executive branch; this is the commitment that was made by this Congress; it was not the 100-percent commitment referred to by the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Now, why do I point this out? Because other educational programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and in the National Defense Education Act have been funded at far less than the full authorization. Let us take title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In that particular title the President's budget, as it was submitted to the Congress, provided half of entitlement. That is all that was provided. To take care of the low-income child, the deprived child, the President provided about half of entitlement.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when the gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment to pay out not only 100 percent of entitlement under category A, where the child lives and where the parent works on a military or other Government reservation, that when he fulfills the commitment of at least 90 percent entitlement to all districts made by the President of the United States in the budget document submitted to this Congress in January 1967, we are fulfilling completely the commitment that was made by this Congress and the executive branch. And it was known full well by every school board in the United States qualifying under Public Law 874 of this act. Now we are in conference on the urgent supplemental bill, and this has been in conference for a period of the last 6 or 7 weeks. We are in a position very close to agreement on this particular item. If this was offered tomorrow in conference I am sure the Senate would snap it up right now, the offer made by the gentleman from Illinois.

No, Mr. Chairman, I think when we provide every dollar that was in this

budget and every dollar that was promised at the time the school districts drew up their budgets that we have met every commitment we have made.

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes so that I may yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EVANS] and I apologize for not being able to yield to him earlier.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has referred quite often to the notice that the school districts received under category A funds in impacted aid in regard to the cutback in implementation of that portion of the impacted aid program.

I would ask the gentleman in regard to that—what a school district could do when it has a high level of military personnel and other Government personnel who are living off the base and who are living in low-income housing areas of high population density, and where there are a large number of students in a school district that does not have the economic base either through its assessed valuation or its income in that area to be able to do anything in planning in this regard.

We have this situation, and in fact there are some school districts in my congressional district which, in the absence of these funds, have no capacity to plan in any way at all for this.

Mr. LAIRD. I would just like to say to the gentleman that he is amending the wrong section.

If the gentleman is interested in those areas that have low evaluation and low income, he should be amending title I of ESEA where only half of the entitlement is requested. There is where the poor children are given priority in the allocation of funds, and not in this.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. We are talking about impacted military personnel and Government personnel in these areas.

Mr. LAIRD. If you are worried about the property tax base and the poor economy of the area, that is dealt with by title I of ESEA.

The gentleman is talking about that problem in connection with the wrong program.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. That is the title to which the gentleman referred or directed his remarks toward military impacted areas and governmental impacted areas.

Mr. LAIRD. This is title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It goes to the heart of the problem so far as education is concerned in the low income area.

Title I is funded at about 50 percent in the budget that was sent up by the President at the start of this session.

The gentleman asked me how we could fund these schools. If he wants to increase Federal funds for that purpose, ESEA is the place to do that.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when the general debate is over and we return to the House,

I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to this issue of impacted aid so that everybody will have a convenient opportunity to put his views in the RECORD.

We have debated the matter of impacted school aid for many years. I believe that most Members feel the law providing assistance to impacted areas is in some respects bad and needs very considerable revision.

I think that virtually all Members feel that certain impacted aid funds are justly due to many school districts. This is my firm view.

Let me again review just what the situation is.

The school districts have not been misled generally speaking but there are certain factors which must be considered.

In the budget last year, for fiscal 1968, the President asked for \$416 million for impacted school aid and Congress provided every penny of that amount. There was a reduction of 5 percent applied against the appropriation under Public Law 90-218 but, I am told, the schools were promptly advised of the total funds they could expect. So, every school district knew what the situation was with respect to the available funds for fiscal 1968.

But a few weeks ago some Members began to receive complaints that the school terms would be cut short if additional impacted aid money was not provided.

I have a letter today from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare saying:

This agency has checked, and no school term has been limited as a result of our not having provided the sums asked for in the President's budget.

The President asked for \$416 million for this purpose for fiscal 1968. What we did in Public Law 90-218, House Joint Resolution 888, was to provide for a reduction in appropriations, and, therefore, we in Congress provided for a cut, indirectly, in this program of about 5 percent. There is pending in the urgent supplemental bill, now in conference between the House and the Senate—and the conference is, I believe, scheduled to be resumed after the vote on the tax bill—a provision of additional funds for this program. The House, in connection with that supplemental bill agreed on an additional amount of \$20.8 million above the 1968 budget. The House voted for that. I voted for that. And other adjustments can be made in the light of all the circumstances.

I would hope that the House would be willing to let us continue to try to work out a settlement of that problem rather than adding \$90 million above the budget here, as per the amendment of the gentlewoman from Hawaii, or the \$53 million as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois. The \$90 million is too high and I would hope that both amendments would be voted down, and that in the conference on the urgent supplemental we seek to arrive at some sort of equitable settlement of this controversial and difficult issue.

I think everyone can have confidence

that some sort of settlement will be worked out, because we have already achieved a meeting of the minds on a minimum of \$20.8 million. That amount was, in effect, rejected in the other body when the conference report was considered. I would hope that the Members of the House would give us further opportunity to work this matter out.

The schools have had their regular term. They would like to have additional money for the next term. We have plenty of time to debate this issue and to make a determination as to the dollars. There will be additional dollars, I think I can assure you, for the affected schools. I have three in my own congressional district. So I am not speaking from a lack of information or interest in regard to the proposal. But I would earnestly hope that you would forego action on this today and let us continue to consider the item in the urgent supplemental bill. That will give us further opportunity to work out some sort of settlement on this issue.

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

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

Mrs. MINK. Is it not true that what we are talking about in the supplemental appropriation is reimbursement funds to the school districts for programs that have already been completed in the current school year? We are not talking about money which they are going to be able to plan for in a subsequent year?

Mr. MAHON. I must say that they have been able to get along for the school year which has just ended, or so the Department indicates in this letter, which I shall be glad to make available. They would like to have these additional funds for the forthcoming year, because their cushion has been cut down by the fact that Congress passed Public Law 90-218 and made a reduction of some 5 percent in the full national entitlement. This is the situation that confronts us plus the further fact that there were some other miscalculations which the schools had not anticipated. I hope both amendments will be voted down.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]. I was not aware that there would be an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I am aware of what the chairman of the full committee has said, that both amendments ought to be voted down. So I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

As I understand the amendment, it provides for a 100-percent entitlement in category A and provides for 90-percent entitlement in category B. I believe we have a responsibility and the commitment to provide financial entitlement to school districts in federally impacted areas. Congress has been doing this in varying amounts ever since the enactment of Public Law 874. The crisis in

education in school districts that benefit from this law was created by the influx of employees and their families into areas where defense installations so suddenly sprung up.

Acres of land and buildings have been removed from the legitimate tax base in communities where this has occurred. The Congress many years ago moved—and rightly so—to soften the impact of these installations with the passage of Public Laws 875 and 815.

The school budgets of these affected communities have been made up on the basis that the Federal Government would live up to its commitments. Failure to do so would force a reworking of these budgets and incur a real hardship on the areas involved.

I am sure that all of us are aware that such sweeping changes in these budgets and educational programs would constitute a crippling blow to school districts throughout the United States and at a time that demands the best possible educational systems.

If the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois fails, I submit we have failed to live up to our obligation. This failure would create serious problems for many communities.

Local mayors and school committees and school superintendents have a tough enough job in providing good and adequate education without the constant worry of whether or not the Federal Government is to honor its commitments.

It might very well be that there are some inequities and some windfalls in this program, but we ought to face that problem squarely and meet it with changes in the substantive law. This is not the place nor the time to do, through the appropriation process, what should be done by changes in the basic law.

Tables will be placed in the RECORD indicating the impact upon school districts all over the country of the neglect to provide adequate funding under Public Law 874.

Let me cite my own area. Chicopee, Mass., would lose almost \$350,000 if this amendment is not adopted. One can imagine the seriousness of this loss to this city. Other communities in my district would face similar serious losses of revenue—Springfield, Wilbraham, Ludlow, Hampden-Wilbraham school district, Granby, South Hadley, and Belchertown.

Schools charged with educating the children of Federal employees and military personnel are caught in a financial squeeze of almost unprecedented severity. Armed Forces personnel, for example, have been sending more and more children to community schools ever since the buildup in military manpower stemming from the Vietnam war.

These military personnel, moreover, contribute little to the community base, because they are often transients living in apartments or on Federal installations. As a result, schools are faced with swelling student populations and shrinking educational budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I think Congress ought to honor its commitments to do what it has the obligation to do under the laws that assist federally impacted communities. To abandon this commitment

would, in my judgment, be shortsighted and wrong.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and the substitute amendment close at 5:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and on the substitute for the amendment close at 5:30. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Did all of that time come out of my 5 minutes? If it did, I will just sit down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yielded for this purpose. He has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate close in 30 minutes. I have lost 5 minutes. Congressman Flood wants to talk for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania the unanimous-consent request limiting debate and closing debate at 5:30 has just been agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now make the unanimous-consent request that all debate end in 30 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor, and he has 1 minute remaining, if he cares to use it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LAIRD. Is it not true that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was recognized for 5 minutes before the debate limitation was arrived at? I therefore suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman had been recognized for 5 minutes and is entitled to proceed under the recognition given by the Chair before the unanimous-consent agreement was arrived at.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was recognized for 5 minutes on his pro forma amendment. He then yielded to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas, and most of the time was consumed, but the Chair would certainly entertain a unanimous-consent request that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be recognized for 5 minutes at this point.

The Chair hears no such request, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] for 1 minute.

Mr. FLOOD. Let us see where I come into this act. I am supposed to know something about parliamentary procedure.

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be recognized for 5 minutes and that the 5 minutes be taken out of the time allotted.

Mr. FLOOD. I would not agree to that. The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent has been requested that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be recognized for 5 minutes and that the time be taken from that of other Members who had been observed seeking recognition.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Chair recognizes the first speaker under the limitation of time, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH], for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, the Honorable PATSY MINK, to the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1968.

This amendment would insure 100 percent entitlements to various impacted school districts in our country by the addition of \$90,965,000 in funds in all categories of the Public Law 874 program in the affected school districts.

It is of the most compelling urgency that the Congress provide funds necessary to meet the commitments made to these entitled schools. In most areas, these schools have relied on the Federal Government to compensate them for the extra burdens created by the Federal activities in their areas, and they have prepared their budgets accordingly. There is involved then the matter of the Government's word to these severely affected districts.

It is imperative that the Congress recognize this obligation and provide the necessary funds at once. The Office of Education, by direction of the administration, has, without notice to anyone, frozen over \$20 million in funds appropriated for that purpose.

The loss of these needed funds will mean increased student-teacher ratios, curtailed programs, lower teacher salaries, and strikes at the heart of needed education for the youngsters of Oklahoma and the Nation at large.

In my own congressional district in Oklahoma, there are three major military installations which of course require educational facilities for the children of military families who live in the surrounding communities. The loss of these funds in these communities means great hardship and a curtailment in educational programs.

Just seven of these schools who have written my office have indicated that the Office of Education has notified them that they will receive only 50 percent of their budgeted entitlements this year, and an additional 30 percent this fall. This means a loss of over \$474,792 to these seven schools alone, in greatly needed educational assistance.

None of us I am sure could validly object to the Public Law 874 program. It is simply a compensation to the localities who must support educationally the chil-

dren of our military personnel who are living in the community, but whose installation upon which they serve does not support the community with taxes.

I believe that it is incumbent upon us to place priority on the education of our youth during this difficult period in our history. This is the one good way to provide for the future reduction in our welfare dependency and to advance our economic development.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TIERNAN yielded his time to Mr. ST GERMAIN.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended once again to offer an amendment to provide the funds necessary to meet full entitlements under Public Law 874, the impacted schools program. However I am now happy to join my colleague the gentlelady of Hawaii in support of her substitute amendment which is identical to mine.

My views on this matter have often been revealed before this body. However, they are best summarized in a letter which I sent to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, when this committee was considering amendments to the urgent supplemental appropriations bill for 1968. I would, at this time, like to read part of this letter for it also provides somewhat of a synopsis of the history of the impacted school fund legislation.

The most often heard argument in support of our nation's involvement in Viet Nam is that this nation must live up to its commitment to the Vietnamese people if its other commitments across the globe are to have any meaning at all.

This commitment, I need not remind you, has cost the lives of thousands of Americans while even more will wear the scars of this war for the rest of their lives.

How, pray tell, can a nation sacrifice the lives of its precious young men based on a commitment to some people thousands of miles from its shores when it fails to live up to the commitment to its own people in the form of legislation enacted by the Congress?

I am speaking in particular, Mr. Chairman, of the commitment made by the Congress to the impacted school districts across the land.

In 1950, after its Education and Labor Committee held hearings throughout the nation, the Congress recognized its responsibilities to communities where its activities imposed special burdens on local school districts and enacted Public Law 874. The Federal Government's commitment to the impacted school districts is clearly spelled out in Public Law 874 and, yet, we have consistently failed to live up to this commitment. Why should this commitment be brushed aside while we wage a war to live up to a commitment made to some people many miles from our shores?

The Congress has authorized, under existing legislation, an expenditure of 486 million dollars in fiscal year 1968 to meet full entitlements for this program. However, when the appropriation bill was considered, this House voted to make available only 416 million dollars. At the time, I said on the House floor that:

"If this figure [416 million dollars] is accepted, we will in effect be telling the school

districts that we refuse to fully live up to our commitment and that they will have to water down their educational programs accordingly.

"I regard this as a disgrace and a tragedy—a disgrace because we, the Congress, have failed to live up to our commitment; and a tragedy because our school children shall have to pay for our irresponsibility in the form of watered-down programs."

Unfortunately, my amendment to provide additional funds was rejected and the bill was sent to the Senate. Much to my delight, the other body approved an appropriation of 450 million dollars. However, the House version providing 416 million dollars was subsequently agreed to in conference and later approved by both bodies.

Our commitment was further watered down as a result of economy measures by this Congress and a grand total of only \$395,390,000 was made available for this fiscal year.

For the State of Rhode Island, this means that it will receive \$2,638,017 instead of \$3,289,396 or will experience a reduction of \$651,379. This all comes, Mr. Chairman, after the school districts have not only formulated their plans based full entitlements, but have implemented these plans. How can we pull the rug on our own children like this—for it surely is our children who will bear the brunt of our irresponsibility?

The highly-esteemed Senator Fulbright of Arkansas has introduced an amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations Bill passed by the House the third week in February which will provide an additional 91 million dollars for school maintenance and operation in federally affected areas. It is to this amendment that I wish to address myself.

Senator Fulbright has provided this Congress with what will no doubt be the last chance for this Congress to make good on its commitment to the impacted school districts. Let us not allow this opportunity to pass.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I plead for your Committee's assistance in making sure that this opportunity does not pass, by approving a recommendation that the Senate appropriate an additional 91 million dollars in support of the impacted areas program.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved Senator FULBRIGHT's amendment to provide the additional \$91 million needed to meet our commitment to the impacted school districts across the land, and the Senate subsequently approved the committee's recommendation.

Since the passage of this legislation by the Senate on March 11, the "urgent" supplemental appropriation bill has reached an impasse in conference.

Mr. Chairman, it is now the month of June and time continues to pass without any significant progress by the conferees while the entitled school districts patiently and hopefully await the outcome of this legislation. I do not know when, how, or if the conferees will ever act on the amendment for additional Public Law 874 funds, but I do know that these funds are needed and are needed now.

I ask the support of my colleagues for this substitute amendment which, if approved, will enable this body to live up to its expressed commitment to the impacted school districts of our Nation.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to my colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. I join in the remarks of my distinguished colleague.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink amendment to assure needed funding of our impacted area program.

Literally millions of American schoolchildren will be directly affected by our vote on this amendment.

We cannot afford to default on this important program and this obligation of our Government.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mink substitute amendment. I cannot help but feel that these funds are extremely important at this time in our country.

I know that this will have great benefit in my district.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE].

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the amendment to H.R. 17734 to provide a second supplemental appropriation of \$90,965,000 for all categories of the Public Law 874 program for federally affected areas. Previous authorizations have provided funds for only about 80 percent of the entitlements of most school districts now receiving this vital assistance.

The Nation's schools which are affected by extensive Government land holdings do not have an adequate tax base to provide for modern schools and school equipment. The Public Law 874 program was designed to compensate for that loss in tax revenues. This year, the Government has not paid its share. In effect, the Government is delinquent in its school taxes. This measure, H.R. 17734, will mark "paid in full" the Government's school tax bill to federally impacted areas.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAILSBACK].

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment before the House which would seek to restore 100-percent entitlement in all categories of the Public Law 874 program for the federally impacted school districts.

Eighteen years ago Congress recognized the wisdom and justice of this program which sought to supplement the budgets of school districts which were faced with the task of providing education for a large number of children whose presence in the district was precipitated by Federal employment of the parents.

The Federal Government does not pay State and local taxes on the land occupied by Government installations nor on the operations of Government institutions. This reduces the taxable base of many communities while at the same time these same institutions bring in many children for the community schools to educate. Furthermore, in many cases families whose children attend community schools live on the installation

itself, or in a type of housing with a very low real estate tax base, thus denying even further the amount of tax revenues the communities can gather to support the local schools. The increase in military activity accompanying the Vietnam war has accentuated the problem, but the current budget of the administration would reduce the funds directed to this program.

School districts have often complained that one of the problems with Federal funds has been that it is sort of an off-again-on-again sort of thing, and that it is difficult to plan local budgets with the changes involved and with late appropriations. This problem is compounded for those districts affected by military installations as in the middle of the year they learn that the funds that have been expected and planned for will be significantly less.

I have examined closely the cuts in funds to the 11 school districts in my district, and know that these reductions are serious. The effect could well be a significant reduction in the quality of education offered to all the children in these communities.

I have long argued for economy in Government; and in the special financial difficulties in which we now find ourselves as a nation, I know that budget reductions must be made. But I believe that there are many other areas of governmental activity involving much larger sums in which reductions can be made and some of the fat cut out. To tinker with the education of our children by denying a type of aid which we have said is just and proper for nearly two decades, I believe, would in the long run be false economy. Therefore, I urge that we restore the full entitled amount of this vital program for so many affected school districts in our land.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the Congresswoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

The importance of Public Law 874 funds to federally affected schools cannot be ignored and should not be minimized under the guise of partial funding of entitlements. Congress has recognized that thousands of the Nation's school districts cannot meet fully the financial burdens of their educational programs and of constructing additional schools and facilities in areas heavily impacted by Federal activities—without the benefit of Federal financial support. Accordingly under Public Law 874, Congress has undertaken to provide Federal assistance for such purposes. The districts, in turn, have come to rely on such funds and to utilize them to good advantage in keeping pace with the ever-burgeoning demands for education and for school construction and expansion. This is particularly true in the 12th District of Illinois where in only one county—Lake County—entitlements under Public Law 874 for the fiscal year 1967 totaled well over \$2 million.

Now, at a time when the activities and programs of the Federal Government have reached an alltime high and school districts are most severely impacted, we are told that the Public Law 874 appropriation must be cut by some

\$90 million. I have always like to consider myself as one who has shown a sincere concern for reducing Federal expenditures and getting the most for the taxpayer's dollar. However, I believe it to be false economy to drastically cut a program directed toward one of the Nation's most crucial needs—education—when so many other areas exist for exercising fiscal restraint.

The need for improving education and educational facilities has never been more urgent. All about us we see tragic signs of American society's discontent. In such times of crisis we examine our institutions—especially our schools—and ask: "Are they meeting their responsibilities?" The same question has been, and should be, asked of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that if we do not provide federally impacted school districts with the funds they so urgently need to provide new and better facilities for the teaching of young minds then we will not meet our responsibilities and the schools most assuredly cannot meet theirs. I urge the House to support the amendment to restore to full funding the entitlements in all categories of the Public Law 874 program so that the Nation's federally affected schools can get on with the vital job of improving the quality of American education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KAZEN].

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentlelady from Hawaii and wish to associate myself with her remarks. Of the multitude of programs which are supported by Federal funds, in my judgment, none is more worthy than aid to schools in impacted areas. I do not think that the Congress can go wrong any time that we put money into education. This is one area where there is no question that we actually reap a profit from every dollar spent. There is no better investment than the one we make in education.

This particular program is geared to help those school districts who through no fault of their own are overtaxed in their facilities by the children of Federal personnel. In my district I have many schools that were hard pressed to end this last school year. Some were able to operate by cutting back on programs and others by borrowing money which they somehow must pay back.

As one of my superintendents very aptly put it not too long ago in a letter which he sent me and I quote:

We find that we are advised that after our budget is made, our money is obligated, teachers employed, desks bought for the children and the children are here, that the government is going to deprive us of 20% of our money for those federally connected children. If we were a wealthy district, this would be no problem. However, we are not even average in wealth. We are below average. We have recently voted \$2 million of bonds and raised our taxes 30 per cent to build buildings for the children in this district. We have raised our maintenance tax for operation.

I commend the gentlelady for sponsoring this substitute amendment and join her in urging its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, while all of us would like to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii, I would point out that the amendments now under discussion are limited to funds for operation and maintenance only. There is nothing in these amendments, either the original or the substitute, that will provide any funds for school construction. I propose as soon as this amendment is voted up or down to offer an amendment providing \$40 million for school construction. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] providing \$50 million is approved, it seems to me then the House could vote funds for school construction and school construction funds, in my judgment, are just as important in many districts of this country as funds for maintenance and operation. Therefore I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii. It will, if approved, provide the funds for the impact program and will meet an outstanding implied commitment by the Government.

Perhaps it will be in order for the legislative committee which handles this subject to review the entire impact program and make such changes as may be appropriate. The important thing is to apply this form of Federal assistance to those districts which are deserving and are bona fide recipients. This is not the time nor the place to consider that issue. The school districts should know well in advance what can be expected under this program. It is manifestly improper and unfair to authorize a certain amount, lead the people to believe the funds will be forthcoming, and then have the amount reduced.

This proposition has been thoroughly debated. It is most important that this amendment be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the very important substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii. I am deeply concerned about the status of Federal impact funds needed to provide financial aid to Alaska under the provisions of Public Law 874. For many years the Federal Government has provided aid to school systems having a high incidence of Federal activity, on the premise that such school districts do not receive sufficient tax dollars from Federal activities to cover expenses required to provide an acceptable level of education for the children of persons connected in some way with the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and others in this Chamber have emphasized the very serious financial crisis now facing the Nation—and that our fiscal situation must be resolved in a responsible

manner. This next week we are scheduled to take final action on a \$16 billion tax increase/spending reduction program. Should this measure become law, it will force the administration to make a reevaluation of all Federal programs in the harsh light of today's realities.

I am most disturbed that when the administration reassesses national interests and attempts to establish priorities, education does not receive the high status it merits. The action we take today can firmly establish the point that education of the Nation's children is second to none when it comes to priorities. For it is through the challenge and stimulation of our children's God-given talents, which is only possible through adequate education, that a bright future can be assured for our children and for our Nation.

The basic principles of our national fabric demand the ability and responsibility of each and every citizen to respond through reason. To shortchange education through budget and fiscal limitations causes a corresponding reduction in the level of education that is possible, and, therefore, endangers the future of the entire American society.

Last year, as an economy measure, the administration decided to reduce the funds of federally impacted school districts by 20 percent. Under this action Alaska would lose some \$2.4 million of its very limited 1968 entitlement, one of the largest reductions among all States. Considering that Alaska is the 50th in population and among the highest with the ratio of schoolchildren actually residing on nontaxable governmental installations, such a cut is highly damaging. The reason given for this severe reduction was that Congress was demanding fiscal restraint for all programs during the present financial crisis. The action by the administration indicates that education is a low-priority item. Mr. Chairman, I most vigorously disagree. The education of our children is not a nonessential item—if I may use a double negative. It is essential, and fundamental and paramount. It cannot be reduced or postponed. The order of priorities established by the President is upside down.

Over the opposition of the administration, the other body added a provision to the urgent supplemental appropriations bill which would have restored full funding of almost \$91 million for the vital 874 program. Also added were \$100 million for other programs. As a compromise measure, the conference report provided a disappointing \$21 million for the 874 program—which was an increase of \$21 million, since this matter had not been considered in the original urgent supplemental appropriation bill passed by the House. Under the conference compromise, Alaska would have realized a substantial part of its total entitlement. However, it now appears that Alaska's public schools may lose even this sum of money since the other body rejected the conference report which was approved by the House.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment does not pass the House, the pupil-teacher ratio will go from 25 to 1 to 30 to 1 in the remote areas of Alaska. The State of Alaska has borrowed the money to off-

set this deficiency during the current school year/fiscal year. Because of the critical financial impact, if this amendment does not pass, Alaska will be forced to delay in the fall opening of some rural schools and in the total closure of others. What are we to do? Must we find some other funds somewhere to send our children elsewhere to school, or force them to seek their education by correspondence courses? I certainly hope not.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that we enact full restoration of entitlements to our schoolchildren. The administration has not yet shown the capability to properly determine priorities when it comes to the education of our children. Today we have the opportunity—possibly the last for this fiscal year—to assure that education receives the status and attention it merits. We simply cannot defer the education of our children. The opportunity will be permanently lost for the unfortunate youths of today who are made to suffer if we are derelict. The school administrations over the country who have obligated themselves in anticipation of these funds for this 1967-68 school year now completed, will be disastrously burdened by the financial impact if we lose faith with them by refusing to appropriate these desperately needed Public Law 874 funds.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I urge you to adopt the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the House of Representatives quit making a mockery of the educational system of our country. We pass laws to help those school districts that bear the brunt of educating the children of our servicemen and those called to work in the industrial and service installations that support our war effort and then by fatuous reasoning deny them that which we say was their just due.

You can rationalize why the money is not available when they need it, you can confuse the school officials by talking about budgets, entitlements, percentages curtailed and all of the patois of the Congress but they cannot understand why, having been told they will get a certain amount it is not forthcoming when they have to make their own budgets and fix the tax rates for their respective districts. They have a right to question the sincerity of the Federal Government.

We are here dealing with the most sacred thing this country possesses: the children of our country. Let us not "short change" them on their education. A vote for the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii keeps faith with the efficient school administrators of our country and the children who will come after us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE].

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment submitted by the gentle lady from Hawaii. The debate has adequately explained the justification for the position outlined in her amendment. If there are abuses in implementation of Public Law 874, let us change the

law, but let us not renege on an implied commitment to the school districts in impact areas now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, it might interest colleagues to know that in speaking for 45 seconds on this matter, each second I stand here represents \$5,000 lost to the city school district of San Diego.

The San Diego Unified District, a portion of which I am honored to represent, relies as heavily on this program as any school system in the Nation. The district's current entitlement is about \$6 million of the \$13 million allocated to all school systems in San Diego County under the program.

Uncertainty over how much of the entitlement can actually be paid has caused San Diego school administrators to reassess their entire financial picture. In plain fact, this big and highly productive school system is on the brink of a financial crisis—caused in large part by the apparent failure of Congress and the Federal Government to meet commitments so clearly set forth by Public Law 874.

Budget officers in the San Diego system now foresee a fiscal 1969 budget deficit of \$2.2 million—despite strenuous efforts to hold all expenses to a minimum. Even though \$4.5 million in divisional requests for new programs was rejected by the cost-conscious administrators, that projected deficit still stands out like an indictment against congressional inaction.

Where, then, will additional cuts be made, if they are needed to bring the budget into balance? Our school officials have been thinking about this, and their answers are not very reassuring. According to San Diego Superintendent Ralph Dallard, further reductions would have to be made "in present programs and services and/or in a scaling down—or even elimination—of salary improvements."

Let us think a little about the implications of that course of action. It would amount to economizing at the expense of our most precious asset, our school children. At a time when our most respected leaders are talking about the critical importance of education in building a better America, the San Diego school system, it appears, will not only be denied the wherewithal to carry out improvements—it may also have to cut back drastically on what it already has.

Most of us agree that our school teachers are underpaid in relation to other professionals in our society. Congress demonstrated this concern only recently when it enacted legislation giving the teachers of the District of Columbia a 19-percent increase.

But what if Congress is pinch-penny with impact aid, with a resulting freeze on staff salaries in San Diego and presumably many other school systems?

At the very least, the recruiting problems of the affected school systems would be compounded. And I expect that many veteran teachers would become understandably disillusioned, and perhaps find other teaching jobs or even new careers outside the teaching profession.

The teachers, at least, would have a choice. They could seek greener pastures if they wanted to.

But no such option would be open to the children. In the long run, they are the ones who would suffer the most, if we permit our school systems to deteriorate, even a little, by renegeing on our statutory commitment to the more than 4,200 federally impacted school districts. After all, these school systems did not ask the Government to take land and other real estate off their local tax rolls; but they did turn to us for partial compensation for their losses.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I also rise in strong support of the substitute amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

As President Johnson has stated in the past:

The education of our people is a national investment. There is no greater challenge than that of providing our children and youth with the opportunity to develop fully their talents and interests. Education is vital to the achievement of a Great Society and is our major weapon in the war on poverty.

It is difficult to reconcile these admirable and well-accepted views with the current situation wherein Public Law 874 is funded at a level of about 86 percent of entitlement for fiscal year 1968.

William Carey, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated in a letter some time ago:

The reduction in the impacted area program is * * * a reflection of the hard choices which are necessary to meet critical domestic needs in a time of extraordinary requirements for our international commitments.

Yet President Johnson does not find it difficult to dim his enthusiasm for education—and logic—to the point where he will sacrifice \$91 million in funds for a well-proven, successful program while he requests about 24 times as much—\$2.18 billion—for his fiscal year 1969 poverty program which all too often has turned into an administrative tangle embroiled in local feuds and is, as someone so aptly stated, "mired in the swamp of mediocrity."

Furthermore, it is simply not true that other educational assistance programs will make up for the loss in Public Law 874 funds.

Money under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 goes to districts with large numbers of low-income families and must be spent in a specific way for additional programs superimposed on the educational program already being sustained. Public Law 874 funds generally go to entirely different districts—those that have more students than normal due to tax-exempt Federal Government activities in the area. It is one of the few programs which assists the local taxpayer in meeting day-to-day operating costs of the regular school program. Any loss here will mean reductions in basic school programs.

It is significant that Federal control under Public Law 874 has been kept to a minimum, a goal which the Congress has often stated. No other form of Federal assistance has produced so little erosion of local control.

My district is strongly opposed to any reductions in Federal aid to impacted school districts. As one person put it, "The caliber of people brought here by Federal aerospace and electronic activities demands a high level curriculum taught in good schools. We have been making giant strides, and thus far we have been able to provide this curriculum. Loss of Public Law 874 funds would present an enormous crisis to our district. Our taxpayers are already heavily burdened to keep up our schools. We would prefer that less money be spent on the programs of the Great Society and antipoverty programs as a means of economizing."

There is great justification for upgrading the level of education of the disadvantaged who live in areas of poverty. Such an improvement is unquestionably an addition to our national assets.

But we all agree that the objective of education must go beyond bringing the disadvantaged up to a norm. It must also concentrate on the very fertile minds of those whose backgrounds have blessed them with special aptitudes. Here is our source of scientists, technologists, and intellectuals who will be leaders of tomorrow and whose skills can build a better life for all—rich and poor alike.

It is a fact of life that students with these aptitudes are often concentrated in areas of Federal impactation. We cannot afford in this crucial time of technological and ideological competition with the Communist world to cut back on the accelerated educational programs which we now offer talented and superior students. Yet this will be the inevitable result of the President's recommendations regarding Public Law 874.

In addition, the districts receiving Public Law 874 funds are not rich in terms of local tax dollars. Most of them are at the maximum tax rate allowed by law and are bonded to their legal capacity. In almost every case the districts will have to turn to the State for additional help beyond the amount they will receive automatically.

Dollarwise, local schools will take a drubbing if Public Law 874 is not continued at full entitlement.

It cannot be said that the loss of Public Law 874 aid will be offset by application of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Since this is a law with nationwide application, its benefits and provisions are now available to all school districts and its application should be nondiscriminatory. But if some school districts are forced to surrender the payments they have received for a Federal impact which has narrowed the local tax base, then those districts are the victims of discrimination. They are prevented from taxing a Federal installation which contributes children who must be educated at partially local expense and they receive no more, probably less, Federal aid. In the sense that local citizens are asked to shoulder what is properly a

Federal responsibility, they are the victims of discrimination.

I strongly support continued full funding of Public Law 874 because the program has been successful and has involved a minimum of Federal regulation; because of the bonafide need the program is designed to meet, and because its maintenance will prevent discrimination between school districts.

Ninety-one million dollars is a small commitment to the education of tomorrow's leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PETTIS].

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment which has been offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Certainly, each and every one of us is interested in doing whatever is possible and necessary to establish priorities for Federal expenditures. However, our basic commitment in Vietnam has resulted in an overall increase in the impact on Federal institutions, particularly those located on the west coast serving the logistical needs in Southeast Asia and the Pacific theater of operations.

This situation has increased the number of military personnel and the number of school-age dependents, and as a result, the readily recognized responsibility of the Congress, as embraced in the initial passage of Public Law 874 carries with it even greater meaning and demand to the affected school districts.

For this reason, I sincerely believe, and wholeheartedly recommend to my colleagues, that support of this amendment is an absolute essential.

The school boards and their administrators have had a very difficult time in planning their budgets, and I believe it is incumbent upon the Congress to do its part to meet its basic responsibility—to carry out a long-standing commitment to the impacted areas of this country.

Quite frankly, I believe a principle is at stake here, and I want to do my part to see that this principle is upheld. Therefore, I strongly urge the House to support the Mink amendment. While I hope that this amendment will not fail, I do want to go on record as supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, should the Mink amendment fail.

A continuation of the funding and relief to these areas is an absolute essential to guarantee the budgetary and fiscal commitments of these school districts.

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

Mr. PETTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

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

Mr. Chairman, in this case of clearly over-riding necessity I consider it proper and essential that I support, in behalf of my congressional district, the substitute

amendment of the gentlewoman from Hawaii which adds \$90 million to operations and maintenance in school districts in Federally impacted areas.

These are not needs subject to suspicion. These are needs which in my district cannot possibly be met in many school districts of Utah from the local tax base because such tax base is virtually nonexistent where Federal installations have gone into such desert areas as the Dugway Proving Ground in Tooele County and accounted for virtually 100 percent of the public school population.

I have announced support for the \$6 billion spending reduction and also the surtax. The spending cuts must be on the basis of priorities. In my judgment the expenditure need represented by this substitute amendment would have my own very high priority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my distinguished colleague's amendment to restore funds for the Public Law 874 program in fiscal year 1968 to 100 percent of entitlement in all categories of the program for affected school districts.

The purpose of the amendment, as the lady from Hawaii has indicated, is to add \$90,965,000 for the Federal impacted aid program which is designed to help school districts defray increased operation and maintenance costs resulting from Federal activities in the area.

I have had several lengthy discussions and meetings with local school superintendents in my district who are rightfully concerned about the adverse effects and hardships the present situation is working on their districts. They are deeply distressed by the lack of favorable House action the last time this program was considered in the House. They question the sense of priorities we have established, particularly in light of the favorable action taken by the other body on this very question.

It is not often that I beg the indulgence of my colleagues on issues outside the scope of my own committee assignments. But on this issue I feel very strongly. I have seen the program's beneficial effects over the years. It is a sound concept and has done much to assist in the educational advances that have been made. I am aware also of the serious dislocations resulting from the present state of limbo.

On the basis of information furnished me by Mr. J. R. Nichols, superintendent, Mascoutah, Ill., Community Grade School District No. 10, and which I submitted to the distinguished Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, I am alarmed at the seriousness of the cut in funds for the implementation of this program. The data he has provided on 21 school districts in St. Clair County receiving Public Law 874 funds, Mr. Nichols has computed that the program meets 60 percent of the cost of educating a child living on a military base and 30 percent of the cost of educating a child living away from a military base. In other words, the school districts face a deficit as it is.

To further diminish their base of support would only increase their costs to a point that would seriously affect the value of the education their students would receive. I do not think this is the intent of Congress. Instead of being cut, the program needs to be expanded to more adequately meet the actual costs involved in federally affected areas.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this pending amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]. The amendment would only do justice to those areas which have been subjected to an impact of need to expand their school programs through no fault or control on their part. We must bear in mind that, had it not been for our national defense activities, the school districts involved would not be in the predicament in which they find themselves. Plain justice, therefore, would demand that Federal assistance be extended to these school districts to the fullest possible extent. The amendment would do this and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii. In talking about this I believe it is important to ask, 100 percent of entitlement of what?

In many of the districts that I represent and in many of the school districts which the other gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS] represents 100 percent of entitlement does not really equal what it costs to keep the young people in school. When we realize the fact that the total tax base for those areas has been withdrawn. We should be talking about the amount necessary to make up for the withdrawal of that tax base.

Mr. Chairman, we can talk about 100 percent of entitlement and we can talk about 90 percent of entitlement but what we ought to talk about is 100 percent of cost if we are to do anything which is meaningful. Ninety percent of entitlement is just 10 percent less desirable.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin certainly confused the facts when he said let us apply NDEA title I funds to this problem. The purpose of ESEA title I funds is remedial and in many instances goes into entirely different districts.

The purpose of the funds under Public Law 874 is to replace the tax base withdrawn by Federal impact and to assure the children of Federal workers and servicemen quality education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time I have, I hope to add some additional comment in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]. Awhile ago we were discussing entitlement of school districts to impacted aid. One of the speakers read a letter which pointed out

no school had been closed because of a reduction in Federal assistance and that no school activities had been curtailed. Whoever said that omitted and neglected to say that the funds that were used to carry on these schools in the absence of Federal entitlement had to come out of local funds which are nearly depleted because most of the districts have reached the absolute limit of their tax levies as provided by law.

Mr. Chairman, it was suggested a minute ago by a member of the Appropriations Committee from the other side of the aisle, in speaking against the Mink substitute for the Michel amendment, that school districts had not been misled because they knew what they were going to get, simply because the President had put them on notice in his message this year and also in January of 1967. It was argued that the federally impacted school districts should have known that they were not going to get all of their entitlement. Now, that is a very shallow argument and hardly worthy of dignifying by an answer. The law provides very clearly in Public Law 81-874 that there is a formula of entitlement, for category A being children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property; category B, children who either reside on Federal property or reside with a parent employed on Federal property; and category C, children whose attendance in the school of the local educational agency is a direct result of the activities of the United States. Now, this entitlement is clearly spelled out, and no announcement of the President or anyone else can reduce or change this entitlement. The only way that entitlement can be changed is for the Congress to repeal Public Law 81-874.

So long as children are in a school district they are countable for eligibility and entitlement, and the Congress has no moral right to renege on its longstanding commitment to provide funds by appropriations to conform to the entitlement provided by law under Public Law 81-874.

We hear so much today on all sides about obedience to law and respect for law and order. How, then, can the Congress say that because there are some provisions of Public Law 81-874 that should be modified, that we can use the power of the purse to mutilate this law and render it meaningless? Such a course is not conducive to public confidence. Last week the Congress passed the omnibus crime bill in order to control the disregard for law in this country, yet we contribute this week to the general discomposure or inquietude of the country by our disregard for a statute just as much a part of the law of the land as any Federal criminal statute.

If the law is bad, then it should be repealed or modified, and then there would be no legal commitment to our school districts. Then the school districts could simply refuse to accept children coming into their schools who reside on Federal property, and also those who reside with a parent employed on Federal property. The facts are that school districts have relied on this entitlement. It is a kind of an implied contract between

the school districts and the Federal Government. We should not disregard that contract.

The argument has been heard that the Member who supports the restoration of funds for federally impacted areas will be fiscally irresponsible in the face of demands for a \$6 billion reduction of expenditures in connection with the surtax increase. The obvious and apparent answer to this contention is that defense funds are in general exempted from expenditure reductions, and certainly most of the children in federally impacted school districts come from Army posts, Air Force bases, Navy and Marine installations, arsenals and depots which are part and parcel of the defense effort and contribute to our national security. Even if this were not so, in the process of expenditure reduction there can be no other responsible or logical approach than to set up a list of priorities, and while national security and national defense should come at the top of the list, in the opinion of many of us the next most important object of governmental expenditures should be in the field of education, which directly or indirectly affects everyone in our entire society and even more importantly, not only this generation but the future of our country.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE].

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the gentlewoman from Hawaii to provide full funding for Public Law 874. Approval of this amendment would provide urgently needed and promised money to those school jurisdictions which have a heavy concentration of federally connected children.

In view of the present deficit, my colleagues and I have stressed the need to establish priorities in Federal spending. I feel very strongly that education at all levels should always receive top priority in our Federal budget. It is essential for the social and economic progress of our Nation that our young people receive the finest preparation possible for their role in the future of our democracy.

To meet the various educational needs of all students, school authorities must be free to make long-range plans. Therefore, they must be assured that at some later date those funds which previously have been authorized, will in fact be appropriated. I hope Congress will see that it has an obligation to meet and will appropriate the \$90,965,000 needed to bring Public Law 874 up to full funding. I shall continue to work for impacted aid—a vital need in the budgetary consideration of the school districts all across our Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the appropriation of funds which will assure full entitlement being made available to the schools of our land which are impacted by the expansion of the Federal activities and enlargement of Federal installations in recent years. The Seventh Ohio District,

as a result of redistricting, will have the largest number of such impacted school districts next year in the State of Ohio and these school districts will together have the largest entitlement to Federal funds of those in any congressional district in the Buckeye State. These school districts have effectively met the challenge of educating the children of those who are longtime residents of their areas because these longtime residents have generally been willing to tax themselves more heavily than the local tax level of the average Ohio school district. This has benefited the children of those whose assignment or employment at the Federal installations impacts the area, as well as benefiting their own children. As a matter of fact, at least one school district in my Congressional District has undertaken a special program for handicapped children, "Children Having A Potential," which serves the children of Air Force personnel throughout the world. Air Force personnel with children who could benefit from this program are given consideration for assignment to Wright Patterson Air Force Base because of the existence of this CHAP program at an impacted school nearby. If impact funding is not maintained at its full level. Should this specialized program be abandoned by this school or should local residents be asked to tax themselves further in order to maintain this specialized program of so much value to the Air Force.

The failure of our Federal Government to fund impacted school entitlement could clearly have an adverse effect on the morale of the personnel of the armed services. Without such funds, local residents must take up the slack for the benefit of those whose employment has impacted their school—as well as for the benefit of their own children. If they don't take up the slack, then their own children—as well as the children of Armed Forces personnel—become second-class citizens. This should not be.

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

Mr. GUDE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to provide full funding under Public Law 874 to school districts impacted by Federal activities.

In view of the great emphasis being placed upon education today, it is completely inconsistent to create a crisis for local school districts by providing only 80 percent of the entitlement under this law. These school districts have planned their budgets on the basis of full funding, and the Federal Government has the responsibility to meet its obligations in this regard.

Public Law 874 was created under the concept that where the Federal Government is supplying a national need by putting a Federal installation into a district, the local problem which is thereby created for educating the children of Federal employees should be assisted by providing Federal funds.

For nearly 18 years this has been an effective program and it has been done without any Federal controls of any kind.

I am concerned about the problems our failure to provide full funding will create in some school districts where there is no tax base and you have an Army reservation, or military installation, and the local school district, maybe with no tax base outside of residential property and little or no industry for property taxation purposes. Such school districts undoubtedly will face financial crises unless full funding under Public Law 874 is provided.

In Kansas, we have many school districts which already have planned their budgets on the basis of receiving their full entitlements under this law. There are certain school districts in which the Administration's recommendations for 80-percent funding would cause havoc in the educational program of these particular communities.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a great deal of talk about establishing priorities in spending. We must put our fiscal house in order, and we must meet the needs of our American boys who are fighting in Vietnam; but we cannot ignore or downgrade longstanding and proven domestic programs. That is where priorities must be established. In establishing priorities, it would appear that the Federal Government has a strong obligation to meet its full commitment under Public Law 874, a proven and longstanding program.

If we fail to do this, school districts which receive this support must either eliminate some of the educational services they provide our schoolchildren, or the school district must find other means to raise funds to continue its educational effort.

The latter, of course, would mean imposing upon local taxpayers an increased tax burden to support needed educational efforts which arise as a result of Federal requirements.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii, and I hope that it will be passed overwhelmingly.

Certainly, with the exception of the conflict in Vietnam, our commitments to education should have the highest priority.

As has been stated so often on the floor, a lot of these programs are long-range programs where commitments are made, and we have to keep those commitments. I sincerely believe there should continue to be this wonderful cooperation between the local, State, and Federal Governments to insure that the education of our youngsters is second to none.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, I hope that the substitute amendment is adopted wherein the Federal Government will increase the amount for impacted aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a most important vote that we are being asked to cast today. It is

not only a vote in support of the education of our children, but it is a vote, I believe, which expresses our commitment to programs which have been long established in the Government. A vote for the substitute amendment which I have offered honors the commitment which has been kept by the Congress of the United States for the past 17 years of this program, since 1952.

It is admitted that the President has not requested the funds for this particular fiscal year that we are discussing, but neither did the President ask for funds for the previous fiscal year, for 1966, but the Congress saw fit to appropriate 100-percent entitlement during that particular congressional session.

It seems to me that the school administrators have not had the notice that has been mentioned, and in order to assure the continued benefits of this program, and to assure the best possible education for our youngsters, I urge support of my substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed amendment to restore \$90,965,000 to the supplemental appropriations bill we are considering.

And, I certainly concur with the gentlewoman from Hawaii that payment of full entitlement under Public Law 874 to all federally affected school districts is a just debt that should be paid by the Federal Government.

In my statement before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations early last month, I stressed the importance of Public Law 874 funds to schools in my district and my State.

I am very much aware of the pressures on Congress these days to not only hold down spending on domestic programs, but to cut back such spending. I know that the decisions we must make are difficult ones.

In my statement before the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, I said:

My concern is that insufficient money this year, and in recent years, has been appropriated for aid to federally impacted schools under P.L. 874.

Although \$416,000,000 was appropriated for Fiscal Year 1968, only \$395,390,000 was allocated to the entire program because of the Bureau of the Budget cut-back in funding in December. In the Urgent Supplemental Bill, the House did not add to the funding for impacted aid legislation, but the Senate added approximately \$91 million. In conference, it was agreed to raise the appropriation to \$416 million, but the Senate refused to accept the compromise, so the bill is still in conference.

The current level of allocation to Montana is \$3,228,000. If the amount of \$416 million is finally accepted by both the House and the Senate, it will mean an increase of a little over 5 percent or approximately \$3,400,000 for my State. If the Senate figure is finally accepted, it will increase the P.L. 874 funding to Montana by about 23 percent, to a total of \$3,970,440—an amount which my State badly needs.

Cutbacks in funding for federally impacted schools has a much greater impact, I believe, in a State like Montana than it might for other areas. Our tax base is more limited because of the lack of major industry

in the State and the fact that a considerable portion of land in the State is federally owned.

In the Browning Public Schools in Browning, Montana, this cutback in impacted aid funds has created a major problem. Browning is adjacent to the Blackfoot Indian Reservation, with an enrollment in the primary school of 80 percent Indian children and 90 percent in the secondary school. Under the present level of allotment, the Browning schools are receiving approximately \$446,000. If the \$416 million figure for P.L. 874 is finally accepted by the Congress, these schools will receive approximately \$540,000, but if the Senate figure is accepted, the amount to the Browning schools will increase to approximately \$563,000. For a small school system with such a high proportion of its students coming from families from which no taxes are derived, \$117,000—or even \$94,000—would make a substantial difference in the quality of education these schools are able to offer their students. A really good education is of particular importance to these children, if they are to be prepared to take their proper place in today's society. Indian children have many handicaps to overcome, and we must not add the further handicap of an inadequate education.

The number of federally-connected children in our schools in Montana has frequently fluctuated. The most recent figures I have indicate that there are roughly the same number of B category children as A category children in the schools in Great Falls, Montana adjacent to Malmstrom Air Force Base. What also disturbs me about the present situation is that unless the Office of Education is able to fund Public Law 874 at a 100 percent level, many servicemen at Malmstrom Air Force Base, returning from Vietnam, may find an inadequate school situation for their children. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that we in Congress can justify short-changing these young men who are fighting for our country. Malmstrom is not in my Congressional District, but I am concerned about the quality of our schools and educational opportunities not only in my District, but in the entire State, because lack of educational opportunities anywhere in the State are going to ultimately have an impact on the entire State.

It is my hope that this Subcommittee will give vigorous support to appropriations permitting full funding of Public Law 874 both for Fiscal Year 1968 and future years.

In recent months, many studies have been made of the causes of unrest and violence in our country. Without exception, these studies have indicated that one of the basic causes of such unrest is lack of adequate education, which, in turn, leads to unemployment—lack of communication skills and knowledge with which to get a job.

We have made phenomenal strides in education in the last decade, particularly in the last few years. It is ironic that such progress has not kept pace with the growing demands on our educational systems, making necessary the expenditure of vast sums on remedial education and "crash programs" to upgrade verbal skills and train people for jobs.

I believe most sincerely that an important key to the solution of our domestic problems in this area lies in the field of public education and that this is one area we cannot fail to support fully.

I am aware that cuts must be made in our domestic spending as long as we must pursue the Vietnam conflict. But, I am convinced that if we are to continue to grow as a Nation, and remain the strong, vital country we have always been, the one place where we cannot economize is in the field of education.

An informed, alert, educated people is the basic strength of our country. Our children are our hope of the future, and the least we can do for them, I believe, is to insure that they have maximum educational opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support the proposed amendment to restore funds for Public Law 874. I believe that we would be derelict in our responsibilities to our Nation's youth if we fail to provide any or all of them with the education they need to meet the demands of today's society.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to reduce Federal spending. But I am sure that all of us realize we must reduce Federal spending.

The President has reserved under Public Law 90-218 5 percent of the money we appropriated in the last session of the Congress for maintenance and operations under impacted aid, so that 81 percent of entitlement is now being paid.

It seems to me the reasonable compromise offered by the gentleman from Illinois should not be taken lightly by the districts that qualify for impacted aid; 90 percent was the only commitment made by this Congress and by the executive branch of the Government to these school districts from one end of the United States to the other. It seems that to go beyond the 90-percent commitment that was made over 1 year ago—and I emphasize which was made a year ago last January—is to go beyond the responsibility that this Congress has for this fiscal year.

I would also remind the Congress that the school year has closed, and the fiscal year is practically over, so these funds contained in the amendment are actually funds that will be spent in 1969 for next school year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to yield my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN], but since he was losing \$5,000 for every second that he was speaking, I decided I would not do it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii to restore 100-percent entitlement in all categories of Public Law 874 for federally impacted school areas.

This is the second time this year I have voted for these funds. I felt this matter was imperative when the urgent supplemental appropriation bill came before the House April 4. As we well recall, our efforts to restore full entitlement fell short by only 10 votes on that occasion. I hope the House has had an opportunity to reconsider its action and will today rectify the situation.

Many of our schools made up their budgets with the understanding that they would receive this entitlement. The prospect that the rules can be changed in the middle of the game, so to speak, places them in a most untenable position. I strongly side with those school

administrations who are protesting that this is unfair treatment.

One of the great problems confronting our Nation is that of educational facilities. Public Law 874 was enacted to alleviate such problems when they have been aggravated by the population impact of Federal installations which place an unfair burden on local taxpayers. I have consistently supported Public Law 874 over the years and I believe it absolutely necessary to meet our responsibilities to our impacted school districts.

Certainly the program must be carefully reviewed and evaluated next year to make certain that there are not abuses, but the meat-ax approach Congress has taken to the program this year is most unjust. I urge the House to reconsider the action it took April 4 and to approve full entitlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as we have said a number of times, the commitment that was actually made was back in January, 1967, in the President's budget—and all schools well know it—was 90 percent of entitlement.

What my amendment calls for is 90 percent for category B schools plus 100-percent entitlement for category A schools.

If you bear in mind what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said, under the provisions of House Joint Resolution 888, Public Law 90-218, the schools are currently getting only 81 percent of entitlement.

What I am offering in my amendment in this \$53 million is a 19-percent increase in category A and a 9-percent increase over this year in category B.

It is adequate and sufficient and it will do the job. Furthermore we can get the other body to agree to that figure I am sure. So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would ask to vote down the substitute amendment and adopt my more reasonable approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the House is expected to vote next week on a tax bill coupled with a reduction of \$6 billion in budget spending for the next fiscal year, 1969.

The funds involved in the pending \$90.9 million amendment could only be expanded in the next fiscal year, 1969.

This \$90.9 million figure is above the President's 1969 budget. It is not in the budget total which the tax bill conference report seeks to cut by \$6 billion. Increases above the budget, such as in the pending amendment, can only add to the problem of effectuating the overall reduction of \$6 billion.

There is pending in the urgent supplemental bill a figure lesser than this; \$20.8 million which the House has agreed to, is still in conference and can be altered.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down by the House so that the matter can be reconsidered and a suitable compromise agreed to in later legislation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, again in the Congress we review the matter of Federal assistance to county public school systems in areas of high Federal employment. There are good reasons for the Congress to take a new look at the whole proposition of aid to school districts based on special criteria, such as the density of Federal employees in the area.

There are those who believe the program results in discrimination against other areas where the need is equally great, but where the situation does not fit established guidelines. I would urge the Congress to review this whole matter and reassess the program for assistance in impacted areas, to make sure we are not robbing Peter to pay Paul, and that in the broadest sense the public is being served equitably through the investment of their own funds.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the meantime, we cannot change horses in midstream. We cannot undercut school systems whose plans and commitments have been made, based on normal expected funds authorized by Public Law 874. Therefore, it seems to me only logical that we must continue the program as a commitment made until a reasonable alternative is presented.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I take this time to urge the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other conferees on the urgent supplemental appropriations bill to accept nothing less than 100 percent payment for both A and B pupils and support a full entitlement of Public Law 874.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii, an amendment which I feel is essential to the fulfillment of our obligations to overtaxed school districts of this Nation, an obligation which Congress assumed in a public law intended to relieve a situation which still exists.

One of the great difficulties which school districts have been experiencing is that of meeting the demands of a shifting population. Large influxes of military forces, civilian employees at military bases, and employees at other Government installations, can completely upset the orderly plans for meeting the expenses of education. When a large industry moves into an area, its presence on the tax rolls improves the income of school districts concerned. This is not true with the Government installation.

It is easy to say that the communities were eager enough to get these military and other Government installations. Of course they were. They contribute greatly to the general economy of the area—but let us pin down the subject to the school district. It may take years for this improvement in the general economy to be translated into available school revenues. In the meantime, the schools face increased expenses without a commensurate increase in revenue. This the Congress recognized when it passed Public Law 874.

Our school superintendents must try as best they can to coordinate Federal appropriations with their local and State revenues and try to do the best job pos-

sible in meeting their needs. They cannot do this if they must wait until the school year is over to find out whether Congress will appropriate the funds already authorized by law. School administrators were first warned that they would get only 86 percent of the appropriations for both category I and category II of Public Law 874. Then they were told it would be 98 percent of category I and 81 percent of category II. Public Law 874 authorized 100 percent for both categories, and the amendment we proposed today would restore that amount.

The Office of Education estimated today that my district would lose approximately \$750,000 in previously anticipated revenues if this proposed amendment is not accepted. Certainly there is ample evidence, all over this Nation, that education is not the place to cut our budgets. If, in desperation, we must make some cuts in educational funds, let us not cut established and successful programs such as this one.

I believe we have an obligation to the schools of America to meet our commitments fully in the financing of Public Law 874, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, there is an urgent need for full restoration of Public Law 874 funds in my district, and I feel certain that the need is just as great in all districts throughout the country which are heavily impacted by Federal installations.

We welcome the Federal Government in our community, but we lose substantial real estate, personal property, and business license tax revenues which would normally accrue to us.

The localities appropriate more than half of their total budgets to education and are forced to raise local taxes annually in an effort to keep pace with their ever-increasing educational needs. In spite of this, I am not proposing a similar increase in Public Law 874 funds. I am simply advocating that we continue these funds at their previous level in order not to work an undue hardship on these already overburdened taxpayers.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, the Public Law 874 and 815 programs are accomplishing an invaluable service for our education system, and it is vital that sufficient funds be provided to enable them to continue to function efficiently. The aid they provide to schools in communities with enrollments swollen by the impact of Federal installations is essential. Schools in areas surrounding military bases are especially dependent upon this type of assistance and will suffer unless these additional funds are approved. In this sense the Public Law 874 and 815 programs are certainly defense-related activities.

It was my privilege to serve on the great Committee on Education and Labor during my first term in the House, in the 81st Congress. At that time I was a member of the subcommittee that conducted hearings on the problems of federally impacted areas, and in this capacity became a cosponsor of Public Law 874 and 815 legislation.

Ever since then I have followed the

course of this program with deep interest and pride as it has made a mounting contribution toward the future of our country by helping provide ample education in communities that could not otherwise bear the burden of great Federal impact. In 1967 my State had received \$126 million under these programs. Without it the children of those associated with Tinker Air Force Base, Fort Sill, Altus Air Force Base, and Clinton-Sherman could not be getting the educational facilities they deserve.

I urge adoption of the Mink amendment and the continuation of these programs at full effect.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, the burden and benefits of Federal educational activities are nationwide. The Public Law 874 program, first adopted in 1950, recognized the inequity of forcing local taxpayers to pay the extra costs of educating an increased enrollment of new pupils as a result of expanded Federal activities in local school districts.

The program has been equitable and has worked well up to now. Presently, however, there is a serious problem. This year the House Appropriations Committee did not consider inclusion of additional Federal aid to impacted school areas in the supplemental appropriations bill, because this was not included in the administration's request. This means that Maine's First District would lose 20 percent of an estimated \$1,265,000 in automatic formula grants from the Public Law 874 program in 1968.

Unfortunately, school districts which had expected to receive full allocations under this program were advised—after the school year had begun—and after school budgets had been prepared and approved—that they would receive only 80 percent of the amount to which they are entitled. To the Maine Department of Education and school officials of Maine, this means a reduction in revenues of over one-half million dollars. With limited tax resources, it is clear that our Maine school districts, facing increasing costs for 1968, and with already fixed budgets and appropriations, will not be able to educate our children. I cannot imagine a more critical situation. The impact on several Maine communities will be disastrous; over 75 communities will be directly affected.

Unless we approve this amendment to the second supplemental appropriations bill to provide an additional \$90,965,000 to restore 100 percent of entitlement in all categories of the Public Law 874 program, Maine will be deprived, and so will the Nation of the funds it needs to provide an adequate education in those school districts, whose enrollments are enlarged as a result of large numbers of Federal workers in the vicinity. I believe the one common denominator in all the challenges facing us is education. Education is the key word when we talk about problems of employment, expanding our economy, revitalizing our institutions and cities, and in communicating problems as well as solving them.

There is no question that reductions can and shall be made in Federal spending. But to slash Federal aid to educa-

tion in impacted school districts does not consider priorities. Our vital educational programs must not be reduced. Public Law 874 should receive top priority. Unless full assistance for federally impacted areas is made available to our Maine school districts, I have been advised that some schools will be closed. I can think of no way in which our Nation can better demonstrate its concern for our civilian and military personnel and their families, than by restoring full assistance for education in impacted areas.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriation for "education and welfare services" by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Approximately one-third, or \$1,107,000, of the \$3,107,000 recommended by the Appropriations Committee for this item is for vital welfare assistance to Alaskan natives.

Under the terms of Alaskan statehood, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is maintaining, on an interim basis, its original responsibilities for the education and welfare of Alaskan natives. These functions will ultimately be transferred to the State of Alaska.

Except for the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is still responsible for the education and welfare of all Indians in the Western States who live on nontaxable lands. Thus, this supplemental appropriation to assist Alaskan natives is comparable to action that would be taken in most other Western States under the same circumstances.

This supplemental appropriation would be used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide direct welfare assistance to Alaskan natives as a result of two major disasters late last year.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs will use \$683,000 of the supplemental appropriation to augment the income of some 912 Alaskan native families embracing 4,508 people who are almost totally dependent upon the commercial harvest of salmon for cash to meet their basic living needs. Last year the salmon catch was about one-half the average for the preceding 10 years and as a result virtually eliminated the major source of income for these 912 Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut families living in 70 different Alaskan communities.

In addition, \$424,000 has been included in this supplemental appropriation for the restoration of native housing damaged in the disastrous Tanana River flood last August. This flood caused damage to some 305 native homes—225 in Fairbanks, 59 in Nenana, and 21 in Minto. The amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee will be used to cover only the costs of the basic necessities and to restore these native homes to their condition prior to the flood.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee have long recognized the urgent need for improving the shocking and disgraceful native housing in Alaska and other Indian communities throughout the Nation and I commend them for their actions.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully and

wholeheartedly urge that we continue the worthy record established by this Congress and approve the supplemental appropriations to meet the urgent needs of Alaskan natives.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to fully fund the impact aid to education program and to urge the House to adopt this measure.

This program for assisting school districts burdened with the responsibility of educating children of federally employed families is the most successful school aid program we have ever had. I have consistently supported the program for two reasons. First, since Federal activities create many of the problems such as overcrowding of schools, the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to assist these school districts. Second, there is very little Federal intervention in the school districts' spending of these funds.

Presently, school districts under this program are receiving only about 86 percent of their full entitlements because the administration refused to fully fund the program. Local school administrators, including those in my area of San Diego, now find themselves out on a dangerous limb because their budgets were prepared on the basis of receiving full entitlements. Unless we meet our obligation today by adopting this amendment, these school districts will be left stranded with two alternatives. Either they can cut back their educational programs or increase local school tax rates. I submit that there are many more areas in our Federal Government where we can economize rather than in the impact aid program. For example, we spend billions of dollars on so-called antipoverty programs which have not been anywhere as effective as local school systems in fighting illiteracy and subsequent poverty.

In April, the House voted to increase the impact aid funding by some \$26 million. I supported that proposal then even though I preferred to see the full \$91 million approved. My feeling at that time was that by granting a "half-loaf" then, it would give Congress time to try to correct our national fiscal crisis so that the second "half-loaf" could be granted in the supplemental appropriations bill before us today. Now that the time of decision is upon us, I strongly urge that we approve this much needed appropriation for the impact aid program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. MINK and Mr. MICHEL.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 80.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAHILL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAHILL: On page 17, after line 17, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"GRANTS FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

"For an additional amount for grants to local educational agencies for construction of school facilities, as authorized by the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, 20 U.S.C. 631-647), \$40,000,000."

And redesignate accordingly.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I realize the hour is late and I shall try to explain this amendment very briefly. I cannot help but observe, however, that this last vote dramatically demonstrates, at least to me, the wisdom of those Members who have urged the President to announce in advance what cuts he proposes to make of the \$6 billion, because it seems to me if we vote a tax bill and then we are told that areas such as this are going to be part of the \$6 billion cut, then what we are really doing is kidding ourselves, because we are going to come right back here and restore every nickle that is cut.

This amendment is similar to the previous amendment, except that this provides \$40 million for school construction, as distinguished from school maintenance. As an example, I represent a district that has Fort Dix and McGuire Air Force Base. We are marshaling our troops at Fort Dix to send overseas. We are bringing our wounded veterans back to the hospital facilities at Dix and McGuire. This means personnel are being brought in. The school districts are not adequate by way of facilities and they must construct new schools.

In this bill we do not have any money for school construction. The Commissioner has told us that there is needed for current construction programs, \$167 million. We are providing only \$24 million.

This amendment provides \$40 million of the \$167 million that is necessary. It is a compromise amendment. It is necessary if we are to provide the schools that will house the teachers and to supply the necessary facilities. It is as essential, in my judgment, as maintenance and operation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This should be known as the amendment to get money to build schools that are not built. This has absolutely no relationship whatsoever to Public Law 874, upon which the Committee has just acted.

Now, you have done pretty well with 874. Do not overplay a scene. Never do that.

There is now in the reserve \$49,323,000. Hear that, \$49,323,000 in the reserve.

You have three funds for 1968, three funds of \$24,772,000.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, as contrasted with the maintenance funds of

Public Law 874, these funds carry over as construction funds always do. They carry over from one year until the next year.

And furthermore, as different from Public Law 874, the entitlements for 1968 carryover. And you have a total carryover of entitlements of \$150 million.

What you are concerned about on construction is an entirely different thing. There is an old phrase about this kind of thing which does not bear repeating in nice company, but I think you know what the situation is.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey wish to have me yield?

Mr. CAHILL. Yes.

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

Mr. CAHILL. Does the gentleman agree that there are some districts in this country, which have entered into contracts for the construction of school buildings on the basis of grants already committed to them and have now been told that those grants are being deferred?

Mr. FLOOD. But does the gentleman not understand that the carryover of construction is from year to year? All construction under all budget arrangements for all departments is year to year. So this is not true.

Mr. CAHILL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. CAHILL. If a school district has counted on a grant of \$800,000 and has entered into a contract to pay for the construction of a school building, where does the school district get the money to pay the contractor?

Mr. FLOOD. The school districts spoken of—and there are not a corporal's guard in the entire United States—may have to do this. This is a 1968 supplemental bill. Imagine the poor broken hearts of the school boards. They will have to wait perhaps two whole weeks. Is that not too bad? Is that not too bad?

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. CAHILL. While I have the greatest of respect for the gentleman—

Mr. FLOOD. And I admire my neighbor from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I will say to the gentleman that in my judgment, in this particular case he is mistaken. If my friend will, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, guarantee that the two school districts in my district will get their money after waiting 2 weeks, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Let me tell you this. You should talk to my subcommittee. I am the chairman of a subcommittee on which there are 11 votes. There are 10 votes against me. I am a peerless leader. I would vote for you in 5 minutes, but the committee will not.

Mr. CAHILL. I believe the gentleman has answered my question, and I will not withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Just wait for 2 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time, and of course this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

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

"School assistance in federally affected areas", \$500,000; and

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question on the item on page 20 of the bill, line 4, "School assistance in federally affected areas," \$500,000.

Mr. FLOOD. That is a transfer of funds from where the money is to the work incentive programs. This is in the bill and in the report. The gentleman is prodigious in reading the reports. This is a program which we cut back by about \$20 million, but we feel it is such an important program that we have not eliminated it, and we do not feel that we should imperil it.

Mr. GROSS. This then is in addition to the millions in Federal funds for so-called impacted schools. Is that right?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman has read this bill. It is on page 19 at the top of the page. It is a \$10 million program, and the funds are not fresh money. It is a transfer of funds.

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

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$455,000, and release of \$260,000 pursuant to Public Law 90-218.

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

Does it require a deficiency appropriation to run the Bureau of the Public Debt, may I ask someone on that particular subcommittee?

Mr. STEED. Yes, because they not only have the automatic pay raise they have to take care of but also the workload has increased. They have to pay for most things they use. These are automatic mandatory increases.

Mr. GROSS. They may be mandatory increases but this is because the Bureau of Debt is out of money, or will be out of money?

Mr. STEED. Yes, but this request is made in order for them to finish the year.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman agree that it is entirely fitting that the Bureau of the Public Debt be out of money since every other agency and department of Government apparently is out of money?

We are fast working up to a bankrupt situation in the entire Federal Government, and it is intriguing that even the Bureau of the Public Debt is in here asking for money in a deficiency basis.

Also, Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is on his feet let me ask about the Secret Service and the \$700,000 which is being sought for that Service. Is that in addition to the \$440,000 that was authorized for the Secret Service a few days ago or is it in addition?

Mr. STEED. That is in addition to this amount, because this amount here is needed to pay salary increases and other automatic costs that the present

staff must have in order to finish out the year. The \$400,000 is to take care of the brandnew activity that we just started last week.

Mr. GROSS. A great many of these items, representing millions of dollars contained in this bill, are for salary increases; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Most of the Treasury Department appropriation bill, as the gentleman knows, traditionally 80 percent of their total budget goes for salaries because of the large number of people employed in the Post Office and Treasury Departments. So when the Congress granted the pay raise, it imposed a very heavy burden upon the Department in order to meet these pay raise increases.

Mr. GROSS. But, this does not include a single dime for the \$1.6 billion pay increase that becomes effective automatically on July 1; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is right; there is no provision contained in here for that.

Mr. GROSS. And yet we are going to vote next week on a tax increase bill that contains a proviso purporting to cut spending by \$6 billion; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is the gentleman's understanding. However, I do not know if the conference report has been filed as yet on that particular matter.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman agree with me that this is about as incongruous a situation as this House could possibly get in, having just voted to add \$90 million to \$100 million for so-called impacted schools in a \$9 billion deficiency appropriation bill here today, and yet be confronted next week with a bill to increase taxes and claim that we are going to cut expenditures by \$6 billion?

How nonsensical can you get?

Mr. STEED. The Treasury Department bill for 1969 has already passed the House and we reached a conference agreement today and hope to have it up for consideration of the House next week. That bill, when it becomes law, will have no increase contained therein for salary increases which go into effect next July. If that does go into effect, then we will be confronted with the proposition of an additional deficiency with which to pay these increased salaries.

Mr. GROSS. It is going to be very interesting to look at the record of those who vote for a tax increase next week and compare that with the vote today by which this bill is increased by \$100 million.

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

The Clerk will read.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that the remainder of the bill be open to amendment at any point.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that most of the remainder of the bill is on increased costs that were necessary as a result of pay legislation, and I believe that most Members are familiar with the general requirements.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving

the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the meaning of the language of section 303 on page 61 under "General Provisions."

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

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

Mr. MAHON. This is a provision that was requested in the budget, and it is required. It makes it possible to make the payments which are referred to in section 301.

This provision was carefully screened, and I do not believe the gentleman would have any objection to it. It just enables the departments and agencies to carry out the law, and pay the salary increases at the rates that were approved by the Congress.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], looked into this rather deeply, and I believe he could speak very wisely on it if the gentleman from Iowa would yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Under the pay increase bill we passed last year, there are three increments to the pay increase. The next one is proposed to come due on July 1.

Now, the President in his total budget figures included approximately \$1.6 billion for that pay increase, but this has not been included in the individual bill. This particular section, section 303, will permit the administration to make those increases in pay without going according to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, which means that they can appropriate the pay increase as it comes due as of July 1. In other words, the pay increase in the 1969 fiscal year appropriation act.

Mr. GROSS. Does that mean that the Executive order that was issued today, or is proposed to be issued very shortly, providing for a pay increase in the executive branch as well as the pay increases for employees of the legislative branch, is covered by this language?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It is due any time, if it was issued today, probably that is the one which conforms to a law that we passed last year, but this will permit the administration to administer those pay increases without having them in each and every individual appropriation act. It will have to come eventually with a supplemental bill to cover it, which is estimated to be about \$1.6 billion.

Mr. GROSS. That means an automatic pay increase?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. When we passed the pay increase bill last year it was in three increments, that is correct.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. We have made as sure as it is reasonably possible to do so that the administration will have to follow all of the provisions of the budget act, which are contained in section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; that means that they will have to report to Congress what they have done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 62, after line 13, insert the following:

"None of the funds in this act shall be available for any expense in connection with licensing the import by any private individual or by any nongovernmental corporation, organization, firm or institution of any surplus military rifles, shotguns, pistols or other firearms, or destructive devices or for the expense of clearance through Customs by any such importers of any such surplus military rifles, shotguns, pistols or other firearms or destructive devices."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, Members may be surprised that I offer this amendment to an appropriation bill.

Yet any vehicle is proper if it is the only one at hand.

I have been in Congress almost 20 years. In all that time, I have not had an opportunity to vote on a House bill regulating guns, let alone offer an amendment. The bill we considered last week was an omnibus bill. It was considered under a parliamentary situation which precluded the offering of any amendments. The bill had to be accepted or rejected in toto.

The purpose of my amendment today is to ban the importation of surplus military weapons. It would ban the utilization of Federal funds for licensing the import of military surplus rifles, pistols, or other firearms by any private individual or by any nongovernmental organization, firm, or institution, or for any expense of clearance through customs of any such firearms by any such importers. The effect of the amendment would be to stop all importation of foreign manufactured military surplus firearms, whatever their nature. The United States would no longer be "the dumping ground of the castoff surplus military weapons" of any nation. There are compelling reasons why such a ban is desirable.

In the most general sense, the tragic events of the past week serve to underline the urgent need to limit the dissemination throughout society of the instruments of violence. As Senator EDWARD KENNEDY stated on the floor of the Senate less than a month ago:

Tougher firearms legislation is required . . . in order that 200,000,000 Americans can sleep and walk and work and play with greater peace of mind. That is the question before us, and the results of the way we answer today will be measured in lives saved, robberies avoided, injuries prevented and snipers disarmed. If we are really serious about doing something about crime and riots and violence, here is our chance.

I offer the House, through this amendment, yet another chance to achieve the purposes outlined in Senator KENNEDY's speech and urge them not to let that chance pass.

It is not necessary here to recite again the long list of public opinion polls, conducted among gun owners alike, that overwhelmingly endorse stronger gun

control legislation. It is not necessary to remind us of the flood of mail now passing into our offices—strong and effective gun control. It is difficult to take seriously the arguments that firearms control laws infringe on the rights of the average citizen when so many average citizens clamor for their passage. The amendment is not offered as a panacea for all the destruction wrought in our society by the indiscriminate use of firearms, but rather as an improvement on existing legislation that is clearly inadequate in the light of the dimensions of the problems we face.

I hardly need remind you that the weapon that killed John F. Kennedy was an Italian military surplus rifle. Evidence before numerous congressional committees showed that during a recent 5-year period there were 50,745 cases where long arms—that is, rifles and shot guns—were used in crimes of violence or other illegal activities. The reluctance on the part of Congress to limit in any way the freedom of responsible sportsmen to purchase weapons for hunting and target shooting is understandable, but the fact remains that those same weapons can be used to perpetrate crimes of all descriptions.

It would be indeed fortunate, for sportsmen and legislators alike, if rifles themselves and weapons "generally recognized as particularly suitable for or already adaptable to sporting purposes" could be relegated to a category that was entirely exclusive of weapons used in crime. That is not, unfortunately, the case. Weapons that kill game or obliterate bulls-eyes are just as efficient as instruments of human destruction, as weapons designed especially for that purpose.

It is also irrefutable that military weaponry, whatever its suitability or adaptability for sporting purposes, is designed for use in warfare against men. When the Congress was formulating its gun control legislation, it would have done well to address itself not only to military weapons adaptable to sport, but also to military weapons adaptable to criminal activity.

The Department of Defense has already made a policy decision that reflects the judgment that it is undesirable to make available to the general public surplus military weaponry of any description. The Department of Defense formerly disposed of its surplus firearms through commercial and other private channels, but has suspended all such sales since 1963. Moreover, the policy in recent months calls for the disposal of all surplus military firearms either through dumping them in the ocean or in some other way destroying them. If the Department of Defense can take such drastic measures to keep military firearms off the open market, the Congress can certainly do no less. It is certainly an anomalous situation when a government bars the sale of its own military surplus firearms and dumps them in the ocean, while at the same time continuing to countenance the importation of foreign manufactured surplus weaponry. There is more than ample precedent, then, for the course of action I propose here today. It is my judgment that the sportsmen

and property owners in this Nation can provide for their needs well enough without the availability of imported surplus military firearms.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] who offered the amendment. I count him my very good friend. But I oppose the amendment. I think he is mistaken in his objectives in offering the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the facts. There are those who seek gun registration in the United States. There are those who in final analysis want to deprive all individuals of the right to own firearms. If you will think on the language now before us, innocuous as it seems, the language—and I quote from the amendment itself—would require that the weapons covered by the amendment be registered by type and serial number with the Commissioner of Customs, and the names and addresses of the initial retail purchasers—

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

Mr. SIKES. In just a moment.

Mr. YATES. You are reading the wrong amendment. That is not the amendment under consideration. That is the one I propose to offer next.

Mr. SIKES. Then both of them are bad. I am opposed to both and both should be defeated. They have no place in the orderly consideration of sound legislation.

The Congress has just completed action on a handgun control bill. Both the House and the Senate had opportunities to consider and to adopt language of this type, but neither did so, nor was the language recommended by any committee of Congress.

The question of additional gun controls is still before Congress. We have the President's recommendations. The committees of Congress are considering these and other proposals. Obviously, this is not the time and place to adopt another gun bill. There have been no hearings. We know nothing of the requirements imposed on the departments of Government by this language. We do not know how many additional personnel would be needed. We do not know how much more recordkeeping and paperwork would be required. We know that it would be costly because of the additional requirements, but there are no funds included. In fact this is a supremely useless gesture for it applies to a supplemental bill for fiscal 1968 which ends in less than a month.

May I point out that we do have effective laws which govern the importation of weapons and, as far as I know, there has been no complaint about the operation. Surely there is no requirement for precipitous and poorly considered action at this time.

One final thought: Many of the weapons which the gentleman proposes to bar are good weapons which can be procured by law-abiding sportsmen for less money, and that is what they are seeking.

I would not want to see the House rule out the opportunity for law-abiding

citizens to acquire good weapons by this precipitous action. It has been considered by no committee and recommended by no committee of Congress. It is before us late in the day. Should we be swayed by the eloquence of the distinguished sponsor and by prejudice against all weapons because of the terrible things that recently have happened, to adopt this unfortunate amendment?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order that I may ask unanimous consent that the Clerk re-read the amendment so we may be sure what the amendment is that is being considered?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is being requested that the Clerk re-read the amendment. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk re-read the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct. I had quoted from the amendment which will follow. It should be significant, however, that every objection I have raised would prevail against the pending amendment except for my language pertaining to registration. There is no requirement for registration in the language which the gentleman has offered, but every other statement which I made against it holds. My argument in its entirety will hold against the amendment requiring registration of imported weapons which the gentleman from Illinois is prepared to offer next. That language is even more dangerous, for it would set the beginnings of gun registration. This is one step from gun confiscation and denial of the right of the individual to own weapons of any kind.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to the importation of firearms. The President has sent down a further message this week in regard to firearms. I am advised that the Judiciary Committee of the House met this morning for the purpose of considering that message and with the hope of reaching an early decision on an additional bill having to do with firearms. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I regret to be placed in the position of concurring in an action that seems to me premature and which might undercut the present deliberations of the Committee on the Judiciary.

It would seem to me this language ought to be thoroughly probed. Members cannot come to a definite conclusion as to its merit in the next 2 or 3 minutes. I think the subject of the amendment ought to be thoroughly and carefully studied by the Committee on the Judiciary, and by the House, or by the appropriate legislative committee. I think that a committee might very probably incorporate any worthwhile provision of the amendment in legislation dealing with the general subject. We ought to deal with this subject, not in piecemeal, but meet it head on in a well-crucified bill and not in a hastily drawn limitation on an appropriation bill.

I am not arguing for or against the objectives of the gentleman's amendment, but I am arguing against the timeliness of the consideration of this sort of provision in a very limited time period here on the floor, without hearings or deliberate committee consideration.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman over the years and recently has been a very firm advocate of economy and of maintaining a sound balance of payments. It is not true, if this amendment is adopted, it will help the balance of payments of the United States? Does not every little bit help?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, an amendment in that respect would be very insignificant, of course. Besides, the main thrust of the amendment is firearms control and registration, not balance of payments. We want to be sure that we take the right action with respect to this matter through the appropriate committee, which in this case would seem to be the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 60, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 62, after line 13, insert the following:

"None of the funds in this Act shall be available for any expense in connection with the clearance through customs or licensing the import by any private individual or by any nongovernmental corporation, organization, firm or institution of any rifles, shotguns, pistols, or other firearms which are not registered by type and serial number with the Commissioner of Customs, and the names and addresses of the initial retail purchasers of which are not subsequently furnished to said Commissioner."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

Mr. MAHON. It is legislation on an appropriation bill, requiring additional duties, not otherwise provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. YATES. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I am not quite sure as to the point the chairman of the committee makes. Certainly there are not additional duties imposed on any of the officials of Government here. Such additional duties as may be imposed are those which are usually required in connection with landing passports or information of that kind.

In this case the information which is to be submitted is not by the collector of customs but by the individuals who import the guns.

Insofar as additional duties are con-

cerned, if there are any additional duties, they are not of a kind which would be subject to that rule.

For example, I cite the case that appears in "Hinds' Precedents," volume 4, No. 4002, where the case under consideration was one where an appropriation was limited for payment of the expenses of certain judges unless on an itemized statement. In that case there was a requirement for itemization. In that case the Chair at that time overruled the point of order which was made.

This, I submit, is a similar case, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest that the point of order should be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, as I interpret the amendment the Commissioner of Customs would be required to assume the further responsibility of registration, of keeping the names and addresses of the initial retail purchasers, and so on, as set forth in the latter part of the amendment. It does seem to me that this is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it does require these additional duties not heretofore prescribed by law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois speaks of firearms which are to be registered by type and serial number with the Commissioner of Customs. However, the amendment does not purport to establish a system of registration to be maintained by the Commissioner of Customs and it seems to the Chair merely requires that this information be furnished to the Commissioner of Customs along with the names and addresses of the initial retail purchasers.

The Chair therefore would interpret the amendment as not imposing any additional duties of a ministerial sort upon the Commissioner of Customs, but rather upon the importer or holder of the license.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the gentleman from Florida, my very good friend, for whom I have profound respect, argue to the House about the horrors of gun registration.

What is it about guns that makes them so sacred, so inviolable? Is a gun such a glorious and beautiful thing that to register it would somehow blemish its beauty or detract in any way from its legitimate utility? Granting the fact that most of the more than 50 million guns in the United States are used for sport or personal protection, one wonders nonetheless what it is about them that should make them immune to registration, or how such registration would interfere with their use. Registration is, to be sure, somewhat of a bother, but then so is getting shot, or robbed, or assaulted with a firearm. If I had my choice, I would prefer to be bothered by a little red tape.

But is registration so terrible? Auto-

mobiles—even sports cars are registered, and we all know the love lavished on a Porsche, or a Mercedes or an Alpha Romeo by a sports car buff. And what about dogs? Dog lovers register their pets faithfully—and that registration usually involves attaching to the animal's collar a cheap-looking metal tag. Why should a dog have to haul around with him such an unattractive badge of identification? Because society demands a measure of protection. Dogs perform certain positive social functions—they provide companionship, flush and retrieve game and sometimes even track down criminals. But those functions provide for canines no exemption from registration, because some dogs do bite—and some also carry disease which threatens the personal safety of our citizens.

Guns neither carry disease nor bite, but they kill and maim thousands of Americans every year, in addition to the other functions they perform. There is no valid reason why a single gun in this country should be exempt from registration. The choice between avoiding a small inconvenience and taking substantive steps to stem the rising tide of violence by firearms is no choice at all. I shed no tears for the firearms manufacturers or gun lobbies whose prosperity they think—without reason in my opinion—might in some way be diminished by thorough firearms registration measures. But I have sympathy for the thousands of families across our Nation that each year are forced to bear the burden of grief resulting from the unchecked, unlicensed dissemination of firearms throughout our society.

Our refusal to enact meaningful firearms control legislation has the effect of sanctioning violence. In no other civilized nation in the world does the gun enjoy such freedom from reasonable restraints as in the United States so flagrant is its immunity that an editorial columnist in one of the Chicago newspapers has facetiously suggested that the torch in the Statue of Liberty's hand be replaced by a pistol. This is grisly, unfunny suggestion to be sure, but so is the grisly and protected gun.

We took a step last week to curb the hand gun's excesses. We ought to take the same step for all other guns. We ought to be committing ourselves to creating the kind of national environment in which such a thought would never occur. The rhetoric that resounds in this Chamber deploring violence is made hollow and meaningless by the reluctance of Congress to take substantive action to restrict the use of the instruments of death and destruction. The amendment I propose today would require the registration by type and serial number of all rifles, shotguns, pistols, and other firearms imported into the United States and the names of the first retail purchaser inscribed. The Department of Commerce estimates that last year alone the United States imported 239,141 rifles, 221,667 shotguns, and 747,013 pistols and revolvers. Imported firearms accounted for more than 40 percent of the total U.S. consumption of guns in 1967, according to the best estimate of

the Commerce Department. This amendment would be a major step in the direction of universal registration of firearms and I urge you to support it.

The amendment that I propose today would require the registration by type and serial number of all rifles, shotguns, pistols, and other firearms brought into the United States and the name of the first retail purchaser inscribed with the Collector of Customs. That would give the police an opportunity to act. I point out to you in connection with the death of Senator Kennedy that the criminal or, rather, the alleged criminal who killed him was identified by his family from a picture, but if by some chance he had escaped, leaving the gun behind him, under the laws of the State of California, he would nevertheless have been found, because that gun was registered and the police were able to go to the person whose name they had and find that the person whose name was registered had given the gun to him.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time or the place to write legislation on this very important subject of gun control. The matter is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee, as I understand it, met today for the purpose of trying to take early action on legislation involving this important subject.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of this amendment might lead some people to believe the Congress had really dealt comprehensively and substantively with gun control legislation, which in my opinion would be erroneous.

The pending amendment says that none of the funds in this act shall be available for examining, licensing, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, the funds contained in the pending bill are designed to deal with gun importations. There are other funds available, previously appropriated, that could be used. The amendment applies only to this pending supplemental bill, the main thrust of which expires at the end of this month. Therefore, this is unfeasible and not substantial.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it would not be wise to pass this sort of temporary legislation which none of us can completely and definitively interpret here on the floor. There are many Members on the floor of the House who are favorable to some sort of more effective action with respect to control of firearms. This matter ought to be given a thorough hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary or any other appropriate legislative committee.

Mr. MAHON. No funds are provided in the pending bill for gun control, but nonetheless the amendment applies only to funds in this bill. Why take that position, since it seems ineffective in the circumstances? To do so might tend to mislead and prevent due consideration of the subject.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman cries again for inaction. When will we act? The gentleman from Florida said that the adoption of this amendment would be the opening wedge. Yes, it would be an opening wedge, an opening wedge for reasonable restraints on the use of the deadly weapons which threaten our society. It is time that Congress took steps to heed the demand of the American people for protection from the growing menace of guns, both pistols and long guns.

Mr. Chairman, the journey of 1,000 miles begins with a single step. This amendment, meager as it is, represents the first step in the direction of adequate gun control.

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

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BATTIN. In view of the ruling of the Chair, or the chairman [Mr. MAHON] raising a point of order, I recall that the Chair said that this did not require registration or keeping of books.

In light of the argument made by the gentleman from Illinois in speaking for his amendment, I wonder if it is possible for the Chair to reverse itself, and sustain the point of order?

Mr. YATES. The parliamentary inquiry comes too late, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair is not going to interpret the amendment for the gentleman from Montana. The gentleman from Montana is perfectly capable of doing so.

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

As we all know, the administration had hoped to bring out the new gun bill today, but unfortunately by a vote of 16 to 16 in the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee declined to report the new Celler bill—the administration's new firearms bill.

Another vote will be taken, as I understand it, on the 20th of this month. In view of that delay it seems to me that since the public is urging action at this time, and we are all aware of it, we are all getting flooded with mail, that this amendment is an opening wedge. It would merely call for the registration of imported weapons. I think we can use the term used by the distinguished gentleman from Florida that it is an "opening wedge," and that it is a small, little opportunity for us in the House to express our sentiments on what I would call today as the overriding issue in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAHON. I assume the gentleman would agree that there is no money in this pending bill relating to weapons control, and that since the amendment only says that none of the funds in the pending bill shall be used, and so forth, the amendment would not really prohibit the licensing of imported weapons, and so forth, unless funds for the pur-

pose were appropriated in the pending bill.

So, it seems to me the amendment is ineffective. We must not mislead ourselves or the American public. We should leave the resolution of this matter to a more deliberate occasion before we take action.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Again, Mr. Chairman, is the cry of delay, delay, leave it to the Committee on the Judiciary. I say, Mr. Chairman, in 20 years the Committee on the Judiciary has not brought us in a bill that would provide gun control legislation.

Second, Mr. Chairman, there are funds in here for the Office of the Collector of Customs; there are funds in here that are made available as a result of the release of funds of the Economy Act of last year. There is action that can be taken in this bill. Do not be misled by the blandishments of my dear friend, the chairman of the committee, but he is not telling the truth when he says that this is not a meaningful gesture. This is a meaningful act. And this House ought to go on record in support of control of guns beyond the proposition adopted last week.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois remind the House of the testimony, and as to what happened in our committee, where the Commissioner referred to the illicit arms that came into this country from foreign countries in packages, and where the customs service conducted a test on this very question?

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

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

Mr. YATES. The customs service recounted to our committee that it had taken a 10-percent sampling of the mail coming back from Vietnam, on mail that was coming through customs, and there were arms, there were rifles, there were shotguns, there were knives, hand grenades, bazookas, all kinds of weapons that were coming through the mail, and which, incidentally, can still be imported, ammunition, rifles, shotguns can still be imported. But that was just a sampling of what happened on 1 day on what was coming back to the United States through customs.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY]. I would like to ask him whether or not the administration bill about which he was talking, that was introduced yesterday and the print of which was first made available sometime late yesterday afternoon contains a provision for gun legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. My understanding is that it does not.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am very glad that the gentleman made that statement because we were talking about gun registration, by the gentleman from Illinois.

Now I could not help but note, being on this side of the aisle, that the statement was made, that there has not been any gun legislation out of the Committee on the Judiciary for 20 years.

Mr. McCARTHY. And there has not been.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Now for those 20 years the party on the gentleman's side of the aisle has been in the majority on that committee.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the bill about which the gentleman from New York is talking, and was in the corridors giving advice this morning—I repeat—came into the House late yesterday. It was before the committee this morning and it was not read either by line or by paragraph or by sentence or by title. The unbelievable procedure was sought to report that bill out with no hearings whatsoever and without even reading the bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary is not acting on important legislation in that careless fashion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to reply?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I asked the gentleman, does the gentleman know whether or not the Attorney General did know that this supplemental was coming up?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield for a reply?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have asked the gentleman a question, did the Attorney General know it?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not aware of what the Attorney General knew about this. But this bill which I cosponsored today is basically along the same lines as the original Celler bill.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further since I only have 2 minutes remaining on this matter.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this observation.

Essentially, gun legislation goes through the Committee on Ways and Means. These are amendments of the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938.

The Committee on Ways and Means held extensive public hearings on this legislation back in 1965. The administration witnesses were unable to tell us what the law enforcement had been in this area and they were told to report back after they had made a thorough investigation. There has never been a reporting back to the Committee on Ways and Means.

I might say while on this subject, as I stated on the floor of the House last week, the gun that Oswald received to shoot the President could not have been obtained if these laws were being enforced. Nor could Martin Luther King's assailant have gotten that weapon if the laws on the books were being enforced.

The administration had better get around to trying to enforce the laws that we already have before we are able to understand how we are going to go ahead and tighten up.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that we were able to prevent this undue haste in taking action

on this legislation in the Committee on the Judiciary this morning. Without any intention to delay the consideration of that legislation after that unfortunate and unjustified speedy action was taken, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary finally declared that the bill would be up for further hearings on the 20th of June.

I would be very pleased if the gentleman from Illinois or people who are interested in approving legislation that will be effective will make that known to the committee.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in the course of this debate an unfortunate attempt has been made to point a finger of shame or blame at some committee of this House or on one of our national political parties for being dilatory in the passage of gun control legislation over the past 20 years.

I have not been a Member of this House for 20 years and so I cannot testify as to everything that happened here during that entire period. I can, however, testify as to the events that occurred today and which reflect great credit on the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH]. I refer now to the events that the gentleman mentioned in his remarks but which the gentleman described with a modesty that prevented the House from gaining a clear picture of the role that he himself played.

It is no exaggeration to say that the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, by his restraint and his timely action, preserved the opportunity of the 90th Congress to debate and vote on such legislation this year. It was his motion to reconsider the committee vote that kept the subject alive for this year, and as the gentleman from Illinois has said, it is here and now that concerns us tonight.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I asked my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio to yield because I wanted to say to him that over the last 20 years my party did have the majority except for one Congress, the 83d Congress, when the Republicans were in power. We have our sins for having been the majority party and having done nothing about gun control in that period. But you have failed your responsibility as well, because you Republicans did nothing in the 83d Congress. That was your sin and your failure. You had 2 years to take action and you did nothing. And if my memory serves me correctly, the Eisenhower administration made no recommendation for such control.

But why talk of the past. We are here today and both parties have the opportunity to do something today. What will the Republicans do today? How will you vote on the amendment today? You have a responsibility today. How will you vote? You ought to vote for my amendment.

Mr. CAREY. I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois; even though it may be a faltering step, it is a slightly meaningful move in

the right direction. The time has come to do something. I think what we ought to call this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is a name that could be shared with his colleague from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. This is nothing more than a domestic Findley amendment. I have sat here and listened to Findley amendments offered one after another that would prevent exports from the United States from falling into the wrong hands, so that they may not be used to kill American soldiers and overthrow free government in the world. If it is right to do that, how much more right is it to take simple precautions to prevent the import of foreign munitions manufacturers from falling into hands in this country that could be used to point the weapons to secure the overthrow of this Government and the killing of public officials and the spread of crime and disorder in this country?

What are we seeking to protect here? Americans or the free import of foreign munitions manufacturers? Why is it wrong to find out where the guns are going in this country? The largest arms cache I have seen lately that has been unearthed by the police was in the hands of such groups as the Revolutionary Action Movement. Are my friends anxious to see that the Revolutionary Action Movement will be able to secure a greater importation of firearms in order to overthrow the Government of this country?

Are we afraid to let guns be registered so that they can go in this country to protect those elements in our society that would do that, and they could get more guns?

I would like this amendment to be called the Yates-Findley amendment, for the amendment would protect American lives, American citizens, from exports of foreign munition manufacturers that are coming in, cargo by cargo, and are falling into wanton hands to be used for any purpose to disrupt the peace, order, and tranquillity of this country. If we are anxious to restore domestic tranquillity in this country, let us begin by doing with these guns what we do about prize cows, prize pigs, and, yes, even the registration of little children by the Public Health Service.

What is wrong with finding out where the guns are going? If we know where they are, we may be able to do something to stop the flow of deadly weapons into hands that should not have them, not those designed for the protection of their own lives, but those who have heinous plans to use these guns abortively and without any regard to our Constitution, to overthrow the Government of the United States.

If you do not care about protecting the citizens from foreign imports and munition importers in this country, for God's sake, find out where the guns are going before you find out, looking up into the gallery, that an importer took away your last chance to vote for gun legislation.

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

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the Yates amendment, but I would like to set the record straight as to the

gun legislation before the House Judiciary Committee.

Gun legislation was for the first time assigned to the Judiciary Committee in the 90th Congress. The chairman, with the cooperation of the minority leader, held hearings in the spring of the first session. We tried for a number of months to arrive at a consensus. Admittedly, we have failed up to this time. It has not been because of a lack of interest or concern on the part of either the Judiciary Committee chairman or the ranking minority member.

It is my sincere hope that our committee will report favorably H.R. 17735 on June 20 with support by a substantial number of members on both sides in that committee, and that we may then bring the bill to the floor promptly so that the American people through their elected representatives will have an opportunity to deal with this difficult matter.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendment thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.
The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 76, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole, 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. O'HARA of Michigan, 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. 17734) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 133, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—226

Abbutt	Baring	Blanton
Adams	Barrett	Blatnik
Addabbo	Battin	Boggs
Anderson,	Belcher	Boland
Tenn.	Bennett	Brademas
Andrews,	Berry	Brasco
N. Dak.	Bevill	Brinkley
Aspinall	Blester	Brooks

Brotzman	Hechler, W. Va.	Poage
Brown, Calif.	Henderson	Podell
Brown, Mich.	Hicks	Poff
Brown, Ohio	Hollifield	Pollock
Broyhill, Va.	Hosmer	Price, III.
Burke, Mass.	Howard	Railsback
Burleson	Hungate	Randall
Burton, Calif.	Ichord	Rees
Burton, Utah	Jacobs	Reid, N.Y.
Button	Jarman	Reinecke
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
Clausen,	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Don H.	Kazen	Rogers, Colo.
Clawson, Del	Keith	Rooney, Pa.
Cleveland	Kleppe	Rosenthal
Cohelan	Kluczynski	Roush
Colmer	Kupferman	Royal
Conte	Langen	Rumsfeld
Corman	Leggett	Ruppe
Cunningham	Lennon	Ryan
Daniels	Lipscomb	St Germain
Davis, Ga.	Lloyd	St. Onge
Delaney	McCarthy	Schweiker
Dellenback	McClory	Schwengel
Dent	McCloskey	Scott
Dickinson	McCulloch	Shriver
Diggs	McDonald,	Sikes
Dole	Mich.	Sisk
Dow	McFall	Skubitz
Downing	Macdonald,	Smith, Calif.
Dulski	Mass.	Smith, Okla.
Duncan	Machen	Snyder
Eckhardt	Madden	Springer
Edmondson	Mailliard	Steed
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias, Calif.	Steiger, Ariz.
Eilberg	Mathias, Md.	Stephens
Esch	Matsunaga	Stratton
Evans, Colo.	May	Stubblefield
Everett	Meeds	Stuckey
Fasell	Meskill	Taft
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Talcott
Fraser	Minish	Taylor
Friedel	Mink	Teague, Calif.
Fulton, Pa.	Minshall	Tenzer
Fuqua	Mize	Thompson, Ga.
Gallagher	Montgomery	Tiernan
Garmatz	Morris, N. Mex.	Tunney
Gathings	Morse, Mass.	Udall
Gibbons	Morton	Utt
Gonzalez	Mosher	Van Deerlin
Gray	Moss	Walde
Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	Walker
Griffiths	Natcher	Wampler
Gubser	Nedzi	Watson
Gude	Nichols	Watts
Gurney	Nix	Whalen
Hagan	O'Hara, Mich.	White
Halpern	Olsen	Widnall
Hamilton	O'Neill, Mass.	Wiggins
Hammer-	Ottinger	Wilson, Bob
schmidt	Patman	Wilson,
Hanley	Pepper	Charles H.
Hanna	Perkins	Winn
Hansen, Wash.	Pettis	Wolf
Hardy	Philbin	Wylie
Harsha	Pickle	Wyman
Hathaway	Pike	Young
Hawkins	Pirnie	

NAYS—133

Adair	Dwyer	King, N.Y.
Albert	Edwards, Ala.	Kornegay
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, La.	Kuykendall
Arends	Eshleman	Kyl
Ashley	Fallon	Laird
Ashmore	Findley	Landrum
Bates	Fino	Latta
Betts	Flood	Long, Md.
Blackburn	Ford, Gerald R.	Lukens
Bolling	Fountain	McClure
Bray	Frelighuysen	McDade
Brock	Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen
Broomfield	Gallifanakis	MacGregor
Broyhill, N.C.	Goodling	Mahon
Buchanan	Griffin	Marsh
Burke, Fla.	Gross	Martin
Byrnes, Wis.	Grover	Michel
Cabell	Haley	Miller, Ohio
Cahill	Hall	Mills
Casey	Halleck	Monagan
Cederberg	Harvey	Moorhead
Chamberlain	Hays	Morgan
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Myers
Collier	Horton	Nelsen
Conable	Hull	O'Konski
Corbett	Hunt	Passman
Cramer	Hutchinson	Patten
Culver	Irwin	Pool
Curtis	Joelson	Pryor
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Quie
Denney	Jonas	Quillen
Devine	Jones, Mo.	Rarick
Dowdy	Kee	Reid, Ill.

Reifel Schneebell Vanik
 Reuss Selden Vigorito
 Riegle Shipley Waggonner
 Robison Slack Watkins
 Rogers, Fla. Smith, Iowa Whalley
 Roth Stafford Whitener
 Roudebush Stanton Wyatt
 Sandman Steiger, Wis. Yates
 Satterfield Sullivan Zablocki
 Saylor Thomson, Wis. Zion
 Schadeberg Tuck
 Scherle Ullman

NOT VOTING—74

Abernethy Flynt Moore
 Andrews, Ala. Foley Murphy, Ill.
 Annunzio Ford, O'Hara, Ill.
 Ashbrook William D. O'Neal, Ga.
 Ayres Gardner Pelly
 Bell Gettys Price, Tex.
 Bingham Gialmo Pucinski
 Bolton Gilbert Purcell
 Bow Goodell Resnick
 Bush Green, Oreg. Rivers
 Carter Hansen, Idaho Ronan
 Celler Harrison Rooney, N.Y.
 Conyers Hébert Rostenkowski
 Cowger Helstoski Scheuer
 Daddario Herlong Smith, N.Y.
 Dawson Holland Staggers
 de la Garza Karsten Teague, Tex.
 Derwinski Karth Thompson, N.J.
 Dingell Kelly Vander Jagt
 Donohue King, Calif. Whitten
 Dorn Kirwan Williams, Pa.
 Erlenborn Kyros Willis
 Evins, Tenn. Long, La. Wright
 Farbstain McMillan Wydler
 Feighan Mayne Zwach

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

Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Harrison.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Moore.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Cowger.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Gardner.
 Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Mayne.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Wydler.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Price of Texas.
 Mr. Farbstain with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Zwach.
 Mr. Foley with Mr. Goodell.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Bush.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Murphy of Illinois.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. William D. Ford.
 Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. King of California with Mr. Bingham.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Flynt.
 Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Helstoski.
 Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Donohue.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Ronan.
 Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kyros.
 Mr. Whitten with Mr. Karsten.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Karth.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Holland.

Mr. ROBERTS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
 Mr. RARICK changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
 Mr. WIGGINS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONAS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 17734, to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 324, nays 33, answered "present" 3, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—324

Abbitt Halpern
 Adair Corman Hamilton
 Addabbo Cramer Hammer
 Albert Culver schmidt
 Anderson, Ill. Cunningham Hanley
 Anderson, Tenn. Daniels Hanna
 Andrews, N. Dak. Davis, Ga. Hansen, Wash.
 Arends Delaney Hardy
 Ashley Dent Harsha
 Ashmore Devine Hathaway
 Aspinall Dickinson Hays
 Baring Dole Hechler, W. Va.
 Barrett Dowdy Heckler, Mass.
 Bates Downing Henderson
 Battin Dulski Hicks
 Belcher Duncan Holifield
 Bennett Dwyer Horton
 Betts Eckhardt Hosmer
 Bevil Edmondson Howard
 Biester Edwards, Ala. Hull
 Blackburn Edwards, La. Hungate
 Blanton Ellberg Hunt
 Blatnik Esch Ichord
 Boggs Eshleman Irwin
 Boland Evans, Colo. Jacobs
 Bolling Everett Jarman
 Brademas Fallon Joelson
 Brasco Fascell Johnson, Calif.
 Bray Findley Johnson, Pa.
 Brinkley Fino Jones, Ala.
 Brock Fisher Jones, N.O.
 Brooks Flood Kazen
 Broomfield Foley Kee
 Brown, Mich. Ford, Gerald R. Keith
 Brown, Ohio Fountain King, N.Y.
 Broyhill, N.C. Fraser Kleppe
 Broyhill, Va. Frelinghuysen Kluczynski
 Buchanan Fulton, Pa. Korczynski
 Burke, Fla. Fulton, Tenn. Kuykendall
 Burke, Mass. Fuqua Laird
 Burleson Gallianakis Landrum
 Burton, Utah Gallagher Langen
 Byrne, Pa. Garmatz Latta
 Byrnes, Wis. Gathings Leggett
 Cahill Gibbons Lennon
 Carey Gonzalez Lipscomb
 Casey Goodling Lloyd
 Cederberg Gray Long, Md.
 Chamberlain Green, Oreg. Lukens
 Clancy Griffin McCarthy
 Clark Griffiths McClory
 Clausen, Don H. McCloskey
 Clawson, Del. Grover McCulloch
 Cleveland Gubser McDade
 Cohelan Gude McDonald,
 Colmer Hurney Mich.
 Conte Hagan McFall
 Haley Hale Macdonald,
 Halleck Mass.

MacGregor Poff Steed
 Machen Pollock Steiger, Ariz.
 Madden Pool Steiger, Wis.
 Mahon Price, Ill. Stephens
 Malillard Pryor Stratton
 Marsh Quillen Stubblefield
 Martin Rallsback Stuckey
 Mathias, Calif. Randall Sullivan
 Mathias, Md. Rarick Taft
 Matsunaga Reid, N.Y. Talcott
 May Reifel Taylor
 Meeds Reinecke Teague, Calif.
 Meskill Rhodes, Ariz. Tenzer
 Miller, Calif. Rhode, Pa. Thompson, Ga.
 Miller, Ohio Riegle Thompson, Wis.
 Minish Roberts Tiernan
 Mink Rodino Tuck
 Minshall Rogers, Colo. Tunney
 Mize Rogers, Fla. Udall
 Monagan Rooney, Pa. Ullman
 Montgomery Roth Utt
 Moorhead Roudebush Van Deerlin
 Morgan Roush Vigorito
 Morris, N. Mex. Roybal Waggonner
 Morse, Mass. Rumsfeld Waldie
 Morton Ruppe Walker
 Moss St Germain Wampler
 Murphy, N.Y. St. Onge Watkins
 Myers Sandman Watson
 Natcher Satterfield Watts
 Nedzi Saylor Whalen
 Nelsen Schadeberg Whalley
 Nichols Scherle White
 Nix Schweiker Whitener
 O'Hara, Mich. Schwengel Widnall
 Olsen Scott Wiggins
 O'Neill, Mass. Selden Wilson, Bob
 Ottinger Shipley Wilson,
 Passman Shriver Charles H.
 Patman Sikes Winn
 Patten Sisk Wolf
 Pepper Skubitz Wyatt
 Perkins Slack Wylie
 Pettis Smith, Calif. Wyman
 Philbin Smith, Iowa Yates
 Pickle Smith, Okla. Young
 Pike Snyder Zablocki
 Pirnie Springer Zion
 Poage Stafford
 Podell Stanton

NAYS—33

Brown, Calif. Edwards, Calif. Mosher
 Burton, Calif. Gross O'Konski
 Button Hall Quie
 Cabell Hawkins Rees
 Collier Jonas Reid, Ill.
 Conable Jones, Mo. Reuss
 Conyers Kastenmeier Robison
 Curtis Kupferman Rosenthal
 Davis, Wis. McClure Ryan
 Dellenback Michel Schneebell
 Dow Mills Vanik

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Adams Diggs Hutchinson

NOT VOTING—73

Abernethy Flynt Murphy, Ill.
 Andrews, Ala. Ford, O'Hara, Ill.
 Annunzio William D. O'Neal, Ga.
 Ashbrook Gardner Pelly
 Ayres Gettys Price, Tex.
 Bell Gialmo Pucinski
 Berry Gilbert Purcell
 Bingham Goodell Resnick
 Bolton Hansen, Idaho Rivers
 Bow Harrison Ronan
 Bush Hébert Rooney, N.Y.
 Carter Helstoski Rostenkowski
 Celler Herlong Scheuer
 Cowger Holland Smith, N.Y.
 Daddario Karsten Staggers
 Dawson Karth Teague, Tex.
 de la Garza Kelly Thompson, N.J.
 Derwinski King, Calif. Vander Jagt
 Dingell Kirwan Whitten
 Donohue Kyros Williams, Pa.
 Dorn Long, La. Willis
 Erlenborn McEwan Wright
 Evins, Tenn. McMillan Wydler
 Farbstain Mayne Zwach
 Feighan Moore

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

On this vote:
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Adams against.
 Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Hutchinson against.
 Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania against.

Until further notice:

- Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
- Mr. Rivers with Mr. Berry.
- Mr. Purcell with Mr. Harrison.
- Mrs. Kelly with Mrs. Bolton.
- Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Moore.
- Mr. Stagers with Mr. Pelly.
- Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Bell.
- Mr. McMillan with Mr. Carter.
- Mr. Dorn with Mr. Ashbrook.
- Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cowger.
- Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Gardner.
- Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
- Mr. Feighan with Mr. McEwen.
- Mr. Willis with Mr. Vander Jagt.
- Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Mayne.
- Mr. Dingell with Mr. Erlenborn.
- Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Wydler.
- Mr. Ewins of Tennessee with Mr. Price of Texas.
- Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Smith of New York.
- Mr. Gettys with Mr. Zwach.
- Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Goodell.
- Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Derwinski.
- Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Bush.
- Mr. Herlong with Mr. Murphy of Illinois.
- Mr. Dawson with Mr. Holland.
- Mr. King of California with Mr. Bingham.
- Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Flynt.
- Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Helstoski.
- Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Donohue.
- Mr. Daddario with Mr. Ronan.
- Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
- Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kyros.
- Mr. Whitten with Mr. Karsten.
- Mr. Wright with Mr. Karth.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1968.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 17325. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to advertising in a convention program of a national political convention; and
- H.J. Res. 1298. Joint resolution authorizing the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

ANNUAL COMPARISON OF FEDERAL SALARIES WITH THE SALARIES PAID IN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 327)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I forward herewith the annual comparison of Federal salaries with the salaries paid in private enterprise, as provided by section 5302 of title 5, United States Code.

The report, prepared by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, compares the present Federal statutory salary rates with average salary rates paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as reported in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin No. 1585, *National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay, June 1967*.

In addition, the report develops July 1968 adjustments in statutory salary schedules which the President is directed to make under section 212 of P.L. 90-206, the Federal Salary Act of 1967.

Also transmitted is a copy of an Executive order promulgating the adjustments of statutory salary rates to become effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1968.

Public Law 90-206 provides that comparable adjustments shall be made by administrative action of appropriate officers, in the salary rates of employees of the judicial and legislative branches and those of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee employees.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 11, 1968.

DIRECTIVE OF THE SPEAKER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IMPLEMENTING THE SALARY COMPARABILITY POLICY IN 1968 FOR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REQUIRED BY SECTION 212 OF THE FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following directive of the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives implementing the salary comparability policy in 1968 for officers and employees of the House of Representatives required by section 212 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967:

DIRECTIVE OF THE SPEAKER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IMPLEMENTING THE SALARY COMPARABILITY POLICY IN 1968 FOR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REQUIRED BY SECTION 212 OF THE FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

Pursuant to the authority and duty vested in the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives by section 212 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 634; Public Law

90-206; 5 U.S.C. 5303, note) to implement the salary comparability policy set forth in section 5301 of title 5, United States Code, in the year 1968 for personnel of the House of Representatives, the rates of pay of personnel of the House of Representatives whose pay is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives are adjusted as follows:

IMPLEMENTATION OF SALARY COMPARABILITY POLICY IN 1968 FOR PERSONNEL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SECTION 1. Subject to sections 216 and 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 638, 642; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 60e-14, note; 2 U.S.C. 351-361), the per annum gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) of each employee whose compensation—

(1) is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and

(2) is fixed at a rate of basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law, is increased by an amount equal to the percentage increase in such per annum gross rate of compensation of such employee as provided in the following table of increases in compensation:

Table of increases in per annum gross rates of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law)

	Percent of increase
Per annum basic rate of compensation:	
Not more than \$4,000	5.85
Not less than \$4,005 but not more than \$4,500	6
Not less than \$4,505 but not more than \$5,000	6.5
Not less than \$5,005 but not more than \$5,500	7
Not less than \$5,505 but not more than \$6,000	7.5
Not less than \$6,005 but not more than \$6,500	8
Not less than \$6,505 but not more than \$7,000	8.5
Not less than \$7,005 but not more than \$7,500	9
Not less than \$7,505 but not more than \$8,000	9.5
Not less than \$8,005 but not more than \$8,500	10
Not less than \$8,505 but not more than \$9,000	10.5
Not less than \$9,005 but not more than \$9,500	11
Not less than \$9,505	11.5

SEC. 2. Subject to sections 216 and 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 638, 642; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 60e-14, note; 2 U.S.C. 351-361), the single per annum gross rate of compensation of each officer or employee, except an officer or employee to whom Section 3 or 4 of this directive applies, whose compensation—

(1) is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives,

(2) is fixed at a single per annum gross rate, and

(3) is increased by section 214(b) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 635; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 60e-14(b))

is increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by section 1 of this directive in that per annum gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation provided by law) in effect immediately prior to July 1, 1968, of an employee to whom section 1 applies—

(A) which is equal to, or

(B) if not equal to, is the highest such per annum gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) which is nearest in amount to,

the single per annum gross rate of compensation, in effect immediately prior to such date, of the officer or employee whose compensation is referred to in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this sentence.

Sec. 3. (a) The single per annum gross rate of compensation of the position referred to in House Resolution 904, Eighty-eighth Congress, enacted into permanent law by section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 281; Public Law 89-91), shall continue in effect until the effective date of the first adjustment, following the effective date of this directive, in the per annum rate of compensation of the officers described in the first sentence of section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (79 Stat. 1120; Public Law 89-301; 2 U.S.C. 31).

(b) On and after the effective date of such first adjustment, the single per annum gross rate of compensation of the position referred to in such House Resolution 904 shall be in an amount which bears the same ratio to the per annum rate of compensation of the officers described in the first sentence of such section 601(a) as changed by such first compensation adjustment therein, or as changed by each compensation adjustment therein following such first compensation adjustment, as then currently applicable, as the per annum gross rate of compensation of such position as in effect immediately prior to the applicable adjustment in the per annum rate of compensation of such officers bears to the per annum rate of compensation of such officers as in effect immediately prior to such applicable adjustment.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be in effect with respect to the position referred to in such House Resolution 904 only so long as such position is held by the incumbent thereof on the effective date of this directive.

Sec. 4. The single per annum gross rate of compensation of each office or position referred to in—

(1) House Resolution 909, Eighty-ninth Congress, enacted into permanent law by chapter VI of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1967 (80 Stat. 1064; Public Law 89-697), or

(2) section 214(e) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 636; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 74a-2),

shall be a single per annum gross rate equal to the annual rate of basic pay for Level III of the Executive Schedule in section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

Sec. 5. In order to preserve and continue the pay relationships existing immediately prior to July 1, 1968, between—

(1) positions on the United States Capitol police force and on the United States Capitol telephone exchange, respectively, the compensation for which is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and

(2) positions on such police force and telephone exchange, respectively, the compensation for which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate,

the respective single per annum gross rates of compensation of personnel on such police force and telephone exchange, respectively, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives are increased, subject to sections 216 and 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 638, 642; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 60e-14, note; 2 U.S.C. 351-361), by respective amounts equal to the respective amounts of the increases provided in the year 1968 by the President pro tempore of the Senate, under section 212 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 634; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 5303, note), in corresponding rates of compensation for personnel on such police force and telephone exchange, respectively, whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

SEC. 6. The per annum rate of compensation for each compensation step of each compensation level (HS level) of the House Employees Schedule (HS) under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079-1084; Public Law 88-652; 2 U.S.C. 291 and following) is increased by an amount equal to the percentage increase in such per annum rate as provided in the following table of increases in the rates of compensation of such schedule:

Table of increases in per annum rates of compensation of the House Employees Schedule

Per annum rate of compensation:	Percent of insurance
HS level 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7-----	5.85
HS level 8-----	6.2
HS level 9-----	6.5
HS level 10-----	7
HS level 11-----	8
HS level 12-----	9
HS level 13-----	10

SEC. 7. Subject to sections 216 and 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 638, 642; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 60e-14 note; 2 U.S.C. 351-361), the single per annum rate of compensation in effect immediately prior to July 1, 1968, of each employee whose compensation—

(1) is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives,

(2) is fixed on the basis of a saved rate, and

(3) is increased by section 214(c) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (81 Stat. 636; Public Law 90-206; 2 U.S.C. 293c),

is increased by a percentage which is equal to the percentage provided by section 6 of this directive for increases in the rates of compensation for the compensation steps of that compensation level of the House Employees Schedule in which the position of such employee is placed.

SEC. 8. House Resolution 1015, Ninetieth Congress, adopted January 15, 1968, is amended by striking out "maximum rate authorized by Level 5 of the Executive schedule by Public Law 90-206" and inserting in lieu thereof "annual rate of basic pay for Level V of the Executive Schedule in section 5316 of title 5, United States Code".

SEC. 9. The additional compensation provided by this directive for personnel whose per annum compensation is fixed at a rate of basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law shall be considered a part of basic pay for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this directive shall become effective on July 1, 1968.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,

Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the directive will appear in the Journal of today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader if he will advise the House of any changes in the program and what the program is through the balance of this week.

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

Mr. REINECKE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from California, House Resolution 1187, which is a travel resolution in connection with the international labor organization conference in Geneva will be called up tomorrow.

In addition, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] has advised that he will call up the conference report on the Treasury, Post Office Department appropriation bill tomorrow, which will be the first conference report, I believe, on a major appropriation bill for the year.

Two conference reports may be called up from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Then the bill, H.R. 12639, vessels, passenger, operating differential subsidy and H.R. 15190 with reference to the canal connecting the Pacific and Atlantic Study Commission.

Beyond that the program so far as I know at this time will continue as previously announced, and I thank the gentleman for taking this time so that Members could be advised of the program.

Mr. REINECKE. I thank the gentleman.

FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF INDIANA SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times it is indeed refreshing to hear good and kind things said about people—and I am, of course, referring to our distinguished Speaker's remarks concerning Father Flaherty.

It is also good to see some of the fine and decent people in this country honored. Yesterday afternoon I was present when the President of the United States honored many distinguished young scholars of this country. It was an impressive ceremony.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes of the House of Representatives' time to describe the Washington scholarship trip for high school juniors which we have begun in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. It is a program by which we are honoring our own scholars.

It seems to me that good government stems from an abiding and eager interest in government on the part of all our citizens—and that this interest should start at an early age.

With this in mind, I initiated the "Fifth District Scholarship Trip to Washington." Through this program I hope to bring the educational advantages of my congressional office closer to students, their families, and the communities in my district. Service groups and civic-minded citizens have been invited to lend their support by sponsoring the students.

And I might add, they responded most enthusiastically.

On Sunday, June 9, the first of three groups arrived at Washington National Airport to begin a 3½-day introduction to "what goes on in Washington." Their schedule is so planned that the students will have the opportunity to actively learn about the executive, legislative, judicial, and administrative processes of our Government. They will meet with Representatives and Senators of both political parties, view sessions of the House and the Senate, speak with a Peace Corps representative, attend a Department of State foreign policy briefing, visit the Supreme Court, and hear the proceedings of a congressional hearing.

We hope and believe that this will be a rare opportunity for the students to get firsthand answers to questions raised in their high school government classes. We hope they will return not only with some answers, but with a continued interest in these processes of government.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the names of these specially selected, capable students who are participating in this program which promises to offer an unusual and educational "inside" look at how our Government works:

Tom Cooke, Northwestern High School, Kokomo, Indiana.

Wesley Wright, Oak Hill High School, Converse, Indiana.

Rod Forrer, Pendleton High School, Pendleton, Indiana.

Franklin Wilson, Bluffton High School, Bluffton, Indiana.

Mike Wilburn, Ossian High School, Ossian, Indiana.

Rex Richards, Anderson High School, Anderson, Indiana.

Jan Leatherman, Huntington County Community High School, Huntington, Indiana.

Denise Stohler, Markleville High School, Markleville, Indiana.

Lyn Means, Western High School, Russla-ville, Indiana.

Barbara Baumgartner, South Adams High School, Berne, Indiana.

Mary Ann Reynolds, Belmont High School, Decatur, Indiana.

Barbara Amick, Pendleton High School, Pendleton, Indiana.

EULOGY OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY BY REV. JOHN F. FARLEY

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to assist at a concelebrated Mass held at Our Lady of Providence Seminary in Warwick, R.I. on Thursday, June 6, at which time a very eloquent eulogy of Senator Robert F. Kennedy was delivered by Rev. John F. Farley.

In his poignant remarks, Father Farley, a member of the faculty at the seminary, quoted the late Senator when he commented upon the assassination of his good friend Dr. Martin Luther King. Senator Robert Kennedy said at that time:

You can be filled with bitterness, with hatred, with a desire for revenge . . . We can

move in that direction . . . Or we can make an effort to understand as Dr. King did—to replace violence—the violence that has spread across our land—with compassion and love.

Robert F. Kennedy certainly had sufficient reason to be bitter but he chose to replace violence with the compassion and love that prevailed throughout his distinguished life.

We can replace violence with compassion and love. Let us, for his sake, choose to do so. Let us in the wise words of Father Farley begin "a people's march against violence and anarchy." To do otherwise would be to disregard the message of love, understanding, and concern for others given to us so eloquently in the form of the life of Robert F. Kennedy.

Let us keep in mind some other words of Robert F. Kennedy:

This motive must guide us: to tame the savagery of man and make gentle the life of the world.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include Father Farley's eulogy, which appeared in the June 7 edition of the Providence Visitor, in the RECORD, as follows:

SEMINARY TRIBUTE PAID SENATOR KENNEDY

(NOTE.—The following eulogy was delivered Thursday morning by Rev. John F. Farley, a member of the faculty at Our Lady of Providence Seminary, at a concelebrated Mass held there prior to the seminary graduation exercises.)

Sometime during those eerie hours when our grief-shot nation was waking Dr. Martin Luther King, Senator Robert Francis Kennedy spoke these words:

"A man who dedicated his life to love and to justice lies dead. You may ask: Where is our country going? What are we to do now? . . . There are two ways of answering, I think . . . You can be filled with bitterness, with hatred, with a desire for revenge. . . . We can move in that direction. . . . Or we can make an effort to understand as Dr. King did—to replace violence—the violence that has spread across our land—with compassion and love."

Now, just a few months later, the Senator, himself a man dedicated to like causes, lies dead. Men whose livelihood turns on their tooling of words—the newsmen, commentators, and politicians—have filled the airwaves and the papers with the expected shock and condolences and the unanswerable questions. Nothing they've offered seems nearly so appropriate as Senator Kennedy's own reflection. It is one of those rare pieces of advice, because it was not only offered to others but lived by the man himself.

Robert Kennedy was assuredly a man of compassion. He had that deep sympathy, that feeling for others which his martyred brother had; that Christ-like "compassion for the multitude" (Mk. 8:2) which may well be his family's greatest treasure. He made manifest his "effort to understand." A very, very rich man, he became acutely sensitive to the sufferings of the poor. I can still see him, coat slung over his shoulder, trudging behind the mule cart along Atlanta's sun-stung streets in the unscheduled Poor Man's march, a bobbing beacon of white on a sea of black bereavement. And neither he nor the poor he mourned with felt anything out of place with his being right there! Many of his age are disheartened by the Generation Gap that separates them from the nation's youth, even from their own children. In his "effort to understand," he was moving to bridge that gap, as only a man of compassion can. With his deep sense of mission, he often became impatient with the slow pace of legislative response to people's needs. But even there, he could understand; he insisted in the May 1967 interview by Roger Mudd that his fel-

low Senators were the finest group of men anywhere in public life. He despised brutality and violence. He had a keen awareness of the dangers he faced, even a premonition of what did happen to him. But there was no fear that could keep him from seeking out his brothers whose "joys and hopes," whose "griefs and anxieties" he must share.

He loved his brothers. "He lived in them; he felt with them and for them (the phrase is Newman's); he was anxious about them; he gave them help; and in turn he looked for comfort from them."

It is no gesture toward canonization, but simply to offer one human being's notice of another, when I say that his compassionate effort bears the mark of beatitude. Men who had never heard the words from Matthew 5 could grant that he was "poor in spirit," "meek and merciful," a "promoter of peace," one who did "hunger and thirst for justice," who "suffered persecution in the cause of right."

Back in 1963, Bobby Kennedy borrowed from Romeo and Juliet some lines to speak of his brother's tragic end. I trust he would allow their re-use this heart-aching day in 1968:

"Take him and cut him out in little stars; and he will make the face of heaven so fine, that all the world will be in love with night; and pay no worship to the garish sun." (R. & J. III, 2)

As planned, yesterday evening by our Bishop, this Mass was to be offered for Senator Kennedy's recovery and for the health of our nation. The changed circumstances have not altered the urgency of that second intention. I must resist, I suppose, the temptation to dwell on group or mass-guilt; yet I cannot escape the chilling and terrible fact that men who refused to live by the sword are cut down by it; that we who have prided ourselves for being the promised land, the new Jerusalem for other lands' peoples, must in some measure hear the reproach delivered to the old Jerusalem "You kill the prophets and stone those who are sent to you."

We need something more, I'm afraid, than gun-laws and commissions, however necessary these may be. We need a deep national re-assessment of the place of law and duties and rights. We need a new people's march—a people's moral march against violence and anarchy.

One man's life and death SHOULD influence us (cf. Epistle of today's Mass). But thus far—I wonder! "Let us," as our President pleaded last night, "for God's sake resolve to live under law."

We gather here at this altar, a people who believe in eternal life in God's power to raise man from every dying. We pray in this season of Pentecost to the "Father of the poor" to "heal our wounds . . . to wash the stains of guilt away." (Seq.) May I lay that belief and that prayer on Senator Kennedy's grave as our fragile piece of rosemary, the bittersweet symbol of an undying love and a death-superior compassion.

I wish I could give some comfort to those who loved him most, to his "star-crossed" family. Instead, I must again take something from them—from Jackie's prayer card, the prayer that is in all our hearts:

"Dear God, please take care of your servant, Robert Francis Kennedy; and please, please! take care of this country he loved and served so well."

VETO OF OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT URGED

Mr. GONZALEZ. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, after the passage of the so-called anticrime bill, Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL and I requested President Johnson consider a veto of this ill-considered measure.

Today, in furtherance of our request I have prepared the following letter addressed to the President, setting forth a bill of particulars.

Under unanimous consent I place the letter in the RECORD at this point:

JUNE 11, 1968.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to urge that you veto the so-called Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act recently passed by Congress.

This Act will contribute neither to crime control or safe streets. It represents an unreasonable and an unthinking response to a series of problems that require careful, sober thought and good judgment. The Act reflects none of these qualities.

We do not serve the worthy goal of preserving supremacy of the law by enacting bad law. Diluting the constitutional protection of the individual against compulsory self-incrimination, is bad law. The Act blatantly attempts to overturn the recent Supreme Court decisions elucidating this protection and this right. It is interesting to note that under the Military Code of Justice, members of the Armed Services have long been entitled to the rights which this portion of the Act would abolish for the civilian population. For example, Article 31 of the Military Code provides, in part, that no person accused or suspected of an offense may be interrogated without first being informed of the nature of the accusation and being advised that he does not have to make any statement.

This section has been in the code since 1956. It is ironic and perhaps a measure of the time that final enactment of the so-called Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act would strip away from civilians rights guaranteed to military personnel.

Authorizing wiretapping and bugging in cases not involving the national security, is bad law. You yourself, Mr. President, have previously gone on record opposed to such injudicious government activities. The multitude of violations of privacy which this act would permit cannot be justified. They can only be explained as an example of legislative hysteria. Instead of attempting to legalize invasions of privacy we ought to be seeking ways to "exercise the full reach of our constitutional powers to outlaw electronic bugging and snooping," as you stated in your State of the Union address last year.

The Act, Mr. President, is a defective and perverse effort to cope with some of the most serious problems this Nation has ever faced. But these diverse problems, including organized crime, civil riots and disorders, the excessive traffic in guns, and the need to assist local law enforcement agencies, cannot be effectively dealt with by taking 8 giant steps toward a police state.

Again, we urge you to veto the so-called Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

With every good wish, I am
Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ, JOHN MOSS, RICHARD BOLLING, FRANK CLARK, PATSY MINK, DON FRASER, JOHN CONYERS, JEFF COHELAN, JEROME WALDIE, ROBERT LEGGETT, ROBERT KASTENMEIER, CHARLES DIGGS, PHILLIP BURTON, ED ROYBAL, DON EDWARDS, TOM REES, GEORGE BROWN, JR., WAYNE ASPINALL, WILLIAM RYAN, HENRY REUSS.

TAX RAISERS LED BY TAX DODGER

Mr. RARICK. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League, as organizer of the June 19 "Solidarity Day" march by the Poor People's Campaign against the American people is deplorable.

For Sterling Tucker—the leader of the movement to raise taxes—is a tax dodger. He apparently believes in you and me paying taxes, but does not believe in paying taxes himself.

Tucker pleaded "no contest" and was convicted in 1959 of charges of income tax evasion by a Federal court in Cleveland of failure to pay \$1,661 in taxes between 1951 and 1954. At that time he was executive director of the Urban League in Canton, Ohio. His sentence was a \$500 fine and a 1-year suspended sentence with a 5-year probationary period.

I include several news clippings to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 24, 1966]

TUCKER GETS INCOME TAX CASE PARDON—JOHNSON EXPUNGES 1959 CONVICTION FOR EVASION IN OHIO

Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League, has been granted a Christmas Eve pardon of his conviction on charges of income tax evasion, the Justice Department announced yesterday.

Tucker, 42, pleaded no contest and was convicted in 1959 by a Federal court in Cleveland of failure to pay \$1,661 in taxes during the period between 1951 and 1954. At the time he was executive director of the Urban League in Canton, Ohio.

On Dec. 5, 1959, Tucker was sentenced to pay a \$500 fine and given a one-year suspended sentence. He was placed on probation for five years. The fine was paid and Tucker was discharged from probation in 1961.

The petition to President Johnson seeking the pardon bore, as character references, the names of three of Washington's most prominent Negro leaders: District Commissioner John B. Duncan; the Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, Democratic National Committeeman and former president of the Washington NAACP, and Dr. R. Frank Jones, medical director of Freedmen's Hospital.

Dr. Jones was president of the Washington Urban League when Tucker accepted the appointment here in 1956.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 8, 1968]

STERLING TUCKER: VETERAN CRUSADER FOR NEGRO CAUSE

Sterling Tucker, tapped by the Poor People's Campaign to finish organizing the June 19 "Solidarity Day" march here, is a veteran organizer, noted for his broad access to both white "establishment" and the world of the black militant.

He is a frequent guest at the White House and the District Building.

He was also on the streets during the April riots here with equal access to police headquarters and the SNCC office on U Street n.w.

The executive director of the Washington Urban League since 1956, Tucker, 44, has started a number of civil rights and job-op-

portunity programs through his organization.

He recently undertook a project to help Negro servicemen returning from Vietnam to readjust to civilian life. Another effort currently under way is aimed at setting up neighborhood centers in the ghetto where League workers can assist poor people in legal matters, instruct them in landlord-tenant relations and discuss direct political action.

During last April's rioting, the Urban League set up a "Rumor-Control Center" which handled thousands of telephone calls, dispensed information and attempted to confirm reports of specific developments in the city.

"Rioting is a low and primitive but real form of communication," he says. "This is a way people feel they can get a response from a society that isn't listening."

To reduce the chance of rioting, the Urban League last summer established a 24-hour alert program that employed ghetto youths who roamed the city's toughest police precincts, prevailing on disgruntled street corner crowds to air their grievances through normal channels instead of violence.

The program is under consideration for use again this summer.

By the same token, Tucker was involved in the Poor People's Campaign this spring before its leader the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, asked him yesterday to be coordinator of the "Solidarity Day" march.

Quietly, League officials have dealt with District and Federal officials in helping to arrange the establishment of Resurrection City near the Lincoln Memorial.

During the heavy rains two weeks ago, when much of the 15-acre encampment was converted to a muddy swamp, League officials, working through D.C. City Councilman J. C. Turner, arranged to have a large contracting company go to the site, survey the situation and recommend remedial action.

Tucker, who came to Washington from Canton, Ohio, in 1956, is a diminutive, energetic man. He was once thought to be on President Johnson's list of possible appointees to Washington's new City Council.

FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, during May there were 18 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam, an all time record for the past 2 years. Of these 18, 13 were British, 1 Japanese, 3 Cypriot, and 1 from Singapore. This makes 61 free world arrivals in North Vietnam so far this year—or more than double the number during the same period last year. With the prospects for a negotiated settlement so dependent on how the war goes from here on out, this is an intolerable situation.

At no time during the past 2 years was the number of monthly arrivals ever higher than it was in May. In fact, we appear to be rapidly slipping back to the point where we were before Congress began to have some success in prodding the administration to do something about this incredible form of aid and comfort to the enemy.

Furthermore, not only has the total number of arrivals risen, but the number

of different flags is on the increase as well. This is particularly disturbing in the case of the appearance of a Japanese-flag ship during May. As such vessels have been absent since mid-1965.

Several weeks ago, when I first read reports indicating that there would be a resumption of this trade, I asked the Secretary of State what steps he was taking in response. In a letter dated May 16, 1968, I was advised that while it was true that a Japanese vessel "may be en-route to Haiphong," the U.S. Government had "made clear to the Japanese Government our concern over the possible reappearance of any Japanese-flag ship in the North Vietnam trade." Unfortunately, however good the intentions, the fact remains that such a vessel succeeded in going to North Vietnam, and we can now only wonder how many will follow her lead.

Mr. Speaker, again in May, British-flag vessels head the list in this intolerable business. Some 49 of the 61 free world arrivals this year have flown the British flag. Excuses may be found and rationalizations may be offered, but the simple fact is that these are British ships. I have repeatedly sought to bring this to the attention of the Congress and the American people, for it is frequently argued that London is somehow not responsible for these ships. In order to clarify this, I asked the Treasury Department to make an inquiry of the relationship of these vessels to British maritime law to the appropriate officials of the Hong Kong Marine Department. At this point in the RECORD I insert my letter to Treasury and the information that was obtained:

APRIL 19, 1968.

HON. HENRY FOWLER,
Secretary of the Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the course of my study on the problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam I have been unable to determine the exact procedures through which the Hong Kong shipping companies are able to obtain British registry for their vessels. It does appear, however, that the vessels are actually processed through Hong Kong offices of the British Government, and that some fees or taxes are levied by the British as a consequence of this registration.

As you have advised that you have Treasury representatives in Hong Kong, I would be most grateful if you could have an early inquiry made to determine:

The mechanism of registration of vessels that entitles them to fly the British flag;

The obligations that devolve on the vessels and their owners as a result of accepting British registry;

The fees and/or taxes that must be paid as a consequence of this registry;

Any available information on the disposition of these funds.

If registration forms and other supporting documentation will provide answers to the above questions, copies of such forms would be appreciated.

Thanking you for your courtesy, I am,
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1968.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: The Secretary asked me to obtain through our representative in Hong Kong the information you re-

quested in your letter of April 19 relating to British registry of vessels owned by Hong Kong shipping companies. I am pleased to send you now the enclosed copy of the letter received by Mr. Bach, our Hong Kong representative, from the Acting Director of the Hong Kong Marine Department. Mr. Bach additionally was given to understand that the proceeds from the fees and/or taxes are placed in a general fund for administration of the Colony.

I hope this information is adequate for your purposes. Should you wish to obtain copies of the laws and regulations referred to in the Marine Department's letter, perhaps the British Embassy in Washington would have them available.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARGARET W. SCHWARTZ,
Director.

Enclosure.

MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Hong Kong, May 2, 1968.

MORTON BACH, Esq.,
U.S. Treasury Representative,
U.S. Consulate General,
Hong Kong.

DEAR MR. BACH: You enquired concerning the registry of vessels in Hong Kong.

In these respects section 117(1) of the Hong Kong Merchant Shipping Ordinance (Cap. 281 of Laws of Hong Kong Revised Edition 1964) applies the United Kingdom Merchant Shipping Act 1894 to the Colony, and a vessel registered in Hong Kong is also a "British registered" vessel.

1. *Mechanics of Registration:* For the registration of ships in Hong Kong the following requirements apply:—

(a) the ship must be owned wholly by persons of the following description: either (i) British subjects (within the meaning of the British Nationality Act 1948 and with valid British passports); or (ii) Bodies corporate established under and subject to the laws of some part of Her Majesty's dominions, and having their principal place of business in these dominions.

(b) the name of the ship must be approved by Board of Trade, London, in accordance with Section 50 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1906.

(c) the ship must be surveyed in accordance with the Merchant Shipping (Crew Accommodation) Regs. 1961 and M.S. (Tonnage) Regs. 1968, and a Certificate of Survey produced.

(d) the owner(s) has/have to apply for British registry of the ship in accordance with section 8 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894.

(e) a Declaration of Ownership must be produced in accordance with section 9 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894.

(f) on the first registry of a ship the following evidence must be produced in addition to the Declaration of Ownership, and in accordance with section 10 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894:—

(1) Builders Certificate:

(ii) Bill(s) of Sale or documents of sale or transfer prior to registry if the vessel has passed through several owners hands before registry.

(NOTE.—Foreign Bills of Sale must be attested or in some other manner authenticated by a Consular Officer and if in a foreign language, must be accompanied by an official translation.

Foreign registry must be closed free from encumbrances).

(g) A Ship's Carving and Marking Note must be produced, duly certified by an approved Surveyor of Ships, British Consul or Vice-Consul, and/or an Officer of Customs and Excise, all in accordance with section 7 of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894.

2. *Obligations devolving on owners of vessels where these are registered in Hong Kong:* All Hong Kong registered vessels must comply with Merchant Shipping legislation.

Generally speaking this is contained either in our own regulations, or in United Kingdom Acts when the associated regulations are extended to Hong Kong under appropriate Orders-in-Council, i.e.

HONG KONG REGULATIONS

Merchant Shipping (Crew Accommodation) Regulations 1961.

Merchant Shipping (Life Saving Appliances) Regulations (Cap. 281).

Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Regulations 1968.

UNITED KINGDOM REGULATIONS EXTENDED TO HONG KONG

Merchant Shipping (Fire Appliances) Rules 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Life Savings Appliances) Rules 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Radio) Rules 1965.
Merchant Shipping (Direction Finder) Rules 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Cargo Ship Construction and Survey) Rules 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Dangerous Goods) Rules 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Grain) Rules 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Pilot Ladder) Rules 1965.

Collision Regulations 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Muster) Rules 1965.

Merchant Shipping (Navigational Warnings) 1965.

Load Line Rules.

Oil in Navigable Waters Act—certain sections.

3. *Fees payable upon registration:* The total initial registration fee payable for a 10,000 tons (gross) vessel is about HK\$6000, but fees are on a sliding scale being related to gross tonnage.

(It should be noted that fees for various safety surveys and certificates are not included here).

4. *Other requirements:* All Hong Kong registered vessels must be in possession of valid Loadline and SAFCON Certificates. In the majority of cases these are issued on behalf of the Hong Kong Government by one of the recognised Classification Societies i.e., Lloyds Register of Shipping; American Bureau of Shipping; Bureau Veritas; and Det Norske Veritas.

Additionally of course the competency of masters and crews is dealt with under the Merchant Shipping Ordinance (Cap. 281) and briefly a master, first and second mate, first and second engineer must all hold certificates of competency granted in the United Kingdom under the Merchant Shipping Acts, or colonial certificates of competency declared by any Order of Her Majesty in Council to be of the same force as if they had been granted under the M.S.A.'s.

This correspondence shows clearly that a vessel registered in Hong Kong is also a British registered vessel. Whatever loopholes may exist in British maritime law, I am satisfied that they could be closed if there were sufficient determination to do so. At the very least, it would only seem fair to those countries that have agreed to withdraw their flag vessels from this trade.

The North Vietnamese are using the bombing halt to resupply their forces and bolster their economy, while increasing their infiltration of the South—and this with the increasing help of these free world ships. With our casualties now greater than ever before, I simply can not understand why the administration does not take effective action to stop this free world shipping to North Vietnam.

I include at this point a table on free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam, and my correspondence with the State Department:

FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM, 1968

	British	Cypriot	Italian	Singapore	Greek	Lebanese	Japanese	Total
January.....	9	1						10
February.....	7	1						8
March.....	10		1	1				12
April.....	10				1	1		13
May.....	13	3		1			1	18
Total.....	49	5	1	3	1	1	1	61

MAY 9, 1968.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A recent press report indicates that a Tokyo shipping firm is planning to assign one of its vessels to trade with North Vietnam in Mid-May.

I would appreciate any information you may have on this report together with views of the Department concerning the resumption of such trade should it occur.

With my kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1968.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of May 9 concerning press reports that a Japanese shipping firm is planning to assign one of its vessels to the North Viet-Nam trade.

We have received information that the *Kotoku Maru*, owned by the Showa Kaiun Company (alternatively Seiwa Kaiun Company) of Tokyo, may be enroute to Haiphong with a cargo of medical supplies and, possibly, dry goods. The Showa Kaiun Company is a small operator with a number of small ships (the *Kotoku Maru* has a capacity of 2,500 gross tons) totalling some 30,000 gross tons. The firm's ships have been involved in trade with Communist countries and the *Kotoku Maru* has been making runs to North Korea. Showa Kaiun is not a member of the Shipowners Association which suspended all shipping operations to North Viet-Nam in April 1965.

We have made clear to the Japanese Government our concern over the possible reappearance of any Japanese flag ship in the North Viet-Nam trade. The Government of Japan is actively looking into the situation. I can assure you that the Department of State's policy continues to be one of enlisting the cooperation of all Free World governments in keeping their ships out of the North Viet-Nam trade.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

A HELPER GETS NO HELP

Mr. WATSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I know all of us are laden with the burdens of life, but I think every now and then when we have a little humorous incident developing in the city, we should all enjoy it—and if some Members have not heard about some activities last Saturday at "Tent City," I would like to share it with them.

Perhaps Members read yesterday's Evening Star, which reported that one James Clark, a hardworking plumber from the District of Columbia, went down to "Insurrection City" and wanted to help them last Saturday, in the hot sun, to put in their sewer system. It developed no one down there wanted to help old James despite repeated pleas over the public address system for volunteers. James went out and had to do it all by himself. Finally, he turned to one man, according to the Washington paper, and said, "You look like a big man. How about helping me dig this ditch or cover it up?" The man said, "Brother, I came down here to get away from shovels." That's right, these people aren't interested in jobs; they only want handouts and others to do the work for them.

If we want to end this debacle and disgrace down there, perhaps we can by installing an employment office on either end of "Insurrection City," require all able-bodied people to work, and then the thought of having to work will force them to leave. I know many of the American people asked the question whether we lost our minds when we permitted the administration to allow this encampment in the first place. Now, with such idiotic developments as happened last Saturday the people will rightly demand an end to this national disgrace.

For the benefit of all Members of the House, I include the complete article.

GETS NO HELP: PLUMBER STRIVES TO AID TENT CITY

(By Chris Wright)

James H. Clark stood shoulder-deep in the freshly dug trench, sighting down the line of black sewer pipe he had just laid between two rows of Resurrection City's plywood shacks.

Clark is not a resident of the poor people's encampment. He is a licensed plumber with his own business in Washington.

Yesterday he was at Resurrection City laying a sewer line so the showers would have drains and not create a quagmire. He was doing the work free, and asked the encampment officials about the possibility of help.

Periodically the public address system would ask for volunteers—for an unspecified task. Clark would look up once in a while, shrug his shoulders and bend back down into the trench.

No volunteers came.

"DON'T WANT TO WORK"

"These people don't want to work," he said. When the motor of the earth-mover idled, transistor radios could be heard inside nearby shelters. From time to time a group of men would gather around the ditch and watch Clark work.

Once Clark looked directly at a big man who seemed to be a leader and asked him to get some help and begin filling the trench behind them.

The man looked surprised. "Brother, I came down here to get away from shovels," was the reply.

By late afternoon the line was about half-

way to the showers. Someone obtained a second earth-moving machine but only began to haphazardly fill the trench. He soon went away.

As Clark worked, he said he has very little use for the Poor People's Campaign, personally. But he feels sorry for the people in the camp—and he likes to see a job, especially one done by Negroes, done right.

HELPED BY COUSIN

"I sure would like to regrade that last section," he said, apologizing for his use of rocks instead of brick to support the pipes. The afternoon sun beat down. He walked off down the trench carrying his red level.

Clark, of 431 10th St. NE, donated his time for the project. He also got his cousin to help, and guaranteed payment for earth-moving machinery, that was supposed to be rented out of campaign funds.

He got started on the pipe-laying on Saturday after a friend called him and disclosed that the tent city was in trouble because of its non-existent sewer system.

No stranger to weekend work—"You can drive down the street and see people sitting on their porches, but I usually find something to do"—he got organized and was digging before the city's residents seemed to realize he was there.

As the day went on his pipeline progressed steadily through the hot, sun-baked clay toward the plywood shower stalls in the center of the camp.

Clark and his helper ignored camp residents who jumped the trench, kicking dirt where they were working.

RAINS FILLS TRENCH

As huge thunderclouds began to blot out the sun at about 6 p.m., Clark looked anxiously at his handiwork and the mostly unfilled trench.

A few big drops fell, making dark spots on his green denim shirt.

"I'm a damn fool," he threw down the shovel in his hand.

"But I've been one—brought up that way." He picked up the shovel and finished bracing the pipe joint.

The rain clouds got darker. "The least they could do is fill up this hole."

He jumped out of the ditch. "Take this shovel and put it in our truck," he told his cousin. "I'm going to do something about this."

Clark strode off between the plywood houses. His cousin disappeared in the other direction.

Time passed. The rain began to fall in sheets across the camp.

The hole began to fill with water. The loosely piled earth on the sides turned to runny mud.

At the other end of the camp three men in yellow rain slickers experimented with one of the earth-moving machines. They didn't know who Clark was.

TRIBUTE TO THE LANCASTER CLEFT PALATE CLINIC

Mr. ESHLEMAN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Lancaster Cleft Palate Clinic in Lancaster, Pa. An article recently appeared in a magazine published by the American Medical Association, *Today's Health*, which detailed the magnificent work being done by this medical team in my district. The Lancaster Cleft Palate Clinic has become

internationally renowned as the leading center of knowledge about treatment of cleft palate victims.

This type of oral defect has been a great crippler throughout the world. Dr. Herbert K. Cooper brought hope and success in treatment of it when he pioneered the team approach for rebuilding cleft palate victims. Dr. Cooper is now the director emeritus of the clinic he founded and his son, Dr. John A. Cooper, now is in charge of the 50 people on the staff of the Lancaster clinic.

Since its origin in 1938, the clinic has treated over 14,000 people who were born with a cleft palate. Patients of all ages are accepted, but great significance is placed on beginning treatment when the patient is an infant. The results are happiest as treatment progresses through childhood and adolescence. All phases of the problem are dealt with including corrective surgery, speech development, and social adjustment. Knowledge concerning methodology and causation factors is continually updated through extensive research work. The outcome of the clinic's effort is the ability of people, who would in the past have been hopeless cripples, to lead a normal life.

While the philosophy of aid to mankind is the Lancaster clinic's obvious contribution to America, another bit of philosophy of this team is also truly commendable. In a letter to me, Dr. Herbert K. Cooper recently summed up this second consideration. He stated:

We feel it is important to keep our representatives informed of the work we are doing supported in part by tax dollars. We do not feel that the government owes us everything. We think we should show our ability to operate on our own also.

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

INVESTIGATION NEEDED TO DETERMINE IF FOREIGN DIRECTION IS PROMOTING VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the U.S. Attorney General to open an investigation into foreign direction of Communist and Arab propaganda activities promoting violence and terrorism among young people in the United States, especially college students.

The political assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy was apparently motivated by his support of the State of Israel and opposition to the Communist and Arab line in the Middle East. The accused assassin, Sirhan B. Sirhan, who is not an American citizen, was reportedly active in extremist agitation of Arab and so-called "New Left" student circles at Pasadena State College in California.

The assassination was in obvious conformity with the stated aims of the pro-

Communist Arab terrorist organization known as the "El Fatah." This group has advocated the emulation of the Vietcong and the assassination of Israelis and others who dare support Israel. Arab extremists identified with the so-called Arab national liberation front have been trained in Moscow and Peking, and have been endorsed by the Vietcong.

Mr. Speaker, President Nasser of Egypt and other Arab leaders urged Arabs throughout the world to demonstrate their wrath on June 5, the first anniversary of the outbreak of last year's Middle East war, a war caused by the Communist and Arab attempt to liquidate the State of Israel. June 5 was the day Sirhan Sirhan assassinated Senator Kennedy, according to the charges lodged against him.

The Communist aim, Mr. Speaker, is to keep the Middle East issue inflamed and stampede us into making a hasty and unsatisfactory withdrawal from Vietnam, now subject of peace talks in Paris. The Communist aim is to penetrate and dominate the Middle East and Mediterranean. Now it appears that a further step has been taken, escalating the violence and riots mushrooming on the campuses of American universities. It involves the exportation of terrorism. They have moved from the guerrilla tactics of the Arabs against Israel to the assassination of American politicians inside the United States.

I think the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the Attorney General to ascertain the answers to the following questions:

First. Who finances the Organization of Arab Students in the United States?

Second. What is the group's links with foreign embassies?

Third. What are the connections with Stokely Carmichael, of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, who recently visited Cairo and Damascus where he discussed Arab revolutionary tactics and methods of cooperation?

Fourth. What are the ties with the so-called New Left?

Fifth. What measures are now contemplated to control foreign agitators, especially those active in radical student movements and other subversive activities?

I am asking for a report from the Attorney General at his earliest convenience.

STOP-AND-FRISK DECISION OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. McCULLOCH. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 of this year, I introduced H.R. 16908, a bill to provide for the investigative detention and search of suspicious persons. I was pleased to be joined by the distinguished minority leader and by 11 Republican members of the Judiciary Committee.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court handed

down two decisions—Terry against Ohio and Sibron against New York—concerning the very sensitive and extremely critical question of whether stop-and-frisk authority may be exercised by the police under the fourth amendment. By a margin of 8 to 1, the Court vindicated the position taken by the cosponsors of H.R. 16908.

The Court said that a policeman may stop a person upon a reasonable suspicion on less than probable cause that such person is engaged in a crime. And if the policeman reasonably fears for the safety of his own person or of those nearby, he may make a protective search by patting down the outer clothing of such person for dangerous weapons. If any weapons are found, they are admissible in evidence.

Thus, on each of these points the Court embraced the principles of H.R. 16908.

More importantly, the Court said that the basic test of a "stop and frisk" is whether, under the circumstances, the governmental interest for law enforcement outbalanced the individual interest in personal liberty. This is exactly the test set down in H.R. 16908. See section 3028 (2).

The Court's opinions not only endorse the concept of investigative detentions under the Constitution but demonstrate the need for clear guidelines.

This is where H.R. 16908 plays its critical role—in guiding the policeman in this most sensitive area. The Court rightly criticized the simple approach of a State statute that authorized the stop-and-frisk practice without laying down the limitations on such activity.

I believe that the discerning reader of the Court's opinions will find that H.R. 16908 has become vitally necessary.

Statutory guidelines are still lacking. Policy decisions must be made which only a legislature can make.

We cannot afford to allow the policemen of our country to be forced to make these difficult policy decisions in the dark.

Effective and efficient law enforcement require that we act now.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. OLSEN. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the two separate accidents in mines that we have all read about in the newspapers are stark reminders of the hazards that still come to workers. They are also urgent reminders of the duty that the Congress has to consider carefully the need to do an effective job of perfecting the provisions—and subsequently passing—the pending Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1968.

Although the mine accidents that we have read about remind us mainly of the need for safety regulations, the health problems of miners are equally important.

"Black lungs," "grinders' rot," "Potter's asthma," "stone mason's phthisis"—these are ancient terms for the progressive crippling lung damage which has afflicted thousands of workers in the dusty trades over the years. The State of Pennsylvania alone is paying more than 16,000 persons \$55 million in compensation claims in 1968 for these occupational pneumoconioses.

Among soft coal miners, the death rate from respiratory disease is five times that of the general working population.

Over 3,000 cases of silicosis are reported yearly from exposure to free silica—the major constituent of all rocks, soils, sands, and clays. In Montana some progress has been made in the prevention of silicosis. In 1961, there were some 780 payments being made. Montana's Industrial Accident Board informs me that they are presently compensating 455 victims, and that 20 of these workers are being assisted by industry itself.

Cotton dust, talc, diatomite, carborundum, sugarcane fiber, asbestos, even the dust from moldy silage—each produces its own form of lung damage wherever dust control and worker protection are inadequate.

A recent study of 231 foundries revealed that 1 in 15 of the 3,200 workers were exposed to environmental conditions capable of producing disabling and fatal diseases. On the basis of this study, the U.S. Public Health Service estimates that more than 20,000 workers in this industry are presently working under dangerous conditions.

Three and a half million American workers exposed to asbestos face a dual threat: not only are they subject to the lung-scarring pneumoconiosis of their trade, asbestosis, but they are endangered by lung cancer associated with inhalation of asbestos fibers. Recent studies of insulation workers in two States showed 1 in 5 deaths were from lung cancer, 7 times the expected rate; half of those with 20 years or more in the trade had X-ray evidence of asbestosis; 1 in 10 deaths were caused by mesothelioma, a rare malignancy of the lung or pleura which strikes only 1 in 10,000 in the general working population. The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1968 would substantially increase the amount of research carried out in this field. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

CRIME STUDY BY CONGRESS PROPOSED

Mr. HANNA. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this morning I joined in a breakfast with approximately 50 Members of the House of Representatives who have been joint sponsors of House Resolution 1, which was originally authored by Mr. PEPPER. The resolution would set up a joint commis-

sion of the House of Representatives and the other body to address itself to the overriding problem of crime.

Since the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy there has arisen a determined and rising demand for more aggressive action on the part of Government to meet and match the challenge of increasing violent crime. No action could be more calculated to recapture a part of the lost confidence which our Central Government has suffered than a direct response to this demand.

I do not believe that the single act of the President in appointing a new Commission to study violence is a sufficient response to the citizens' appeal. This great representative body should use its mechanism of a select committee to go to the people. Allow the public over the broad expanse of our land to express what they feel and what they want. Our selected members should be ready to weigh their suggestions and measure their assessment of the problem and then indicate to the alert and aware segments of society that they will attract what is appropriate to the Federal jurisdiction and what should be accomplished by local and State governments.

Such a move, Mr. Speaker, is consistent with our tradition. It would establish a meaningful manner for the great partnership between the represented and those who represent them. This select committee and its hearings could provide a great impetus to intelligent appreciation for what our National Government can and will do for this problem. I believe it would give a sense of relief to the many of our constituents who are not convinced we care enough to really bring a vigorous effort to the problem of violence and crime.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the sentiment of this body will be immediately to respond in support of the measure House Resolution 1, now before the Rules Committee; to encourage its report to the floor and to support passage in this House.

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

Mr. McCULLOCH. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday—June 6, 1968—the House of Representatives concurred in the Senate amendments to the omnibus anticrime bill, H.R. 5034.

Some supporters of anticrime legislation have raised objections that the House of Representatives acted without proper consideration and in too great haste in approving the wiretapping and electronic surveillance provisions contained in the Senate version of the omnibus crime bill, H.R. 5037. The record clearly shows that the objection is not well founded.

Following the publication of the President's Crime Commission's recommendation, in early 1967, for authorization of

wiretapping and bugging under court order to combat organized crime, the House minority leader, JERRY FORD, and I, and the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee, introduced a very carefully drawn bill to authorize such electronic surveillance by law enforcement officials. That proposal, H.R. 10037, was submitted in May 1967, only after many hours of study by the House Judiciary Committee legal staff, House legislative counsel, and the various sponsors and then only after lengthy consultation with experts in the field. The principal draftsman was Prof. G. Robert Blakey, of Notre Dame Law School, who was the special consultant to the President's Crime Commission on wiretapping, bugging and organized crime. Professor Blakey assisted the Judiciary Committees of both bodies of the Congress during the entire course of this legislation's consideration.

During this time, the spring of 1967, the House Judiciary Committee was engaged in detailed and thorough hearings of the crime program, including wiretapping and electronic surveillance. The hearings consumed 12 days and we heard from scores of witnesses. The subject of electronic surveillance, its legality under the Constitution and its wisdom as national policy, was discussed by judges, lawyers, professors, prosecutors, and the Attorney General of the United States.

In June of 1967, the Supreme Court decided the now famous Berger case in which they shed new light on the subject of electronic surveillance and set out certain guidelines for constitutional minimum requirements. Again the sponsors and supporters of our bill restudied the problem in this new light, reassessed the issues, and in October 1967, we introduced a refined and improved bill, H.R. 13275, conforming to the suggestions of the Berger decision.

In December of 1967, the Supreme Court again spoke on the subject of electronic surveillance in the Katz case. That opinion made it even clearer that our proposal for court supervised, limited surveillance with the numerous safeguards we had meticulously included was a wise and proper legislative proposal. But because of the opposition by the administration or its spokesmen, our Republican-sponsored proposal was blocked in the House Judiciary Committee.

During all this time, the Senate Judiciary Committee was actively considering legislation similar to our bill. They held 10 days of hearings in the spring of 1967 in the Criminal Laws Subcommittee, hearing from numerous witnesses including some of those who testified before the House Judiciary Committee. The Administrative Procedures Subcommittee also held 10 days of hearings on the administration's electronic surveillance bill which would ban police electronic surveillance but permit the executive branch to do so without court supervision in so-called national security cases.

Between the House and Senate hearings and the Senate Judiciary Committee report on the bill there are available many hundreds of pages of study and

analysis of the issues presented by electronic surveillance proposals.

Finally, the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported, with strong bipartisan support, legislation very similar to our bill. It was incorporated in the omnibus crime bill as title III.

The bill was the subject of 15 days of consideration on the floor of the Senate including 2 full days and portions of others devoted to electronic surveillance. On May 23, 1968, the Senate firmly rejected an attempt to delete the electronic surveillance provisions—title III—from the bill by the overwhelming margin of 68 to 12.

During the course of this legislation's movement through the 90th Congress, it has been endorsed either specifically or in concept by:

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

The Judicial Conference of the United States.

The National Association of Attorneys General.

National District Attorneys Association.

Association of Federal Investigators.

All living former U.S. attorneys for the southern district of New York.

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Thus, to say that the House acted precipitously, and without proper consideration is not supported by the record. On the contrary, it was with the utmost cognizance of the issues and with great appreciation for the legislation that the House moved, with proper speed, to embrace the proposal before its declared enemies could finally block it. The war on crime called for and continues to call for prompt and effective action. We responded in this field with dispatch.

MR. BURKE OF MASSACHUSETTS RECEIVES HONORARY DOCTOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 2, our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] received an honorary doctor of science or oratory degree from Curry College, Milton, Mass. Sharing the honors on the same platform was the renowned Negro tenor, Roland Hayes, one of America's outstanding singers.

As the commencement speaker, Congressman BURKE noted that today's graduates face a world today beset by great problems, greater perhaps than at any time since the founding of our Nation. However, Mr. BURKE shares with me the confidence that our youth of today will shoulder the burdens of tomorrow in a manner that will reflect credit and honor on them in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to serve in this legislative body with the distin-

guished gentleman from Milton, Mass., JAMES A. BURKE. He has compiled with great diligence a progressive record as the New England member of the prestigious Ways and Means Committee. He has made child welfare legislation a special concern of his—in the tradition of my predecessor, the late John E. Fogarty. As a recipient of this honorary degree, JIM BURKE follows in the footsteps of my distinguished Senate colleague from Rhode Island, Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL, and his distinguished Senate colleague from Massachusetts, Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to place in the RECORD the citation of Curry College in awarding this honorary degree to Congressman JAMES A. BURKE. Also, at this time, I wish to include Mr. BURKE's noteworthy commencement address, two recent articles from the Boston Globe and the Boston Herald, and the 1968 Curry College commencement program:

JAMES ANTHONY BURKE, member of the United States Congress from the 11th District, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, you are completing your tenth year in the service of our government.

A native of Boston, you attended Suffolk University, and soon after began an active life in public service. You were a member of the Massachusetts General Court for ten years, four of which you served as Majority Leader. You were formerly the Registrar of Vital Statistics.

During World War II you accepted the call of your country and became a member of the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the United States Army, serving overseas with the famed 77th Division for 45 months.

In only your second term in office you were the third person in the history of Congress to be elected to the powerful House Ways and Means Committee in such a short period of time. At the end of this present year you will be the fifth ranking member of that 25-man Committee, where you have now served for eight years. You are the only New Englander to have been elected to this Committee by the membership of your own party in caucus. You have been cited for your 100% Roll Call record as well as for your perfect record of attendance at all public hearings and executive sessions of the House Ways and Means Committee, historically one of the busiest Committees in the Congress.

You have also been an outstanding leader in the field of child welfare legislation throughout your political career. In March of this year you received an award from the Northeast Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America. Similarly, you were honored this year at the 30th Anniversary meeting of the New England Association of Child Care Personnel. You continue to work tirelessly on behalf of child welfare, and it was through your efforts that the authorization for child welfare appropriations was doubled.

And now, by action of the Curry staff, the Board of Trustees concurring, and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Board of Higher Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I confer on you the degree of Doctor of the Science of Oratory, *honoris causa*, and admit you to all of the rights and privileges thereunto pertaining. In token of this action, I present you with this diploma and direct you to be invested with the hood appropriate to your degree.

[SEAL]

JOHN S. HAFER,
President.

The 89th Commencement, Curry College,
June 2, 1968.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE, COMMENCEMENT DAY SPEAKER AT CURRY COLLEGE, MILTON, MASS., JUNE 2, 1968

President Hafer, reverend clergy, Mr. Hayes, distinguished members of the faculty, graduates and guests.

It is an honor and a pleasure to be with you, also, it is a privilege to share the platform with the gifted and world renowned artist, Mr. Roland Hayes whose magnificent voice has brought so much enjoyment to his fellow men in America and throughout the world.

To the graduates my congratulations for the successful completion of your scholastic endeavors. Graduation day is the climax of your life as a student. May it be for all of you the springboard to a bright future in the careers you pursue. May the memories of campus life be fond and vivid, the friendships enduring and cherished.

Today the world is in a chaotic condition. We find students not only in the free world but everywhere protesting against the so-called "establishment," even those behind the Iron Curtain are joining in the protests and demanding more in the way of recognition.

A climax of some kind seems to be approaching the world over, in resistance to all authority, in tolerated violence, crime and undisciplined behavior. This is not only taking place in the United States but uprisings have erupted in France, West Germany, Spain, Italy, Britain. Communist Eastern Europe is affected, so is Red China and Russia is on the fringes to date and may not escape.

Under fire are institutions of higher learning, unequal incomes related to unequal ability and achievement. Rigid bureaucracies of government, war for whatever reason, ideologies. Just about everything.

Here in America, where we have a free and open society, many persons in high places have expressed deep concern about the lawless methods being used by demonstrators. Justice Abe Fortas of the U.S. Supreme Court criticized activities of students at one of our universities as "totally inexcusable from the point of view of even primitive morality". He added, "The advocacy of civil rights does not require or justify the abandonment of all decency".

The New York Times commented: "Justice Fortas' strong condemnation of some of the current student tactics has been noteworthy, not only because Justices rarely speak out on events that could eventually reach the High Court, but also because he has liberal credentials as one of the Court's most consistent libertarians".

While these activities are taking place on our college campuses throughout the country there is another group in our society who are deeply concerned, the so-called "forgotten man," those members of the middle class who feel overtaxed, overburdened and ignored. There are millions of these concerned citizens.

This group is apprehensively watching crime, racial violence, rising taxes, and consumer prices, they are concerned over the value of the dollar and America's gold position, Government spending, rising costs of family expenditures on such vital necessities as medical care and sending the children to college: the Vietnam war and the draft, an apparent disintegration of moral standards and social institutions, and a general loss of confidence in some of the political, religious and educational leaders of our Nation. The public is appalled by the collapse of accepted standards of behavior in many areas.

On the economic front, business has never been better, corporate profits are at their highest peak, unemployment figures are the lowest in the Nation's history and the wages of the workers are steadily climbing to new heights.

However, the cost of the Vietnam war is running close to 30 billion dollars a year and the Nation faces a 22.4 billion dollar deficit for the 1968 fiscal year, with an anticipated 30 billion dollar deficit for 1969. The need for more taxes and expenditure cuts is being debated in Congress at the present time.

Our peace envoys are in Paris attempting to negotiate an honorable and just peace with the Hanoi government. So far, it has been a very exasperating experience for our negotiators with little or no progress. The war continues and the loss of life and casualties remain high. The problem of civil rights is reaching newer and wider dimensions.

It is in this atmosphere that the young graduates face the world today. There are those who are in deep despair facing these overwhelming problems, and yes, there are those who would immediately abdicate their responsibilities and take refuge under the nearest wavering banner.

However, as history has shown in the past, the *youth* of this great and beloved Nation has always risen to the test: They have answered the needs of our country through its most trying ordeals. They have given of their hearts and their minds to the building of the greatest democracy in the history of mankind, and they have always been dedicated to the improvement of our Nation's welfare. Now, as you enter this present day world it is important that you hold to your ideals and with the fresh look of youth proceed bravely so that *you* in *your* time may make a contribution that will be worthy of, and reflect credit upon, *your* generation.

As so well stated, in the inaugural address of the late beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy on January 20, 1961 and which is so apropos today, "now the trumpet summons us again, not as a call to arms, though arms we need, not as a call to battle, though embattled we are, but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in, and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

Today, we read about the passing of Helen Keller, "one of the great women of this century." This gentle woman who walked with kings and presidents in her life-long crusade to help the world's handicapped, proved that individuals can overcome human problems, and go on to phenomenal achievements in behalf of their fellow man. I commend to the young lady graduates the reading of the life of this woman who could be truly called "one of God's great noblewomen." Her life was a triumph over darkness.

To the young men of this graduating class, may I commend the reading of Rudyard Kipling and particularly the immortal poem, "If".

The world is looking to *youth* to carry the torch—*yours* to hold it high with *dignity, integrity* and *honor*. I know the tasks you face will be difficult and many.

To help you in carrying the torch it might be well to remember the universal prayer that has been widely acclaimed in this troubled world, a world in need of a better understanding.

"LORD MAKE ME AN INSTRUMENT OF YOUR PEACE
Where there is hatred, let me sow love
Where there is injury, pardon
Where there is doubt, faith
Where there is despair, hope
Where there is darkness, light
And where there is sadness, joy
Oh Divine Master, grant that I may not so
much seek to be consoled as to console
To be understood as to understand
To be loved as to love
For it is in giving that we receive
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned
And it is in dying that we are born to
Eternal Life."

[From the Boston Globe, June 3, 1968]

CURRY SENIORS TOLD YOUTH WILL MEET TEST

U.S. Rep. James A. Burke (D-Milton) on Sunday expressed confidence that the youth of America will shoulder the burdens they will have to face.

In remarks delivered before 114 graduating seniors at the 89th Annual Commencement exercises of Curry College in Milton, Burke said:

"The world is looking to youth to carry the torch—yours to hold it high with dignity, integrity, and honor. I know the tasks you face will be difficult and many.

"History has shown in the past, the youth of this great and beloved nation has always risen to the test; they have answered the needs of our country through its most trying ordeals; they have given of their hearts and their minds to the building of the greatest democracy in the history of mankind, and they have always been dedicated to the improvement of our nation's welfare."

Receiving an honorary degree along with Burke was Roland Hayes, Negro tenor. Also receiving special awards were the president of the college, Dr. John S. Hafer, Gerald Grasso of Weymouth, and Harold Cohen of Westwood, N.J.

[From the Boston Herald, June 3, 1968]

AT CURRY—114 GET DEGREES

With 114 seniors representing 13 states, Curry College, Milton, graduated its largest class yesterday before capacity audience of 1300 at the college's 89th commencement exercise.

Deploring recent militant campus demonstrations, U.S. Rep. James A. Burke, (D-Milton), called on the graduates to remember millions of Americans he termed "forgotten men" who feel overtaxed, overburdened and ignored:

"They are apprehensively watching crime, racial violence, rising taxes and rising consumer prices."

Burke said the public is appalled by "the collapse of accepted social standards of behavior in many areas," and told the graduates he was confident they "will reflect a credit upon your generation."

Curry President John S. Hafer conferred honorary degrees to Rep. Burke, citing his 100 per cent roll call vote and efforts on behalf of child welfare, and to concert tenor Roland Wiltse Hayes, citing his rise from a Georgia plantation cabin to become one of the world's outstanding singers.

THE 1968 CURRY COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AND BACCALAUREATE SERVICE, SUNDAY, JUNE THE SECOND, MILTON, MASS.

BACCALAUREATE SERVICE

Little Theater, 9:30 a.m.

Prelude: Five Short Pieces by Samuel Wesley; Prof. Edward H. Hastings, Organist.

Processional: Marche en Rondeau by M. A. Charpentier (Audience please stand).

Call to worship: The Rev. Cecil H. Rose, Chaplain.

Hymn No. 15: "Praise to the Lord, the Almighty."

Responsive reading No. 23, page 519.

Prayer: The Rev. Milton L. Boyle, Jr., Registrar.

Musical selection: "Lord God of Abraham (Elijah)" by Felix Mendelssohn; Donald Tucker, '69, Baritone.

Introduction of the speaker: Dr. Alexander Moissiy, Professor of French and Russian.

Baccalaureate address: The Rev. Theodore Isals, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School.

Hymn No. 375: "Lead On, O King Eternal." Benediction: The Rev. Cecil H. Rose.

Recessional: "March in E-Flat" by Robert Schumann.

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Academic quadrangle, 11:00 a.m.

Prelude: Psalm 117 by William Selby, Four Psalms of Joy by George Jackson, Fifth Organ Concerto by G. F. Handel, Prof. Edward H. Hastings, Organist.

Processional: Marche Episcopale by Louis Vierne (Audience please stand).

National anthem: Led by Curry College Concert Choir, Prof. Edward H. Hastings, Director.

Invocation: The Rev. Gilbert Y. Taverner, Parkway Community Methodist Church, Milton.

Greeting: Dr. John Stuart Hafer, President, Curry College.

Valedictory address: Ellen Channon.

Presentation of class gift: John B. Fitzmaurice.

Choral selection: Gaudeamus Igitur, arr. by E. H. Hastings, Curry College Concert Choir, Paul Thistle, '71, Organist.

Commencement address: The Hon. James A. Burke, U.S. Representative, 11th Congressional District.

Presentation of recipients of honorary degrees: Dr. Willard Price Lombard, Chairman, Curry Board of Trustees. (The Hon. James A. Burke, Roland Hayes, distinguished American conferees.)

Conferring of honorary degrees: President Hafer.

Presentation of special awards: President Hafer. The Yankee Chapter, American Ordinance Association—Raytheon Company Award: Recipient—Gerald A. Grasso, The Wall Street Journal Student Achievement Award: Recipient—Harold Charles Cohen.

Presentation of candidates for degrees: Dr. Hiram John Evans, Dean of the College.

Conferring of degrees: President Hafer.

Alma Mater: Led by Curry College Concert Choir: (Audience please stand)

"Alma Mater, let us praise thee!
Clothed in beauty, rare art thou,
Old Traditions cling about thee,
New ideals crown thy brow,
And thine eyes are filled with visions
Truth and mercy meet in thee,
Alma Mater, let us praise thee!
Ah! that we may worthy be!"

Benediction: The Rev. James G. Buckley, the Columban Fathers, Milton.

Recessional: "Con Hoto Maestoso" (Sonata III), by Felix Mendelssohn.

BACHELOR OF ARTS

Edith Maria Alfieri.
Donna Elaine Altieri.
James Hunter Ambler.
Sompong Amornvivat.
John Kelly Bamond.
E. Steve Banis, Jr.
Carol Jane Barker.
Jane Grossman Barr.
Anthony Murray Baxter.
Carl Ekstrom Beck, Jr.
Paul Edward Berger.
Robert C. Bernard.
Kevin Arthur Brennan.
Michael Anthony Bruscell.
Francis Xavier Camorali.
Thomas Anthony Cappucci.
Dee Carroll.
Ellen Channon.*
Arnold Harvey Cohen.
Harold Charles Cohen.*
Richard Francis Connolly.
Robert S. Conti.
Bruce G. Corbett.
Michael Corman.
Daniel Benjamin Danton.
Paul Joseph DiBenedetto.
Theodore E. Dombrowski, Jr.*
Susan A. Driscoll.
John Joseph Feeley, Jr.

*Elected to Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities.

Matthew C. Feingold.
 John B. Fitzmaurice.
 Barbara-Anne Flanagan.
 Paul Henry Frazier.
 Anne Elizabeth Gallagher.
 Kevin Thomas Galligan.
 Thomas James Giblin.
 Harvey I. Glasser.*
 Eric Harvey Golden.*
 Robert Peter Gould.
 Charles Edward Gray, Jr.
 Richard John Grogan.
 Jon Emerick Harlor.
 Edward J. Hauck III.*
 David J. Hoffman.
 Mollyne Roberta Honor.*
 Glenn Allen Hughs.
 Edward Carl Jellson.
 Paul Edward Jessoe.
 Marc Alan Kamin.
 Joseph Daniel Kane.
 William Michael Kelleher.*
 Gerald P. Kibbe.
 Elspeth Gail Kindquist.
 Mary R. Klein.
 Henry A. Knapp.
 Maryann Rose Kotapski.
 Joseph Kreplick.
 Richard Burt Kurtzman*.
 Barry Michael Lake.
 Thomas William Lally, Jr.
 Lenore Marilyn Levine.
 Florence Mainieri L. Lipari.
 Philip D. Lipson.
 Toby (Rosenblatt) Marxuach.
 Nancy Elizabeth Materne.
 Paul Barrett McArthur.
 Patrick J. McGeoghegan.
 Robert Emmett McGovern.
 H. Keith Metler*.
 Jeffrey Ian Miller.
 Barry Frank Montgomery.
 John E. Montini.
 William Henry Morris.
 Edmund Francis Noke, Jr.
 Kathleen F. O'Connor.
 Rocco Edward Palladino.
 Carol Marlene Palmer.
 Frank Peronace, Jr.
 Roy Kevin Publicover.
 Donald Victor Purdy.
 Andrea Rauseo.
 Peter Roppolo.
 John Anthony Roselli.
 Charlotte Frances Ross.
 James Joseph Ryan.
 Roderick A. St. Pierre.
 George James Sarkes.
 Eileen Henre Sarrel.
 William Richard Schlieff.
 Debra Lynn Schoenberg.
 Dennis Victor Scialli.
 Carmel Joseph Serge, Jr.
 Benjamin Shavitz.
 George Benjamin Shure.*
 Sandra R. Silvern.
 Donna A. Skolnick.
 Ronald Royster Smith.
 Vernon S. Stromberg, Jr.*
 James S. Summers.
 Dennis I. Tave.
 Richard S. Thistlewaite.
 Marcia Mae Thomas.
 Martin Paul Thorsen.*
 Francis Paul Tomalolo.
 Donald Joseph Upton.
 Lynn B. Varty.
 Robin D. Verner.
 Gregory Clark Wallwork.
 Mark William Weber.
 Maurice Barry Wyman.
 Stephen Nicholas Zanni.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

S. Joseph Cincotta.
 Gerald A. Grasso.
 William F. Hughes, Jr.
 Douglas Scott Sparrow.
 Frank Alan Ward.
 Board of Trustees: Richard E. Adams,
 Lenice Ingram Bacon, Joseph Aloysius Do-
 herty, Leo C. Donahue, Mildred Buchanan

Flagg, J. John Fox, Melville Bell Grosvenor,
 Charles E. Holly, David Russell Hubbard,
 Richard Augustus Kelley, Richard V. Kiley,
 Nathaniel Leverone, Willard Price Lombard,
 Chairman; Kirtley Fletcher Mather, Stewart
 Graffam Orr, George William Perkins II,
 Dunbar Lancaster Shanklin, Clarence A.
 Westhaver.

Board of Consultants: Wilmon Brewer,
 Frieda M. Drapkin, Joseph Drapkin, Tehyi
 Hsieh.

Master of Diplomas: Milton Lorimer Boyle,
 Jr., Registrar.

Chief Marshal: Ralph Kimball Carleton,
 Professor of Chemistry.

Assistant Faculty Marshals: C. Alan Ander-
 son, Associate Professor of Philosophy; Carl-
 ton Condit, Associate Professor of Geology;
 Robert Laurie Keighton, Associate Professor
 of Government; Albert Sherring, Associate
 Professor of Sociology.

Senior Class Marshals: William Michael
 Kelleher, George Benjamin Shure.

Commencement Committee: C. Alan An-
 derson, Warren S. Bazirgan, Jr., Chairman;
 Milton Lorimer Boyle, Jr., Ralph Kimball
 Carleton, Hiram John Evans, John B. Fitz-
 maurice, Edward H. Hastings, Mollyne Rob-
 erta Honor, Robert Laurie Keighton, Helen
 Glendyne LeBaron, Paul Barrett McArthur,
 Cecil H. Rose.

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE
WEEK

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speak-
 er, 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
 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr.
 Speaker, on behalf of myself and 20 col-
 leagues who have joined with me, I am
 introducing a resolution today that
 would authorize the President to pro-
 claim the week which includes Septem-
 ber 15 and 16 as "National Hispanic
 Heritage Week."

The purpose of this resolution is to
 give the appropriate recognition to the
 Hispanic influence and the role of
 Spanish-surnamed persons in the his-
 tory of our Nation.

The resolution points out that—

It is in the tradition of our country to
 recognize, cherish and conserve the many
 cultural contributions of the people who
 have helped achieve the greatness of our
 nation.

Sometimes we tend to forget that
 seven of our States—Arizona, California,
 Colorado, Florida, Nevada, New Mexico,
 and Texas—bear names of Spanish
 origin, as does the Commonwealth of
 Puerto Rico. Many of our cities and
 towns proudly bear Hispanic names, as
 well.

The most heavy concentrations of
 Spanish-surnamed citizens are in the
 five Southwestern States—Arizona, Cali-
 fornia, Colorado, New Mexico, and
 Texas—although many citizens of Puerto
 Rican heritage now live in New York and
 the surrounding area.

The 1960 census shows that the Span-
 ish-surnamed population in the five
 Southwestern States had reached 3,465,-
 000 at that time—nearly 3 million of
 whom were born in the United States.
 I am sure that the 1970 census will show

a substantial increase over this figure.
 California and Texas each had more
 than 1.4 million of the total figure
 shown above.

As you will note from these figures, Mr.
 Speaker, the Spanish-surnamed popula-
 tion of this Nation is large, and I would
 add, has never received the recognition
 due it. For instance, I am advised that
 the Spanish-surnamed population has
 contributed a higher proportion of
 Medal of Honor winners than any sim-
 ilar heritage group. At the same time, it is
 unfortunate that far too many of our
 citizens of Spanish surname are not
 sharing in a proportionate way in the
 fruits of our great Nation. My own con-
 gressional district includes a large part
 of predominately Spanish-speaking east
 Los Angeles, which is a part of the pov-
 erty area in Los Angeles County.

Congress recognized one of the prob-
 lem that besets a bilingual culture such
 as that of the Mexican-American com-
 munity in the Southwestern States last
 year when the Elementary and Second-
 ary Education Act was amended to au-
 thorize additional funds to aid schools in
 overcoming the problems of students for
 whom English is a second language.
 However, after recognizing the difficul-
 ties, we now find that the budget asks
 for an appropriation of only \$5 million
 of the \$30 million that was authorized.

Because of failures such as this to meet
 the needs of the Spanish-surnamed pop-
 ulation, it is necessary to bring out the
 extent to which our Nation's roots are
 imbedded in our Hispanic heritage.

Both President Johnson and the late
 President Kennedy visited majestic Mex-
 ico City in order to express the admira-
 tion and esteem of the United States and
 its citizens for the traditions of inde-
 pendent Mexico. There they received
 welcomes of unexampled enthusiasm and
 spontaneity from the citizens of the
 United Mexican States who share with
 Spanish-American citizens of our own
 United States the rich cultural, linguis-
 tic, social, and religious heritage of la
 raza.

The joint resolution which I have in-
 troduced would recognize this great her-
 itage by authorizing the President to
 proclaim during each year a National
 Hispanic Heritage Week. Such a Na-
 tional Hispanic Heritage Week would in-
 clude the date of the annual observance
 of the anniversary of Mexican inde-
 pendence, celebrated on the 15th and
 16th of September. It would also include
 the date of the annual observance of
 Independence Day, September 15, in
 Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala,
 Honduras, and Nicaragua, as well as
 being close to the date of Chile's In-
 dependence Day, September 18.

In Mexico, and among Mexican
 Americans of the United States, the fes-
 tivities of Mexican Independence Day
 begin on the evening of September 15
 when the President of Mexico repeats
 the famous independence shout—grito—
 of the martyred priest, Father Hidalgo y
 Costilla:

Mexicanos, viva Mexico.

The Members who have cosponsored
 this resolution today are Mr. BELL, Mr.

BURTON of California, Mr. BUSH, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. WIGGINS.

IT TAKES A BIG MAN

Mr. GALLAGHER. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fascinating features of modern history is unfolding before us these days, 3,000 miles across the Atlantic Ocean. Both France and General de Gaulle are going through a critical stage, and future success cannot be predicted for either party at this time. Naturally, American interests would not be advanced if France collapsed as a major nation. Nevertheless, I would be less than candid if I did not say that much of the problem there is a direct result of the policies of De Gaulle. Further, we would do well to remember the classical arrogance displayed by General de Gaulle on every occasion when the United States was enmeshed in domestic or international difficulties.

It takes a big man to see the broader, long-range picture, and to see that our national interests will be best served by a stable, prospering France. President Johnson, fortunately, is just such a big man. He has consistently ignored provocation from across the water, and he stands ready to help our sometime ally in any way that is appropriate. Someday, when the history of the times is written, it will be recorded that De Gaulle's difficulties took on an ironic tinge, when compared with the masterful job of national leadership turned in by Lyndon B. Johnson during the period of his country's greatest challenges at home and abroad.

The contrast between these two world leaders is strikingly described in a recent column by Robert G. Spivack. I insert the column in the RECORD at this point:

THE FUTURE OF FRANCE

(By Robert G. Spivack)

The turmoil in France has caught much of Europe and the West by surprise. Even the Moscow-oriented Communists do not seem to know whether they want a "Red Revolution" at this time, or not.

Unfortunately for France, as she faces the prospect of civil war, she has few friends in the world to whom she can turn, thanks in large part to the special brand of chauvinism-nationalism-racism that bears the label of Gen. deGaulle.

Over the last few years as his anti-Americanism has intensified, Gen. deGaulle—out of the highest patriotic motives—has succeeded in isolating his country from the western democratic nations virtually to a point of no return. He has fired the flames of anti-Americanism along with a bitter campaign against all "Anglo-Saxons" that has been reckless and now, it seems clear, against French interest. The fury with which he de-

nounced U.S. Vietnam policy may have been designed to appease the large Communist element in his country, as well as those die-hard colonialists who still think Vietnam ought to be part of the French empire.

But this effort at internal appeasement has not worked, just as it usually does not work in the case of a nation's external relations.

For Americans it is difficult to think objectively about the fate of France. About the only man who seems able to do so is President Johnson who, despite endless harassment, has never retaliated. Not only has he turned the other cheek but even in the present crisis he has moved to avert a collapse of the franc, has restated our interest in French "stability," and otherwise acted generously.

Johnson's soft response is almost a classic example of killing with kindness. The final irony would be for him to offer deGaulle political asylum down on the ranch until things simmer down.

It will be difficult for other Americans to be so detached. Many will watch France writhe with grim pleasure.

Perhaps if he had followed a different course there would be no crisis in France, but who really can be sure. It's deGaulle's obstinacy, though, that has caused so much anguish in other nations of Europe that suffered most during World War II. His lack of generosity towards British entry into the Common Market has helped reduce her to a third-rate power.

DeGaulle's reckless encouragement of Arab nationalism, probably in the hope of reaping an oil harvest, has proved difficult for Israel.

The list of western grievances is long and it is no answer for de Gaulle to say that Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill did not pay him enough heed during World War II.

But the crisis in France is also a result of the internal policies that deGaulle has followed. The workers, despite the lack of militancy on the part of some of their union leaders, have not fared well under deGaulle during all this long period of French prosperity. Everything has gone up except wages.

Undoubtedly his talk about French "grandeur" and a return to the glories of the past had its appeal. But, in the last analysis, it's not something you can eat or survive on for very long.

So far as the French students are concerned the entire deGaulle era was marked by a pinch-penny approach to education for everyone except the so-called "elite". He was conservative, in the worst sense of the word, that is deGaulle was rigid. There was quite a contrast between his approach to internal affairs, even without a war, and LBJ's Great Society approach.

Now everything is in disarray. DeGaulle, like other men of enormous ego, has built up no one as a possible successor. The Left seems to sense that after deGaulle there could be a deluge. That's about all that holds France together.

THE APPALACHIAN TRAIL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, after the splendid record of the 89th Congress and its achievements in enacting vital measures affecting the conservation of our natural resources, there is some considerable concern over the outcome of conservation bills in this 90th Congress, especially in the light of reported plans to adjourn in August for the political conventions.

Of particular concern is the fate of

the National Trails System proposal of President Johnson, which has been the subject of Senate and House hearings. This proposal is the result of the great efforts of Senator NELSON, who initiated the original Appalachian Trail bill, calling for Federal protection of this famous 2,000-mile footpath from Maine to Georgia.

Early in the second session of the 89th Congress, I was pleased to sponsor the Nelson bill in the House, embodying certain changes recommended by the Bureau of Outdoors Recreation. I did not reintroduce the bill in the current Congress in view of the administration's National Trails proposal, which includes the Appalachian Trail. Others are the Continental Divide Trail, the Pacific Crest Trail, and the Potomac Heritage Trail. In addition, the initial National Trails proposal in March 1966, called for these added trails: the Chisholm Trail, Lewis and Clark Trail, Natchez Trace, North Country Trail, Oregon Trail, and Santa Fe Trail.

Since time is running out on the national trails proposal, I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, a new national trails bill with the Appalachian Trail as the pilot trail so that we may learn from experience what is involved in setting up other trails throughout the land and how extensive Federal participation will be required to protect these areas.

The Appalachian Trail is ideally suited for this test. It is a trail which already exists and is in everyday use by hiking groups. It represents a harmonious relationship between hiking clubs and landowners who willingly permit the trail to pass through their property. It represents an area where the Federal Government could well step in to help solve in part problems of its own making where landowner resistance to the Appalachian Trail is growing simply because of the threat of Federal condemnation.

The longer Congress debates, the greater the threat to the longstanding friendly cooperation between landowners and the volunteer Appalachian Trail hiking organizations who blaze and clear the trail and maintain it in good hiking condition, some to the point of providing overnight shelters.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there is wide approval and sentiment in this Congress for the concept of Federal protection for the existing Appalachian Trail. In some way, the Appalachian Trail got lost in the myriad of trails proposed for Federal recognition. I think that it is time that the Congress got back on the Appalachian Trail. Adoption of my new Appalachian Trail bill or the amending in committee of pending national trails bills by designating the Appalachian Trail as a pilot trail with others in a study category will be a good step toward protecting and preserving this unique trail.

My interest in and support of conservation legislation is well known, Mr. Speaker, and I take special pride in having been the first Member of Congress to sponsor the Cape Cod National Park proposal in legislation filed in April 1957, not long after the national sea-

shore survey undertaken by the National Park Service.

My sponsorship of the revised Nelson bill in the 89th Congress was prompted by the strong associations in my district with the Appalachian Trail. In fact, the originator and founder of the Appalachian Trail is an old friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Benton MacKaye of Shirley Center, Mass., who was honored in 1966 as the recipient of one of the Nation's highest conservation awards.

Mr. MacKaye was designated by Secretary of the Interior Udall as a recipient of the Department's Conservation Service Award for his outstanding efforts in advancing the conservation cause in the Nation. The award cited his pioneering efforts on behalf of the Appalachian Trail and his many conservation attainments, including his profound influence in nurturing the idea for and the actual establishment of The Wilderness Society in 1935.

It is just about 47 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. MacKaye in an article published in the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects* conceived the Appalachian Trail as the longest footpath in the world, a hiking trail which now traverses 2,000 miles of rugged terrain from Mt. Katahdin in Maine to Springer Mountain in northern Georgia.

Mr. MacKaye envisioned a foot trail from Maine to Georgia as the fountainhead of a whole system of wild reservations and parks, linked together by short feeder trails. In his article, "An Appalachian Trail: A Project in Regional Planning," Mr. MacKaye suggested that this trail system might serve as a reservoir of primeval and rural environments at their highest levels of quality.

From this, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the Nation is indebted to Benton MacKaye not only for the Appalachian Trail, but the entire concept of a nationwide system of trails.

Within 2 years after the MacKaye proposal, the Regional Planning Association endorsed the plan and the first Appalachian Trail Conference was held in Washington in 1925.

However, if it had not been for Mr. MacKaye's enthusiasm, great abilities and continued missionary work, the Appalachian Trail, as it is today, would perhaps never have been realized.

Crossing 14 States, eight national forests, two national parks and crossing six major rivers, the Appalachian Trail is the MacKaye dream come true in what he described as a Thoreau-like "sanctuary and refuge from the scrambles of everyday worldly commercial life" for those seeking contemplation, study, recreation, and education.

Covering a rugged 2,000-mile course from Maine to Georgia, much of this winding trail, in many places located along mountain ridges, is within easy reach of more than one-half the population of the United States. Tens of thousands, young and old alike, hike and camp along the trail each year and the challenge of hiking the whole Appalachian Trail is being met with increasing frequency each year.

The length of the Appalachian Trail in the several States, traveling north to south, is now 279.23 miles in Maine,

153.42 miles in New Hampshire, 133.76 miles in Vermont, 82.69 miles in Massachusetts, 55.75 miles in Connecticut, 158.67 in the New York and New Jersey area, 215.87 miles in Pennsylvania, 37.14 miles in Maryland, 462.28 miles in Virginia, 112.60 miles in Tennessee, 147.79 miles in the North Carolina and Tennessee area, 79.67 miles in North Carolina and 76.44 miles in Georgia.

While most of the Appalachian Trail runs through parks and forests, it is important to note that some 800 miles of the trail go through private lands. In recent years some of this land has been converted into subdivisions, highways, and other incompatible uses. In fact, in some instances parts of the trail no longer exist and the private trail club groups maintaining the trail have found it necessary to relocate the Appalachian Trail. One famous change took place not long ago when the trail was forced to leave a wooded area and relocated along a blacktopped Virginia highway, largely because of the concern of the landowners over the rights to their land in the face of possible Federal acquisition.

Fortunately, the Potomac Appalachian Trail Club and the Appalachian Trail Conference, long known for the confidence and cooperation they have gained from landowners, were able to cope with this particular relocation, but the entire concept of a 2,000-mile footpath is faced with serious problems once it becomes necessary to shift from scenic forests to hard-topped local highways.

Benton MacKaye has seen these dangers and has made his voice and great abilities known in advancing the Appalachian Trail cause. This is the warning he has for preservation of the Appalachian Trail:

Never for a moment (or for a sentence) forget what the A.T. is. And what it has been for a nigh half century (since 1921). It is a foot trail and nothing else.

The A.T. is the work of thousands of people working over the years. Don't let this work be cancelled. As it would be if some careless sentence (in any trails legislation) enabled the camel's nose to get under the tent.

This grand old man of the outdoors, now approaching 90, is the father of the Appalachian Trail and one of the moving spirits of the Wilderness Society. He is a graduate of Harvard College, class of 1900, and was among the first employees of the U.S. Forest Service. His Federal employment, from which he retired in 1945, saw service with the Labor Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Benton MacKaye is a noted writer and poet, a charter member of the Regional Planning Association, a member of the Society of American Foresters and a fellow of the American Geographical Society. His efforts in regional planning are recognized today as pioneering in the field of conservation planning. His remarkable book, "The New Exploration," first published in 1928 was reprinted without change in 1962 as a classic guide for use and guidance today.

This is what Secretary of the Interior Udall had to say in designating Benton MacKaye as the recipient of the Department's 1966 Conservation Award:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1966.

Mr. BENTON MACKAYE,
Shirley Center, Mass.

DEAR MR. MACKAYE: It is a distinct privilege as well as a great pleasure to present to you the Conservation Service Award of the Department of the Interior.

From the early days of your career when Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot began to marshal support for conservation of the nation's forest resources, not only was your foresight added to their vision but the great breadth of your humane insight gave depth and perspective to the growing movement. This was manifest in your proposal for a footpath in the Appalachians from Maine to Georgia, and the Appalachian Trail was born. Your pioneering efforts in broad regional planning produced guidelines for comprehensive conservation planning that were far ahead of others' thinking. "The New Exploration: A Philosophy of Regional Planning," which you wrote and which was first published in 1928 was reprinted without change in 1962, and it remains a classic guideline today.

You foresaw the need and laid the foundations for present-day protection of man's total environment through such programs as Urban Renewal and the Interstate Highway System long before the Nation as a whole awoke to its need. Throughout your career your deep concern for the welfare of man's spirit as well as his physical well-being has been your guiding force.

Typical of your ability to link action with prophecy is the profound influence you had in nurturing the idea for and the actual establishment of The Wilderness Society in 1935. That this Society lives and thrives and continues to serve the people through the preservation of the finest examples of native American environments, from which future generations will gain strength and inspiration, is due in great part to your foresight.

The Nation will be forever in your debt for the good that you have done.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

The following Interior Department memorandum accompanied this highly coveted conservation award:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1966.

Memorandum To: Secretary of the Interior.
From: Acting Director, National Park Service.
Subject: Conservation Service Award, Mr.

Emil Benton MacKaye.

We take pleasure in nominating Mr. Emil Benton MacKaye for the Conservation Service Award of the Department of the Interior. His entire career since receiving his Masters Degree in Forestry from Harvard University has been devoted to good land use planning and the preservation of natural beauty. In 1921 he pioneered the idea of establishing the Appalachian Trail, and he was one of the earliest proponents of the concept of regional planning.

Born in Stamford, Connecticut, in 1879, his career as a conservationist began in the era of President Theodore Roosevelt's awakening of the Nation to the need for protection and wise management of its natural resources. From 1905 to 1918 he worked with the U.S. Forest Service in the days of Gifford Pinchot. His activities then were concerned with not only improving and reclaiming the forests of America, but also in the wider issues of conservation. He believed in and fought for protection of the total environment in the interest of man's welfare. His ideals were carried forward during a two-year (1918-1919) assignment with the Department of Labor as a specialist in colonization on a project for the settlement

of returning World War I soldiers to the land. This experience doubtlessly influenced his future interest in regional planning.

In 1921, Benton MacKaye contributed an article to the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects* in which he outlined a plan for "An Appalachian Trail: A Project in Regional Planning." He envisioned an Appalachian footpath from Maine to Georgia as the backbone of a whole system of wild reservations and parks, linked together by feeder trails, to constitute a reservoir of primeval and rural environments at their highest levels of quality. In 1923, the Regional Planning Association of America endorsed the project, and it was off and away. The first Appalachian Trail Conference was held in Washington, D.C., in 1925, and the Trail began to take shape. Benton MacKaye's enthusiasm incited hundreds of volunteers to devote time and energy to the project until it became the 2,000-mile "sanctuary and refuge from the scrambles of everyday worldly commercial life" which, in his words, it is today.

As this project was gaining strength and momentum, Benton MacKaye already was forging ahead into more fundamental conservation fields. In 1925 he contributed, in collaboration with Robert Bruere and Lewis Mumford, an outline of Regional Planning for the *Survey Graphic*. In 1928, his book, "The New Exploration: A Philosophy of Regional Planning," was published by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.

It is indicative of Benton MacKaye's foresight and imaginative ability that this book was reprinted in 1962 (by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois). In Lewis Mumford's words, "This book had to wait a whole generation to acquire the readers that would appreciate it. In the field of regional planning it was not merely a pioneer essay of its own time, but it is still ahead of much of the thinking and planning being done in this field today, since too little of that effort displays either the hard logic or the humane insight MacKaye has brought to the subject."

In rapid succession in 1930 MacKaye wrote "The Townless Highway," "New York—A National Peril," and the "Bay Circuit." All of these dealt with problems now being attacked and solved through such programs as the Interstate Highway System and Urban Renewal. Again Benton MacKaye was a pioneer and a prophet.

In 1923 MacKaye had found time to join a small select group in New York which incorporated itself as the "Regional Planning Association of America," which helped lay the foundations for many of the important conservation measures of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Administration in the thirties. Ten years later he moved to Tennessee as a Regional Planner for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The idea behind the formation of The Wilderness Society was blown into full flame in 1934-1935, and it was largely through Benton MacKaye's love of America's natural beauty and his deep concern for preserving man's heritage of unspoiled nature that this occurred. Fate arranged a meeting of MacKaye, Bob Marshall, and Harvey Broome in Knoxville, Tennessee, in August, 1934, which led Benton MacKaye to draft a set of principles which was the forerunner of a statement that would spark the actual formation of the Society. They were joined in this effort by Harold C. Anderson, Bernard Frank, Aldo Leopold, Ernest Oberholtzer, and Robert Sterling Yard. These eight became the organizers of the Society in January, 1935. MacKaye was its first Vice President when The Wilderness Society was incorporated in 1937. He has continued to be a leading figure in the Society ever since.

Today, in his 86th year, Benton MacKaye continues to be active in his chosen field. He is producing another book ("Gotech-

niques of North America: View Points of Its Habitability"). Throughout his long and active career his contributions to conservation as a forester, ecologist, regional planner, author, and prophet have been outstanding. It is a privilege to recommend him for the Department of the Interior's Conservation Service Award.

A. C. STRATTON,
Acting Director.

Enclosure.

I concur: with delight.

STANLEY A. CAIN,
Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife
and Parks.

The noted Fitchburg, Mass., Sentinel in editorials on October 11 and 12, 1962, had this to say about Benton MacKaye:

MONTACHUSETT'S MAJOR PROPHET

Benton MacKaye is another resident of Montachusett who is at last coming into his own. He is a prophet not without honor now in his own region.

What the few specialists have understood for more than three decades is now becoming the property of the American people; namely, that Benton MacKaye of Shirley Center is a genius of intuitive thinking who in 1928 warned the people against the urban flow, the metropolitan invasion, and who laid down a precise plan to stem the flow, to dam the inexorable movement of business and industry and commercialization and way-side slums—a movement which has now at last caused the concern of millions as they see the ugly continuous sprawl from Boston to Washington.

Benton MacKaye's classic, "The New Exploration," which he wrote largely in our own Montachusett Region, has been issued by the University of Illinois press in a paperback edition, with a history-making introduction for this new edition by famed Lewis Mumford, international authority on regional planning and on the history and culture of cities.

When this classic, now recognized as one of the basic books of all times, was first published in 1928, only 1,500 copies were printed. Most of them went unsold and eventually came to rest at the historic MacKaye cottage in Shirley Center.

Like Thoreau a century or so before him MacKaye could say, "I have a library of more than 1000 books, mostly of my own authorship."

Mr. MacKaye made no money from "The New Exploration," but he did achieve almost instant fame among the few who understood what he was talking about and who realized the implications for the future of his detailed plan to stem the metropolitan flow.

At 83, MacKaye is the gruff, shaggy-headed pioneer in saving our country-sides and our cities, lean and lank as the typical New England Yankee, sparse of words, but using words to cut to the marrow of an issue as surely and cleanly as a surgeon wielding a scalpel.

He enjoys his days at what he calls his "empire," the MacKaye cottage and its environs in Shirley Center, going off now and then to Washington and elsewhere to poke into things and come up with still new ideas that will leave a lasting imprint on American culture.

Lewis Mumford, in his new introduction, comes quickly to the heart of the matter:

"'The New Exploration' is a book that deserves a place on the same shelf that holds Henry Thoreau's 'Walden' and George Perkins Marsh's 'Man and Nature'; and like the first of these books, it has had to wait a whole generation to acquire the readers that would appreciate it.

"In the field of regional planning Benton MacKaye's book was not merely a pioneer essay in its own time, but it is still ahead of much of the thinking and planning being done in this field today, since too little of

that effort displays either the hard logic or the humane insight MacKaye has brought to the subject.

"In Benton MacKaye the voice of an older America, a voice with echoes not only of Thoreau, but of Davy Crockett, Audubon and Mark Twain, addresses itself to the problem of how to use the natural and cultural resources we have at hand today without defacing the landscape, polluting the atmosphere, disrupting the complex associations of animal and plant species upon which all higher life depends, and thus in the end destroying the possibilities for further human development.

"That voice was needed in 1928, and because it was not listened to, it is needed even more today. . . .

"Nobody else in our time has pointed out more clearly the terms upon which modern man, and in particular the American people, may occupy the earth and use judiciously all our resources, natural, technical, and urban, without making the land itself uninhabitable and our own life unendurable."

We need not go out of Montachusett to realize how the people and their government have turned a deaf ear to Benton MacKaye's ideas as set forth in his classic book, "The New Exploration," now republished in paperback with an introduction by famed Lewis Mumford.

The book originally appeared in 1928.

At about that time Mr. MacKaye was working on the Governor's Committee on Open Spaces. One of the recommendations he submitted to the governor was for a Wachusett-Watic greenbelt, including a foot path or trail for hikers that would tie in with the Appalachian Trail.

In 1921 MacKaye had proposed in a magazine article a foot trail that would extend from Maine to Georgia. Here was a brilliant flash of genius which did not have to wait upon popular acceptance for its fulfillment. Within 20 years MacKaye saw the realization of his dream, and he is now known as the granddaddy of the Appalachian Trail.

The Wachusett-Watic Trial and the greenbelt that MacKaye proposed would have been more than a narrow foot trail. Eventually it would have become, if his ideas had been accepted by the authorities in Massachusetts, an open area, a dam against the sprawling urban masses and messes, a part of a logical system of damming the metropolitan flow.

But the plan was rejected.

It is well to bear in mind this rejection of a far-seeing planner and prophet; for the region is now agitating for a North-South Throughway which would come up through Worcester County from the Connecticut border to the New Hampshire line, via the Montachusett Region.

It is a noble concept; but we should be forewarned by what has happened to the Bay State Circuit which MacKaye planned, but which was rejected by the government and the people who, instead, accepted the idea of Route 128.

MacKaye had proposed, long before the coming of Route 128, a Bay State Circuit which would follow the general course taken by Route 128, connecting the North and South Shores, and by-passing the dense Boston metropolitan area.

His proposal was for two main arteries, one northbound, one southbound, with a broad recreational greenbelt between them and with enforced control or zoning of the environs.

What has happened is that Route 128 has encouraged the worsening of those very conditions which MacKaye's proposal was intended to abate:

An almost continuous spread of commercial and industrial development now complicates traffic flow and mars the idea of a dam against metropolitan flow. As peak hours, especially when the numerous industries spew out their workers. Route 128

becomes a bedlam and a threat to life and limb.

No sooner is the route widened than a still greater enlargement is demanded. The standing joke now is this: The authorities are handing out 25-year pins for Route 128 workers.

Another example of the rejection of MacKaye's ideas over the decades since 1928 is the state proposal for relocation of Route 12. In his essay, "Townless Highways," MacKaye long ago laid down a basic principle of major highway-planning: Main arteries were to avoid the peaks of population (the cities and towns) and stick to the valleys of population.

Believe it or not, modern road-planners now in positions of authority are trying to reverse the idea and bring the highways directly into and through cities and areas of dense population.

As a result you see a plan for new Route 12 cutting through a thickly-settled part of residential Fitchburg. This would not only cause the loss of homes by eminent domain of many longtime property owners, but it would also violate common-sense principles of traffic-flow.

Let Lewis Mumford sum the horrible results of the rejection by the road builders of MacKaye's townless highway proposals:

"They butcher precious agricultural land to provide elaborately wasteful and often unnecessary local interchanges; they thrust expressways into rural areas that should be safeguarded against the haphazard and premature settlement that they actually encourage; they bulldoze their way into the hearts of towns and cities that should be bypassed by a generous margin; and in our bigger metropolitan centers, by wrecking the complex system of public transportation that existed even a generation ago, they destroy the centers of cities, turning potential parks into parking lots, and civic centers into garages, creating bottlenecks and traffic jams . . ."

The July 1964 issue of *American Forests* magazine carried a moving account of the dedicated work and activities of Benton MacKaye, entitled "The Verdant Prophet," which follows:

[From *American Forests* magazine,
July 1964]

BENTON MACKEYE: THE VERDANT PROPHET
(By E. John Long)

A prophet, they say, is not without honor save in his own country—and, it might be added, he is usually someone who was "discovered" and proclaimed long after his death. But Benton MacKaye is a seer who is honored by his confreres, who is widely respected in his special field, and who, most reassuringly, is very much, quite vigorously, alive at a youthful 85 years.

For those who may not yet know Benton MacKaye, let me introduce him foremost as a forester, but as a very special kind of "forester-naturalist-planner." He evolved early in his forestry career into a conservationist (then a new term), and as a pioneer regional observer. From the outset, MacKaye has been interested in the broad study of trees, soil and water that leads to a means of making or remaking land to be more habitable.

Along the way he may have done some prophesying, not deliberately, he avows, but in the natural course of thinking, planning, and writing.

FATHER OF THE TRAIL

For instance, let us mention a few of the milestones, such as the Appalachian Trail (the mountain footpath that stretches from Maine to Georgia), of which MacKaye is properly the father. He is, too, a cofounder and the honorary president of the Wilderness Society. As the original advocate of the townless highway, MacKaye sparked our national

interstate and defense highway system. He drew the earliest map-plan for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and worked with the basic designs of the Rural Electrification Administration. He warned of "a high potential—for human happiness or human misery" in Appalachian America (now known as "Appalachia," the nation's largest economic and rural slum problem). Again he foretold of the "wilderness of industrial civilization" spreading along the coastal area, from Boston to Washington, into a formless mass that others have termed "conurbation" or "megalopolis."

But in mentioning this now, I am perhaps jumping ahead of my story. It is an axiom in most writing that you should know something about a man before writing what he has done, or is doing. When I asked MacKaye to tell me a little about his personal life, he pulled me up short. "Bah," he snorted, "my personal life isn't important. I am interested in ideas, life in general."

SEE "WHO'S WHO"

However, he grumbled something about reading "Who's Who," and also referring to a few remarks that Lewis Mumford wrote about him in the introduction to the 1962 edition of MacKaye's best known book, "The New Exploration," which dates from 1928 and is just as sound today as a philosophy of his work as the day it was published.

So I shall borrow from these sources, and from some of his friends who foregather with MacKaye often in the winter months at the Cosmos Club, in Washington, and in summer at his old house in Shirley Center, which he calls "an indigenous community," west of Boston. Although he never married, make no mistake that this lively verdant prophet is a recluse. Mumford says there is ". . . no one who has a better appreciation of the fine sociabilities of life: a good conversation, a good dinner, or a good theatrical performance; yet I know of no one who is more capable of going without them with so little sense of loss." His batching quarters at Shirley, Mumford adds, "for sheer bareness and seediness would make most monastic cells look palatial."

Let us mention a few more highlights about the man himself, and then move on to what he cherishes most—thinking, planning and writing, just a little ahead of his time. It was his good luck, says MacKaye, that he was in New England at least long enough to be born there. The date was March 6, 1879, at Stamford, Connecticut. As an infant he was whisked off to New York City. Perhaps his next nine years as an alien urban youth may have whetted his innate appetite for knowing more of open spaces, large and small; whether they be the harmony of the wilderness of nature, or the challenging ugliness of the "wilderness of industrial civilization as concentrated in great metropolitan areas." MacKaye admits he was too young to recall, but 6 to 9 are impressive years, and he may have already begun to form certain ideas if not convictions.

RETURN TO NEW ENGLAND

In any event, luck gave him another good turn when the family moved to the quiet and pleasant New England village of Shirley Center, 40 miles west of Boston, which Benton has since called his home. It was an ideal place for hikes into the rural countryside, which, after Humboldt, he called "expeditions," because already it was not enough for him simply to enjoy nature, he wanted to know and do more about it. There were longer trips, too, including a six-week jaunt into the White Mountains of New Hampshire, at 18 years, when he noted local marked trails that may have implanted the idea of an Appalachian Trail.

Harvard University was a natural choice for his education. Here was one of the early Forest Schools of the country. He was graduated from College in 1900, and from the

Forest School in 1905. He taught forestry at Harvard off and on between 1906-10.

But MacKaye's thoughts and ideals were beginning to focus more and more toward the expanding possibilities of the U.S. Forest Service, both in Washington and in the field. President Theodore Roosevelt had just backed up the aggressive Gifford Pinchot as the head of the Forestry Bureau, in which MacKaye worked for several years. His activities consisted not only in improving and reclaiming some of the forests of America, but also in the wider issues of "conservation" (Pinchot's pat new label to indicate all natural resources, "the soils and the ores and the waters," as well as trees).

RESOURCES IDEAS POPPING

In fact, all kinds of exploding ideas about resources were popping all over the landscape in those hectic pre-World War I days, when MacKaye conspicuously decided to become a forester-plus. George Perkins Marsh's survey had demonstrated that one civilization after another had been undermined by removal of forest cover—exhausting wood supply, eroding soil, flooding valleys, and changing climatic conditions. These thoughts may seem to be a bit old hat today, but they had to be fought tooth and nail when W. J. McGee and others were drafting the basic reports of the National Conservation Committee, created by President Theodore Roosevelt, back in 1907.

Later on, during the next two years (1918-19), MacKaye became a specialist in colonization with the U.S. Department of Labor. One plan called for the settlement of groups of returning soldiers to the land, but the scheme was dropped. "Social conscience" ideals, however, were being carried forward by Woodrow Wilson, "with the doctrine that basic resources belong to the nation, not voracious private owners"—the work started by Henry David Thoreau. MacKaye's final report to the Department of Labor, on "employment and natural resources," applied imagination to a scheme which, according to Roy Lubove's "Community Planning in the 1920's," surely ranks among the most mature and memorable fruits of the conservation movement.

A BOLD NEW PROPOSAL

While MacKaye envisioned nothing short of a national program of community-building would result, it never materialized. However, he soon prepared a more modest but nevertheless bold proposal—called an Appalachian Trail. This unique project in regional planning was first presented to Clarence S. Stein, when Charles Harris Whitaker (of the future Regional Planning Association of America) introduced them at the Hudson Guild Farm, in the summer of 1921. Stein, chairman of the Committee on Community Planning of the estimable American Institute of Architects, then sponsored MacKaye's "A Project for an Appalachian Trail," published in the *Journal* of the A.I.A., in October, 1921. Although he may not have known it then, MacKaye was on the way to fame. In 1923, the RPAA (Regional Planning Association of America) also endorsed the project.

In essence, the Trail evolved from MacKaye's scouting and walking hikes in the company, many years ago, of his friends Sturgis Pray and Horace Hildreth in the White and Green Mountains of New England. MacKaye's original scheme entailed a series of recreational communities in the entire Appalachians. These would be connected by a walking path that would stretch, at first, from Mt. Washington, N.H., to Mt. Mitchell, N.C., and which later was extended into Georgia. Shelter camps, compared to those already established in New England, would be expanded into cooperative community camps, plus food and farm camps in adjoining valleys, or combined with the community camps.

"SANCTUARY AND REFUGE"

MacKaye hoped that the Trail and its community camps would offer a Thoreau-like "sanctuary and . . . refuge from the scrambles of every-day worldly commercial life," providing a wide range of non-industrial pursuits, contemplation, study, recreation and education. It was not to be a plan for more efficient labor but a plan of escape, although MacKaye grants, at the end of his *Journal* article, "the building and protection of an Appalachian trail, with its various communities, interests and possibilities, would form at least . . . a job for 40,000 souls. This Trail could be made to be, in a very literal sense, a battle against fire and flood—and even against disease." The Trail, MacKaye further estimated, would be accessible to more than half the population of the United States and over one third of Canada. At least 36 metropolitan centers, of more than 100,000 each, could be reached by the Trail within a few hours.

While no scheme was proposed, in the *Journal* article, for organizing or financing the project, MacKaye made some general observations: "Organizing is a matter of detail to be carefully worked out. Financing depends upon local public interest in the various localities affected." The first Appalachian Trail Conference was held in Washington in 1925, and in due course sections of it were completed until it became the 2,000-mile key to Appalachian America. MacKaye incited hundreds of others to participate in laying out and clearing the marked route, achieving, as Mumford so cleverly notes, "by purely voluntary cooperation and love what the empire of the Incas had done in the Andes by compulsory organization."

RIBS ON THE SPINE

As MacKaye originally conceived the Appalachian Trail, it was to be a backbone of a series of wild reservations and parks, and footpath branches of it would be extended in various directions toward centers of population. A trail to Pittsburgh has been recently suggested by Justice Douglas, at the 10th reunion of the hikes along the old C. and O. Canal towpath, as one of the ribs on the main spine of the Trail. He proposed that Cumberland, Md., already on the Trail, be linked with Pittsburgh by blazing a new northwest branch, and that Washington, D.C., be joined to the system by way of the existing C. and O. towpath, now a national monument from Washington to Cumberland.

The proposal, according to the *Washington Post*, might also rekindle interest in a Congressional bill to convert the C. and O. Canal into a full-fledged national historical park, and thus add to it the additional land needed for camping and recreational facilities,—all of which is in hearty endorsement of MacKaye's basic plan to expand the nation's natural playgrounds, in keeping with its growing population and increasing leisure.

Meanwhile, MacKaye has already moved ahead into greener pastures. In May 1925, he helped to outline the "Regional Planning" number of *Survey Graphic Magazine*. Here he added his gift of prophecy to the genius of Robert Bruere in a brilliant survey of problems and hopes of regional planning that, Mumford declares, "may one day take its place as a classic document."

WHAT IS GEOTECHNICS?

Let us get on, however, to the book that, again quoting the discerning Mumford, "deserves a place on the same shelf that holds Henry Thoreau's *Walden* and George Perkins Marsh's *Man and Nature*, and, like the first of these books, it has had to wait a whole generation to acquire the readers that would appreciate it." When this book, MacKaye's *The New Exploration*, appeared in 1928, it was the only American book of a general nature that treated "geotechnics." This was a term coined by Patrick Geddes, a Britisher, and meant the art of modeling

and transforming the earth; or, in other words, "the applied science of making the earth more habitable," by emulating nature.

MacKaye himself, in "Geography to Geotechnics" (*The Survey*, 1950-51), distills the gist of geotechnics further: "Nature has a geotechnics of her own, we call it ecology; it consists of ways developed through the ages for making the earth more habitable. That is why ecology is nature's geotechnics—and geotechnics, man's ecology."

All of which at first glance may distract the average reader, unless he keeps firmly in mind that geotechnics is not something cooked up by a computer, but simply a means of using the earth, from dooryard to globe. To which MacKaye has added an important postscript: "In the normal years of yesterday we might stress the dooryard, but, please, Messrs. Geotechnist, Statesman, Citizens all, in the urgent hours of our day—*keep your eye on the globe!*"

THE TOWNLESS HIGHWAY

While *The New Exploration*:—a *Philosophy of Regional Planning* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928) was slow in getting off the ground, reader-selling, it proved to contain enough solid truth to warrant the publication of a paperback print (University of Illinois, 1962) without a change in the plates! The reprint adds an "Introduction" by Lewis Mumford, a preface by the author, and a valuable appendix on "The Townless Highway," which MacKaye wrote for *The New Republic* in March 12, 1930.

Although there was much writing between "The New Exploration" and "The Townless Highway," let us move along to the latter, because here again MacKaye proved to be a prophet well ahead of his time. The main aims and methods of the townless highway are four: (1) to abolish the motor slum, or road-town, and to develop the rural roadside environment; (2) to stimulate the growth of the distinct community, compactly planned and limited in size, like the old New England village or the modern Radburn, New Jersey; (3) to avoid larger towns and cities by means of highway bypasses around them; and (4) to abolish grade crossings on both the railroad and the motor road, and double-tracking of the highways at distances apart.

So what is so colossal about this, the average teen-ager may say? Well, despite how obvious it seems today, MacKaye's original ideas were bitterly fought by townspeople everywhere, until they finally were tried and found best. It was not long afterward that MacKaye's further extension of the townless highway became "a national system of federal-aided passenger motor roads and defense highways," now being enlarged throughout the nation.

"DAM SITE VERSUS NORM SITE,"

Twenty years later, in "Dam Site vs. Norm Site" (*Scientific Monthly*, October 1950) MacKaye spoke out on watershed management. In response to the President's Water Resources Commission on "how to improve water policy in the field of wilderness," MacKaye pointed out: "Wilderness is two things—*fact* and *feeling*. It is a fund of knowledge and a spring of influence. It is the ultimate source of health, terrestrial and human. In this article we have been concerned with one form of such health, with only casual reference to the other. But the necessity for conserving both of them must finally be recognized, and on equal terms appraised, if ever water policy, or any other policy, is to be improved in the field of wilderness." Fourteen years later this prophecy is just beginning to be fully recognized.

"THE GREAT SOCIETY"

MacKaye's most recent prophecy fulfillment came, indirectly, from an address made by President Lyndon B. Johnson, at the University of Michigan, May 22. Selecting America's goal as the achievement of "The Great

Society," the President said: "The Great Society is a place . . . where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community . . . where man can renew contact with nature."

"Our society will never be great until our cities are great. Today the frontier of imagination and innovation is inside those cities, not beyond their borders . . . once man can no longer walk with beauty, and wonder at nature, his spirit will wither and his sustenance be wasted."

Although the thoughts and ideas of this trenchant speech were no doubt assembled from many sources, the basic concepts were the same as Benton MacKaye first divulged them in "The New Exploration," way back in 1928. In commenting on the resemblance in the *Washington Post*, Irston R. Barnes, chairman of the Audubon Naturalist Society, adds a tribute which epitomizes what the future may still hold for this wise and prophetic naturalist and forester:

"Throughout his life, Benton MacKaye's thoughts have run ahead of his time. It has been able to see in the seed the full flowering of the plant. Had the post-war explosion of cities been guided by his principles, we would have a finer, more habitable country; we would have been spared the cost and ugliness of urban sprawl; and we should have a less burdensome task of rebuilding our cities."

Despite his advanced years, Mr. Speaker, Benton MacKaye is still engaged in the conservation cause and is doing personal writing at his home in Shirley Center. His is indeed a remarkable and active life in the service of the Nation and his fellow man.

After taking a master's degree in forestry at Harvard University, he became a research forester in the infant U.S. Forest Service from 1905 to 1918. In 1918-19, he was a specialist in colonization for the U.S. Department of Labor.

In 1921, he formulated his far-seeing and monumental project for the Appalachian Trail. In 1928 he made a pioneering regional survey of Massachusetts for the Governor's Committee on Open Spaces.

In 1930, he originated the "townless-highway" plan and in 1931-32, he revised highway systems in western Connecticut in accordance with this plan.

In 1933, Mr. MacKaye became a consultant of the Indian Service in a planning study for reservations in South Dakota, New Mexico, and Arizona. He was on the regional planning staff of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1934 to 1936 and formulated the procedure for carrying out the regional planning features of the TVA Act of 1933. In 1937 he made the plan for developing a series of State parks encircling Boston, known as the bay circuit project.

From 1938 to 1941, he was a consultant of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on flood control policies of the Forest Service. He served on the staff of the Rural Electrification Administration in 1942 and 1943. In 1944-45 he made a study of possible development under the proposed Missouri Valley Authority.

In addition to his noted "The New Exploration," Mr. MacKaye is coauthor with Lewis Mumford of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica's* article on "Regional Planning." In 1965 the University of Illinois Press published his monumental "Geotechnics of North America: Viewpoints of Its Habitability."

Mr. MacKaye was a cofounder of the Wilderness Society and became its president in 1945. He served as president until 1950 and is now honorary president of the society.

It is most fitting, Mr. Speaker, that my good friend, Benton MacKaye of Shirley Center, Mass., originator of the Appalachian Trail and lifelong worker for conservation and outdoor recreation for the American people, should be officially recognized and commended for his outstanding contribution to these worthy causes.

I propose that our beloved and distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, formulate and devise some appropriate way, whether by the erection of a suitable plaque or otherwise, at the beginning of the Appalachian Trail on Mount Katahdin and at its end on Springer Mountain, to mark suitably and to honor in a meaningful, enduring manner the wisdom, patriotism, and long-sustained effective efforts of this great son of my district and State.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, the Third District has an historic association with the Appalachian Trail through Mr. Benton MacKaye. In addition, the Third District with its extensive membership in Appalachian Mountain Club of Boston and its active Worcester Chapter, Appalachian Mountain Club, is familiar with the Appalachian Trail, so much so that two former residents, the Reverend Owen F. Allen, who was born in Fitchburg, and Paul S. Macaulay, a former reporter in the Clinton bureau of the Worcester Telegram and Gazette, have had the unique and rewarding experience of having hiked the entire Appalachian Trail.

The Appalachian Mountain Club, which celebrated its 75th anniversary in 1951, is the forerunner of the hiking and trail clubs in America. After its formation by a group of hiking enthusiasts in Boston, the club was faced with the challenge of the White Mountains, then an almost impenetrable wilderness open to a few trappers and timber harvesters. The club mapped the area, cleared short trails leading from resorts, and conceived the idea of the "Long, Long Trail."

It is the Appalachian Mountain Club which blazed and connected these short trails into more extensive routes, as often as not at the expense of their enthusiastic membership.

It is the Appalachian Mountain Club which set up and still operates the famous huts system in the White Mountain National Forest. The AMC huts, which annually attract thousands to this famous summer resort area, are located a day's hike apart and extend from Carter Notch in the east to Lonesome Lake in the west. They are manned by high school and college boys who pack supplies on their backs, cook all the meals, and do general house cleaning for the comfort of hikers tramping through the area.

It is noteworthy that an old and valued friend of mine, Mrs. Louise Brooks Van Everen of Andover, an outdoors leader and life-long Appalachian Trail enthusiast, is a regular user of the AMC huts system.

Mrs. Van Everen, a career woman with an international reputation as a bridal consultant, is a noted mountain climber and her love and affection for the White Mountains of New Hampshire, go back through four generations of mountain climbing Brooks.

Her father, the Rev. Frederick Manning Brooks, her grandfather, Lymna Beecher Brooks, and her father-in-law, Horace Van Everen, like herself, were all members of the Appalachian Mountain Club of Boston.

In fact, it was as a member of this club that she met her late husband, who was also a member. Her children are mountain climbers. Her son, Brooks, met his wife at the same club and today, Mrs. Van Everen takes her grandchildren mountain climbing and hiking along the Appalachian Trail.

Her daughter, Rosalie, now Mrs. Bruce Dodd of Andover, and her four youngsters are all hiking and mountain climbing enthusiasts. One of the Dodd boys, Allison, wrote a composition about mountain climbing with Grandma Van Everen and had difficulty convincing the teacher that his composition was based on actual facts.

Mrs. Van Everen's conception of a real vacation is 3 weeks on the Appalachian Trail with a pack and sleeping bag on her back. It is not unusual for me to receive in the summer or fall, often beyond mid-October when New Hampshire is resplendent in its autumn glory, a postal card from Mrs. Van Everen postmarked Gorham or some other White Mountain community, telling me she is enjoying her mountain climbing and hiking along the beautiful mountain trails.

Like thousands of others, Louise Van Everen has found relaxation and inspiration in the great outdoors and the peaceful retreats in the country and in the hills. Hers is a spiritual experience that is to be envied and I commend and salute her.

The Appalachian Mountain Club also publishes guidebooks and maps on the 1,000 miles of foot trails in the White Mountains and maintains over 100 trails, covering some 335 miles, through volunteer workers.

The Reverend Owen F. Allen, the son of Mr. and Mrs. H. Leonard Allen of Fitchburg, hiked the entire Appalachian Trail in 1960. His interesting account of his experiences appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe of April 8, 1962, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Apr. 8, 1962]

MASSACHUSETTS MINISTER TELLS OF HIS 2000-MILE WALK FROM GEORGIA TO MAINE OVER APPALACHIAN TRAIL

(NOTE.—The famed Appalachian Trail—one of the most spectacular cross-country trails in the world—is not an ancient Indian route but the work of modern Nature lovers. They made great sacrifices completing that trail through volunteer work just 25 years ago—in 1937.)

(Only eight or 10 people have so far covered the entire 2000-mile distance on foot.

(One of them is a native of Fitchburg, Rev. Owen F. Allen, who wrote the following account of his trip exclusively for the Boston Globe.)

(By Rev. Owen F. Allen)

Shortly after noon on Sept. 13, 1960, Lochlen Gregory and I left Baxter Peak on Maine's

Mt. Katahdin heading for Chimney Pond via the "Knife Edge."

It was the second time for me on Katahdin but for both of us this was a moment of once-in-a-lifetime dimensions because it came at the conclusion of a continuous hike that had brought us 2000 miles over the famous Appalachian Trail from Mt. Springer in Georgia.

We had left there on the seventh of June. The whole thing actually got started farther back than that.

It was at the dinner table on Thanksgiving in 1959 in Great Barrington, where we were co-pastors of four Methodist churches, that we changed some half-serious plans for a sabbatical year venture over the entire Appalachian Trail into a decision to make the hike next Summer.

A June 6 commencement and Oct. 1 commitments set the time limits available.

Neither of us could be classed as a seasoned backpacker by any stretch of the imagination. We had made short hikes on mountain trails but never an extended trip like this.

Once the decision was made to go we sought all the advice we could get.

We wrote to the Appalachian Trail Conference in Washington for information, pored over catalogs of hiking gear, and wrote for advice to Earl Shaffer of York, Pa., who in 1948 became the first man ever to walk the entire trail in one stretch.

Out of the mass of material available, we selected what we regarded as the lightest and best equipment available.

About \$125 each provided packs complete with all necessary gear. We carried about 18 pounds at the lightest and up to about 25 pounds with seven days' food.

The food, almost all of the dehydrated type, we bought at stores which the trail route passed or came near.

A typical day on the trail would generally begin at about 5:45 a.m., daylight time, when we rose, dressed and fired up the one burner gasoline stove to start breakfast cooking.

Various instant hot cereals or sometimes pancakes, along with instant coffee was our morning diet.

By 7:15 we had eaten, packed all our gear, cleaned up the shelter area and were ready to "hit the trail."

We geared our hiking to the nature of the trail and of the terrain, trying to expend our energy as evenly as possible. Where the climbing was steep and the footway poor, we set a slow pace—with good trail and easy grades we went much faster.

With this style we kept the rest stops down to as few as possible.

We tried to take an hour-long, shoes-off, break around the middle of each day, but sometimes circumstances such as the weather or our need for more time to reach a lean-to for the night did not permit it.

Lunch along the trail was usually a light meal of raisins or dates, biscuits or cookies, and often some instant pudding.

Depending on our supply, we ate a few candy bars during the day. There was no need to worry about spoiling our appetites—once we had been on the trail a few weeks, we rarely ever felt completely full.

Where the trail went through a town or passed a store, we feasted—the rest of the time we "rationed" out the food we carried in our packs according to how long it had to last.

On the average, we spent about eleven hours on the trail including stops for rest, food, pictures and just enjoying the view.

Once we reached the night's lean-to, we cooked up hot jello to drink and a hot meal of say, soup and minute rice with lots of margarine and brown sugar.

After writing a few notes on the day's doings, we were ready to crawl into our sleeping bags.

Neither of us suffered a major mishap—a bum knee, some stomach trouble, and the

extraction of an abscessed tooth were our worst ailments.

The least trail mileage we covered in one day was 10 miles, the most was 30, but usually it was from 17 to 23 miles. (We could tell from trail guidebooks.)

We first hiked seven days a week but found a Sabbath a necessity and later saved a half day a week for rest.

Wild life is abundant, of course.

We saw deer and grouse from Georgia to Maine, glimpsed a bear and a bobcat, heard whippoorwills and bobwhites galore and a host of others besides.

One eager porcupine in Vermont ruined a polyethylene dish, three mice nested in our raisin box once and we encountered and killed six rattlesnakes, but without doubt dogs were the worst animals we had to deal with.

Laurel, rhododendron and azaleas abound in the southern Appalachians.

While the blazes are pretty much the same, all the way, the character of the trail varies considerably.

In the southern Appalachians it is often graded, having switchbacks, and the footway is good.

Mountain tops there are either heavily wooded or open meadow.

In the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia, the Summer growth may be over your head and briars at times completely overgrow the trail.

The summit of Blue Mountain in Pennsylvania is littered with rocks, large and small, which slow down your pace and punish your feet.

In eastern New York State the trail often follows dirt roads for seven miles at a stretch.

New England, particularly the White Mountains, offers some steep scrambles up the rocks and long stretches above the tree line, although steep climbs and descents are scattered liberally throughout the trail.

Several people we met on the way thought the Appalachian Trail began as old Indian trails, but this was not so.

The Indians used mainly valley ways except to cross the ranges; the Appalachian Trail is, with few exceptions, a mountain top route. It even goes out of its way to cross some peaks.

The idea of such a trail as it now exists, a refuge from urbanization, was first conceived by Benton MacKaye of Shirley Center, and suggested publicly in 1921.

Already existing trails in various places were tied into the through-trail, but a tremendous amount of work was done, almost all voluntary, before the project was completed in 1937.

Relocations are still being made from time to time and a chain of lean-tos, spaced a day's hike apart, still have gaps that need closing.

I guess a lot of people regard hikers as did a little 5-year-old boy in Port Clinton, Pa., who saw us coming and ran up to ask, "Hey, what kind of men are you?"

Why did we hike 2000 miles?

I think the heart of the matter lies in the challenge of the trail waiting to be hiked—"from Georgia to Maine." It gets in your blood and urges you on. Our rewards were great, too—the satisfaction of attaining the sought-for goal, and accomplishing what less than a dozen people have done.

Beyond that, our rewards which much shorter trail hikes afford. There is the gain of a new and valuable perspective on our civilization and our ways.

There is a sharpened appreciation of the great luxury of our everyday life—things like running water and electric lights.

And for us, at least, there is a strengthening fresh communion with the Lord of creation.

Who can stand, as we did, at a place like Vermont's Killington Peak at sunset with the

mountains rising up on all sides as far as the horizon and not know the truth of the psalmist who said, "I will lift up mine eyes to the hills . . . My help comes from the Lord, who made heaven and earth."

Another Appalachian Trail hiker is Paul S. Macaulay, who worked as reporter in my home town of Clinton for the Worcester Telegram and Gazette. In a series of articles written for the Worcester Telegram in 1966, he wrote movingly of the loneliness and exciting beauty of the Appalachian Trail. Five of his interesting articles and an editorial from the Worcester Telegram follow:

[From the Worcester Sunday Telegram, Aug. 7, 1966]

AMONG MOST POPULAR—WHITE MOUNTAINS
IDEAL FOR THE HIKER
(By Paul S. Macaulay)

FRANCONIA, N.H.—After encountering a total of four hikers while crossing Maine, we are in the White Mountains where it is not uncommon to spend a night in a lean-to with a dozen other trampers.

We had just arrived at a shelter on the Carter-Moriah Range when we were joined by nine boys from a Y.M.C.A. camp. This was quite a shock after becoming convinced we were among the last few hikers on earth.

Because of its accessibility and numerous accommodations available, the White Mountains area is probably the most popular range in the country. The mountains, lakes and trails of Western Maine are at least as beautiful as those in New Hampshire, but not as easy to reach.

TRAILS ARE MAINTAINED

The trails in this area are well maintained. There are numerous lean-tos on this and many other area trail systems. After a week on the trail in New Hampshire, we have found only two trees across the path. Fallen timber makes the trail in Maine a proper obstacle course.

Since towns and highways are plentiful, hikers may obtain supplies often enough to keep pack weight down.

Those who wish to carry nearly empty packs and full wallets may use the chain of hostels operated by the Appalachian Mountain Club of Boston. The chain extends from Franconia Notch through the Presidential Range to Carter Notch. All are attractively located and serve fine, hearty meals.

The main attraction of the White Mountains is, of course, the Presidential Range. The principal feature of the range is 6,288-foot Mt. Washington. On its way to Vermont, the Appalachian Trail crosses Washington and takes in most of the other "Presidentials."

In order to go light we left the trail to Tuckerman Ravine at the foot of Mt. Washington where we left some of our equipment. I had spent a night in the ravine two years ago during November and found it very cold and windy. I was surprised to find it almost as unfriendly in mid-summer. There was still a large patch of snow clinging to the head wall of the ravine.

Much of the hiking in this area is above tree line. My wife, who was born in England, tells me that the terrain and plant life above tree line resembles the Scottish highlands. Near some of the higher summits are varieties of plants found nowhere else south of Labrador.

Weather conditions in the Presidentials are considered the "worst in America" by the U.S. Forest Service. Many summer hikers have died of exposure or near Mt. Washington during severe storms.

Despite these conditions, the summit is a beehive of activity. While we struggled up the rugged slopes, dozens of others rode up the carriage road in their cars or sat com-

fortably in cog railway cars. Still others were at the Tip Top House buying souvenirs or drinking coffee.

My wife finds this mountain top commercialism particularly obnoxious but I must admit that I thoroughly enjoyed a chocolate ice cream cone after the hard climb.

I wonder what my friend Bill Connors, the fire warden on Mt. Bigelow in Maine, would think of all this. He was disturbed by the appearance this year of a blinking red beacon atop a mountain eight miles from him.

We were pleased this week to chat with an official of the Appalachian Trail conference. As we were descending toward Crawford Notch we stopped to talk with Art Koerber and his wife, of Pittsfield, Mass. He is vice president in charge of the northern third of the 2,050 mile trail.

He was equally surprised to find that I was "the fellow who writes the articles for the Sunday Telegram." Although he lives in Pittsfield, he receives the paper from friends in the Worcester area.

[From the Worcester Telegram, Sept. 4, 1966]

TAKE A CLOSER LOOK—TRAMPER EXTOLS
BEAUTIES OF STATE'S BERKSHIRE AREA
(By Paul Macaulay)

Few residents of eastern and central Massachusetts realize that the western part of the Bay State contains an area as beautiful as any region in New England.

To my surprise, for I had never seen the Berkshires before, I found the 83 miles of the Appalachian Trail in my home state as pleasant as any other section of the trail.

During the six days I spent hiking through the state, I met only one group of hikers, and that was in the fairly popular Mt. Greylock area. Yet when hiking down through New Hampshire and Vermont it seemed as though every other tramp I met was from the Bay State.

OVERLOOK HOME BEAUTY

This practice of overlooking the scenic wonders of your own back yard is not limited to Bay Staters, however. My wife's parents, who came here from England 15 years ago, lived 10 miles from Stonehenge and never saw it until they returned to England for a visit recently.

Since I'm a lifelong resident of this state, I feel it my duty to describe the attractions of the trail through the Berkshires.

The trail crosses from Vermont into Massachusetts three miles north of Blackington, near North Adams. The crossing takes place in an open area with excellent views of Mt. Greylock and the surrounding peaks. Frankly though, I was more interested in the view at my feet for the region is covered with blueberry bushes. If one isn't careful, blueberry, raspberry and blackberry bushes can cause extensive delays. With my Scottish blood, I find it difficult not to pick a few berries from each patch.

From the state line the route descends, then crosses Rte. 2 in Blackington before climbing the Greylock range. The ascent up Mt. Prospect, just north of Greylock, involves as much exertion as many of the peaks in the White Mountains.

I'M CURIOSITY PIECE

My guidebook assures me that the summit of Greylock (3,491 Ft.) affords "extraordinary views." However, when I was on top, I could barely see the top of the stone Memorial Tower. Greylock "features" an automobile road and I found many people strolling about the summit. As on other such mountains, I found many nonhikers staring curiously at me, wondering, perhaps, if I had just parachuted onto the mountain from a disabled jet fighter.

The route leads from Greylock south through pleasant woodlands to the towns of Cheshire and Dalton. In this area, as in most of the state, the trail follows old woods

roads. I'm sure many of these would afford an interesting days' exploration.

When we passed near Pittsfield, Jo and I had the pleasure of renewing our acquaintance with Art Koerber, an official of the Appalachian Trail Conference, and his wife Sylvia. We had met them high up in the Presidential Range in New Hampshire. I think our second meeting was even more pleasant, since we were treated to an excellent dinner by Mrs. Koerber.

After this enjoyable interlude, I hiked what turned out to be my favorite section in Massachusetts—the 17 miles from Dalton to Upper Goose Pond. Here the trail passes through delightful woodlands, past old orchards, over grassy hilltops and small mountains. The view from Warner Hill is excellent.

MANY CAMPING SITES

In the southern part of the state, the route traverses the Taconic Range, which includes the 2,602-ft. Mt. Everett. Just before reaching Connecticut, the trail passes through Sages Ravine—a lovely boulder-filled gorge through which flows a small stream.

There are numerous camping facilities in the Berkshires area and the trail can be reached by automobile in many places.

In addition to the pleasant woodlands, there are enough respectable sized mountains in the area to keep climbing enthusiasts busy. Those who frequently run off to New Hampshire or Vermont on weekends should definitely take a closer look at the Berkshires.

[From the Worcester Sunday Telegram, Sept. 25, 1966]

A 2,000-MILE TRAIL IS LIKE LONG WILDLIFE SANCTUARY

HAGERSTOWN, Md.—In some ways the Appalachian Trail is like a 2,000 mile—long wildlife sanctuary and my wife Jo and I have gotten great satisfaction from meeting new birds and animals on our way south.

There is one creature, however, which we were hoping not to encounter—the rattlesnake. Rattlesnakes are occasionally seen in Massachusetts and Connecticut but do not become common until New York. They are supposed to be numerous from Pennsylvania southward.

I am not fond of any kind of snake and for the past few weeks I've been keeping a sharp eye on the footway—particularly when passing such places as Rattlesnake Den, Rattlesnake Mountain or Rattlesnake Run.

After I had gotten half way across Pennsylvania without seeing a viper of any kind, I decided it was not necessary to be so vigilant. Naturally, the next thing I did was to step within a few inches of a rattler.

Fortunately for me, he hadn't quite gotten his full growth yet. In fact, he wasn't more than six inches long.

WE EXPECTED TO SEE

This encounter with the "fearsome" rattlesnake nearly completes the list of interesting creatures we expected to see between Maine and Georgia.

Of the large animals, we have met a moose, a bear, and countless deer. I was surprised to see only a few deer in Maine and Vermont. But here in Pennsylvania, as well as in New York and New Jersey, I see half a dozen every day.

This can probably be accounted for, in part, by the nature of the forests in these states. Particularly in Maine, the undergrowth is very dense whereas the woods are much more open in Pennsylvania.

Among the most numerous animals on the trail are raccoons and porcupines. Both animals patrol leantos and cabins at night looking for left-over scraps of food. To see them, all you need to do is turn on a flashlight.

Porcupines, which are most numerous in Vermont, are probably among the more stupid of all animals. They are slow moving awkward and ugly. To kill one, you need only

walk up to him and tap him on the head with a stick. They seem to rely completely on the quills for protection.

LEAST FUSSY OF ALL

The porcupine is also the least fussy of all animals with his diet. I have heard of them gnaw on an empty tin can for the better part of a night. If nothing else if available, they will munch on the floor board of a leanto in order to get any salt left there by humans.

Neither Jo nor I are very knowledgeable about birds, so we've had to rely on local people for the names of birds along the trail.

Fortunately, we were with two Maine natives the first time we heard a loon's cry. I've never been enthusiastic about bird watching, but this is something I'll always remember. I won't attempt to describe that weird sound since this would have been a difficult task for Jack London or Hemingway. I think it would be worth a trip to Maine just to seek out a remote lake with a pair of loons on it.

Another bird I saw for the first time in Maine was the raven. I had just reached the summit of Mt. Bigelow after climbing for six hours. It had been calm below, but it was very windy on top and a storm was approaching. And riding on the gusts of wind, remaining stationary, was a majestic raven looking as though he controlled the mountain and most of the country around it.

I've also seen many hawks, hundreds of quail and partridges, ducks, wild turkeys (almost as big as the farm raised Thanksgiving variety) and pheasants.

Jo and I have always lived in the "thickly settled" areas of America and seeing all this wild game is a new experience for us. Just to catch a glimpse of a deer as it leaps across the trail is more thrilling than seeing dozens of animals at a city zoo.

[From the Worcester Sunday Telegram, Oct. 2, 1966]

SO MANY MARKERS—POTOMAC RIVER REGION IS RICH IN HISTORY

ELKTON, Va.—South Mountain, which extends from southern Pennsylvania through Maryland to the Potomac River, is as rich in history as any area along the Appalachian Trail. In fact, hikers must use caution not to trip over historical markers.

There is little activity along the mountain now. I found it difficult to visualize busy communities and important events as I walked along the crest of the mountain with only birds for company.

The trail reaches the foot of the ridge, which is South Mountain at Pine Grove Furnace State Park in Pennsylvania.

CHARCOAL AREA

The park is named for a large stone furnace which still stands as a monument to the charcoal iron industry. The 30-foot tall structure burned charcoal, rather than coal, and was used to make iron. This and similar furnaces in the area have probably survived because they are too massive to bother dismantling. * * *

A sale in 1838 also included 35,000 acres of land, a forge, blacksmith and carpenter shops, several brick mansions, grist and saw mills, and 30 log cabins.

A few miles farther south on the trail is an area which combines recent and not so recent history. Bunker Hill Farm is the site of an Indian Massacre in Colonial times. Nearby are the buildings of Camp Michaux which was a prisoner-of-war camp for German submarine crews during World War II.

HISTORICAL TRAIL

After a few more hours of hiking, Caledonia Park is reached. It was the site of an ironworks similar to the one at Pine Grove. The park features an excellent historical trail named for Thaddeus Stevens, who owned the ironworks.

Another day on the trail takes the hiker

across the Mason-Dixon line into Maryland. The trail passes within 400 feet of one of the original markers put there in 1765.

The Civil War affected the South Mountain area in Pennsylvania, but it was in Maryland that the Battle of South Mountain was fought.

Actually, there were several battles along the ridge. Although driven off the mountain, the Confederates succeeded in delaying Union troops long enough for Stonewall Jackson to capture Harpers Ferry. Trenches dug by the rebels can still be seen at Crampton Gap.

WAR MEMORIAL

The most impressive feature of Crampton Gap is a 50-foot tall memorial to Civil War correspondents built in the 1890s by newspaperman George Alfred Townsend. The structure looks like a warped Arc de Triomphe and is somewhat cluttered with mythological figures. Some have suggested it is a monument to bad taste.

A few miles south of Crampton Gap, South Mountain dips sharply in deference to the Potomac, which hurries by on its way to the nation's capital. After reaching the river, the Appalachian Trail follows the former tow-path of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. The canal, now a national monument, is the home of hundreds of water birds which take off whenever an occasional hiker comes along.

The trail then crosses the river on Sandy Hook Bridge, within view of the meeting place of the Potomac and the Shenandoah.

The bridge is only a short distance from Harpers Ferry. My wife, Jo, and I are not usually fond of tourist attractions, but Harpers Ferry is not at all typical. There doesn't seem to have been a building boom there since the early 1800s, and I'm sure the town has looked much the same for the last 100 years.

We visited the town in the afternoon after hiking 20 miles, with my beard and hiking clothes. I was somewhat of an attraction myself. I was probably taken for one of John Brown's men.

Souvenir shops are at a minimum and visitors are free to wander through the streets and among the buildings.

The South Mountain section of the trail is the best I have yet seen for hikers with a historical bent.

[From the Worcester Telegram of Nov. 20, 1966]

MAINE HARDEST TO CROSS—HIKER COMPLETES JOURNEY WITH NATURE'S PERMISSION

(This is the last in a series of 23) articles by Paul S. Macaulay of The Telegram staff, who spent the five months from early June to early November hiking the Appalachian Trail from Maine to Georgia.)

My walk is over. A few days ago I stood on top of Mt. Springer in Georgia. After glancing back toward Mt. Katahdin, 2,050 miles distant, I walked down from the mountain leaving the Appalachian Trail behind.

At one time I didn't expect to get through the state of Maine. I think that the mountains and the wilderness were testing me then. I'm grateful that they saw fit to let me finish the journey. Without their permission it would have been impossible.

It may seem strange of me to endow mountains with human traits, but each mountain worthy of the name has a character. I'm sure of it.

It would be impossible to summarize all my experiences and views on the Appalachian Trail, but I'll say what I have space for.

Since I have always lived in the North, I cannot offer an opinion on which section of the Appalachians is most beautiful. But I will say that New England contains by far the most spectacular scenery.

The most impressive feature of the trail, I would say, is Mahoosuc Notch in Maine. Unfortunately, it will remain unknown to most people since it is reached only by determined hikers.

Most of the other spectacular features etched in memory are located in New England. This area is definitely the most popular. I met 10 times as many hikers in New England as in the other states.

Without hesitating, I'll say that Maine was the most difficult state to traverse. The central and northern portions of the state are true wilderness areas.

Perhaps the state kindest to the hiker is Massachusetts. Where the Appalachian Trail crosses the Massachusetts Turnpike, there is a costly pedestrian overpass for hikers. This is in sharp contrast to Maine where the Kennebec River is a formidable barrier (no bridge).

New York is the only Appalachian Trail state that charges hikers a fee. The "Empire State" extracts a nickel from hikers crossing the Hudson on Bear Mountain Bridge. Empires are becoming more expensive to run these days.

In my introductory article I said I expected this adventure to cost \$500. It has turned out to be twice that but I still consider it inexpensive. A two-week vacation in Europe could easily cost as much or more.

Hiking is becoming more popular every year. This isn't surprising in view of its many advantages. It's inexpensive but you can see sights forbidden to people traveling by car. The accommodations (lean-tos) are free, yet they have better locations than the best motels. Friendships made on the trail represent the best advantage of all.

I think I've learned more about America and her people this summer than in all my years of schooling. I've met hikers from all over the country. I've talked to backwoods-men in Maine, farmers in Pennsylvania, hunters in Virginia. I've learned new things by listening to the owner of a small grocery store in New Hampshire. I've enjoyed the hospitality of such persons as a forest ranger in Erwin, Tenn., and I've been given advice on hiking by a sporting camp owner in the Maine wilderness.

The Appalachian Trail is not a main thoroughfare, but it is one of the shortest routes to adventure and the heart of America.

[From the Worcester Telegram of Oct. 5, 1966]

ALONG THE APPALACHIAN TRAIL

The 2,000-mile hike of Paul S. Macaulay over the length of the Appalachian Trail from Maine to Georgia does much to promote the trail and the Appalachian Mountain Club, which created and maintains it.

In this season of natural beauty and fine hiking weather, Macaulay's feat is an added invitation to enjoy various stretches of the Appalachian. And the segment that enters Massachusetts at North Adams is a logical place to begin.

Anyone choosing a jaunt up Mount Greylock in Macaulay's footsteps will be impressed by two points especially. First, the trail seems more personal, more a part of the Bay State's heritage, through the knowledge that Macaulay, starting up at Mt. Katahdin in Maine four months ago, walked along the same paths on his way to Virginia, his current location along the way. Published accounts of his adventures also foster this feeling of familiarity.

The second point is that the trail seems to be rather neglected and poorly marked at the start of the Massachusetts segment. The reasons for this are no easily explained. But the fact is that it isn't easy to locate the crossing of Route 2 in North Adams, and it's extremely difficult to follow the path from its course along a side street to its clearly marked route up to the mountain.

If Macaulay's feat is going to boost the long footpath as a tourist attraction, somebody had better take care not to confound prospective hikers. A clear marker and sign on Route 2 and visible blazes along the first

mile of the trail would certainly improve the tourists' chances of seeing and exploring this famous and historic route.

This can, of course, be attended to. The Appalachian trail is one of the outdoorsman's great joys in this part of the country, and it is pleasant indeed to think that more and more will learn of it and use it.

Early this year, Mr. Speaker, I gave thought to introducing a revised national trails system bill with the designation of the Appalachian Trail as the pilot trail for Federal recognition and protection. I am indebted to Lee McElvain, the hardworking assistant counsel of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for assistance, guidance, and help in the drafting of the new bill, which I am introducing today. The text follows:

H.R. 17789

A bill to establish a national system of trails, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Trails Act."

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide for the ever-increasing outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population and to promote public access to, travel within, and enjoyment and appreciation of the open air, outdoor areas of the Nation, trails should be established (i) primarily, near the urban areas of the Nation and (ii) secondarily, within established scenic areas more remotely located.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to provide the means for attaining these objectives by instituting a national system of recreation and scenic trails, by designating the Appalachian Trail as the initial component of that system, and by prescribing the methods by which, and standards according to which, additional components may be added to the system.

NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) National recreation trails designed to accommodate various uses may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, States, local governmental units and public or private organizations upon finding that (i) they are reasonably accessible to urban areas and (ii) they meet the criteria established in Section 4 of this Act and such supplementary criteria as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. Subject to the consent of the Federal agency, State or political subdivisions having jurisdiction over the lands involved, such trails shall be located across lands in Federal ownership; across lands donated to and accepted by the United States, for the purpose of establishing such trails; or across lands permanently administered, without expense to the United States for land acquisition, by an agency or political subdivision of a State or States.

(b) National scenic trails shall be authorized by Congress and shall consist of defined extended trail corridors so located as to provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities through which such trails may pass.

(c) Connecting and side trails may be established by the Secretary of the Interior or by the Secretary of Agriculture, when lands administered by him are involved, (i) when they may be provided without expense to the United States for land acquisition; (ii) when they provide additional points

of public access to national recreation or scenic trails; or (iii) when by written cooperative agreement appropriate Federal, interstate, State, or local governmental agencies or private organizations or individuals consent to the location of such trails across lands under their control or jurisdiction. Such trails may be appropriately designated and marked as components of a national recreation trail or as components of a national scenic trail.

RECREATION TRAILS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is directed to encourage States to consider, in their comprehensive statewide, outdoor recreation plans and proposals for financial assistance for State and local projects submitted pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, needs and opportunities for establishing (i) primarily, recreation trails in or near urban areas and (ii) secondarily, park, forest, and other recreation trails on lands owned or administered by the States. He is further directed, in accordance with the authority contained in the Act of May 28, 1963 (77 Stat. 49), to encourage States, political subdivisions, and private interests, including nonprofit organizations, to establish such trails.

(b) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is directed, in administering the program of comprehensive urban planning and assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, to encourage the planning of recreation trails in connection with the recreation and transportation planning for metropolitan and other urban areas. He is further directed, in administering the urban open-space program under title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, to encourage such recreation trails.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is directed, in accordance with authority vested in him, to encourage States and their political subdivisions and private interests to establish such trails.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are directed to improve, expand, and develop recreation trails on park and forest lands within areas administered by them.

(e) Pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act, recreation trails which involve no expense to the United States for land acquisition, may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as national recreation trails.

SCENIC TRAILS

SEC. 5. (a) National scenic trails shall be established by Act of Congress. The Appalachian Trail, a trail of some two thousand miles, extending generally along the Appalachian Mountains from Mount Katahdin, Maine, to Springer Mountain, Georgia, is hereby established as the initial national scenic trail. The right-of-way for such trail shall comprise the corridor area generally depicted on maps identified as "Nationwide System of Trails, Proposed Appalachian Trail, NST-AT-101—May 1967," which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director of the National Park Service. Where practicable, such right-of-way shall include lands protected for it under agreements in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, to which Federal agencies and States were parties. So as to retain its primeval environment, the Appalachian National Scenic Trail shall be administered primarily as a footpath by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. In all other respects, such trails shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, where lands administered by him are involved, shall make studies of the feasibility and desirability of designating other trails as national scenic trails. Such studies shall be made (i) in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies administering lands through which

such additional proposed trails would pass and (1) in cooperation with interested interstate, State and local governmental agencies and public and private organizations. When completed, such studies shall be the basis of appropriate proposals for additional national scenic trails which shall be submitted from time to time to the President and to the Congress. Such proposals shall be accompanied by a report, which shall be printed as a House or Senate document, showing among other things:

- (1) the proposed route of such trail (including maps and illustrations);
 - (2) the areas adjacent to such trails, to be utilized for scenic, historic, natural, cultural or developmental purposes;
 - (3) the characteristics which, in the judgment of the Secretary or Secretaries, make the proposed trail worthy of designation as a national scenic trail;
 - (4) the current and prospective status of land ownership and use along the designated route;
 - (5) the estimated cost of land acquisition, if any;
 - (6) the plans for developing and maintaining the trail and cost thereof;
 - (7) the proposed Federal administering agency (which in the case of a national scenic trail wholly or substantially within a national forest, shall be the Department of Agriculture); and
 - (8) the extent to which a State or its political subdivisions and public and private organizations might reasonably be expected to participate in acquiring the necessary lands and in the administration thereof.
- (c) The following routes are hereby authorized for study in accordance with the objectives outlined in paragraph (b) of this section:

- (1) Continental Divide Trail, a three-thousand-one-hundred-mile trail extending from near the Mexican border in southwestern New Mexico northward generally along the Continental Divide to the Canadian border in Glacier National Park.
- (2) Pacific Crest Trail, a two-thousand-three-hundred-and-fifty-mile trail extending from the Mexican-California border northward generally along the mountain ranges of the west coast States to the Canadian-Washington border near Lake Ross.
- (3) Potomac Heritage Trail, an eight-hundred-and-twenty-five-mile trail extending generally from the mouth of the Potomac River to its sources in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, including the one-hundred-and-seventy-mile Chesapeake and Ohio Canal towpath.
- (4) Chisholm Trail, from San Antonio, Texas, approximately seven hundred miles north through Oklahoma to Abilene, Kansas.
- (5) Lewis and Clark Trail, from Saint Louis, Missouri, approximately four thousand six hundred miles to the Pacific Ocean in Oregon, following both the outbound and inbound routes of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.
- (6) Natchez Trace, from Nashville, Tennessee, approximately six hundred miles to Natchez, Mississippi.
- (7) North Country Trail, from the Appalachian Trail in Vermont, approximately three thousand two hundred miles through the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, to the Lewis and Clark Trail in North Dakota.
- (8) Oregon Trail, from Independence, Missouri approximately two thousand miles to near Fort Vancouver, Washington.
- (9) Santa Fe Trail, from Independence, Missouri, approximately eight hundred miles to Santa Fe, New Mexico.
- (10) Long Trail, extending two hundred and fifty-five miles from the Massachusetts border northward through Vermont to the Canadian border.
- (11) Mormon Trail, extending from Nauvoo, Illinois, to Salt Lake City, Utah,

through the States of Iowa, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 6. (a) By publication in the Federal Register the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of Agriculture, where lands administered by him are involved, is authorized temporarily or permanently to relocate the national scenic trails upon a determination, in his judgment and after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, States, local governmental units and public or private organizations, that such a revision is necessary to preserve the purposes for which such trail was established: *Provided*, That a substantial permanent relocation of the trail route shall be by Act of Congress. Such Secretary is authorized to relocate recreation and connecting or side trails within the National trails system which involve lands administered by other Federal, interstate, State, or local governmental agencies after consultation with and assistance of such agencies.

Except where such trails are located within components of the national wilderness system, they may provide campsites, shelters, and related-public-use facilities; other uses that will not substantially interfere with the nature and purposes for which the trails are established may be permitted by the Secretary charged with the administration of such trail. Reasonable efforts shall be made to provide sufficient access opportunities and to the extent practicable efforts shall be made to avoid activities incompatible with the purposes for which such trails are established. The use of motorized vehicles along any national scenic trail shall be prohibited and shall not be permitted with the natural and historical areas of the National park system, the national wildlife refuge system, the national wilderness preservation system, and other Federal lands where trails are designated as being closed to such use by the appropriate Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary charged with the administration of the trail may, upon application, authorize the use of motorized vehicles when, in his judgment, such vehicles are necessary to meet emergencies or to enable adjacent landowners to have reasonable access to their lands: *Provided* further that lands included in the national trails system by cooperative agreement of a landowner shall not preclude such owner from using motorized vehicles on or across such trails or adjacent lands from time to time. Except to the extent otherwise provided by law, the Federal laws and regulations applicable to Federal lands or areas included in any national recreation or scenic trail shall continue to apply. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, in consultation with appropriate governmental agencies and public and private organizations, establish a uniform marker, including thereon an appropriate and distinctive symbol for each trail such as now in use on the Appalachian Trail, for all trails authorized for inclusion in the National trails system. Such markers shall be erected and maintained in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, if he is charged with the administration of such trail. The distinctive AT marker now in use on the Appalachian Trail shall be retained for this initial pilot trail within the National trails system.

(c) Within the exterior boundaries of areas under their administration that are included in the right-of-way selected for a national recreation or scenic trail, the heads of Federal agencies may acquire lands or interests in lands by written cooperative agreement, donation, purchase with donated funds or exchange.

(d) Where the lands included in a national recreation or scenic trail right-of-way are outside of the exterior boundaries of federally administered areas, the Secretary charged with the administration of such

trail, shall cooperate with, and encourage, the states or local governments involved (1) to enter into written cooperative agreements with landowners, private organizations, and individuals to provide the necessary trail corridor or (11) to acquire such lands or interests therein to be utilized as segments of the national scenic trail. One year after the establishment of a national recreation or scenic trail such Secretary may enter into written cooperative agreements with landowners, States, local governments, private organizations and individuals for the use of lands for trail purposes or may acquire lands or interests therein by donation, purchase with donated funds or exchange.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may accept title to any non-Federal property within the right-of-way as provided in subsection (c) and subsection (d) of this section and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under his jurisdiction which is located in the States through which the trail passes and which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. The Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his exchange authority, may utilize authorities and procedures available to him in connection with exchanges of national forest lands.

(f) The appropriate Secretary may utilize condemnation proceedings only in cases where, in his judgment, all reasonable efforts to acquire such lands or interests therein by negotiation have failed, and in such cases he shall acquire with donated or appropriated funds only such title as, in his judgment, is reasonably necessary to provide passage across such lands: *Provided*, That such authority shall be limited to the most direct or practicable connecting trail right-of-way not exceeding fifty acres per mile. Money appropriated for Federal purposes from the land and water conservation fund shall be available for the acquisition of property for the purposes of this subsection.

(g) The Secretary charged with the administration of a national recreation or scenic trail shall cooperate with and encourage the States to operate, develop and maintain portions of such trails which are located outside the boundaries of Federally administered areas. When deemed to be in the public interest, such Secretary may enter written cooperative agreements with the States or their political subdivisions, landowners, private organizations or individuals to operate, develop and maintain any portion of a national recreation or scenic trail either within or outside a Federally administered area.

(h) The appropriate Secretary, with the concurrence of the heads of any other Federal agencies administering lands through which a national recreation or scenic trail passes, and after consultation with the States, local governments, and organizations concerned, may issue regulations, which may be revised from time to time, governing the use, protection, management, development, and administration of trails of the national trails system. Any person who violates a regulation issued pursuant to this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and may be punished by a fine of not more than \$500, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

UTILITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized, with the cooperation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and other Federal agencies having

jurisdiction, control over, or information concerning the use, abandonment, or disposition of rights-of-way and similar properties that may be suitable for trail route purposes, to develop effective procedures to assure that, wherever practicable, utility rights-of-way or similar properties having value for trail route purposes may be made available for such use.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the acquisition of lands or interests in land for the purposes of this Act.

There recently came to my attention a colorful illustrated scroll describing the pleasures of hiking the Appalachian Trail. The scroll was designed and printed in color by Mr. Robert Wirth of Baltimore and bears appropriate sketches and photographs depicting typical Appalachian Trail scenes. I cite the text as most appropriate in describing the pleasures and joys of the great outdoors and hiking along the Appalachian Trail:

To have lifted the heavy pack to your shoulders,

To have watched the nuthatch walk down the tree,

To have drunk from the mountain stream,

To have looked curiously at the turtle,

To have rested under the canopy of green,

To have puzzled over the animal tracks,

To have cooked over the hickory fire,

To have heard the staccato sound of the woodpecker,

To have counted the chipmunks,

To have slept at the timbered shelter,

To have laughed at the woodchuck,

To have gazed at the mountains beyond,

To have listened to the shriek of the hawk,

To have photographed the wildflower,

To have walked on and on and on . . .

For some 2000 miles, the longest continuous marked trail in the world runs along the crests and wild lands of the Appalachian Mountain region of the eastern United States. From Georgia to Maine, it proceeds through private and publicly owned land, including eight National forests, two National Parks, and many state parks. For hikers, backpackers and those interested in the outdoors, the Trail provides an experience that serves as a strong counterpoint to an urban oriented society.

A NEW APPROACH TO OUR PRESSING PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to try some new approaches to the solution of our pressing domestic and international problems.

These include: Crime and violence in our streets; rejection of our country's traditional values and ethics by a significant number of our citizens; and the alienation of our various social, racial, and age groups.

Our problems extend also to our relations with peoples and nations beyond our boundaries: to our foreign affairs and the advancement of our foreign policy objectives.

In both areas—domestic and international—human attitudes and motivations are the key factor in the relations between individuals, groups, and nations.

For many years, we have underestimated and underutilized the contribution which our social and behavioral scientists could make to the solution of our problems.

The time has come to correct this situation.

A few days ago, the Congress took a giant step into the present by granting the social sciences equal status with the "hard" sciences in the operations of the National Science Foundation and of the National Science Board.

This legislation, presently awaiting final approval, constitutes the first step in the right direction.

But it is not enough. We must follow through with additional measures which will bring the knowledge, the experience, and the insights of our social and behavioral scientists to bear on the making of national policies.

I am today introducing two bills designed to achieve that objective.

My first bill provides for the convening of a White House Conference on the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

My second bill calls for the establishment, in the Executive Office of the President, of the Office of Social Sciences Adviser to our Chief Executive.

The enactment of these two measures, together with the approval of the 1968 amendments to the National Science Foundation Act, will assist our Government, at the highest level and in a meaningful way, in pursuing the solution of our most urgent domestic and international problems.

THE AGE OF SCIENCE

For decades now, we have been living in the age of science—an age which has been shaped, even dominated, by the hard sciences.

Thanks to the technological achievements of the past 50 years, we have made tremendous strides in many areas of human endeavor.

We have realized wide-reaching revolutions in communications, in transportation, in the generation of power, and in other fields of technology.

But we have lacked comparable progress in the field of human relations, in the art of living at peace with each other, and in achieving man's aspirations for individual fulfillment.

We have built magnificent skyscrapers—but largely ignored the human dimension of a congested, modern-day, urban environment. We have created great factories which produce marvelous products—but failed to cope with the effects of a depersonalized, automated industrial regime.

We have awakened great aspirations, here and abroad—but have not managed to mobilize the human resources necessary to bring them into reality.

We have learned to split the atom and to build the nuclear bomb—but not to weld human emotions and energies to the task of building durable peace.

Time and again, faced with our own failures, we have disparaged the contribution which the social and behavioral sciences could have been making to the solution of our problems, enrichment of our lives, and attainment of our national and international objectives.

I am delighted that we are beginning to remedy that situation.

The 1968 amendments to the National Science Foundation Act will enable our social and behavioral scientists to participate more fully in the search for solutions to our problems.

They will be able to do this in their own right, as equal partners of the "hard" sciences, and through integrated, interdisciplinary approaches sanctioned by the National Science Foundation.

What we need now is a prompt enactment of the two proposals outlined in my two bills.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND FOREIGN POLICY

Several years ago, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I was instrumental in initiating several studies of the role which human attitudes and motivations play in the advancement—or obstruction—of our foreign policy objectives.

We learned through those studies that our Government was making little use of the knowledge developed by our social and behavioral scientists, and that the relations between the Federal Establishment and the academic community were in a state of considerable disrepair.

We found, for example, that of our Government's annual \$17 billion outlay on research and development, only a minuscule portion was being devoted to research in the social and behavioral sciences—and that funds devoted to foreign policy-oriented research were only a fraction of that smaller whole.

We also discovered that the bulk of research relevant to the advancement of our national interests in the international scene was being conducted by agencies which had no direct responsibility for our foreign policy.

We found, further, that coordination between Government research programs in this field was inadequate; that duplication and research gaps abounded; and that the allocation of our resources, human and financial, bore no relation to any systematic, long-range projection of our national needs and resulting priorities.

Most of our findings on this subject were detailed in three reports—"Ideological Operations and Foreign Policy," House Report 1352, 88th Congress; "Behavioral Sciences and the National Security," House Report 1224, 89th Congress; and "Modern Communications and Foreign Policy," House Report 362, 90th Congress.

REMEDIES PROPOSED

In submitting our reports to the Congress, our subcommittee proposed various remedies.

I am happy to say that some of them became embodied in new programs and undertakings.

In 1964, for example, an interagency Foreign Area Research Coordinating Group—FAR—was established under the chairmanship of a Department of State representative, to serve as a forum for the interchange of information between Government agencies sponsoring research on foreign affairs.

In 1965, the Department of Defense moved to designate a central point for

the coordination and clearance of foreign affairs research.

That same year, the Foreign Research Council was established to review research relating to foreign affairs on a Government-wide basis.

Subsequently, funds for social and behavioral sciences research increased and our Government began to pay more attention to the results of such research.

These were small, but encouraging, improvements.

SOCIAL SCIENCES FOUNDATION

In 1966, in an effort to focus more attention on the role which the social and behavioral sciences could play in governmental operations, I introduced three bills:

H.R. 15457, calling for a White House Conference on the Social and Behavioral Sciences;

H.R. 15458, calling for the establishment, in the Executive Office of the President, of the Office of Social Sciences; and

H.R. 15459, calling for the creation of a National Social Sciences Foundation.

Although a Senate subcommittee focused on this last proposal, conducting some very useful and informative hearings on the subject, and although a House Government Operations subcommittee did some equally valuable work in this field, the proposals did not materialize in statutory enactments.

THE 1968 AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT

This year's amendments to the National Science Foundation Act, long under congressional consideration, do much to promote the objectives which our subcommittee studies and reports have supported.

By granting the social sciences explicit parity with the "hard" sciences in the operations of the Foundation, and of the National Science Board, they at least elevate these vital sciences to the position which they have long deserved to occupy.

I hope that this development and early congressional action on the two bills which I introduced today, will lead to a much more extensive and fruitful cooperation between our Government and our social and behavioral scientists in the solution of national problems.

POULTRY BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the House that the safe poultry bill will be before us tomorrow.

The loopholes in the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 must be plugged. In most respects the act of 1957 is a good one, but it still allows 1,600,000 pounds of poultry products to go on the market each year without Federal inspection. This is 13 percent of our total production.

This serious deficiency in our present inspection system can be corrected by the enactment of H.R. 16363, a bill identical to the one I introduced on Febru-

ary 27, 1968, H.R. 15622, which was along the lines proposed by the President in his message to Congress on February 16, 1967.

Poultry processing is big business in America. The industry enjoys gross annual sales of almost \$3 billion. If we are to protect and expand this market, we must be able to assure the consumer that the poultry products offered for sale are always clean and wholesome.

The intent of H.R. 16363 is similar to the provisions of the Wholesome Meat Act that was passed by Congress last year and became law on December 15, 1967. The proposed legislation would not replace the present Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957; it would merely amend and improve it.

From previous hearings on the bill, I have learned that unwholesome poultry products can spread 26 different diseases to human beings. Even more alarming is the fact that children in certain States may be exposed to these diseases through the Federal school lunch program. This is one of the loopholes that must be plugged without delay.

H.R. 16363 has measures similar to those in title II of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. The bill would authorize surveillance of the activities where adulteration or misbranding could occur other than in just the processing or slaughtering phase. The persons or firms subject to such supervision would include, among others in commerce, poultry products brokers, renderers, animal-food manufacturers, and dealers in 4-D poultry. The 4-D is a trade term that means dead, dying, disabled, or diseased poultry.

For these reasons, I strongly urge that this bill be passed without further delay.

NEED FOR GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy compels me once again to reaffirm my support for legislation to control the traffic in firearms in this country. I have supported such legislation throughout my 12 years in Congress, and I have been grievously disappointed that no significant laws on gun control have been enacted.

I shall vigorously support the President's recommendations to limit the sale of firearms. I further support legislation requiring the registration of all firearms. I do not delude myself into thinking that such a law will end killing—any more than the laws governing the registration of motor cars and the licensing of drivers has ended automobile fatalities. But I am certain that those laws reduce automobile fatalities significantly without in any way impinging on the liberties of Americans. Last year, no less than 6,500 murders were committed in the United States with guns, compared to some 30 in England. I am absolutely persuaded that a substantial proportion of those 6,500 lives could have been saved if we

did not, as a nation, make firearms so freely available to whoever takes a whim to use them.

I intend to fight for the rigorous gun control legislation that the President and responsible Members of Congress propose. I believe we must put an end to this savagery. I would hope that all my constituents will notify the majority leader of the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD, and the Speaker of the House, Congressman McCORMACK, that they earnestly favor gun control legislation. I would also ask them to back me in the effort to get this vital legislation enacted into law.

GUN CONTROLS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is about a week since Senator Kennedy was cut down. It is about the time that many will forget the sharp pain they felt when they heard that he had been shot. It is time to add his name to the growing list of men shot down in the political service of their country.

We must build memorials for the dead, but it is not time we built a memorial to the living also? Our Chaplain has prayed that he rest in peace. And he should, he was a good man, and outstanding in every way. Why cannot we act so that the American people might live in peace?

One of the most distressing aspects of the assassination of Senator Kennedy was the calm and professional way that the press and television networks covered the story. They wrote and sounded like people who had been this terrible route before; and indeed they have. They were professional, but yet they still had a little of the old feeling of shock left. How much longer will they still be shocked. Once more? Perhaps two or three times more? I am sure no longer than that. Then the story will just be a story, and the list of names will become a statistic.

If we do not act to control this violence the tragic list of the dead on the podium and ballroom floor will become another dreary rendition, like the list of dead on the highway. Even now our political concepts are changing.

The President has ordered the Secret Service to protect candidates from the derangement of a handful of men. In order to do their job, the Secret Service will have to protect those competing for the Presidency of the United States from most of the people they meet, for who can tell which of the milling throng of well wishers is really the man with the weak mind and the strong gun?

The growth in protection will cause a separation between public officials and the people, and that is something that goes against all of our instincts. The growth in protection will cause all of us to feel that acts against the lives of public men are expected. As psychologists say, people tend to do what is expected of them. Perhaps men with seething hatreds and irrational wishes to do ill will see that violence is indeed the thing that is expected, and it will be done. Thus

the virus of violence will cause isolation of public officials and candidates by the police, and the protection in turn will reinforce in disturbed people the tendency to commit violence.

The tragic events of last week hit the people of this country forcefully. Senator Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and President Kennedy were all people who represented great idealism to many Americans. President Kennedy advocated international peace and understanding, and he was cut down. The Reverend Dr. King preached nonviolence and he was cut down. Senator Kennedy was motivated by a desire to better the lives of those who do not share the affluence of the society in which we live, and he was cut down.

For these men America has mourned. Every time one of them has died a terrible death, the people have demanded that we do something.

Will we listen this time?

Yes, when the great fall the people hear. But, what happens when the nearly great fall, or when the average American falls? Surely there is no national outcry. There is only quiet sobbing by a wife, or mother, or sister, or perhaps the victim was a woman.

Last year 5,600 Americans were shot with firearms. Last year in England 30 people were shot. If their population were equal to ours, that would mean 120 shootings against our 5,600. Last year in France 14 people were shot. If France's population were equal to ours it would mean less than 60 people shot against our 5,600.

The issue, then, is not only one of preserving our democracy against political assassinations. It is also one of protecting our families against the loss of breadwinners, children, and other loved ones.

Through misleading facts and statistics and through a great publicity campaign the Congress has been led to believe that strong gun reform is not needed nor wanted by the people. In fact, the reverse is true.

Allow me to give you an example of the type of misleading statement that is given to the Congress and to the American people in an attempt to justify continued unregulated use of weapons.

In an article entitled "The True Facts on Firearms Legislation—Three Statistical Studies," the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc. attempted to explain why strict gun control laws are unnecessary.

The first point they make is to utilize a very impressive-looking set of statistics to "prove" that only 3.4 percent of the 3,243,370 serious crimes committed in the United States during the year 1966 involved guns. The numbers are large and exact, and the figure does look small indeed. However, when the breakdowns are examined carefully a totally different picture is revealed. Of the 3,243,370 crimes, 1,370,300 are burglary. This means that a house is broken into and things are taken. No confrontation with the householder occurs, or else it is not burglary, but robbery. Thus, already half of the crimes already are shown to be of a nature where a gun would not be used in any case. However, when we look at the statistics for robbery we see

a different picture. Here 38.9 percent of the crimes are committed with the use of firearms.

Last, one might look at the statistics for homicide. Here the figures are as follows: Firearms, 59.3 percent; knives or cutting instruments, 22.3 percent; personal weapon—hands, feet, and so forth—9.4 percent; blunt objects, 5.4 percent; miscellaneous, 3.6 percent. So, 3.4 percent of serious crimes becomes almost 40 percent for robbery and almost 60 percent for murder. And these are the figures that a gun association tries to use to prove its case.

Next, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc., shows that in States without gun laws and licensing, the crime rates are no higher than in the States that have strict rules. Again, there are tables with all kinds of statistical analyses, and square-root signs and other mathematical formulations. The only thing that is not in their tables is some commonsense. By and large the States with license requirements are the big States with most of the Nation's large urban areas. New York, California, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts are among the States with requirements. Most of the nonlicense States, on the other hand, are primarily rural. Arizona, Kansas, and Vermont are on this list.

Now we all hear so much about the problems of the cities. We hear of drugs and riots and unsafe streets. We hear also of the better conditions in rural areas, where most city problems do not manifest themselves. Yet, even though all of this is so, we find, by the gun association's own admission, that there is every bit as much crime in the pastoral areas as in the seething ones. How can they explain that?

Their third point is similar to their second. They say:

As the proportion of the population possessing firearms goes down, crimes rates go up.

Here again, lots of statistics hide the point that in the cities with crime, strict gun control laws hold down the number of guns, so that there is less gun ownership in cities with crimes, hence where there are fewer guns, there is more crime. All that this proves to me is that if there were to be free access to guns in these cities crimes would shoot up, and that if there were to be stricter controls in other areas, the crime rate would go down.

Aside from this sort of statistical mass that proves nothing—nothing favorable to the gun lobby in any case—what do the gun people have to say that might be a legitimate reason not to curb guns?

They have two arguments here. The first is that we should not put gun owners through the trouble of getting a license unless we get even more proof—perhaps that means ever more assassinations—than we have now. In other words, we weigh human lives on one hand, and the convenience of sportsmen, who would not want to bother to register their weapons, on the other. Even for dogs we insist on registration in many places. For cars we insist on registration everywhere. No State says that it is not necessary to register cars because cars kill only a small percentage of those who die. No State says that drivers should not need licenses. We care if people who need

glasses drive. Should we not care just as much if people who need to have insane tendencies corrected have guns? Why can we not say that gun owners must go through registration just as car owners do, and that they be checked just as car drivers are? Do we believe that a car is more dangerous than a loaded gun?

The other reason they give is a constitutional and political one. The Constitution, they say, gives everyone the right to bear arms. What the Constitution does, of course, is to say that the right to carry arms is associated with the militia. In the days when the Nation was founded people were expected to defend the country against animals and Indians. Now our danger is from nuclear bombs abroad and madmen at home. I doubt handguns at home would protect us from atomic bombs, and as for madmen—last week's assassination points out that if we have guns freely, the madmen will also.

We must weigh all of these facts carefully, and decide what our clear responsibility, at this session of this Congress, is.

It is my firm belief that we must pass a strong gun bill now. We cannot wait until next year, we cannot wait until another leader of our people joins the mournful list. We cannot wait until another 5,600 or 10,000 Americans die. The people are writing in torrents demanding that we act now.

I will not vote for adjournment of this Congress until and unless we do our duty and end this disgraceful situation.

The omnibus crime bill has made an inroad into mail-order sales of handguns. We need more.

The President in his message of June 6 called the legislation just recently passed a "halfway measure." That it truly is. We have restricted interstate and over-the-counter purchases of handguns, but not long guns. Can we really believe that effective control of long guns and ammunition is not needed? Just consider these facts:

President John F. Kennedy was killed with a rifle; Medgar Evers was killed with a shotgun; Martin Luther King was killed with a rifle; and on one bloody afternoon in Austin, Tex., Charles Whitman killed 16 people and wounded 31.

With a handgun you have to get pretty close to your victim. With a high-powered rifle you can sit in relative safety several hundred yards away and pick him off.

No one could possibly suggest that rifles and shotguns are not as dangerous as handguns. Try to tell that to the women of this Nation who sit in terror behind locked doors at night. Try and tell that to the many little children of this land who have lost their fathers because someone has snuffed out their lives with a rifle or shotgun.

It is necessary that mail-order sales of guns to individuals end. It is necessary that no one be able to buy any gun, long or short, until his record and proof of age are checked out. It is necessary that we end the glaring loopholes in our laws that allow people to buy machineguns and to buy war-surplus weapons that a good machinist could easily put in working order.

Earlier in this Congress the gentleman

from New York [Mr. CELLER] and myself proposed bills that would accomplish these things. Instead a much milder bill—title IV of the omnibus crime bill—was passed.

The omnibus bill just is not good enough. It leaves untouched the area that must be controlled so that shootings like those of the Kennedy's and the King's and the three marines senselessly gunned down in a Washington restaurant a few days ago will not be repeated.

The omnibus crime bill provides for training of policemen and for riot control. Other laws provide for programs to end urban unrest and riots through better social justice for minority groups. What provides for saving the Nation from the madman, the criminal, and the man with a terrible temper who gets instant courage with a loaded gun in his hand? There is nothing, and we must change that before more of our best people die. Our goal should be peace in the streets, and the first step is taking guns out of the hands of criminals.

The gun associations say that "Guns do not kill, people kill." This is true. Some accuse those of us working for effective gun laws of being antigun. This is not true. I am not antigun; I am against people who would kill with guns having free access to them.

Certainly a good gun law is going to inconvenience the sportsman. I think, however, that a sportsman is also a family man and also a man who loves his country. I think that almost all sportsmen are willing to put the public good above their own convenience, and to put their responsibility to society above an hour in the courthouse and perhaps a small registration fee.

I wish that I could say that this problem could wait, for that would be more convenient for us in Congress. If we cannot pass this bill and shoulder our responsibilities now that terror has struck again and the people are demanding action, when can we do it?

We have known for a long time that men who live by the sword shall die by it. We have found again, however, that those who have lived by the olive branch are dying by the gun, and this must be stopped.

I appeal to this Congress to pass the strong gun control bill that I introduced in May of 1967, or to pass Mr. CELLER's bill, which is identical. We can pass any good bill. To pass no bill, however, is to pass the sentence of death upon an untold number of Americans in the years to come.

We must not adjourn this 90th Congress knowing that we have defaulted in our clear duty. I know that you will agree that adjournment must wait if that is what is necessary so that our gas station owners and businessmen and candidates for the Presidency of the United States might live.

KOREAN LOAN SHARK SITUATION REINFORCES HOUSE VOTE ON TRAVEL RESOLUTION

Mr. MINISH. 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. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives passed a travel resolution authorizing the House Banking and Currency Committee to send eight of its members and two of its employees to investigate the operations of U.S. military credit unions in the European and Pacific commands, with particular emphasis on the organization of such credit unions in those countries hosting U.S. military installations but without credit union facilities for members of the Armed Forces. This subcommittee will also investigate credit and finance problems facing servicemen and fraudulent activities of sharp practice credit extenders in dealing with members of the Armed Forces.

On May 21, the Bayonet, a weekly newspaper published by the 7th Infantry Division Information Office in Korea, ran an article by Sgt. Bill Hoerg., describing a loan shark racket that is being operated outside of Camp Casey, Korea. The article clearly shows why it is necessary for the Banking and Currency Committee to travel to the Pacific command to put a stop to these types of practices and to establish credit unions.

I have also received letters from servicemen stationed in Korea containing the disturbing allegation that some military personnel have apparently assisted these loan sharks in collecting debts in which the interest rate runs as high as 36 percent a month.

Approximately 2 years ago, the Department of Defense issued a directive which provided that lenders must follow certain procedures and fill out certain forms if they lend money to servicemen and then expect assistance from the military in collecting that debt. It would appear that military officials in Korea are ignoring that directive and are, in effect, acting as the official collection agency for the Korean money lenders.

One serviceman who wrote me indicated that he had a great deal of information about the loan sharking going on in Korea but was afraid to make it public because he had been told that it might damage United States-Korean relationships. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what this information is that might be damaging to the relationships but I intend to find out and let me say that I am far more interested in protecting the welfare of our servicemen than I am in keeping silent because of diplomatic considerations.

Of particular concern to me is a portion of Sergeant Hoerger's article which indicates that American servicemen who cannot repay their debts are subjected to physical violence. I am certain that when the subcommittee visits the Pacific commands, the subcommittee will go to Camp Casey to see firsthand the problem that is described by Sergeant Hoerger and that every effort will be made to establish a credit union at this installation so that a serviceman can obtain credit at a reasonable interest rate and not have to worry about intimidation or worse if he should fall behind in his payments.

Mr. Speaker, because of the impor-

ance of this matter and the graphic illustration of what is happening to our servicemen in Korea in the area of money lending, I am including a copy of Sergeant Hoerger's article in my remarks:

BAYONETMEN FALLING PREY TO EASY CREDIT IN THE "VILL"

(By Sgt. Bill Hoerger)

CAMP CASEY.—Over one million Won (about \$3,700) is borrowed by 7th Infantry Division personnel in the Casey-Hovey area from Korean Nationals every month. Add another million Won for current and back interest, and an \$85,000 a year business is the result.

These are the estimated figures of Sgt. 1. C. Harrison L. Richardson of G-5, Civil Affairs Office, 7th Inf. Div. The "open door" policy of G-5 allows Korean Nationals with grievances of all sorts to personally present their problems to the division without having to go through a multitude of red tape. And probably the most outstanding complaint of the Koreans is with regard to unpaid loans by American soldiers.

Bayonetmen, ignorant of existing laws, their personal rights and responsibilities, have been borrowing money from local Korean Nationals, many of whom are "loan sharks." As a consequence, they have fallen into a vicious circle of indebtedness and unimagined trouble.

Commenting on the situation a concerned Sgt. Richardson said, "These men (the borrowers) are blind! They cannot foresee their monetary obligations during a month's span. They do not stop to think about how much they will have to pay back for one of these loans, and they just do not realize the extent of complications that may evolve from such a transaction."

Men have foolishly signed questionable promissory notes and have agreed to usurious interest rates. Korean law requires all individuals loaning money for a profit to obtain a license. Most of the "loan sharks" have no such permit.

In addition, Korean law stipulates that interest charged will not exceed 36 percent per month. Even if a creditor has the necessary license he may still be charging more than the prescribed interest limit.

Although 30 percent per month on a 1,000 won loan doesn't seem exorbitant, it adds up to an annual interest of 360 percent. So if an individual doesn't pay his loan back promptly he could end up owing three and half times his original loan in a year's time.

Oftentimes men do not stop with just one loan. They discover how easily credit is obtained and may borrow some 12,000 won during the month. It is not unusual for a man to find that he cannot repay all of his debts incurred for the month.

When the "due date" passes on a loan, a new interest charge is often added. Forty percent on the unpaid balance is a frequent figure. Now, the soldier not only owes 1,300 won, but 40 percent of that—or 1,820 won.

Sometimes there is a man who, for a number of reasons, finds it impossible to ever repay all of his village bills. The "loan shark" has an answer to this man's monetary problems: the Black Market. For the mere delivery of a "made in the USA" television set, a GI might have his interest rate cut in half.

Or, for three sets of slightly used OG's, the soldier might be granted the reduction of as much as 1,000 won off his original bill. Just as simple as that—until the actual delivery is made.

Then, who can guarantee that both parties will keep to the illegal transaction? Can the soldier go to the authorities if the "loan shark" doesn't live up to his part of the bargain?

What about the fellow who is going to "outsmart" the Koreans and simply refuse to pay his debts? It takes but a split second for some hired hoodlums to give a hesitant

soldier a brutal reminder of his responsibilities.

An honest creditor will go to G-5 and request the military's aid in settling disputes over unpaid bills. The usual reaction is for the office to notify the man's unit, describing the circumstances and leaving it up to the unit commander to decide the outcome. The result is often a disgusted "short-timer" being flagged until his debts to Koreans Nationals are paid in full, for a dishonorable failure to pay just debts is an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice for which judicial action may be taken.

A "just this once" Black Market deal; a beating by hired thugs—can all lead to an even worse situation: Subversion. The power of money overcomes the power of common sense. Even though the information provided may seem to be of relative unimportance, a man might betray his country for the mere reduction of imprudent loan made in the village.

The "loan sharks" and "pawn brokers" are not stupid. They know all the angles. And, just as you make a loan for a house or car in the States, you are responsible for your actions when making a loan from a Korean National.

The soldier has created his own dismal situation. He requested the loan. He agreed to the exorbitant interest rates and he signed his name to the contract.

LINCOLN-DICKEY—WHY PAY MORE FOR LESS?

Mr. CLEVELAND. 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 Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, although the House has voted to kill the Lincoln-Dickey hydroelectric power project in northern Maine three times in the last 3 years, I have my doubts as to whether or not we have finally heard the last of it. As long as electric rates in New England are high, voices will be crying in the wilderness for a dam at Lincoln-Dickey.

But a dam at Lincoln-Dickey is not the answer to the high cost of electric power in New England. By the time it would be completed in the late 1970's, this dam would cost the taxpayer approximately \$277 million. Another \$8.5 million for necessary transmission lines, along with other related costs, would boost the total price tag to an estimated \$380 million.

The figure of \$380 million is the one stated by the Army Corps of Engineers last fall. This still does not take into account the fact that construction costs have been rising an average of about 5 percent a year, so it would be safe to say that the Lincoln-Dickey boondoggle would in the end cost the taxpayer \$400 million plus.

As I pointed out in a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 23, page 31463—entitled "Why Pay More for Less?" a pump storage power project is currently under construction at Northfield Mountain in Massachusetts which will cost an estimated \$74.35 million and produce 1 million kilowatts annually. The Lincoln-Dickey Dam is designed to produce 723,000 kilowatts a year.

Just recently I learned that the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, a private company which annually pays about \$6 million in State taxes and more than that in Federal taxes, has ordered construction of a nuclear-powered generating plant in Newington, N.H. This facility estimated to cost \$150 million would produce in excess of 800,000 kilowatts of electricity, and would be completed in the fall of 1974.

In other words, both the Northfield Mountain pump storage power project and the Newington nuclear generating plant would produce more electricity, at less cost, and sooner than the hydroelectric dam at Lincoln-Dickey. Without even taking the conservation aspect into account, my question still stands: "Why pay more for less?"

RIOTS OR CIVIL WAR NEXT WEDNESDAY?

Mr. DEVINE. 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. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday, June 2, issue of the Columbus, Ohio Dispatch, an article authored by Mrs. Alice Widener appeared relating to Wednesday, June 19, and the proposed "demonstrations."

To say the least, if there is any accuracy in this article, it is disconcerting. I am submitting it in the RECORD in order that all Members of Congress and other officials of the U.S. Government may be put on notice concerning the facts set forth by Mrs. Widener:

JUNE 19 A RED LETTER DAY IN DARKEST SENSE OF WORD

(By Alice Widener)

Put a red circle around June 19 on your calendar. That is the day set by the leftist radicals to do unto the United States as they are doing unto France. June 19 is the day that the American radicals have set for the start of a series of demonstrations provocative of violence and led by students, a day marked out for crisis which leftist radicals hope will start a civil war in the United States.

If that war were to break out, it is most unlikely we could retain our present form of government with all its freedoms and opportunities. Unless forces loyal to the United States government put down all illegal activities by demonstrators on June 19, the consequences for our nation could be tragic.

Civil war, fought by mobs in the streets, cannot be won by moderates. If the radicals succeed in their demonstration of June 19 in Washington, D.C., and there is a serious outbreak of violence, then anarchy and chaos created by militants—with students in the vanguard—will spread across our land.

As things stand now, the radical students plan to penetrate where the Poor Peoples March cannot go without detection because of color. Much less easily identifiable, white radical students—having moved into our nation's capital from all regions to act as a vanguard—will seek to "capture" strategic positions in government offices and other areas declared off-limits in Washington by the U.S. Government.

Students will shave their beards and quietly join forces with the Poor Peoples March. They plan to conceal their nefarious con-

nection with it at first. Then, after they have succeeded in a Trojan Horse operation, they will declare they are demonstrating for "peace and freedom" and for all demands set forth by black militants in the Poor Peoples March.

The inhabitants of Resurrection City are now pawns in a deadly game. Perhaps they are unaware of what is planned by the radical left. Perhaps they are not so unaware.

At any rate, they are pawns in a bloody game of chess played by professional insurrectionists, political guerrillas, and ambitious demagogues.

There are, of course, major differences between the American and French situations. Many French essential industries and public utilities are owned by the government and a workers' strike is a strike against the government. This is not the case in our country where railroads, telephone, TV and radio stations, and electric light and power industries are privately owned and workers are well paid.

Basically, however the French—despite their factionalism—enjoy the unifying factor of racial homogeneity and do not suffer from the agonizing racial and religious differences that create cleavages among Americans.

For our country, since the Civil War, there never has been a real threat to our government. There is one now.

The first open thrust of that threat will be made in Washington, D.C. on June 19. Since the destiny of nations sometimes rests on imponderables, loyal Americans ought to pray for a torrential rain on that fateful day. When the rains come, they dampen the fires of violence.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME NAIVE, UNWORKABLE, AND IRRESPONSIBLE

Mr. DEVINE. 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. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a well-known columnist, Henry Hazlitt, wrote an article which appeared in the June 9 issue of the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch relating to the proposed guaranteed annual income.

All Members of Congress who may ultimately be called upon to consider the philosophy encouraging such legislation should have the benefit of the views of Mr. Hazlitt and I am, therefore, including them for the RECORD:

COUNTRY'S GUARANTEED INCOME PROPOSAL IS NAIVE, UNWORKABLE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

More than 1,000 academic "economists" have signed a statement, sponsored by Profs. John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul A. Samuelson and others, endorsing a "national system of income guarantees" based solely on "need." They confidently assure us that the cost would be "well within the nation's economic and fiscal capacity."

So the problem of poverty, which has plagued the world since the beginning of history, is to be solved overnight by the ridiculously simple device of taking still more money away from those who work for it and turning it over to those who don't.

This idea is blandly put forward in a year when we are already running up the largest budget deficit in the last 22 years. This will be the eighth annual deficit in succession, and the 32nd in the last 38 years. It will be followed by a substantial deficit in fiscal 1969, even assuming that the new \$10 billion

tax increase is enacted and the proposed \$6 billion expenditure cut really put into effect.

The guaranteed income is also being proposed at a time when the nation's combined relief and welfare burden is already the greatest in its history.

For the federal government alone, welfare and relief payments are scheduled to total some \$69 billion in fiscal 1969. This is 10 times as great as total federal expenditures for all purposes in the Roosevelt year 1938. If we add the additional net welfare and relief expenditures of the states and localities, the total becomes even more tremendous.

The signers of this guaranteed income indorsement make no attempt to estimate the cost of their proposal. Figures have been rather casually mentioned, ranging from \$11-\$26 billion a year. Realistic analysis shows that the actual cost would greatly exceed the highest of these figures.

The new proposal comes, let us also remember, at a time when, as a result of past welfare spending, chronic deficits and money printing, the dollar has already lost 64 percent of its purchasing power in 1939.

Living costs rose in April at an annual rate of 4 per cent, the fastest in 17 years. Confidence that the convertibility of the dollar into gold can be maintained is already at a new low.

Would the adoption of a guaranteed income really help the country? Would it in the long run even help the poor?

No doubt at the beginning some would get paper-money incomes higher than they had before. But the ultimate result of the scheme would be a Latin-American type of run-away inflation, total collapse of the purchasing power of the dollar, a demoralization of the working habits of the people and a general increase in impoverishment.

If the head of a family were paid \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year whether he worked or not, or bothered to look for a job, or whether he spent his guaranteed income on drink, drugs, prostitutes or gambling, he would begin to think himself a fool to work for any less than the guaranteed handout. Millions would simply give up their jobs.

And how many capable of earning more than the guarantee would go on working, and submit to an even more onerous income tax than ever, for the privilege of continuing to support their neighbors in idleness?

It is idle to pretend that a gimmick like the "negative income tax"—which would reduce the guaranteed income by only \$1 for say, every \$2 of real earnings—would prevent this wholesale erosion of incentives. For those living on the guaranteed income would consider this an exorbitant 50 per cent tax on their actual earnings.

The guaranteed income proposal is naive, utopian, unworkable and irresponsible.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION—SANDERS ANSWERS THE CHALLENGE

Mr. CLEVELAND. 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 Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the season when millions of young men and women in caps and gowns step up to a podium to accept hard-won diplomas, and then step into the dawn of new careers.

But how quickly, Mr. Speaker, they could lose their grasp on the world around us.

It is no exaggeration to say that our world changes so rapidly that today's

well-educated person can quickly become relatively uneducated if he does not continue to master the implications of both social and technological changes.

EDUCATION CONTINUES AFTER GRADUATION

The continuing education of many of today's graduates will be easier because of their association with industries which have added a new dimension to their traditional training and education programs.

One such industry has its headquarters in my district; Sanders Associates, Inc., of Nashua, N.H.

Industry, of course, has long recognized the importance of providing specific technical training which better prepares new employees to perform their tasks, and familiarizes experienced employees with improved equipment and methods.

There is an obvious reason for industry to interest itself in this type of training since there is a direct relationship between the training and later job performance.

But I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that today many industries are going beyond this type of training to offer employees opportunities to increase their education at the professional level, and also to expand their personal development.

The reasoning behind this expanded effort by industry is that employees who are well-rounded educationally are better citizens.

And, better citizens help create a fertile climate in which individuals, industry and the community can realize their full potential to enrich life.

The type of wide support for education I refer to is well illustrated by the education programs of Sanders Associates, Inc.

A SPACE-AGE INDUSTRY

Sanders' development and manufacturing programs for the Federal Government range from electronic and anti-submarine warfare systems and ground support systems for battlefield and missile operations to sophisticated radar systems for training men, instantly evaluating the effectiveness of missile systems, and detecting low flying aircraft in forward battlefield areas. They also include new concepts in both electronic countermeasure systems, and a completely new system for air traffic control.

In the expanding commercial electronics markets, Sanders Associates has developed computer display systems which allow instant selection of specific computer information and, if necessary, changing and updating the information while it is displayed.

This equipment is part of Sanders integrated data management systems which are tailored to the varying administrative needs of government and business.

These advanced systems are developed and manufactured in plants in five States: in addition to plants in Nashua and Manchester, N.H., the company has facilities in South Portland, Maine, Bedford, Woburn, and Cambridge, Mass., Plainview, N.Y., and is leasing facilities in Springfield, Va., pending completion of a new plant late this summer at Reston, Va.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AT SANDERS

Sanders Associates' operations require highly competent employees whose interests and knowledge are constantly expanding. Its success in stimulating employee interest in continuing education is shown by the fact that this year 20 percent of its employees are engaged in formal education courses; almost 1,200 in courses at 47 college level institutions outside the company, 800 in on-premise courses, and 62 in apprentice training.

The 24-man staff of Sanders Associates' Education and Training Department presides over a diversified but carefully balanced education program ranging in support up to the doctorate level.

Under its tuition assistance program, the company prepays the cost of evening courses which are job related or required for a job-related degree.

Recognizing the importance of advanced university-level work to employees in modern industry, Sanders Associates has established its graduate fellowship program under which college graduates who wish to study for a master of science or doctorate degree may apply for assistance for tuition and other academic fees as well as living expenses, while attending school part time or full time.

The advanced studies certificate program is aptly described by the company as a "mind stretching" program emphasizing continued growth and development of the individual and the company. It is offered at the Nashua, N.H., plant, and includes university-level courses ranging from communications, physical and managerial science, to ideas of man, leading ultimately to the Sanders advanced study certificate.

Other on-premise courses reflect the needs and interest of employees and the company: shorthand, oceanography, symbolic logic, and radar analysis, for example.

SANDERS SUPPORTS OTHER PROGRAMS, TOO

In addition to education programs for employees, the company actively supports educational institutions. During the past year, Sanders Associates has pledged substantial amounts to the Rivier College development fund and to help establish the University of New Hampshire's Merrimac Valley Branch in Manchester, N.H.

Sanders data display systems, donated to Dartmouth College, are being used at the college's Kiewit Computation Center in research on the application of computer techniques to problems of the modern world.

Under its scholarship program, children of Sanders Associates' employees are encouraged to apply for financial assistance for higher education. Last month, substantial scholarships were awarded to six high school seniors on the basis of their achievement, promise, and need.

In recognition of the need for financial support of educational institutions by graduates, Sanders recently inaugurated an international matching grants program under which the company matches up to \$100 per year, the

contributions of its employees to the colleges or universities from which they received a degree.

Mr. Speaker, the understanding of the importance of education today which is shown by Sanders Associates in these programs has a vital collateral effect.

Many of its employees, with company encouragement, take an active interest in the school systems of their communities, as members of school boards, officers of PTAs or simply as concerned citizens.

AN EXAMPLE FOR ALL TO FOLLOW

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that Sanders Associates' overall education program contributes far more to society than simply upgrading the skills of its employees. The breadth and depth of those programs lead to more complete individual development.

This means more alert, conscientious citizens—the prime ingredient of a State such as New Hampshire, which is advancing into the latter decades of this century ready to develop the opportunities of the future guided by the successes of the past.

Sanders Associates, as the largest employer in the State with the lowest unemployment rate in the Nation, New Hampshire is setting a commendable example in encouraging responsible citizenship.

It is this awareness that industry has much more to contribute to society than running an efficient production line that gives us cause to believe that we will solve the social problems which loom ahead of us.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT MAILING OF UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS

Mr. OTTINGER. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited credit cards, and to require that credit cards requested by consumers be sent by registered mail only.

The proliferation of the credit card is a contemporary phenomenon which I find impressive, and a little frightening. Impressive because it has so obviously met a real need in the business community; frightening because of the potential abuses inherent in the operation of the credit card business.

Two months ago I wrote a short letter to the Postmaster General, urging him to adopt regulations which would have the effect of banning unsolicited credit cards from the mail, and of requiring that credit cards for which applications had been filed be sent by registered mail. The Postmaster General replied that he had no authority to do this, but, upon publication of my proposal, a large number of citizens from all over the country, wrote in strong support of the need for this kind of protection. I have had letters from Florida to Connecticut, from

California to Massachusetts—all highly favorable. I have not received a single letter in opposition.

The impetus behind my letter was a story told me by a constituent, who had received an unsolicited credit card from one of the major oil companies, sent by third-class mail, with a large inscription in red on the outside: "Credit card enclosed." As I wrote the Postmaster General:

Little imagination is required to envision the very real possibilities of theft anywhere along the mail-handling process, or the resultant problems attendant upon reestablishing credit when the addressees discover that they have just underwritten the cost of one or more transcontinental trips or other spending sprees on the strength of cards whose existence they had no reason to suspect.

It is no answer to state that no legal liability attaches until the card is actually received and used by the addressee. In the first place, I do not believe that this is always the case—I have been told that holders of all-purpose credit cards have been assessed on occasion for charges made on cards which were deposited in their apartment mailboxes and taken before they picked up their mail. In the second place, and more importantly, I do not feel that the consumer should be put to the burden and inconvenience of proving, before a court and likely with the assistance of an expensive lawyer, that he should not be held responsible for an unknown debt created by an unknown thief.

It is my feeling that barring unsolicited credit cards is a reasonable action. It is of little inconvenience to a company starting a new credit card to mail out a notice to potential subscribers, telling them of the issuance of the cards, and asking whether they care to join. If they do, well and good. If they do not, the matter should end there.

I feel also that it is entirely reasonable to require that credit cards requested by consumers be sent by registered mail. This will have the effect of insuring that no one can be held for any debt arising from the use of a credit card until the card has been demonstrably received by the holder or by an adult in his or her family. There will no doubt be some additional costs associated with this requirement, but they will be slight when compared to the potential costs to the consumer if such a step is not taken.

In introducing this bill, I am happy to acknowledge an indebtedness to my friend and colleague from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], who introduced similar legislation earlier in this Congress, and whose legislation served as a model for much of my own proposal.

The Miami News of May 6, 1968, carried a short editorial on the subject. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

KNOT IN THE CARDS

Ever get a credit card through the mail? One with your name neatly embossed on a hard piece of plastic and all ready to go charging through filling stations, stores and other businesses?

You didn't ask for the card. You don't want the card. But there it is. So you try to destroy the darn thing lest it fall into the hands of someone dishonest who might decide to take a free ride on your name. But

the plastic is tougher than your hands and you've got blood on your fingers to prove it. So you have to hunt for the scissors to slice the card into harmlessness. Then you have to hunt for someone to sharpen the scissors.

If you've had that experience and inconvenience, then you've got a friend in Rep. Richard L. Ottinger (D-N.Y.) The congressman wants the Post Office department to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited credit cards and to require requested credit cards to be sent by registered mail.

Say yes, Post Office. Please—

The bill reads as follows:

H.R. 17770

A bill to restrict the mailing of credit cards

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section immediately following section 1734:

"§ 1735. Unsolicited credit cards and similar documents and devices nonmailable

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, every credit card and every other document and device intended or adapted for the purpose of establishing the identity and credit of any person in connection with the purchase or rental on credit of goods or services, or the obtaining of loans, are nonmailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or station thereof or by any letter carrier, and shall be withdrawn from the mails under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

"(b) This section does not apply to credit cards or other documents or devices described in subsection (a) when mailed:

"(1) by any person other than the issuer or a person acting on behalf of the issuer; or

"(2) in response to an application or request therefor (including replacements of the original credit card, document or device), if the mailing is by registered mail and is restricted to delivery to the addressee only.

"(c) Whoever knowingly deposits or causes to be deposited for mailing or delivery any matter declared by this section to be nonmailable matter except in accordance with subsection (b) of this section shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

Sec. 2. The table of contents of chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 1735. Unsolicited credit cards and similar documents and devices nonmailable."

THE TEACHER CORPS—A VITAL PROGRAM THAT GETS RESULTS

Mr. CLEVELAND. 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 Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in this time of fiscal crisis, inflation, and talk about the need for a tax increase, the Congress has a responsibility to cut expenditures. I have supported these cuts. Two weeks ago, I voted against the motion to instruct the conferees on the tax bill to reduce expenditures by only \$4 billion.

But Congress has an equal responsibility to exercise judgment in where these cuts are to be made. Time and time again, I have urged the administration

to establish priorities, determine which programs are the most essential, and stretch out or delay those which are of low priority.

Our needs are too great at home to continue spending \$2.3 billion in foreign aid, \$4.6 billion in space programs, and \$4.7 billion in public works projects under the "pork barrel" bill. How can we justify expenditures of \$1 million a day for publicizing Federal programs when many vital programs are barely keeping their heads above water because of a severe lack of funding.

GHETTO SCHOOLS NEED TEACHERS

The Teacher Corps is a case in point. Here is a small program, only \$13 million last year, but a program which is directed to an area of critical national need, and is getting results. Like several other programs, it seeks to improve educational opportunities for children in our inner cities and in our areas of rural poverty. But it does more for the money and it does it faster.

I first voted against the Teacher Corps program back in 1965, when it came into existence. It looked then like just another one of the Great Society programs which seemed fine on paper, but of doubtful practicability. Even the National Education Association opposed this program.

But during the past 3 years, a small number of dedicated people have strived to make the Teacher Corps work. Today, there are 1,520 young men and women, together with 350 experienced team leaders, working in 124 school systems. Many of these people will go on to devote their lives to teaching in ghetto and impoverished rural schools after they have completed the 2-year program.

TEACHER CORPS WIN NATIONWIDE SUPPORT

Today the Teacher Corps has won my support. The National Commission on Civil Disorders has asked that the Teacher Corps "be expanded into a major national program." School superintendents, principals, and mayors in major cities and in small towns have applauded the work of the Teacher Corps people that they have selected for their schools and communities. Even the National Education Association has reversed its earlier hostility, and has enthusiastically endorsed this program.

Yet, in spite of this clear record of performance, Teacher Corps programs in schools and communities where tensions are highest may have to be cut back this summer because of insufficient funds. Thousand of young men and women who have sought to work in the very schools and communities where teacher shortages are at the worst will be turned away. Through the Teacher Corps, these men and women could go to work immediately in these schools and communities.

OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS DO LESS FOR THE MONEY

Yet while the Teacher Corps is struggling for existence, we are appropriating funds for federally supported teacher fellowships that cost as much, but produce far less. Many of the people on these fellowships don't work for their

keep, while Corpsmen, during the 2-year period they are being trained as teachers, are making a real contribution to the school system through tutoring students, aiding fellow teachers, and so forth.

But perhaps more important, the fellowships do little to correct the basic weakness in many programs of teacher training. They may, in fact, perpetrate these weaknesses, for the fellowships pay for students in conventional teacher-training programs. These programs have for years been removed from the problems of the ghettos and the rural poor.

COOPERATION

Contrast this with the Teacher Corps. Universities and school systems, working together, use the Teacher Corps to develop teacher training programs that responds to the needs of the schools where children are missing out on an education. Increasingly, the programs that have been developed for the Teacher Corps are being offered to regular students as well.

Community groups also participate in the development of Teacher Corps programs. Schools use the Teacher Corps to help provide new bridges to communities that are frequently suspicious or hostile.

If the Teacher Corps is forced to re-trench this year, perhaps the greatest loss will be in the young people who will be turned away. These are people who seek to serve their communities and their Nation where the need is clearly the greatest. They are not now teachers, but teachers they will become. They see in the Teacher Corps a vehicle through which to serve now and the promise of getting, while serving, the best training ever offered for a tough job.

The Teacher Corps has now little opposition. It was hailed by the majority of the Republicans on the Education and Labor Subcommittee as a program that Republicans "can conscientiously, and even enthusiastically, support." It has been cited as an example to be copied, a program that combines local direction with Federal assistance.

FORWARD FUNDING ESSENTIAL

There are some eight or nine other federally supported teacher training programs. The Teacher Corps is the only one for which funds are appropriated in September or October for training which begins in the previous June or July. Yet forward funding—the appropriation of funds in September or October for programs which begin the following June or July—is particularly important for Teacher Corps. For Teacher Corps programs school systems must vote matching funds, appoint team leaders, and, with the universities, recruit and select their Corps members in advance. Universities must plan their training and designate faculty. They need 3 or 4 months to plan. Local control is impossible without this forward planning time.

This year, school systems in our major cities have worked with their universities to develop Teacher Corps programs. They have recruited and selected their Corps members. They have had to take the chance that funding would be provided. They may have made a mistake.

A GOOD BARGAIN

If the Teacher Corps is funded at last year's level of \$13 million, programs will be cut back throughout the United States. Funding at last year's level will not support programs of equal size this year because last year's appropriation cut out forward funding and transferred some of the costs from last year's budget to this year.

If the Teacher Corps has succeeded in doing a critical job more effectively than other programs we are supporting, it is clearly in our Nation's interest to support this program and cut others. At the very least, we should cut the budget request of \$31.2 million for the Teacher Corps no more than the across-the-board cuts that will apply to other budget requests.

Life magazine has said, "At those prices, it remains the best bargain in the Federal education program." In these times of fiscal crisis and urban unrest, we are in sore need of a bargain.

CARDINAL CUSHING EULOGIZES SENATOR KENNEDY AS HERO TO NATION'S POOR

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, on Sunday, June 9, 1968, a requiem memorial mass was celebrated in the cathedral in Boston, Mass., for the late U.S. Senator Robert Francis Kennedy, at which memorial mass, His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, presided and delivered a touching eulogy. In my remarks I include the text of the eulogy delivered by Cardinal Cushing:

CARDINAL EULOGIZES SENATOR KENNEDY AS HERO TO NATION'S POOR

Only a few years ago, in circumstances like these today, it was my sad duty to try to put into words the universal grief that we felt on the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Today, a melancholy fate summons me once again to test the power of language to express the deepest emotions of the human heart as we commemorate the tragic murder of Sen. Robert Francis Kennedy.

Brothers closely joined in life, now are entwined also in death, both felled by the hand of the assassin. History, which cannot fail to record the glory of their deeds, will take note too of the sad correspondence of their passing.

Like most brothers, they had much in common—a common heritage of faith and courage, a will steeled for accomplishment, and a compelling impulse for public service. They brought to public life, both of them, a new dignity and a new urgency; each added new dimensions to his office, so that, before this nation and the world, they gave promise of a fuller life and better times for all men everywhere.

As their vitality caught the imagination of so many peoples, so too their spirit stirred the forgotten hopes of the poor, the lonely, the oppressed and the deprived. So much of what was greatness, now lies buried beside a hill in Arlington, beneath a flickering flame.

Four and a half years ago Sen. Kennedy committed himself to continue what his brother had so nobly begun; from that moment his boundless energy sought to insure that those ideals they had pursued together should not perish from the earth. Today, as we take time to reflect on his life and character, we can take some measure of what, in that short time, he has meant to America.

If he could speak to us today, Sen. Kennedy would, I think, take his greatest consolation in the knowledge that among heavy hearts, those with a special burden of sadness are the poor. For all of us—but for them especially—he was a hero. No one in our time has related so well to their needs, no one has been so understanding of their aspirations, no one has been so honored among them.

In good times and bad, he could walk among the citizens of our slums, he could penetrate the urban ghetto, and in the surest sense be a man among his people. In him, as in so few, they saw hopes; in him they recognized concern; in him they would not be forgotten. Who can say what it was in his character that gave such confidence to the dispossessed, that made them see in him their brother!

For my part, I think it was both the strength of his convictions and the open sincerity of his heart. He was not one to trifle with the truth; when hard things had to be said, he could say them; when difficult deeds were demanded, he could do them. He had, in his own life, known something of the wounds this world can inflict on the innocent; he knew too how ineffective in the harshness or reality is the balm of soft words. Now that the poor have lost their champion, all of us are impoverished.

We must raise our eyes beyond the boundaries of this nation to the far lands of the earth if we wish to understand the universal mourning of this week.

Not just to Americans, but to millions across the globe a torch that flamed in the night has been extinguished. By some mysterious identification, those who had never even hoped to meet him saw in Sen. Kennedy, bearing the mantle of his martyred brother, some message of hope for all mankind.

To a generation that was weary, he symbolized strength; to those confused, he pointed a way; for those drifting, he set a course; to those heavy with years, he offered his youth; to those despairing, he was a figure of promise. Who can say how many little lamps around the world went out when death won its struggle last week in Los Angeles! The world is mourning a loss that is as wide as the planet itself.

Men in public life, in our country and elsewhere, are men who live on the edge of danger. No one could have been more conscious of this from his own experience than Sen. Kennedy. But danger to him was not an anxiety, it was not a worry; it was, as he often said, "part of a man's life." He was fond of quoting the ancient Greek poet who said: "Men are not made for safe heavens."

Valor, we know, is an essential part of greatness; only the brave can prevail. Although he was never reckless of life, he seemed to welcome risk, to be willing to challenge and to conquer it. He knew that the same protection that could guard his life could also be a barrier between himself and his people. He chose not to accept its demands. It was, I think, an act of faith on his part to put himself under the protection of Providence, to do his own best, and to leave the rest to God.

Not many people will mention it, I suppose, but Sen. Kennedy was a devoutly religious man, and the values for which he labored were essentially spiritual ones.

I do not mean that his religion was not related to his life and actions; I mean the

opposite; his religion was the inspiration of all that he was and all that he did.

The beads that entwined his dying hand said something of his life; he was a man of prayer. Now that faith has brought him into the Lord's kingdom, he is at rest; he has found the only "safe haven" he has ever sought, and he has won it dearly.

Our hearts and prayers go out to his wife and family, especially to those who are now children of a fallen hero.

We remember too, his stalwart mother and brave father, his brother Ted and his sisters.

We share their sorrow, though we cannot assuage their grief. To the loss already sustained, now a new one is added; only faith assures them that they will meet again in another and better world. We pray for his repose and for their consolation.

TRINITY SQUARE REPERTORY COMPANY

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD three articles concerning the Trinity Square Repertory Company of Providence, R.I. This company has become one of the most adventurous and visionary resident companies in the country. They recently received an invitation to the International Festival at Edinburgh, the only American regional theater to receive such an honor.

Its energy is also indicated by the fact that they have purchased the ANTA Washington Square Theater in New York, and plan to move it to Providence and rebuild it.

The Trinity Square Repertory Company has brought to the Rhode Island school systems, and to the people of Rhode Island, professional repertory theater unequalled anywhere along the entire eastern seaboard. Trinity has instilled into thousands of schoolchildren an enduring appreciation for the arts and the classics through Project Discovery. They have brought to Rhode Islanders an unparalleled cultural expression.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues join me in saluting the players and managers of the Trinity Square Repertory Company and in wishing them the best of luck in all their endeavors.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Record American, May 15, 1968]

HONOR FOR PROVIDENCE TROUPE AND A NEW PLAYHOUSE, TOO

(By Elliot Norton)

In Providence, the Trinity Square Repertory Company has been unusually active and uncommonly successful. Its players have done well enough with an impressive series of plays to get a bid to the International Festival at Edinburgh. Its managers have been bold enough to buy a New York playhouse which they will reconstruct in their home town. Call them dynamic.

The Edinburgh invitation is an honor not received by an other American regional theater: It is a considerable distinction, too for the Festival in Scotland is a considerable

event, attracting distinguished practitioners of all the arts from all over the world.

The purchase of the ANTA Washington Square Theater in New York is a bold undertaking and so is the plan to rebuild it in Providence. It took courage to make the purchase from New York University, which was preparing to raze the building, and high imagination to pack it away, tote it over the road and then store it for future reconstruction: the company doesn't even own a site on which to put it up.

GOOD IN PLAY ABOUT OSCAR WILDE

During five pioneering seasons, the Trinity Square Repertory Company has put on some fine productions. The level of their performances, in the opinion of one intermittent observer, has been high. Several shows have been distinguished in the Trinity versions; much of their acting, particularly this season, has been commendable.

Since the players have had no home of their own, they have made do in a reconverted church which seats perhaps 400 and, with larger productions, in the comfortable theater owned by the Rhode Island School of Design.

In the season of '67-'68, they were particularly good in a new play about Oscar Wilde, called "Years of the Locust" and they did nicely, too, in Ibsen's "An Enemy of the People," in the modernized version of Arthur Miller.

It was the Wilde Play which intrigued the directors of the Edinburgh Festival and the success of the Providence version which led them to ask Trinity to come to Scotland for one week beginning Aug. 19, at the Church Hill Theatre, Edinburgh.

An Englishman named Norman Holland is the author of "Years of the Locust" which takes Oscar Wilde to Reading jail and shows with considerable poignancy the humiliations and the hurts he suffered there after the trial which convicted him of a sordid affair with Lord Alfred Douglas.

Although the subject matter is familiar; the play has its own freshness and the author, the Providence director, Adrian Hall, and the actors, especially Richard Kneeland as Wilde, kept it honest avoiding sensationalism.

PORTABLE THEATRE PROVES PROVIDENTIAL

The company bought the ANTA Washington Square Theatre in anticipation of future needs.

The New York playhouse was erected by the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) in 1964 as a temporary home of the Lincoln Square Repertory Theater, when that troupe was under the direction of Elia Kazan and Robert Whitehead and waiting for the Beaumont Theater to be built in Lincoln Center.

Designed by Jo Mielziner and Eero Saarinen Associates, it was fitted ingeniously into a huge cavity on Washington University's property and so constructed that it could be dismantled when the players should move uptown and the University should need the land for classrooms.

"Man of La Mancha" was the most successful production in the theater. It was still running when New York University announced the playhouse would have to come down in order to make way for a new School of Commerce. The building could be taken apart, or demolished. It could be bought.

For the Trinity Square Company, this was providential. Or you might say Providential. The directors went to New York, examined the theater, which has 1145 steeply banked seats around a thrust stage, contracted to buy it, transport it over the road and then, eventually, to reconstruct it as soon as a suitable site and a proper amount of money for building can be found.

You can count on them to find the proper place at the proper time. They are energetic,

[From the Boston (Mass.) Morning Globe, May 10, 1968]

NEW YORK THEATER RHODE ISLAND-BOUND
(By Kevin Kelly)

The Trinity Square Repertory Company in Providence has purchased the ANTA Washington Square Theater in New York and the 1145-seat building will be dismantled within the next two months and moved to Providence where it will be stored until a permanent site is found for the building.

The acquisition is another step forward in Trinity's phenomenal development as one of the most adventurous, if not visionary, resident companies in the country. A specific date for the theater's re-building has not yet been announced.

Designed by Jo Mielziner and Eero Saarinen & Associates, the building was erected in 1964 at 40 West Fourth Street by the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) as a temporary home for the Lincoln Center Repertory Company, then inaugurating its first season. The company now operates at the Vivian Beaumont Theater in the Lincoln Center complex.

After the company moved to the Beaumont, the ANTA Theater booked the highly successful musical, "Man of La Mancha," which ran for 974 performances from November 1965 through March 1968. The musical is now running on Broadway at the Martin Beck Theater.

The Trinity Square Repertory currently is operating in two theaters, the 315-seat playhouse at Broad and Brigham streets, and the 1000-seat auditorium belonging to the Rhode Island School of Design, which the company primarily has used for student performances. On occasion the auditorium has been used for evening performances for adults, with the seating capacity reduced to 400 seats.

It is expected that the ANTA building for which Trinity paid \$40,000, will be rebuilt a year from now, on either one of two sites: the present location of the playhouse or, possibly, in Roger Williams park.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Evening Bulletin, May 7, 1968]

TRINITY SQUARE WILL MOVE NEW YORK THEATER TO PROVIDENCE
(By James T. Kaull)

The Trinity Square Repertory Company has purchased the structure of the ANTA Washington Square Theater in New York City and is having it moved here as a permanent home.

The unusual theater, in which the seating arena is almost entirely below grade level, is on land owned by New York University, which wants to build a new School of Commerce there.

Milton Stanzler, chairman of the Foundation for Repertory Theater of Rhode Island, the group that operates the Trinity Square theatrical enterprise, said today that no site in Providence has been chosen yet.

Trinity's decision to buy, move and reconstruct the New York theater removes it from the proposed sports arena-convention center project in downtown Providence. It had been suggested that Trinity Square occupy and pay in part for a 1.8-million-dollar, 1,000-seat theater in the arena-convention center.

Mr. Stanzler said the current project of moving the structure from New York and installing it here would be less expensive.

ANTA stands for American National Theater & Academy, a group founded in 1935. It built the Washington Square theater and opened it in 1964 with Arthur Miller's play "After the Fall," performed by the newly formed Lincoln Center Repertory Company.

Beginning in November, 1965, the theater housed the successful musical, "Man of La Mancha," which has since moved uptown to the Martin Beck Theater because of the ne-

cessity to clear the downtown site for NYU's new building.

Mr. Stanzler said the structure, including seats, heating and air-conditioning systems, is being bought for \$40,000. It will cost from \$5,000 to \$10,000 to have it trucked here. Seats already were arriving today.

The structure and equipment will be placed in storage, Mr. Stanzler said.

The big outlay will be from \$250,000 to \$300,000 to excavate a site and reconstruct the 1,145-seat theater, he added.

Above ground, the only part of the theater that can be seen is a simple, one-story, metal-sided structure that contains the small lobby, offices and stagehouse.

The arena itself was sculptured out of the ground and seats emplaced on a floor that slopes deep into the earth.

Trinity Square will launch a capital funds drive, Mr. Stanzler said.

In the overall plan for Providence's convention center, Trinity Square was to put up at least \$800,000 as an initial contribution toward the 1.8-million-dollar cost of the theater portion.

In addition, planners suggested a rental of \$40,000 a year for the first 10 years and \$60,000 a year for the next 10.

The theater company now has no home that it can permanently call its own. It uses a hall in the Trinity Union Methodist Church as its headquarters, but plays to high school student audiences in the federally backed Project Discovery at the Rhode Island School of Design Auditorium.

ECONOMY MOVE

By comparison with what might have been expected in the convention center proposal, Trinity Square will "come out of this cheaper," Mr. Stanzler said of the ANTA Theater moving project.

Although the theater company looked with some favor on the convention center proposal, some criticism arose in the community from other groups that felt the proposal did not meet the city's long-expressed need for a performing arts center available to all.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Morning Globe, Apr. 17, 1968]

EDINBURGH INVITES RHODE ISLAND PLAYERS
(By Kevin Kelly)

The Trinity Square Repertory Company, which has established itself in Providence, R.I., as one of the best regional theaters in the country, has been invited to participate in the Edinburgh (Scotland) International Festival in August.

Under the direction of Adrian Hall, the company will present the European premiere of Norman Holland's "Years of the Locust," which was given its American premiere in Providence in February.

The two-act play, a harrowing account of the last years in the life of Oscar Wilde, will be performed in Scotland with its original cast, Aug. 19-24, at the Churchill Theater.

After Mr. Holland's play opened at the Trinity Square Playhouse, it received overwhelming acclaim from the critics and the public. According to the company's press representative, Nance Movsesian, it broke all attendance records in the five-year history of the Playhouse. It was presented by arrangement with Joan White, Hy Silverman and Beverly Landau. In addition to a forcefully eloquent performance by Richard Kneeland, as Oscar Wilde, the production had a brilliant piece of scenic design by Eugene Lee, a multi-level set of Reading Gaol in which the entire action of the play takes place.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. MINISH. 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. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's message on gun control.

Last August 2 I introduced the administration's bill to impose effective controls upon all firearms. Today I have introduced a measure to cover rifles and shotguns under the restrictions on handguns contained in the omnibus crime bill passed by the House last week. As I stated then, that mild gun control bill was a step in the right direction. However, it is not enough; more must be done. The evidence in favor of a gun control bill is overwhelming. The President has recommended stronger controls over long guns and ammunition; the National Crime Commission advocated a gun bill which covers all firearms, not merely handguns; the latest Harris survey shows that 71 percent of American citizens favor a strong gun bill. The Congress must act, and it must act now. Legislation has been pending in Congress for many years which would limit the mail-order sale of rifles, shotguns, and ammunition in interstate commerce. Since 1963 America, and the world, has grievously suffered as some of her greatest leaders have been assassinated by means of firearms. President John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and now Senator Robert F. Kennedy were all cut down in the prime of life by the bullets of a cowardly assassin. And while the assassins fired, Congress dallied. How long must we wait and suffer. The time has come for affirmative action; we must heed the President's warning and act upon his proposal and immediately pass an effective gun control bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to the following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT):

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. FLYNT, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KYROS, for today, June 11, 1968, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PHILBIN, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, on June 11.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, on June 13.

Mr. QUILLEN, for 30 minutes, on June 12.

Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, on June 12. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FARSTEIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GALLAGHER, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. CAREY, for 1 hour, on June 15.
Mr. BOLAND, for 1 hour, on June 19.
Mr. SMITH of Iowa, today, for 40 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. JOELSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include a newspaper article.

All Members (at the request of Mr. MAHON) to extend their remarks on the Dow amendment in the Committee of the Whole today.

All Members (at the request of Mr. MAHON) to extend their remarks preceding the vote on the Michel amendment relating to Public Law 874 and the Mink substitute amendment in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 17734 and to include certain tabular information.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa to revise and extend his remarks today during general debate on the second supplemental appropriation bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland immediately following the remarks of Mr. McCULLOCH in debate on the second Yates amendment.

Mr. PETTIS to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following the remarks of Mrs. MINK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. SCHWENGEL.
Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.
Mr. CEDERBERG.
Mr. BUCHANAN in three instances.
Mr. HALLECK.
Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
Mr. CLANCY.
Mr. ROTH.
Mr. MORTON.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. SCOTT.
Mr. BATES.
Mr. SNYDER in two instances.
Mr. RED of New York.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. KLEPPE.
Mr. WATSON.
Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. ROBISON.
Mr. LATTA.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. GURNEY.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
Mrs. MAY.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RESNICK.
Mr. PODELL in two instances.
Mr. BURTON of California.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.
Mr. RIVERS in two instances.
Mr. CULVER.
Mr. TAYLOR.
Mr. KING of California.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. DIGGS.
Mr. ABBITT.
Mr. MARSH in two instances.
Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in eight instances.
Mr. BARING in three instances.
Mrs. SULLIVAN in three instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.
Mr. STEPHENS.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. BINGHAM in four instances.
Mr. COHELAN in two instances.
Mr. KASTENMEIER in five instances.
Mr. GALIFIANAKIS.
Mr. GILBERT.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. McCORMACK.
Mr. REUSS.
Mr. RYAN in two instances.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
Mr. MATSUNAGA.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. KORNEGAY.
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
Mr. STEED in two instances.
Mr. ALBERT.
Mr. CAREY in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. HAGAN in two instances.
Mr. ASHLEY in three instances.
Mr. BRADEMAS in six instances.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a Joint Resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4919. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Hualapai Reservation in Arizona;

H.R. 13154. An act for the relief of Dr. Santiago Jose Manuel Ramon Bienvenido Roig y Garcia;

H.R. 13912. An act for the relief of Angeliki Giannakou;

H.R. 16674. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17325. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to advertising in a convention program of a national political convention; and

H.J. Res. 1298. Joint resolution authorizing the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence to compel the attend-

ance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1999. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public Education Act; and

S. 2349. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 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:

1926. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the second annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 705(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (H. Doc. No. 326); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1927. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 865(1) (2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1928. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1967 to March 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1929. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 1205), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a tract of land to Lillian I. Anderson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1930. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Mukleshoot Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 98, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1931. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1932. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of April 30, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1933. A letter from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1251. An act to make certain reclamation project expenses nonreimbursable; with amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOAGE: Committee on Agriculture. 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 (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1213. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3306, a bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108) (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1214. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15087, a bill to authorize the further amendment of the Peace Corps Act (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1215. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1166. An act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1187. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEED: Committee of conference. H.R. 16489. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1544). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 17759. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 17760. A bill to recognize the rights and obligations of the civilian employees of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17761. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to honey producers for losses sustained by reason of the application of Government-approved insecticides on adjoining cropland; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 17762. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17763. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of

the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17764. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 17765. 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. FASELL:

H.R. 17766. A bill to establish an Office of Social Sciences in the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 17767. A bill to establish a Commission on a White House Conference on the Social and Behavioral Sciences; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 17768. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 17769. A bill to amend section 922 of title 18, United States Code, to make the provisions of such section relating to handguns applicable to shotguns and rifles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17770. A bill to restrict the mailing of credit cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 17771. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 17772. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Port of Cascade Locks, Oregon, a certain interest in lands in the State of Oregon for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 17773. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize a Federal law enforcement officer to detain and question a person suspected of committing a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 17774. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 17775. A bill to prohibit the investment of income derived from certain criminal activities in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17776. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit the investment of certain income in any business enterprise affecting interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17777. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Organized Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 17778. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 17779. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (for himself, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. SHRIVER):

H.R. 17780. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to pay the special pay authorized

under section 310 of title 37, United States Code, to certain members of the uniformed services held captive in North Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 17781. A bill to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 17782. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BRASCO, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina):

H.R. 17783. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 17784. A bill to establish the Capitol Guide and Education Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 17785. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HICKS, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. McDADE, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. CULVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. McFALL, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 17786. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, for the purposes of authorizing appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. DE LA GARZA):

H.R. 17787. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 17788. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for better control of the interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 17789. A bill to establish a national system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSH, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. WIGGINS):

H.J. Res. 1299. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including September 15 and 16 as National Hispanic Heritage Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 1300. Joint resolution to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in January 1970, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

to assist the States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 1301. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including September 15 and 16 as National Hispanic Heritage Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. COWGER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SKUBERTZ, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. BRAY, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. POFF, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. DENNEY):

H.J. Res. 1302. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of October 13, 1968, as Salute to Eisenhower Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 787. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication entitled "Fascism in Action"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 788. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 789. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

349. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to welfare payments to non-

residents, which was presented to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17790. A bill for the relief of Aniello DeSimone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17791. A bill for the relief of Pietro Genna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 17792. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zoe Ioannidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 17793. A bill for the relief of Mr. Matteo Scaduto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosemarie Huguette Labus, and her daughter, Vivian Labus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17795. A bill for the relief of Manuel Luis Hilario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 17796. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Tortorici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 17797. A bill for the relief of Dina Albins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 17798. A bill for the relief of George O. Jirles Saleh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17799. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon James F. Wegener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 17800. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Bougiotopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17801. A bill for the relief of Mr. Serafim Panagopoulos and Mrs. Johanna Panagopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17802. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cascone and his wife, Giovanna Cascone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17803. A bill for the relief of Angelo Noto and his wife, Maria Pluchino Noto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17804. A bill for the relief of Chun Myung Bai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 17805. A bill for the relief of Diaoniasa Japco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17806. A bill for the relief of Carla (Chala) Schieber, Bibi Schieber, Maia Schieber, and Lida Schieber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 17807. A bill for the relief of Marin Ciceric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

339. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of supervisors, county of San Mateo, Calif., relative to welfare payments to non-residents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

340. Also, petition of Mr. Jerry Robert Leon, relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

341. Also, petition of John M. Medeiros, North Adams, Mass., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

342. Also, petition of William Green, Junction City, Oreg., and others, relative to World War I veterans payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HUNGER IN AMERICA

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 11, 1968

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the first step in resolving any critical problem is to admit its existence and accept some responsibility for its solution. In response to the CBS television program "Hunger in America," State, local, and Federal officials are beginning this process. I ask unanimous consent that two articles from Chicago's American be printed in the RECORD. These articles tell the story of efforts that have begun to define and deal with hunger and malnutrition in my own State of Illinois.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNTOLD NUMBER OF CHILDREN GO HUNGRY IN STATE

(By Malden Jones)

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—Many children are being admitted to Illinois hospitals for treatment of acute malnutrition.

Some are taken to hospitals for treatment of physical injuries suffered because they literally collapsed from hunger.

Others are admitted for treatment of acute cases of pneumonia or dysentery brought on by malnutrition.

Many of these are children who have been declared ineligible for state and federal food aid programs.

Others attend schools which do not accept free federal surplus food for lunches, or who are not served lunch by schools because they are unable to pay 15 or 20 cents for a hot meal.

State officials, hospital authorities, and medical associations in Illinois admit that malnutrition is a serious problem in some areas of the state, particularly in the southern counties.

Edward T. Weaver, director of the Illinois department of children and family services said:

"Government agencies require all sorts of forms for reports on everything from gunshot wounds to rape and venereal diseases, but nobody is interested in hearing about children who are admitted to hospitals suffering from starvation."

Weaver said some children admitted to hospitals for treatment of broken bones may have suffered their injuries because they collapsed from hunger.

NO REPORT REQUIRED

Many of the children treated for dysentery and pneumonia are victims of malnutrition which brings on these two diseases, Weaver said.

He noted that neither doctors nor hospitals are required to report malnutrition although

it is diagnosed as the primary or secondary cause of a child's illness.

Weaver said that many of the estimated 27 million undernourished Americans identified recently by testimony before the House committee on labor and education "receive absolutely no aid of any kind from hundreds of aid programs administered at a cost of millions of dollars."

BLAME U.S. AGENCIES

School officials and state agencies lay much of the blame on the United States departments of Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare, accusing them of "bureaucratic bullheadedness."

Although malnutrition exists in the state, the first step has yet to be taken to attack the problem.

A study by CHICAGO'S AMERICAN and the Better Government association disclosed that no information exists about the incidence of malnutrition in Illinois.

No medical, public aid, or state agency is required to keep records on malnutrition or associated diseases with it.

PROBERS ARE FRUSTRATED

In the current investigation, probers were frustrated at every turn as they sought to determine the extent of acute hunger which exists among school and pre-school children.

Nor are figures available on the number of children who die in such hospitals from starvation, or from diseases contracted because of malnutrition.

Ray Suddarth, director of the school lunch program in the office of Ray Page, state su-