

rapid expansion of that program is urged. In addition, the report proposes that a training program in debt and money management counseling for defense credit union personnel be initiated.

Part of the study deals with the price/quality aspects of the military exchange program. The principal goal of the exchange system, to make necessary goods conveniently available at low prices, is largely achieved, the report says. But the lack of any performance-quality testing is seen as a weakness that should be corrected either by expansion

of present extremely limited lab facilities or through contracts with other government labs or commercial facilities. The report also points to the need for more consideration of the needs and pocketbooks of low-rank military personnel in the selection of merchandise.

The problems of servicemen in securing auto insurance and the rates charged them were also studied. The department is urged to study the merits of the "no fault" insurance concept now being widely debated and under consideration by the legislatures in a

number of states. A feature of this new approach known as "excess coverage" makes the youthful serviceman suddenly an attractive risk at a relatively low rate. This change in status derives from the fact that the premium would not have to cover such potentially costly items as loss of income and medical payments, the report says.

Still another section of the report recommends that the directive covering conditions for the sale of life insurance serve as the basis for similar regulations for the sale of mutual and variable annuities.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 27, 1969

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

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

All things come from Thee, O Lord, and of Thine own have we given Thee.—1 Chronicles 29: 14.

O Thou whose wisdom is so wise that we often doubt it, whose love is so loving we often deny it, and whose truth is so true we often fear it, grant unto us such a full measure of Thy spirit that we may never doubt Thy wisdom, never deny Thy love, and never fear Thy truth.

Thou hast called us to live together in peace and good will. Let Thy presence so move in men that the leaders of the world may find support for peaceful procedures in their endeavor to establish justice, to maintain order, to develop understanding, and to build bridges between nations and people.

Teach us to unite what we ought to do with what we will do, that walking in the way of Thy word and obeying Thy commandments, we may have life more abundant, liberty more abounding, and love more abiding—all to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 265. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies.

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

H.R. 12167. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution to recognize the 10th anniversary of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint reso-

lution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 621. An act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

S. 1076. An act to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1708. An act to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes;

S. 1932. An act for the relief of Arthur Rike; and

S.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

THE HONORABLE JOHN MELCHER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana, Mr. JOHN MELCHER, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with respect to his election.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MELCHER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY CONFERRED BY EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 122) to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman briefly explain the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I shall be very glad to. The enactment of the proposed legislation will extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 months, to August 30, 1969. The Export Control Act furnishes the basic authority for control of exports to Communist bloc countries. It furnishes the authority for restricting the outflow of scarce materials, as well as the authority to regulate exports in furtherance of the foreign policy and national security of the United States. The temporary extension of the Export Control Act, which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1969, will enable the committee to complete its deliberations.

This has been agreed to unanimously by the subcommittee and by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), the ranking minority member of the full committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 122

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2032), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 30, 1969".

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 780) was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 94]

Albert	Gallagher	Nedzi
Anderson, Ill.	Gibbons	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Gray	Ottinger
Aspinall	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Berry	Griffiths	Pettis
Blaggi	Grover	Podell
Bingham	Gude	Powell
Blatnik	Hagan	Pryor, Ark.
Brown, Calif.	Halpern	Purcell
Brown, Mich.	Harsha	Railsback
Bryohill, Va.	Hawkins	Reid, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Riegle
Cahill	Hébert	Roberts
Carey	Heckler, Mass.	Ronan
Casey	Heilstokski	Rostenkowski
Celler	Hicks	Ruppe
Chappell	Holfield	St. Onge
Clancy	Ichord	Sandman
Clark	Joelson	Satterfield
Clausen,	Kee	Schadeberg
Don H.	Kirwan	Scheuer
Coheian	Kluczynski	Smith, N.Y.
Collier	Koch	Snyder
Conable	Kyros	Stanton
Cowger	Latta	Steiger, Wis.
Daddario	Leggett	Stokes
Daniels, N.J.	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Lowenstein	Tunney
Delaney	Lujan	Ullman
Denney	Lukens	Waggoner
Derwinski	McClure	Watkins
Dingell	McEwen	Whalen
Dorn	McMillan	Whalley
Edmondson	Mailliard	Wiggins
Edwards, La.	Mathias	Williams
Esch	Meskell	Wilson, Bob
Eshleman	Michel	Wilson, Charles H.
Evans, Colo.	Montgomery	Wolff
Evins, Tenn.	Morgan	Wright
Fish	Morse	Wyder
Ford,	Morton	Wyman
William D.	Murphy, Ill.	Zion
Fraser	Murphy, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 303 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONCURRING IN THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4229

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 455

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 4229) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby agreed to.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority Member, the able and distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution, the import of it is very simple, as are the objectives that are sought. It really should not require a great deal of debate.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who are interested in the parliamentary situation, let me state very briefly this is a resolution that would, if adopted, take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 4229, having to do with duties on heptanoic acid and agree to the Senate amendment.

When the House passed this bill and sent it over to the Senate, the Senate passed it and added an amendment. That amendment would simply provide for an extension of 30 days of the withholding of taxes on the surtax bill which expires in a few days.

Apparently, there is some confusion as to what happens when the rule is adopted. If the rule is adopted, that is the end of it. It is just that simple. There is no following legislation. The Government, the employers, and other interested employers are authorized to continue the withholding tax for 30 days.

Now I do not care whether you are for or against the extension of the surtax. This really has no bearing on it. It is not a test of how you are going to vote on the tax bill. This is a matter of housekeeping. This is a matter of avoiding the confusion that would result within the Internal Revenue Service, the employers, and other employers who are involved.

There would be a lot of confusion if the surtax were finally enacted and the withholding tax, or the right to withhold, expired next week without this authority.

So, I repeat, it is purely a matter of housekeeping. It is a very simple matter and I see no reason to take any further time in discussing it.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to state to the gentleman that I think this is a necessary resolution.

I think it is a resolution which does not commit the House in any way on the question of the surtax. It would be practically impossible to readjust the withholding schedules within the time that remains and it would cost great expenditures and cause a great problem for the Government itself with its over 3 million employees.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge the adoption of the resolution and the legislation.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. He has said what I tried to say so much better than I said it.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I would like to take this opportunity to protest this kind of legislative procedure. We passed a bill and it has been amended with a totally ungermane provision and sent back to the House. But that is the situation we have before us, and unless the rule is defeated, or unless the previous question is defeated, we are stuck with it.

The question I really wanted to ask is this: If continuation of the surtax is defeated, will the withholding be restored to the taxpayer?

Mr. COLMER. I think in response to that question it is so evident that that

is exactly what will happen, I should have stated it in my previous remarks.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. In further answer to the gentleman's question, the taxpayer would receive an automatic refund when his return is filed in April.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. There are two aspects to the question of the surcharge being extended to any degree or for any length of time. Extension is necessary to avoid confusion and waste. If it is not extended, the taxpayer's right to refund is fully protected.

Mr. COLMER. Again, the gentleman has well stated the situation.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BURTON of California. I would like to join with the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee in support of this rule. I fully associate myself with the remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK). I think the proposal is a reasonable and necessary one, and should be adopted without controversy.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says the money will be refunded next April. Is the Federal Government going to pay interest on the money that it takes from the taxpayer under this withholding and uses until next April?

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman from Iowa, as usual, raises a very interesting question. Judging by the response of the House, perhaps I should leave it there. But I did not intend to treat lightly the question of my friend. I can only say to him that I do not have the answer to that question.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the able ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who is better qualified to answer that question than I.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not think there should be any question as to what the situation is. In the event withholding is extended for 1 month, and the surtax is not continued, then the amount becomes part of the basic withholding of that particular individual taxpayer. In April it is determined whether there has been an overwithholding or an under-withholding in terms of total tax liability. If the proposed action should result in an overwithholding, the taxpayer would receive a refund. If there should be

an underwithholding, even with the withholding that would take place under this measure, the taxpayer would have to pay an additional amount as far as his tax liability is concerned. No interest is paid on overwithholdings.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I would like to direct a question to the gentleman who just spoke. I would like to ask what would happen for the 30 days in which that amount would be withheld which would not have been withheld without this continuing resolution? By the end of the year the taxpayer might catch up, but what about deprivation of the use of that money during the 30 days? There would be no interest paid for that time, and the man would not have given up use of that much money for the 30 days otherwise; is that not correct?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We have overpayments by other taxpayers that exist, irrespective of this surtax, under the law today by reason of withholding. In the course of a year more has been withheld than was necessary.

That takes place for many taxpayers are concerned. We should try to avoid overwithholding, but it does take place, and as of this date we pay no interest on overwithholding.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to add that as a practical matter it would appear to this humble person that the overwithholding is a saving that would occur under this unless we continue the surtax.

Mr. JACOBS. A savings account, however, that would pay no interest.

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

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

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to clarify the statement by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES), and indicate this would be a benefit to the taxpayer, because the taxpayer in the event the surcharge is not voted into effect would receive either a refund or a credit, so the credit would become very important, because in the next period, instead of paying the higher rate, he would be paying the lower rate and receiving a deduction for the amount he had already paid.

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

Mr. COLMER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois if he will now agree to use the time I promised to him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about all the confusion that is going to be created in withholding and not withholding and about all the computers which would have to be restructured.

I wish somebody would tell me what right anyone has in this country to assume that the Congress will continuously rubberstamp the surtax. This surtax dies Monday night, and I would have assumed all parties concerned would have

prepared their machines and computers to end the tax on Monday night in the absence of any affirmative action by the Congress. Will somebody tell me what right anyone had to assume this surtax would be continued?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone is assuming that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Then there will be chaos. All these people are supposedly programming for the deduction after July 1, when there is nothing in the record to indicate this House is going to continue the surtax after July 1.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am telling the gentleman we will have confusion because the employers will have to set up their payrolls differently from the way the payrolls are presently computed, because currently the surtax is in being and currently, therefore, the withholding tables take into account the surtax.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, if I may say something further.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something further.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, after the first of July, if the surtax is not extended, then the employers have to revert back to the payroll and the withholding tables that were in effect last year prior to the enactment of this tax. That will be the law under which they will have to operate.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And for a whole year they knew this law would expire Monday night. Let us stop kidding this Congress and the American people.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi yielded to me.

Mr. COLMER. I yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that is what I thought.

The confusion that will exist for the employers and employees, let me say to the gentleman, is that they will move back under the old withholding schedule in the checks, which will be issued after July 1 unless we do this. Then should Congress enact the surtax, the employers will have to go back again to another table and another withholding schedule. Then in January, if we continue the tax at the lower rate of 5 percent, we will have other withholding tables.

Why have this constant confusion of changing from week to week or month to month? We should give the employers and employees 30 days, so we may determine whether or not the surtax will or will not be continued and on what basis the withholding will be done.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take another moment to comment upon the observation made by my friend from Iowa (Mr. Gross) with reference to his general objection to this type of legislating. I agree heartily with him that

this practice of the other body in taking some minor House-passed bill and adding nongermane amendments is highly objectionable. As the gentleman may be aware, I have been protesting this procedure for years. In fact, I have a resolution pending that would simply provide that where the Senate placed an amendment upon a House-passed bill that was not germane under the House rules that the same would be subject to a point of order when the bill was returned to the House. Although I have urged this for several years, I have not succeeded in getting it reported because of the objection of the House leadership. I am now attempting to have it written into the reorganization bill which is in process of study in my own Rules Committee. I hope that I may be successful.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. First I should like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi for a very fine explanation of the problem before the Congress.

Also, I can say there is nothing unique about this. Time and time again, in the case of the excise taxes, for example, we have continued collecting the excise taxes although Congress had not acted. But in the case of a withholding situation we have to act on it.

I could give the gentleman from Illinois, if he is interested, case after case after case in the enactment of legislation where this happens.

I commend the gentleman. Now permit me to take just a few additional minutes to explain precisely the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment added to the House-passed bill extends the surcharge withholding rates for the 1-month period from June 30, 1969, to July 31, 1969. This is withholding at a rate approximately 10 percent above that which would otherwise be applicable. This does not represent a change in any taxpayer's tax liability for 1969 but instead is intended to make it possible to postpone until July 31, 1969, any decision with respect to the administration's proposal to extend the surcharge. Should Congress not extend the surcharge, this will increase refunds or decrease tax payments otherwise due at the time of the filing of tax returns for 1969. This change should increase receipts with respect to the quarter immediately ahead by \$600 million. It is merely a continuation of the present situation so that there will be time to consider this matter without upsetting the present withholding.

As you know, the administration has requested that a 10-percent surcharge be applied for the entire calendar year 1969 and that withholding rates reflecting the 10-percent surcharge be made applicable for the last half of the calendar year 1969. The request of the administration also, in effect, included the continuation of the surcharge at a 5-percent rate for the first half of 1970—or, more accurately, at a 2½-percent rate for the entire year. Other recommendations included in the administration proposals would repeal the 7-percent invest-

ment credit and would continue the excise taxes on automobiles and communications services, the present rates of 7 percent and 10 percent, respectively, for 1 more year—along with the postponement for 1 more year of the latter scheduled reductions. Nothing in this amendment relates to anything other than the surcharge.

As you know, on June 30, 1969, the surcharge withholding rate on individual income taxes terminates. The surcharge adds approximately 10 percent to withholding rates otherwise applicable. In view of the fact that the House will not be able to consider the administration proposals until Monday, June 30, this amendment provides additional time to consider these proposals without being confronted with the immediate termination of the surcharge withholding rates as of June 30.

Not only is more time needed for Congress to consider the administration proposals, but also in the absence of any action at this time employers might be faced with the difficult problem of changing over from one set of withholding rates as of July 1 and then, should Congress subsequently decide to accept part or all of the administration proposals, be faced with the necessity of shifting back to higher withholding tables if such action is completed by the Congress. This represents a considerable administrative burden for employers and also presents employees with changing take-home paychecks to which they would not be accustomed. It might also present the employees with the problem of underwithholding—that is, owing tax—at the end of the year should the full 10-percent surcharge be continued by the Congress for the remainder of the year.

It was for the reasons I have outlined above that the Senate concluded it was desirable to extend the surcharge withholding until July 31, 1969. This will give Congress time to adequately consider the administration proposals and will give assurance that employers will not be faced with two changes in withholding tables in a relatively short period of time.

It should be clearly understood, however, that this action does not prejudice congressional consideration of the issue of the surcharge since this does not represent a change in tax liability but only a change in the amount withheld. Therefore, should Congress subsequently decide not to enact any extension of the surcharge for the remainder of the calendar year 1969, this change in withholding would not affect any taxpayer's tax liability for the year. Instead, it would either increase the size of the income tax refund for which he had been eligible after the beginning of next year or, alternatively, would decrease tax payments he would be required to make at the time of filing his tax return for the calendar year 1969.

It is estimated that the extension of the surcharge withholding rates until July 31, 1969, will increase receipts coming into the Treasury during 1969 by \$600 million. Whether this represents an increase in receipts for the entire fiscal year or merely represents refunds—or decreased tax payments—with respect to

the latter half of the fiscal year 1970 will depend on whether or not subsequent action is taken by the Congress with respect to the administration's proposal to extend the surcharge.

The Senate amendment changes three dates in present law. First, it amends section 3402(a) (1) to provide that the percentage withholding tables which are applicable before the surcharge, and which under present law again become applicable after June 30, 1969, instead are to be applicable after July 31, 1969. These withholding rates are approximately 10 percent lower than the withholding rates applicable during the period when the surcharge applies.

The second change made by the Senate amendment amends section 3402(a) (2) relating to the percentage withholding tables applicable during the period when the surcharge applies. Under present law, the use of these tables terminates as of July 1, 1969. Under the Senate amendment, these tables continue in effect until August 1, 1969.

As an alternative to the percentage withholding tables, wage bracket withholding tables may, under present law, be used by the employer to determine the appropriate amount of withholding.

The third change made by the Senate amendment relates to section 3402(c) (6) which presently suspends the use of the regular wage bracket withholding tables for the period of the surcharge. Under present law, the use of the regular wage bracket withholding tables is suspended until July 1, 1969. The committee amendment suspends the use of the regular wage bracket withholding tables until August 1, 1969. In the interval, special wage bracket withholding tables apply, which in general provide rates that are 10 percent higher than the rates under the regular wage bracket withholding tables.

The changes made by the committee amendment apply with respect to wages paid after June 30, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by placing in the RECORD at this point an article from the *Wall Street Journal* indicating the concern which employers have over this matter:

CAPITOL HILL SLOWNESS ON SURTAX RENEWAL COMPLICATES JOBS OF PAYROLL EXECUTIVES

While Congressional leaders pondered in Washington whether the income surtax should be extended, payroll officials across the nation bemoaned that the slow deliberations were complicating their jobs.

The executives don't know if they should continue withholding the 10% surcharge on paychecks to be distributed after Monday, when the levy is scheduled to expire.

Congressional leaders are attempting to give them guidance; they hope to complete passage tomorrow of a measure extending the withholding rates a month.

"We just want some type of indications so we'll know what to do," pleaded a spokesman of Fibreboard Corp. in San Francisco.

Some companies were allowing for any eventuality. General Electric Co., for one, said in New York that it has prepared two sets of computer tapes for its payroll due July 3. One of the tapes continues the deduction; the other drops it.

Few companies, however, have the computer expertise of GE, itself a computer maker, so they've been forced to choose one alternative or the other.

General Dynamics Corp., for instance, is convinced Congress will extend the levy, at least temporarily. As a result, it said in New York it hasn't made any plans to alter its withholding procedures.

A pharmaceutical company in the Midwest said it, too, intends to continue collecting the withholding tax. It has notified its payroll centers to continue the existing tax schedule "until further notice."

But this company, less convinced than General Dynamics that the tax will be extended, concedes it may be treading on thin legal ground if it continues to withhold the surcharge without specific Congressional direction.

"In a technical sense, we ought to go around to all our people and say, 'Hey, can we have your permission to do that?' But I don't see us doing that," declared a spokesman for the drug producer. The solution, he said, is more "practical" than legal.

Another company examined the legal issue and concluded it had to stop withholding the surcharge the minute it ran out. "Barring passage of legislation," said an official at Reliance Electric Co., Cleveland, "we don't think we have any legal right to continue withholding at the higher level."

Holly Sugar Corp., Colorado Springs, took a similar position. "I don't see how we can legally withhold more than the law allows," a spokesman declared.

At another company, the timing of the levy's expiration is the subject of a lively debate. Lawyers for CPC International Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., are trying to decide whether the tax expiration applies to when the wages were earned or when the paychecks were signed. At CPC, hourly workers will be paid July 3, after the scheduled expiration, for work performed in the week ended tomorrow, when the tax was still on the books.

Some executives insisted they could handle any necessary tax changes with ease, no matter what Congress ultimately decides on the surcharge extension.

TRW Inc., for example, said in Cleveland that one of its major divisions could adjust its payroll accounting by "merely plugging in a new withholding table." Another division of the same company, however, would have to reprogram its computer to reflect new tax rates, a spokesman said.

Such reprogramming could be time consuming and expensive. One company estimated it would take 40 hours of skilled manpower. Another said that a programming switch could take "at least a month," all of which could prove wasted effort if Congress allows the tax to expire and then reinstates it at some later date.

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

In all honesty, Mr. Speaker, I believe we are all prepared to vote now. I believe we all know exactly what this resolution will do.

The gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, has explained it in great detail.

By way of reiteration, however, we are voting on one resolution, and that is House Resolution 455. When that is voted up or down, that will be the answer.

The gentleman from Iowa says it could be defeated by a vote on the previous question. That is true, of course, but that procedure is used when there is a different rule someone desires to substitute in place of the resolution reported by the Rules Committee, and then the additional hour would be allowed for that debate. As I understand it, there is nothing different to be suggested on this. It is

either to extend the withholding rates for the month of July or not, to vote it up or to vote it down. I do not see any necessity for two votes, with one on the previous question, because one vote on the resolution would accomplish the same purpose.

This is a rather unusual procedure, that is true, but it is the only way it could be brought to the floor. We did it twice last year, as I recall. We did it on the omnibus crime bill and on the civil rights bill. We may have extended the time specifically for discussion on one resolution beyond 1 hour, but outside of that it was one vote up or down.

I believe this must be done this way. The Rules Committee is simply cooperating with the Members, to make this possible, so that we will not get into a lot of confusion.

I urge the adoption of the rule and a "yea" vote on House Resolution 455.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it correct to conclude that if this resolution is adopted we really will be setting up at least for 30 days a dual tax system? The workingman, the man who has his surtax withheld, will continue paying a surtax at least for 30 days, but the self-employed man, the person who does not have withholding, will not be affected, because the surtax will expire for that person at midnight Monday. That is true simply because this resolution says, on line 7, page 2, "with respect to wages paid after June 30." In other words, what we are doing now, when we vote for this—those who vote affirmatively—is really to say that the workingman will have the surtax continued at least for 30 days but the self-employed man, the one who does not have wages withheld, does not come under any withholding system, will have the surtax end for him as of midnight Monday night, assuming the Congress does not take any further action.

Mr. SMITH of California. I am not going to get into a discussion of theory. The gentleman from Wisconsin explained this situation. I will put in my nickel's worth.

My understanding is that if this is adopted the withholding tax rates on all wage earners will be extended through July 31, 1969, at the present rates.

We may have to make a change later with reference to the surtax bill, but since that question cannot be finally resolved prior to July 1 this procedure will insure that we do what we can to avoid confusion with respect to withholding of Federal income taxes.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from California stated it so clearly. Determinations will be made when Congress makes its own decision on the extension of the surtax. That would include everybody, including some people who are supposed to be overpaid, like Members of Congress and so on. The term "working man" includes every man who earns a salary and not just a man who has a

specific job to do. Everybody's tax will be withheld when that passes.

Mr. SMITH of California. It might be a good idea, as a matter of fact, for those with outside income to keep withholding the amounts necessary, because next spring they may have to find a little more money, if the surtax is extended next Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, but I do not have any further requests.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the committee yielding to me, and I hope not to take 5 minutes.

I want to join with my distinguished friend and chairman in support of this resolution. Along with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), I agree with him in his explanation of the position. He did an excellent job in explaining it. This is a very simple position. I hope that this resolution will pass by an overwhelming majority vote.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, of course, that this was in line with the desires of many of us in the past few weeks in our attempts to get a little more rationale into the so-called surtax package which the Committee on Ways and Means presented to the Committee on Rules. We felt that, based on the President's own statement, there was no rush and no reason to hurry, as indicated here, which existed in this area. The very action that we are taking today indicates that we do have plenty of time to give consideration to some of the other things which relate to taxes that the American people are concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take just one moment longer to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that it is my understanding on next Monday—and I am going on the assumption that the program will not be changed, because I might say that, without criticism of anyone specifically, the gears have been shifted so regularly, almost every 24 hours, that I am not sure what we will be considering then but it is my understanding at this point at least—the surtax will be up on the floor. I would like to have my colleagues keep in mind the statements that occurred in the last 24 hours regarding the position of the other body. They propose to take up substantial reform measures in connection with this so that if perchance this House should decide to act affirmatively on Monday or on whatever time it may be scheduled, that is, on the surtax bill, I can very easily see that the House will be foreclosed from its opportunity really to write tax reform legislation and we will see the other body usurp that prerogative. I hope over the weekend or sometime between now and the time we vote on this measure that we can give real consideration to this, because if that should occur, then so far as this House is concerned, we will be precluded in the 91st Congress from taking any action or making any attempt to vote specifically on any of the issues that the American people are so gravely concerned about. We will simply not see this matter con-

sidered in Congress. I hope that thought will be kept in mind.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, we had quite a long session in the Committee on Rules the other day on this 1-year surtax extension. I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) who just addressed the House that there is not much we can do today on this 1-month extension of the 10-percent surtax. I intend to support this resolution today, but the big vote on this question of surtax extension comes up on Monday. That will be the important vote. A year ago I opposed the 10-percent 1-year surtax. I listened at that time to the arguments about how it was going to stop inflation, and I see it has not stopped inflation at all; it has helped expand inflation.

I was very much disappointed to find that we are going to have this vote come up on Monday because I thought that the Members were going to have an opportunity to go home next week over the Fourth of July weekend and talk to the people. Had they had that opportunity to go home over the July 4th weekend this surtax legislation next Monday would be defeated and get the death of a rag doll, because the people are aroused against unjust and unequal taxation. The salaried and wage earners are paying approximately two-thirds of our Federal taxes.

I do not know what the Members are going to do next Monday on this matter, but I am going to say that if we pass this surtax measure any real and effective tax loophole and reform legislation is dead for this session of Congress.

Now, we may get some kind of a tax reform bill from the Ways and Means Committee in August or September, but it will be a skim-milk operation. It will not repeal the fraudulent 27½-percent depletion and other oil tax credits and exemptions. It will probably take a small percentage of tax loopholes from big estates, inheritance and foundations, and real estate and conglomerates.

For the last 3 or 4 years every time the Committee on Ways and Means comes in to the Committee on Rules for a rule on tax legislation I have asked the chairman, "How about loopholes and tax reform?" The chairman would always reply that the committee was too busy with other legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why we should be in such a hurry on this thing, we are going to be here all day anyhow.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Permit me to finish my statement, and then I will yield if I have time available.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I discovered that there are no subcommittees whatsoever set up in the Committee on Ways and

Means. It is the only major committee where the chairman of the committee does not appoint subcommittees.

The chairman could have appointed a Subcommittee on Oil last January. The chairman could have appointed a Subcommittee on Foundation Loopholes, also a Subcommittee on Real Estate, Estates, Inheritance, Stock Transactions, and hearings could be held separately by these subcommittees. One subcommittee could have handled each one, and we could have had a real tax reform bill here in April or May and enacted it by now. The Ways and Means Committee is the only major committee that does not have subcommittees.

Why, Mr. Speaker, there are committees that have as many as 13 subcommittees. The Committee on Education and Labor has six subcommittees, the Committee on Appropriations has 13 subcommittees, the Banking and Currency Committee has eight subcommittees, the Committee on the Judiciary has five subcommittees, and the Agriculture Committee has 10 subcommittees.

What is the matter with the Committee on Ways and Means that it cannot have subcommittees, and stop filibustering on this tax loophole legislation? There could be at least \$15 to \$20 billion in taxes brought in by fat cats "loopholers" that are not paying any taxes on their profits. There are 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee. I want to comment on nine or 10 of these members who are in favor of effective tax reform.

The American public is aroused at tax reform delay. If the Members next Monday vote to continue this surtax for a year, without major tax reform legislation, we will eventually get a real tax reform bill, but it will be after a year from next November when the American people vote in a Congress that will give them the necessary tax reform.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by permission granted I hereby include with my remarks the statement made by me on March 26 of this year before the Ways and Means Committee hearings on tax reform legislation:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Chairman and the Members of the Ways and Means Committee for giving me an opportunity to testify on this much-needed Federal tax reform legislation. I also want to commend your committee for calling these long-delayed hearings in order to secure first hand information for the American public on the deplorable conditions which our Federal tax system has reached in recent years. During my 27 years in Congress I have been shocked by the gradual increase in power, year by year, of specially privileged and powerful segments of our economy slowly and cleverly securing favorable legislation until, in some cases, they are totally exempt on Federal taxes from their exorbitant profits.

Our Federal tax laws, as of today, have become riddled with tax concessions, loopholes, tax credits, and depletion exemptions to a favored few who have the finances to employ powerful lobbyists to relieve their client of the responsibility for providing the revenue necessary to finance the enormous cost to keep our land the No. 1 nation in the world.

Former Treasury Secretary Joseph Barr revealed in January that 21 persons with incomes of over \$1 million paid no taxes at all in 1967, while 155 with incomes of over \$200,000 also escaped taxes entirely.

When the wealthy escape taxes, it is the average taxpayer who gets hit for higher taxes to make up the difference. The best example of this is the 10 percent tax surcharge. Faced with the need for more revenues, the Administration came running to the average middle class taxpayer, while doing nothing to make wealthy foundations, oil millionaires, real estate speculators, and highly-paid corporate executives pay their fair share. Those with incomes of \$15,000 a year or less already pay nearly two-thirds of all personal Federal income taxes, and the surcharge simply adds to their burden. But to the wealthy exploiter of loopholes the surcharge is no problem at all—10 percent of nothing is still nothing.

If just a modest number of the fantastic and excessive tax loopholes and exemptions were eliminated there would be no need for an extension of the surcharge. I have introduced H.R. 9195, which if enacted into law would bring in more than \$9 billion in additional revenue by plugging 18 of the more notorious loopholes in our Federal tax system. This happens to be the same amount that an extension of the 10 percent tax surcharge would yield in fiscal 1970. Thirty-one other Congressmen have sponsored identical legislation.

Among the loopholes this bill would close is the depletion allowance for oil and other minerals. Largely because of the oil depletion allowance, the 20 largest oil companies in the country paid only 8½ percent of their net income in taxes in 1966. One large company with profits ranging from \$61,110,000 in 1962 and similar increased amounts of income in 1963, 1964, and 1965 paid no Federal taxes whatsoever.

Standard Oil of New Jersey had an income of \$1,271,903,000 in 1962 but paid only six-tenths of one percent on their fabulous profits. In the following four years their percentage tax on similar profits ranges as follows:

Organization	Year	Net income before tax	Percent tax paid to
			Federal Government
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	1962	\$1,271,903,000	0.6
	1963	1,584,469,000	4.3
	1964	1,628,555,000	1.7
	1965	1,679,675,000	4.9
	1966	1,830,914,000	6.3
Atlantic Oil	1962	61,110,000	0
	1963	56,747,000	0
	1964	61,081,000	0
	1965	105,299,000	0
	1966	127,384,000	—

Some companies do not do as well as the oil companies, however. Perhaps they do not have as powerful a lobby in Washington as "big oil."

The following statistics on three coal companies illustrate the contrast:

Organization	Year	Gross profit	Percent tax paid to
			Federal Government
Consolidation Coal Co.	1964	\$44,863,073	26
	1963	39,568,737	28
	1962	32,918,065	26
Pittston Co.	1964	13,721,024	30
	1963	(1)	—
	1962	14,699,420	35
Island Creek Coal Co.	1964	7,713,060	18
	1963	5,149,930	24
	1962	3,459,563	(1)

¹Lost by SEC.

The oil lobby will of course argue that the 27½ percent depletion allowance is

needed to insure an adequate supply of reserve oil in emergencies, that it is vital to our national defense, that our economy will collapse without it, and that it will cure the common cold. Fortunately the Treasury has just released a thorough-going study of the tax breaks currently enjoyed by the oil industry and their effect on the level of oil reserves. The study, done by the CONSAD Research Corporation of Pittsburgh, challenges these oil industry arguments, concluding that the depletion allowance and special expense deductions enjoyed by the oil companies add only a small amount to the Nation's petroleum reserves. Furthermore, the Report goes on, the depletion allowance encourages excessive drilling and inefficient production methods and discourages research into other potential fuel sources. I don't think this is a very good bargain for the \$2.25 billion worth of loopholes we gave to oil men in 1968. Big oil has been enjoying this financial bonanza for years. Real estate speculators are almost as generously treated at tax time as oil men.

Former Treasury Assistant Secretary Survey, in a speech last year, said, "The Treasury recently examined the 1966 tax returns of 13 real estate operators, all of whom had very substantial gross incomes, and found that depreciation 'losses' reduced the tax liability of nine of them to zero and of two others to less than \$25."

Doing away with the accelerated depreciation gimmick on speculative real estate would head off operators of this sort and bring in an extra \$150 million in tax revenues each year.

Another gaping tax loophole is the 7 percent investment tax credit, enacted in 1962, which permits business firms to subtract from their tax bills 7 percent of the value of eligible new equipment installed during the year. It was intended to stimulate the economy by providing a subsidy to private investment.

However, our economy has been overstimulated and we are now in a period of serious inflation, fed in part by the investment tax credit. The credit concentrates inflationary spending power on precisely that portion of the economy that is already most overheated—the capital goods section in the first place, it creates a second round of inflation by causing business to hasten to invest before inflation drives up capital goods prices even further.

The Commerce Department Survey of business fixed investment plans for 1969, released on March 13, underscores the need for repeal of the investment tax credit. The survey predicted that total 1969 expenditures for new plant and equipment will reach a whopping \$73 billion, a 14 percent increase over 1968. This contrasts with year-to-year increases of only 4 percent in 1968 and 2 percent in 1967.

This survey indicates strongly that it is capital goods inflation that is most serious, yet the Administration still insists on a 10 percent surcharge on the average consumer to combat inflation. If it is inflation they are concerned about, why not get at the real culprit by repealing the 7 percent investment tax credit?

The list of tax loopholes can be extended almost to eternity, as this committee well knows.

Capital gains which pass through an estate at death are not taxed.

The unlimited charitable deduction allows many millionaires to escape taxation entirely. Special tax treatment for stock options allows highly paid corporate executives to get tax advantages not open to the average wage earner.

The tax exemption for municipal industrial development bond interest encourages plant piracy and gives unwarranted subsidies to wealthy corporations, while costing the Treasury millions in lost revenues.

As an example, certain states of the Union who enjoy the exemption privileges of Sec-

tion B of the Taft-Hartley Law are paying sub-standard wages to millions of factory workers in their localities. These sub-standard wage workers are practically out of the buying market in regard to \$3-\$4 thousand dollar automobiles, \$400 refrigerators, etc., etc., and are adding nothing to the employment and prosperity in factory production of our Nation. This, of course, is an exemption over which the Ways and Means Committee has no responsibility. On the other hand, your committee has recommended, and the Congress has enacted, tax exemptions for municipal industrial development bonds, which encourages plant piracy and gives unwarranted subsidies to wealthy corporations and industrial factories to move into these 14B states because thousands of towns and cities in these areas have taken advantage of the tax exempt industrial development bonds with cheap land and cheap wages to capture thousands of industrial factories from states paying a living wage to its workers. Multimillions could be brought into the Federal Treasury by the repeal of the interest on municipal and other local civic bond promotion.

The hobby farm loophole allows wealthy part-time farmers to escape taxes by using fictional farm "losses" to offset income.

I will not take more of the committee's time by extending the list of loopholes, for time is something we don't have very much of because of the need for immediate action in repeal of tax loopholes, exemptions, etc.

The American people are weary of being told that we are all very concerned about tax reform, that we are working very hard on it, and that it is very difficult and complicated and it is going to take a long time. The taxpaying public is running out of patience, and the surcharge is doing little to make them more tolerant.

Therefore, I would urge the committee to act within the next two months on as many major tax reform items as possible. Tax reform should not be postponed until we can put together a neat, tidy, "skimmilk" package that everyone can agree on. We will be here until the year 2000 if that is the goal.

I am not going to take the time of this committee in detailing the fabulous and fraudulent raid on the Federal Treasury by thousands of tax-avoiding estate foundations. A former Secretary of the Treasury stated before a Senate Committee that he could not speculate as to how many foundations are operating and enjoying tax exempt benefits. Some foundations are engaging in free enterprise industry in competition with regular tax paying corporations and non-exempt business and industries. One official in the Treasury Department testified that he would place the number of foundations enjoying tax exemptions at approximately 25,000. Congressman Wright Patman and other Members have gone into the foundation tax bonanza in detail before your committee, and I know your committee and all Members of Congress are familiar with its tax-avoiding ramifications.

Every tax dollar lost through these loopholes must be paid by another source. For the most part, this loss—and it has been estimated to be a whopping \$50 billion—is paid by moderate income groups, by small people with incomes of \$15 thousand and less, who cannot afford to hire high-priced accountants and tax lawyers to locate loopholes.

The House should be given an opportunity to work its will on tax reform at the earliest opportunity. I firmly believe that the heavy obligation of Government would warrant your committee concentrating on major loopholes which involves literally billions of escaped taxes by certain segments of our economy, and report a bill closing the top-bracket tax-escaping loopholes so the Congress can act immediately on the same. The minor loopholes can be taken up by your committee and considered later in the year.

The American public has become familiar in recent years with the necessity of taking the gigantic tax load off the wage-earner and the salaried citizen while mammoth corporations and gigantic mergers of corporations profit from the American public. I do hope your committee will not submit a weak, and ineffective recommendation on the closing of the tax loopholes. As a Member of the Rules Committee, I for one, and I know of others that for the first time in years, will insist on an open rule on this legislation. This will give the other 410 Members of Congress an opportunity to answer the demand of the almost unanimous cry of the American public for tax reform.

It has been suggested by some Members that this legislation could be enacted in the next few months if the major loophole recipients, whose payments on their huge profits is but a pittance, would start paying into the Federal Treasury a blanket minimum Federal tax ranging from 15 percent to 30 percent of their profits. They then would join with the small businessmen and the wage and salaried citizen in supporting our huge domestic and foreign programs and other Federal obligations.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the extension of the Senate amendment to H.R. 4229. The purpose of this Senate amendment is to extend the surcharge withholding rates for the 1-month period from June 30, 1969, through July 31, 1969. Important hearings on deepening the Tampa Harbor necessitate my presence in Tampa.

I plan to be present Monday, June 30, and vigorously oppose H.R. 12290, the extension of the surtax.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the surtax, one of the most important issues facing this Congress. Of concern to all of us are today's inflationary trends, and I am anxious that the President and the Congress take steps necessary to combat inflation. But I also believe that it is vitally important for the Congress to enact some meaningful tax reform; it is urgent that we right the injustices now threatening the integrity of our Nation's tax system. In addition, tax reform too can affect the Nation's deficit and counter inflationary trends through the revenue it raises.

Three administrations have talked about tax reform and yet none has been enacted. This year the Ways and Means Committee has made significant progress toward reform, and there are indications that a reform package will be submitted to this body for a vote in August.

On Monday we are scheduled to vote on a year's extension of the surtax. I believe that it would be a mistake to approve a full extension of the surtax without reforms. With the passage of the surtax, pressure in the Congress for reform will dwindle and once again the people of this country will not get the reform they deserve.

The surtax is our trump card for reform, let us not give it away until we get that reform.

It is clear that a complete reform package cannot be readied by Monday and so I would urge that only a 3-month extension be submitted for a vote with the understanding—clearly stated in the House—that in late August or September a total surtax/reform package will be submitted.

Three months will give the Ways and Means Committee sufficient time to com-

plete its consideration of the reform proposals, opportunity to better evaluate the fiscal needs of our economy, and a chance to submit a combined reform/surtax package.

Today I am supporting the continuation of the surtax withholding schedules for 30 days. On Monday I will be prepared to vote for a 3-month extension of the surtax if it is coupled with a promise of meaningful reform; but I will not vote for H.R. 12290 now scheduled which provides the year's extension. I regret that in this same bill there are three needed measures which I support: the repeal of the 7-percent investment credit, a delay for another year of the reductions in telephone and automobile excise taxes, and the additional allowance to reduce taxes for those people at the poverty level.

The repeal of the investment credit and the poverty allowance are sweeteners intended to soften our opposition. But at this time I believe we must hold out for tax reform—otherwise the opportunity will be lost for perhaps another 10 years.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House of Representatives is scheduled to take up H.R. 12290, the Surtax Extension Act. Before this bill is considered, the House will act on Resolution No. 453 which provides a closed rule allowing no amendments to the bill after 4 hours of general debate.

In view of the fact that many who are opposed to the extension of the surtax will support the closed rule resolution as a matter of procedure, it is not my intention to oppose the closed rule. Nor is it my intention to support the motion to recommit which will be offered by a member of the Republican minority. The language of this motion has not been identified.

In my judgment, the goals of meaningful revenue-producing tax reform would be more readily achieved on a straight vote against the extension of the surtax. The legislation which we passed today authorizes the withholding of the 10-percent surcharge. A "no" vote on the extension of the surtax and the defeat of this proposal will provide the Ways and Means Committee and the House an extended period of time to develop a program of meaningful tax reform.

I am pleased to advise that my distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable RAY MADDEN, and my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable HENRY REUSS, concur in this position.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8644, SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CRUDE CHICORY ROOTS—AID TO FAM- ILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHIL- DREN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8644) to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots, and ask unanimous con-

sent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 26, 1969.)

MR. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I shall try briefly to explain the conference report.

I will start by saying the conference report is unanimous. It was signed by all of the conferees on the part of the House on both sides of the aisle and all of the conferees from the other body from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the other body made no change in the text of the original House bill, but it did add two social security amendments, which are involved in the conference report.

These two amendments to the original bill are not complex and can be easily explained.

One amendment provides for the extension of a provision which we wrote into law some years ago—June 30, 1961, to be precise—in an attempt to help indigent American citizens who, through no fault of their own, were forced to return to the United States because of war, illness, destitution, and so forth. The best example of that happens to be Cuba where about 70 people a month, mostly old people, come back to our country and Mr. Castro has well taken care of whatever worldly goods they had. That provision of law has been continued on a temporary basis since its original enactment. This conference agreement provides for the continuation of that program so that when such persons land at a dock somewhere in the United States, the Government of our country takes care of them until they are able to take care of themselves. Then they repay this obligation to the Government. That is the first amendment. We continue that program for 2 years.

The second amendment has to do with the so-called freeze on Federal matching with respect to the number of children who are eligible for assistance under aid to dependent children programs. The Senate repealed the provision on this subject, which was included in the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

The House conferees concurred and agreed in the Senate amendments. They did so unanimously because the Governors of every State, I think, whether they be Democrats or Republicans, were terribly concerned about this provision and the administration was terribly concerned about it. We received a letter from Secretary Finch just a week or so ago strongly supporting the repeal of this provision. The provision was originally enacted in an effort to stimulate activities and obtain results under the work incentive program which was also contained in the 1967 amendments. It has not accomplished that purpose.

It was the feeling of the conferees that the way to dispose of this matter was to repeal the freeze provision. That is what the amendment does.

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

MR. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

MR. GROSS. What is the cost of this supplemental bill? Or are we dealing with the supplemental?

MR. BOGGS. No, not at all.

MR. GROSS. Then we are dealing only with the aid to dependent children?

MR. BOGGS. That is correct; we are repealing the so-called AFDC freeze.

MR. GROSS. That is the issue that was raised by the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON)?

MR. BOGGS. This issue has been made by many Members of the House including the gentleman from California. As a matter of fact in the last week or so every time I walked down the aisle here somebody asked me about it, and on your side of the aisle as well. I admit the gentleman from California was very forceful in bringing the issue up several days ago and he has been very, very anxious for this result to come about.

But this result could not have come about if it had not been for the complete cooperation of Members on your side of the aisle, and particularly the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES), who was very helpful.

MR. GROSS. Yes, I do know that there is forceful interest in this, since it is coming up under such short notice and in advance, not after the issue of whether or not to continue the surtax on Monday. It is real interesting that this "AFDC unfreezing" is coming up so suddenly and at what appears to be a propitious time in connection with the drive to pass the surtax.

MR. BOGGS. May I say to the gentleman that we have exactly the same situation here. There is an expiration date of June 30, which happens to be next Monday. So the same problem exists.

MR. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

MR. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and approval that I support the conference committee report before us to eliminate the AFDC freeze.

It is impossible to do justice to all those who contributed to this significant effort. Tens of thousands of concerned citizens called upon their Government to respond to the pressing needs of its children and today's action was the result.

I should, however, like to particularly commend our able and effective majority whip, HALE BOGGS, for his decisive leadership in removing this sword of Damocles from over the heads of the poor and most needy children in America.

It was the united effort of California's able members on the Ways and Means Committee, JAMES CORMAN and JAMES UTT, and the leadership of the dean of the California delegation, CHET HOLIFIELD, speaking in behalf of a united delegation which insured its viewpoint was presented effectively. This victory represents a savings of some \$40 million in the next fiscal year to the State of California.

I should also like to commend Health,

Education, and Welfare Secretary, Robert Finch, for his support of the repeal of the AFDC freeze and John Veneman, the outstanding Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for his leadership in the removal of this unrealistic ceiling.

The AFL-CIO, as well as auto, teamster, longshore, and other independent unions have, over the years, lent valuable support to this effort.

Last, but certainly not least, very special mention and tribute must be paid to Dr. George A. Wiley and the National Welfare Rights Organization, of which he is executive director. They have by their continuous effort alerted the poor of this Nation to their rights under existing laws and to the ominous problems which this freeze would impose. Without their decisive contribution, it is most unlikely that today's action would have been possible.

MR. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

MR. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state to this House that we proposed a freeze on AFDC payments back in 1967, I believe, for a very, very good reason. The fact is that AFDC payments are actually accentuating the very problems they are supposed to solve.

During the last 2 years I have visited neighborhoods where most of the families are receiving aid-to-dependent-children payments. These families have no father present. These children are actually being raised in filth, squalor, and neglect.

Aid-to-dependent-children payments have doubled in the last 4 years mainly because of an increase in illegitimacy. Of course the Governors are concerned about this freeze, because the Governors that you speak of have not faced up to their responsibilities and have simply permitted more and more people to go on the welfare rolls every year, and many of these people are receiving AFDC payments.

In the State of Pennsylvania alone, where employment is at an alltime high and where various companies and industries have trouble employing people, the welfare rolls have increased by 144,000 persons just during the last year. There are many cases where death and injury have occurred to some very young children who are being supported by the aid-to-dependent-children program. Where these children have been left alone at the age of 1, 2, and 3, fires and other things have occurred. And these youngsters have been killed or injured.

In my opinion, since we are going to permit the AFDC payments to escalate each year, we are simply going to make it possible to avoid facing up to the problem that this program is not working. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

MR. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. UTT), a member of the committee.

MR. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment placed on this bill by the Senate. I favored the freeze in the first place, but we did not have sufficient information before us to know what effect it would have. The com-

plaints that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just made are generally in regard to administration. I am sure we are going to have a tightening up of administration nationally as well as in the States.

I talked yesterday with our administrator in California and he said:

I assure you we are going to tighten up on any of the aid to families with dependent children.

I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to vote for this conference report which provides for the repeal of the AFDC freeze that was enacted over my objection in the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

I opposed this provision vehemently in committee when it was being formulated. When the social security bill was up for a vote in the House in August 1967, I voted in favor of it with a great deal of reluctance because it included this provision, but at that time, I cast my vote in favor of the bill because of the many beneficial provisions it contained and in the hope that when the bill came back from the Senate and the conference committee the freeze provision would have been eliminated. When the bill did come back to the floor of the House from the conference, the freeze was still a part of the legislation, and it was primarily for that reason that I cast one of the three votes that were cast in opposition to the conference report in December of 1967.

I support the repeal of the freeze for two reasons. First of all, I think it is unfair to the States to shift the cost of paying a tremendous portion of the AFDC program upon them when the increased cost of those programs results from factors which are largely beyond the control of the States.

Second, I believe that the AFDC freeze could not help but work a hardship upon all of the AFDC recipients of the country. The AFDC freeze provision was aimed primarily at only one segment of the AFDC caseload. By its own terms, it would have operated whenever there was an increase in the proportion of children in any State who are drawing benefits by reason of the fact that they had been abandoned by their fathers. Yet, under the general provisions of the Social Security Act, all of the families, including those in which the fathers were dead, disabled, or unemployed, would have felt the effects of the freeze. The States would have had no choice in this matter since the law provides that the programs be administered uniformly with regard to all recipients.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that if the freeze provision had been allowed to become operative next Tuesday, most States would have been required ultimately to have reduced benefits payments for all recipients and probably on top of that, to increase their eligibility standards thereby making it more difficult for individuals to qualify for assistance under the program.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will very happily vote in favor of the conference report.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

There is no doubt in my mind that the AFDC freeze should be repealed as provided in the conference report. If the freeze provision were allowed to go into operation on July 1, not only would the State and local governments have to assume the burden of paying for 100 percent of the benefits received by individuals on the AFDC rolls in excess of the limitations laid down in the freeze, but also the AFDC recipients on the rolls in most States would have suffered unconscionable hardship. According to the budget for this fiscal year, the freeze provision would have required the States to assume obligations normally the responsibility of the Federal Government in the amount of \$322 million.

Most States would undoubtedly have been forced to lower their benefit payments for all AFDC recipients in an effort to finance their programs within available resources. I would like to emphasize that the effects of the freeze would have been felt by all recipients on the AFDC rolls, regardless of the reason for their being there.

As indicated by the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana who is managing the conference report, it is obvious beyond doubt that the freeze position, in addition to being unjust in principle, has proven to be ineffectual in application. I, therefore, believe that this House is to be commended for recognizing when it has made a mistake and taking the proper steps to undo its mistakes. This is clearly what we are doing today in voting to repeal the AFDC freeze.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am most gratified that the House votes today on the conference report on H.R. 8644 which would repeal the AFDC freeze that otherwise would go into effect on July 1 under existing law.

In my judgment, the freeze proposal was, from the time it was first enacted, a most unwise, unrealistic, and inhumane approach to solving the serious problem of rising welfare costs and inequities existing in our welfare system. In this connection, I would like to have included in the Record an excellent editorial from the June 26 issue of the Newark Evening News commenting on the situation created by the freeze in New Jersey and on a recent court decision upholding it. The editorial concludes:

National inequities on the welfare program still cry for correction in a thorough overhaul which would shift all welfare costs to the federal government.

I most strongly agree with this assessment of the problem and will continue to work for legislation along these lines.

The full text of the editorial follows:

RIGHTING A WRONG

Refusal of a federal court in Newark to upset the freeze on federal participation in the Aid to Dependent Children program leaves this necessary action to Congress, which was responsible for the action in the first place. And with the restriction scheduled to take effect next Tuesday, Congress has little time to respond.

The court is understandably reluctant to interfere with an act of public safety, short of evidence of unequal application, other discrimination or denial of due process. The court held none of these objections applies to Congress' determining that coverage must

be held to a fixed percentage of children in a state, regardless of how fast the number of individual cases grows.

This need not mean closing the door to additional clients or paying them less than others, the court argued, for the state and counties could make up the additional cost—or, bleak alternative in an era of runaway prices, cut back every recipient. And there lies the difficulty, for Gov. Hughes has estimated that even to maintain present levels would cost New Jersey taxpayers an additional \$10.2 million a year.

The Senate voted last week to eliminate the freeze, and sent the measure to conference with the House. The House should concur promptly. National inequities on the welfare program still cry for correction in a thorough overhaul which would shift all welfare costs to the federal government. Congress should be moving in that direction, and not toward foisting more of the burden on the states.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the many sponsors of legislation—H.R. 4576—in this Congress to repeal the existing provisions in the social security law limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children, I most earnestly urge and hope that this House will promptly and overwhelmingly approve the conference report before us, which will accomplish the objective outlined above.

When this so-called freeze or limiting amendment was included in the Social Security Act amendments by our legislative action here back in early 1968, many of us advocated against it and recorded ourselves in opposition, because we very deeply believed, despite the sincerity of its proponents, that the practical effect of such legislative action would prove to be unjust in its projection and uneconomical in its operation. That our doubts and fears about the wholesomeness and efficacy of this legislative proposal were well grounded is indicated by the fact that many of the leading proponents of this particular amendment have, most creditably, upon further research and study, come to agreement with those of us who originally protested against the amendment's merit.

In essence, we believe it is convincingly clear that this freeze proposal, if applied, would inevitably visit extreme hardship and deprivation upon great numbers of innocent and blameless children by forcing mothers into work-training programs, inducing unemployed or low-earning fathers to abandon children, setting up a very doubtfully effective and most uneconomical work-training program, and imposing unjustifiably larger tax burdens—in my own State, some \$5 million—upon the citizens in our various States.

On the economic side, while the work training involved is for low-level jobs, the program is high cost, principally because a mother cannot be required to work or train unless child care facilities are provided. Budget figures show that average per-child day care costs are about equal to the average per-child cash benefit, thereby doubling the welfare outlay for these children on the very long-shot gamble that the new capacity to fill second-rate jobs will, at some indefinite future time, reduce wel-

fare rolls and costs. To most of us, this kind of operation represents a process of reasoning that leaves much to be desired.

As against this mandatory program, wise experience and authoritative evidence indicates that a voluntary program, giving decent jobs and better income, would provide sounder motivation and more lasting improvements than a forced program clouded with compulsion and distrust.

In short, upon the most careful study and examination, the attempt to cure a serious welfare problem by restricting payment benefits to blameless children would appear to be the wrong program for the wrong individuals at the wrong time.

Surely we can and we should, at the earliest moment, in legislative wisdom, provide a better way of helping unfortunate parents and families off the welfare dole, encourage fathers to remain with their families without loss of benefits, while granting them appropriate job training through the shift of child care funds and fostering a proper mother-children relationship that is the basis of wholesome family life. Let us, right now, act to repeal this freeze amendment and speedily move toward the accomplishment of a more equitable and effective child and family assistance program that will be truly in accord with our civilized traditions and beliefs.

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to restate today my strong support for the repeal of the AFDC freeze, a proposal which was embodied in my bill, H.R. 5978, introduced in February of this year.

My regret is that Congress has been so slow in taking definitive action on the repeal. Under law the freeze is to go into effect July 1 of this year, just a few days from now. Understandably, the States have become more and more disturbed by the slowness of our response to this deadline. They stand to lose about \$300 million in Federal matching funds in fiscal year 1970 if the freeze becomes effective.

My own State of New York, with its very large welfare burden, would be particularly hard hit by the freeze. Welfare analysts in my State estimate that we would lose approximately \$80 million a year in Federal funds under the freeze provision. In this period of particularly high and rapidly growing welfare costs, the additional cost to the State would be almost impossible to absorb.

There is, at this time, no justification for retaining the freeze. The rationale behind its initial adoption as part of the 1967 welfare amendments was to act as a spur to the States to initiate rehabilitative programs which would move families off the AFDC rolls and into self-sufficiency. The freeze has not served this purpose. Despite the threat of a cut-off in Federal funds, the work incentive and other programs which the Congress provided in the 1967 amendments have been developed extremely slowly. This has not been the sole fault of the States. The Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and of Labor have also moved slowly in providing the States with guidelines for programs and in the actual establishment of work and train-

ing programs to which the States could refer their welfare recipients. We cannot place a responsibility for action on the States which is not fully theirs.

I also want to note that the administration has recommended repeal of the freeze, and has taken the repeal into consideration in its 1970 budget presentation. Thus, by repeal of the freeze we are not going to place any new or unexpected financial burden on the Federal Treasury. This is an expense which has already been anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress look forward to fundamental changes and improvements in our welfare system. Legislation which I have introduced would establish nationally uniform minimum standards for welfare and would provide for increased Federal matching for welfare programs. Until we have time to undertake more basic legislation, however, we must at least attempt to keep our present system functioning as adequately as possible. We must remove the financial threat to our States and to our welfare recipients which the AFDC freeze embodies. The repeal has been passed by the Senate and approved in conference. I hope we shall overwhelmingly agree to it here today.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conference report on H.R. 8644 eliminates the freeze on aid to families with dependent children payments which was imposed as part of the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend our colleague from California (Mr. BURTON) for the part he played in convincing the conferees of the importance of this action. His intimate knowledge of social security and welfare issues combined with his parliamentary skill were instrumental in making it possible for the conference report to be before us today with a unanimous recommendation on the part of the conferees.

This recommendation recognizes the disastrous effects which the freeze on AFDC funds would have on the lives of those citizens dependent on public assistance and on the financial resources of our large urban States. I vigorously opposed the AFDC freeze when it first came before the House in August of 1967. I pointed out that it would adversely affect the large industrial States like New York, California and Illinois, which are the recipients of migration from the rural South, which, by contrast, would lose nothing in Federal payments through this provision. When the freeze was enacted despite my objections, I joined 17 other House Democrats in urging the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to reject the "antiwelfare" provisions of the bill passed by the House. Among the five antiwelfare provisions specified in that letter was the AFDC freeze.

When the conference report was brought before the House in December of 1967, I reaffirmed my objections to the AFDC freeze and pointed out the disastrous effects it would have on public welfare programs in urban areas. Despite my objections, and those of many other Members, the AFDC freeze was adopted by the Congress, however.

Subsequent to the enactment of this provision of the social security amend-

ments I have introduced legislation to repeal the AFDC freeze in two Congresses—H.R. 14609 in the 90th Congress and H.R. 618 in the 91st Congress. I have additionally cosponsored H.R. 11662 with several Members which would also repeal the freeze on AFDC payments.

As I said in introducing legislation to repeal the AFDC freeze in January of 1968:

In the absence of bold and imaginative efforts to solve the causes of poverty, welfare costs will continue to rise, unless we are willing to see people starve. It is no solution to take out the failures to deal with these problems on impoverished families and dependent children. The percentage freeze on AFDC payments is particularly unwise because it penalizes States which are the net recipients of rural migrants and it punishes children whose sole crime is to have been born of indigent or separated parents.

The effect of the freeze on New York City, as estimated by Mitchell Ginsberg, administrator of the New York City Human Resources Administration, would be between \$30 and \$50 million in possible Federal revenue. This year New York City budgeted \$50 million to cover the loss produced if the AFDC freeze were put into effect. But severe budgetary strains have caused the city to subsequently remove this allocation from the budget.

Hence, if the AFDC freeze is instituted, the only recourse for New York—given its limited financial resources—will be to reduce the level of AFDC payments. At a time when inflation is already severely taxing the meager resources of those dependent on public assistance, a reduction in payments would cause inestimable suffering and hardship to financially deprived families.

Many individuals and organizations have worked diligently to explain the consequences of the AFDC freeze to Congress. In particular, I believe Dr. George A. Wiley and the National Welfare Rights Organization, of which Dr. Riley is executive director, deserve special mention for their efforts to make the poor of this Nation aware of their rights under existing public assistance laws and the implications of the AFDC freeze.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to accept the recommendation of the conference report to repeal the ill-considered freeze on AFDC payments which was enacted in 1967. To retain this provision in the face of the mounting crisis in our cities would constitute an abdication of our responsibility. Congress has to assist our urban areas in their efforts to provide decent standards of public assistance to those citizens caught in the vicious cycle of poverty which engulfs our inner city areas.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 65, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—269

Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	Monagan
Adams	Ford,	Moorhead
Addabbo	William D.	Morse
Albert	Foreman	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Mosher
Anderson, Tenn.	Frey	Moss
Andrews, N. Dak.	Friedel	Murphy, Ill.
Annunzio	Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Arends	Fulton, Tenn.	Myers
Ashley	Galifianakis	Nelsen
Aspinwall	Garmatz	Nix
Ayres	Gaydos	Obey
Barrett	Gilbert	Olsen
Beall, Md.	Goldwater	O'Neill, Mass.
Belcher	Gonzalez	Ottinger
Bell, Calif.	Goodling	Patman
Bennett	Green, Oreg.	Pelly
Bets	Gubser	Perkins
Blaggl	Halpern	Philbin
Biester	Hamilton	Pike
Blackburn	Hammer-schmidt	Pirnie
Blanton	Hanley	Poff
Boggs	Hanna	Pollock
Boland	Hansen, Idaho	Preyer, N.C.
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Bow	Harsha	Pucinski
Braderas	Harvey	Quile
Brasco	Hastings	Quillen
Brock	Hathaway	Reed, Ill.
Brooks	Hechler, W. Va.	Reid, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hogan	Reifel
Brotzman	Holifield	Reuss
Brown, Ohio	Horton	Rhodes
Broyhill, N.C.	Hosmer	Riegle
Buchanan	Howard	Robison
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	Rodino
Burleson, Tex.	Hunt	Rogers, Colo.
Burlison, Mo.	Hutchinson	Rooney, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Jacobs	Rooney, Pa.
Burton, Utah	Jarman	Rosenthal
Bush	Johnson, Calif.	Roth
Button	Johnson, Pa.	Roudebush
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Royal
Cabell	Karath	Ryan
Camp	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Carter	Kazan	St. Onge
Cederberg	Keith	Sandman
Chamberlain	King	Saylor
Chisholm	Kleppe	Schadeberg
Clawson, Del.	Koch	Schneebeli
Clay	Kuykendall	Schwendel
Cleveland	Kyl	Sebelius
Collins	Kyros	Shipley
Conte	Langen	Shriver
Conyers	Lipscomb	Sisk
Corbett	Lloyd	Skubitz
Corman	Long, Md.	Slack
Coughlin	McCarthy	Smith, Calif.
Culver	McClory	Smith, Iowa
Cunningham	McCloskey	Springer
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Stafford
de la Garza	McDade	Staggers
Dellenback	McDonald,	Steed
Dennis	Mich.	Stokes
Dent	McFall	Stratton
Diggs	McKneally	Sullivan
Dingell	Macdonald,	Symington
Donohue	Mass.	Taft
Downing	MacGregor	Talcott
Dulski	Madden	Teague, Calif.
Duncan	Maillard	Thompson, Ga.
Dwyer	Marsh	Thompson, Wis.
Eckhardt	Matsunaga	Tiernan
Edwards, Ala.	May	Udall
Edwards, Calif.	Mayne	Utt
Eilberg	Meeds	Van Deerlin
Erlenborn	Melcher	Vander Jagt
Esch	Michel	Vanik
Eshleman	Mikva	Vigorito
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Waldie
Farbstein	Mills	Wampler
Fascell	Minish	Watts
Feighan	Mink	Weicker
Findley	Minshall	White
Flood	Mize	Whitehurst
Foley	Mollohan	Wilson, Bob

Winn
Wold
Wyatt

Wylie
Yates
Yatron

Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—65

Abbitt	Gross	Poage
Abernethy	Hagan	Price, Tex.
Alexander	Haley	Randall
Andrews, Ala.	Hall	Rarick
Baring	Henderson	Rivers
Bevill	Hull	Roberts
Bray	Ichord	Rogers, Fla.
Brinkley	Jones, N.C.	Ruth
Burke, Fla.	Jones, Tenn.	Satterfield
Caffery	Landgrebe	Scherle
Colmer	Landrum	Scott
Cramer	Mahon	Sikes
Daniel, Va.	Mann	Steiger, Ariz.
Devine	Martin	Stephens
Dowdy	Miller, Ohio	Stubblefield
Fisher	Mizell	Stuckey
Flowers	Natcher	Taylor
Flynt	Nichols	Teague, Tex.
Fountain	O'Konski	Watson
Fuqua	O'Neal, Ga.	Whitten
Gettys	Passman	Williams
Griffin	Pickle	

NOT VOTING—98

Anderson, Ill.	Evans, Tenn.	Nedzi
Ashbrook	Fish	O'Hara
Berry	Fraser	Pepper
Bingham	Gallagher	Pettis
Blatnik	Gibbons	Podell
Brown, Calif.	Gray	Powell
Brown, Mich.	Green, Pa.	Pryor, Ark.
Broyhill, Va.	Griffiths	Purcell
Bryne, Pa.	Grover	Railsback
Cahill	Gude	Ronan
Casey	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Celler	Hays	Ruppe
Chappell	Heckler, Mass.	Scheuer
Clancy	Heilstoski	Snyder
Clark	Hicks	Stanton
Clausen,	Don H.	Steiger, Wis.
Doherty	Kee	Thompson, N.Y.
Cohelan	Kirwan	Tunney
Collier	Lattuca	Ullman
Conable	Lukens	Waggoner
Cowger	Leggett	Watkins
Daddario	Lennon	Whalen
Daniels, N.J.	Long, La.	Whalley
Davis, Wis.	Lowenstein	Wiggins
Dawson	Lujan	Wilson
Delaney	Lukens	Charles H.
Denney	McClure	Wolff
Derwinski	McEwen	Wright
Dickinson	McMillan	Wyder
Dorn	Mathias	Wyman
Edmondson	Meskil	Zion
Edwards, La.	Montgomery	
Evans, Colo.	Morgan	

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

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Waggoner with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Dickerson.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Celler with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Evans of Tennessee with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Zion.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Cohegan with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hechler of West Virginia.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Joelson with Mr. Montgomery.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Kee.

Mr. FISHER and Mr. FUQUA changed their votes, from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 8644 just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I further request unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution (H. Res. 455) previously agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF NOVEMBER 8, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4297) to amend the act of November 8, 1966, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "\$850,000," and insert "\$850,000," and adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "Authority is hereby granted for appropriated money to remain available until expended."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader to advise us as to the program for next week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Speaker, we are listing for Monday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 12290, to temporarily continue the income tax surcharge and certain excise taxes and to repeal investment credit, and for other purposes, under a closed rule with 4 hours of debate waiving points of order; and

H.R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969—the conference report.

There will also be called up by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL) miscellaneous printing resolutions from the Committee on House Administration. In addition to that, Tuesday is Private Calendar day and the Private Calendar will be called. We also hope to adopt the concurrent adjournment resolution sometime on Monday or Tuesday. I note, of course, that the Independence Day recess starts at the close of business Wednesday, July 2, and the House reconvenes on Monday, July 7.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 30

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week, July 2, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, is it possible to go through the first two bills and could they both be called up on Monday? Is it possible?

Mr. ALBERT. It is possible. I doubt that it is probable, I will say to the gentleman, because of the 4-hour debate on the tax bill, but we do hope to finish the legislative business on Tuesday. We have two very important bills next week; if we can finish them by Tuesday, Members can do their office work on Wednesday and be free to leave as soon as the adjournment resolution is adopted.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman. That is what I thought.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AND THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

LIFE IS FUN, FUN, FUN FOR THE YOUNG

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an article from the University of Kentucky Notes for the Veterinary Practitioner, April 1, 1968, which seems particularly timely:

While the FCC is berating television for its cigarette commercials, we wish it would look into another aspect of TV ads aimed not at corrupting the youth, but at demoralizing the adult. In TV commercials, nothing good happens to anyone past the age of discretion. Life seems to end at age 25.

Watch the people in these ads for awhile. Teenagers invariably have great glistening teeth. Adults have dentures and denture breath. Boys switch hair grease and girls are glad. Men don't have hair. If they do, it is full of dandruff. Boys douse themselves with shaving lotion and wait to beat off the women, like traps full of cheese. Older men are happy to find something that drains all eight sinuses.

Young people have fun. Older people have nagging headaches. Young people spend all night wolfing hamburgers at amusement parks or beach parties. Older people go to a nearby movie and have to leave because their stomach is killing them. Girls have yards of blonde hair full of body, and boys nuzzle it. Wives have gray hair and their husbands won't take them dancing.

Men work hard and get ahead, only to have some plumply assistant tell them they have bad breath. The teen-age wife makes a cup of coffee and turns her husband into a sex maniac. The older wife washes, irons, mops floors, and puts up with birds on the sink, and her husband comes home with a miserable headache and takes it out on her. Girls are always washing their hair. Wives are always washing dishes.

Teen-agers wear sneakers and sandals. Adults wear support hose. Teen-agers rub each other with suntan oil. Adults rub each other with liniment. Teen-agers spend a lot of time in boats, sports cars, and swimming pools. Adults spend their time in doctors' offices and listening to tedious insurance peddlers. Adults get hay fever and sneeze. Young people are always at the end of a glorious evening. Adults are always at the end of their rope.

Life is fun, fun, fun for the young. They can laugh even with their mouths full of hair. About the only happy time for an adult is when he has an accident and the insurance company pays off. It isn't fair.

Worse, we have a feeling that it's all too true.

THE CREDIBILITY CHASM: NEW ADMINISTRATION MOVES NEAR THE BRINK

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, when my longtime and respected friend, Herb Klein, took office as President Nixon's communications director, he made himself responsible for keeping open the channels of truthful information to the American public.

As of this morning, Mr. Klein seems faced with his first serious challenge.

Late editions of yesterday's Los Angeles Times quoted HEW Secretary Robert Finch as saying he would resign if denied the appointment of Dr. John H. Knowles as Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.

Later in the day, both the White House press secretary and Secretary Finch himself flatly denied that published report. Their denials are carried widely in this morning's newspapers.

The Times, though, has a different story, one of intrigue and purported behind-the-scenes wheeling and dealing over the proposed nomination of Dr. Knowles.

In fact, there seems to be some suspicion that Dr. Knowles—and the objections to his appointment from some of the mossier elements of the American Medical Association—are being used to trade for votes on the administration's surtax extension bill.

I continue to have full confidence in the Los Angeles Times. The coverage of the Knowles case is the kind of responsible, enterprise reporting we have come to expect from the Times and, in particular, from Tom Foley, the reporter who broke the story of Secretary Finch's threat to resign.

At this point, I will include two articles from this morning's Los Angeles Times dealing with the Knowles situation:

THE KNOWLES CASE: NIXON'S DOMESTIC POLICIES AT STAKE

(By Robert J. Donovan)

WASHINGTON.—Robert H. Finch's agony over the Knowles case raised serious questions Thursday not only about the influence and political future of the secretary of health, education and welfare but over the direction of the Administration's domestic policy.

The essential question is whether Finch's victory or defeat in this case, which will be decided today or Saturday, will foreshadow a progressive or conservative course in civil rights, welfare and other major fields.

The immediate issue is whether Dr. John H. Knowles, a liberal favored by Finch but opposed by the American Medical Assn. and its conservative allies in Congress, is to be nominated by President Nixon as Finch's chief assistant in the health field.

The President and his associates, who pride themselves on administrative efficiency, have made a monstrosity out of the handling of this matter. Washington has not seen a worse mishmash of its kind in years.

DIFFICULTY IN DECIDING

At the very least—and not for the first time either—it has portrayed the Nixon Administration as having great difficulty making up its mind on a tough issue.

Beyond that, however, the showdown, in which the President took a direct hand Thursday, harbors deeper implications. Since Finch has become preeminently the symbol of the moderate, progressive elements in the Administration, for example, would his defeat signify that the conservatives in the White House and in Congress have got the upper hand with the President?

Already an outcry has been raised by liberals—and even some conservatives—against the Administration's first civil rights program—a proposal outlined to Congress Thursday by Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell. It would replace the soon-to-expire 1965 Voting Rights Act, which Negroes regard as an important symbol, with a new law to ban literacy tests for voting everywhere in the country.

Furthermore the Administration appears to be on the brink of a new policy giving some racially segregated school districts in the South more time to desegregate.

All of this, let alone the possibility of a conservative being chosen instead of Dr. Knowles as assistant secretary for health and scientific matters in HEW, adds up to welcome news for Southern conservatives. This is the case despite the fact that the Administration will argue strongly that its voting bill and school guidelines are not regressive but are designed to meet changing conditions.

FOLLOWING SOUTHERN STRATEGY?

Still, especially now that the Knowles case is in the headlines from coast to coast, the question is being asked here whether the President may not be following a so-called Southern strategy.

There was speculation on Capitol Hill Thursday, for example, that Mr. Nixon might be trying to talk Finch out of the Knowles nomination in exchange for Republican and conservative Southern votes in the tight fight over extension of the 10% income tax surcharge.

Whatever strategy finally emerges, the President has put Finch through an ordeal on the Knowles case.

As far back as January Finch tapped the Massachusetts physician to be chief operating officer for extensive medical programs, including Medicare and Medicaid.

Congressional allies of the AMA swung into opposition to Knowles behind the leadership of Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.), Senate minority leader.

After five months of tugging and hauling, Finch seemed to have won his fight. At his televised press conference last week the President said he would support whomever Finch recommended.

Then on Tuesday, Finch said that "a letter is going to the White House with a recommendation" and Dirksen as much as conceded defeat.

Evidently, however, enormous hidden pressure continued to be applied to Mr. Nixon presumably by senators and representatives who received campaign contributions from the AMA. The medical association is one of the largest contributors to House and Senate candidates.

In any case, just when Mr. Nixon was expected to nominate Knowles, word leaked from Capitol Hill Wednesday night that he had changed his mind.

On Thursday instead of sending up the nomination the President sat down with Finch and discussed several possible candidates for the post, of whom Knowles was only one. This was either some kind of unfathomable window-dressing or else a severe setback to Knowles' chances and, if this is the way it works out, to Finch's influence and prestige.

Finch, who resigned as lieutenant governor of California last January to come to Wash-

ington, knew he was taking a big gamble with his political future by heading HEW when he could have had any one of several other important posts.

He was aware that HEW would be the cockpit of bitter fights over civil rights, school desegregation, medical care and welfare.

Finch is politically ambitious. While he knew that HEW might prove a political graveyard for him he calculated that he could win his fights, or enough of them anyway, and emerge with an even greater reputation than he had when he entered.

From the outset he became, in many eyes, the star of the Administration, its most publicized and glamorous figure.

Now, however, he has run up against the buzz-saw of conservative Republican power in this city, and the outcome of his gamble is at stake.

The changing of the school desegregation guidelines, which is expected to be proposed either today or early next week, will not enhance his reputation among the liberals, in all probability. If in addition he should feel forced to surrender on Knowles, his standing here would be diminished politically. It would suggest among other things that his influence with the President is somewhat less than has been pictured.

Indeed the Knowles case seems to have become a symbol of its own—a symbol of the conservatives' influence with the President. This may be why Mr. Nixon has found it necessary to put the star of his Administration and a loyal friend of long standing through an ordeal that is not just uncomfortable but may be politically damaging to Finch in the end.

FINCH BATTLE WITH PRESIDENT ON KNOWLES CASE NEARING CLIMAX

WASHINGTON.—A tug of war between President Nixon and his longtime political ally, Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch, over the appointment of an assistant secretary for health neared a climax Thursday after a 45-minute Nixon-Finch White House conference.

Only one thing seemed clear, however, at the end of a day of confusing and often conflicting statements: Finch's choice of Dr. John H. Knowles of Boston for the job was as much in doubt as it has been anytime in the five-month history of the controversy.

White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler said no final decision had been reached but indicated the nomination of someone would be announced today or Saturday.

Late Thursday, Finch authorized his press office to say the Health, Education and Welfare Department would issue a statement today on the matter. A spokesman did not say what the statement would be about—except that it would not reveal who would get the appointment.

The only hint of the outcome came from Sen. Charles F. Goodell (R-N.Y.), a Knowles supporter, who told newsmen in mid-afternoon Thursday that he was confident Finch would recommend Knowles and that the announcement would be made today. Goodell's prediction was made after he talked with top HEW officials but before Finch returned to his department after the White House conference.

At a White House briefing for newsmen Ziegler denied that Finch had threatened to resign if the President did not support his recommendation of Knowles, 43-year-old head of Boston's Massachusetts General Hospital, for the HEW post. The Times quoted Finch Thursday as saying the President would "have to find another secretary" if he did not name Knowles and The Times stands on the accuracy of its report.

Finch chose Knowles for the job last Jan. 15. Knowles immediately ran into heavy but largely behind-the-scenes fire from the American Medical Assn. and Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.).

The basis of the AMA objections to Knowles appear to be varied. The only public statement was made April 23 by the AMA President Dr. Dwight L. Wilbur, who said the association favored the appointment of someone who would represent "the broadest scope of medicine and would not be too closely oriented to any one segment of medicine or the health field."

Knowles, a physician, has been primarily a hospital administrator and it was his well-recognized success in this regard at the huge Boston medical complex that first attracted him to Finch.

The AMA opposition is also believed to stem from other factors. Knowles has been an outspoken advocate of prepaid medical insurance for all Americans, an issue that has been anathema to the AMA for decades.

WANTS VOICE

Furthermore the association is said to have felt that in return for its substantial support for Republican office holders, particularly in the House, it should have a voice in the selection of the assistant HEW secretary who would be running the increasingly important federal health programs.

During the months of struggle, while the AMA's fight was being led by Dirksen, White House officials refused to acknowledge that Finch had reached a final decision in favor of Knowles—and Finch continued to insist he had not changed his mind.

There was little question that the Senate would confirm Knowles if the President submitted the nomination. Knowles has had the open and enthusiastic backing of Senate Majority Whip Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.).

However, Finch was said to be concerned that proposing Knowles in the face of Dirksen's opposition might endanger other HEW programs. He also wanted to avoid an open party scrap.

FINCH RESPONSIBILITY

At his news conference last week Mr. Nixon was asked whether he supported his HEW secretary, Finch, or his Senate leader Dirksen. He replied that Finch has the responsibility for selecting his assistant secretaries and that "when he makes a recommendation . . . I will support that recommendation." Furthermore he said Finch would make the recommendation this week.

Finch visited Dirksen briefly Tuesday at the Capitol on another matter and told newsmen later that he had written a letter to the White House with his recommendation, although saying he was not sure the letter "has actually left my office yet."

Through it all there was never any question that Knowles was Finch's man. Thus Finch expressed surprise when he was informed by Times reporter Thomas J. Foley early Thursday morning that Mr. Nixon was being quoted by senators and congressmen as saying Knowles was out.

KNEW NOTHING

Finch, who had been in New York during the day, said he knew nothing of any change and that neither the President nor any other White House official had called him about it. Finch said he would like to make some phone calls and would call the reporter back.

He did so and told Foley he had not been able either to confirm or deny that the President had decided not to back Knowles. But he said he had no reason to believe the post would go to anyone other than Knowles.

During the telephone conversation Finch was asked what a repudiation now—after Mr. Nixon's televised news conference support would mean to him.

"Well, he'd have to find another secretary," Finch replied.

SON LISTENING

After the telephone conversation, Foley discovered that his 19-year-old son, who had become intrigued by the story his father was reporting, had been listening to the conver-

sation on an extension in another part of the house.

Finch went to the White House early Thursday morning for a series of meetings but first authorized the HEW press office to issue a statement saying a number of names had been discussed with the White House and that Finch "has indicated his preference for assistant secretary for health and scientific affairs. The selection is now up to the White House."

A few minutes later, however, Ziegler told newsmen several times at his regular morning briefing that "no final recommendation had been made. Asked if the White House had received the Finch letter, Ziegler said there had been no formal recommendation.

A 45-MINUTE TALK

At his afternoon briefing Ziegler told newsmen the President and Finch had talked for about 45 minutes and that "several names were discussed" but that no final decision had been made. He said he was confident it would be made before the end of the week.

Ziegler was asked about the HEW statement that a letter with Finch's recommendation had gone to the White House. Ziegler replied, "This matter is not being handled in a letter manner." He said it was being handled in conference between the President and Finch.

"VERY ACCURATE"

Next Ziegler was asked about a report circulating on Capitol Hill that the nomination was being withheld pending a vote in the House on the President's request for an extension of the 10% surtax. Ziegler said he had no knowledge of any such request by lawmakers.

Asked about Foley's story on the threatened resignation, Ziegler said, "I can categorically and absolutely deny" that this is Finch's position.

When informed that Foley's son had heard the conversation, Ziegler replied, "Tom Foley of the Los Angeles Times is a very fine reporter, a very accurate reporter . . . What I'm reporting here is what I was told."

At the HEW department Finch issued a statement that "I have no intention of leaving the Administration. I regard my post as HEW secretary as a four-year commitment."

In Boston a spokesman for Knowles said the doctor would have nothing to say about the issue. Knowles has maintained a discreet public silence about the controversy swirling around him. However, he is known to be anxious to take the job and accepted the offer from Finch as soon as it was made last January.

TREATED "SHABBILY"

One congressional source close to the fight said he was concerned that Knowles "has been treated so extraordinarily shabbily" by the opposition to his appointment.

The biggest unanswered question Thursday was why the President changed his mind, if indeed he has, about supporting Finch's choice.

Some sought to tie it to the surtax fight, speculating that a certain number of additional conservative Republican votes would be obtained for the unpopular tax measure in return for dropping the Knowles appointment. However, several House Republican leaders denied any such motive.

HERE IS ONE WAY TO REDUCE POSTAL DEFICIT

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am here inserting for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from a newspaper published in my district.

It concerns the practice of Federal departments and agencies sending out one- and two-page news releases in big 8½ by 11 envelopes.

I commend the editor for publicizing this practice. I am confident that there are many, many other wasteful uses of the mail being made by Federal departments and agencies.

In an effort to start some action in this area, I am writing each Cabinet member and the heads of all major independent agencies to ask that each appoint a responsible official in their department or agency to look into their use of the mail and make recommendations as to more efficient use. I am asking that they report to me what actions they take in response to this request.

I invite all of my colleagues to join me in this effort to insist that before we increase postal rates or make other demands upon the public regarding the postal service, we insist that the Federal Government put its own house in order.

The editorial, taken from the Goldsboro, N.C., News-Argus of June 24, 1969, is as follows:

BY DURN, MAYBE WE CAN DO SOMETHING

We Americans have a built-in cushion of apathy that keeps us from going completely ape over the incomprehensibly big problems we can't do anything about—like the national debt.

But every now and then one of the little things can really get our dander up and it makes our whole day when, with a stroke of inspiration, we realize we CAN do something about it.

For months we have a couple of times a week had our day marred by getting in the mail a "news release" from some government agency.

The release would be a single page, or perhaps two pages. But it invariably would come in a whopping 12½ by 10 inch manila envelope—and of course at government expense.

The U.S. Department of Commerce and the Internal Revenue Service are habitual in this.

Not only does the big envelope cost 10 times what a regular size envelope costs, but because of its additional weight, it falls into a 12 cents rather than six cents postage rate.

Now it seems to us that an economy-minded Congress or department heads should have lowered the boom on such obvious and easily eliminated waste long before now.

But since they haven't, through inspiration born of frustration, we have come up with a plan of persuasion:

Let's all of us in the newspaper, radio and TV field who receive these "news releases" make a deal with the government agencies. If they will send their releases in regular size envelopes whenever possible, we'll consider them. But if they send them in the whopping 12½ by 10 inch jobs, we'll file 13 them without even looking.

There are almost 10,000 newspapers in this country. Based on one weekly news release each from the IRS and the Department of Commerce to newspapers alone, the potential savings in postal costs would exceed \$150,000 annually.

NEED FOR DAY CARE FACILITIES

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 12 I introduced the Day Care Center Facilities Act, a bill which would authorize \$55 million a year during the next 4 years to renovate and construct child-care facilities.

The need for additional facilities is of such growing magnitude that there is no question but that a federally supported national program will have to be initiated within the next few years. It is important, however, that the Congress act now before the situation becomes any more urgent.

To indicate one part of the problem in very concrete terms, I include here a column from the March 31 issue of the Washington Post:

DAY-CARE SHORTAGE HURTS JOB TRAINING

(By William Raspberry)

Don't talk to Maurice Knighton about welfare recipients not wanting to work. He knows better.

But if you want to talk about how society seems to be doing all it can to see to it that welfare recipients remain on the dole, that's something else again.

Knighton is president of the Sequential Computer Corp. at 6507 Chillum pl. nw. His firm is training 120 former welfare mothers as data transcribers under two Manpower Act programs.

The training program is a success, according to Knighton, the Labor Department and the women themselves.

But a number of women have had to leave the program because they can't find day-care facilities for their children.

"It's really a very serious problem for us," Knighton said. "I'd say that at least 85 per cent of these women are the sole support of anywhere from one to four children, mostly from newborn infants to 5 or 6 years old.

"There just isn't any adequate day-care service available to them, so they end up leaving the children with older relatives or in some cases virtually unattended.

"The result is accidents, lost time when the babysitters don't show up, full days lost sometimes when the children have to go to the clinics. Some of our women have actually moved so they could be close enough to a day-care center to get on the waiting list."

In an attempt to see what could be done about the problem, Knighton assigned his assistant, Michael Zajic (pronounced Zike), to explore the possibilities.

What Zajic found was that most of the legislation directed at training the hardcore unemployed takes note of the need for day care and often provides for payment for day-care services. But it does not provide for creating day-care facilities, and the problem is that there simply aren't nearly enough to go around—only some 3000 slots when more than 100 times that number are needed.

The Welfare Department will reimburse mothers for babysitting services. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has some money available for upgrading established day-care centers. "But no government agency," Zajic said, "seems to have the authority, the ability and the money to establish a day-care center."

As a result, only between 6 and 7 per cent of Knighton's trainees have their children in day-care centers. The rest are being taken care of on a catch-as-catch-can basis.

It is a particular problem, he said, because most of the trainees have had almost no previous work experience and, as a result, no experience at procuring sitter services. The absence of adequate day care is the chief reason for the high turnover rate among the

trainees, Knighton said. About 20 of the first 60 enrollees have left the program.

Knighton thought he had come up with an ideal solution to the problem.

There is in the warehouse district where his officers are located a vacant restaurant that could be converted into a day-care center capable of handling up to 60 children.

In addition, next door to the restaurant is another vacant building that could be used for expanding the center. Knighton has an option on both buildings.

"We contemplated a Class A center that would meet the most stringent requirements for nutrition, health care, education, cultural experiences and the rest," he said. "We had in mind to operate on a nonprofit basis, with the mothers paying as little as \$1 a week per child on a sliding scale based on income. We believe we could do it at 25 per cent less than any other Class A center in town and still provide a full-time registered nurse, trained teachers and one staffer for each five to seven children."

Knighton said he was willing to put \$10,000 of the company's money into the center.

The problem is that he needs at least \$25,000 to renovate the buildings as well as some operating funds. The money, as far as he can tell, simply isn't to be had.

A part of the reason is that much of the pertinent legislation simply assumes the existence of day-care facilities. Another is more philosophical: There is the rather middle-class notion that children under age 3 are better off at home with their mothers.

DR. MARK SHEDD SHOWS CALLOUS DISREGARD FOR NORTHEAST HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA, ITS TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at this moment, as I address this body the schools superintendent of Philadelphia, Dr. Mark Shedd, is showing the film "High School" to members of the Philadelphia Board of Education at the school administration building in Philadelphia.

The film is a controversial representation of education at, in the words of its director-producer, "a typical white middle-class school—Northeast High School in Philadelphia." Northeast High is in my district, the Fourth, of Pennsylvania.

Inexplicably, Dr. Shedd has not objected to out-of-Philadelphia showings of the film in its 6 months of existence. But Dr. Shedd has deliberately excluded the concerned community, including myself, and the faculty and students of Northeast—the "actors" in this film—from this screening.

After comparing accounts of the film in the press with the observations of the teachers and students of Northeast, I must conclude that the film is a gross distortion which does not begin to reflect the school's fine program.

For example, year after year, 70 percent of Northeast's graduates go on to some form of higher education.

Dr. Shedd's failure to lead in the defense of the school in face of criticism in the national press raises serious questions about his ability to preside as administrator of Philadelphia's entire school system.

His failure to take the lead in decrying this film as a gross misrepresentation shows his callous disregard for the school

and its teachers and students, my constituents.

The Philadelphia taxpayers have a right to complain over the school superintendent's failure to obtain rent for the use of the premises over several weeks by the film's producer, Frederick Wiseman, or pursue an interest in the film's profits.

Dr. Shedd should not have allowed the film to be made on the school premises without the consent of the actors—the faculty and students. I advise interested participants in the film to determine their legal rights against Mr. Wiseman as well as Dr. Shedd.

I think the situation in Philadelphia closely parallels recent complaints against movie producers for using Federal facilities at Fort Benning, Ga., to film "The Green Berets" and at Pearl Harbor to film "Tora! Tora! Tora!" in violation of Government regulations.

I suggest to my colleagues that Dr. Shedd's conduct in this matter is such as to raise questions as to his credibility as he appears espousing many projects before our various congressional committees.

VOTING DISCRIMINATION

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States presented a constructive and forthright statement at a meeting of the House Judiciary Subcommittee yesterday on the subject of voting rights.

In addition to calling attention to the benefits which have resulted from enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 the Attorney General recommended extension of his authority so that voting discrimination can be attacked in all of the 50 States.

The precise measures which the Attorney General is recommending have not yet been introduced, and my personal attitude regarding the various proposals which he has made will depend on subsequent testimony and a careful review of the subjects to be covered.

Let me state initially that I have joined with a number of my Republican and Democratic colleagues in urging an extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. However, this should not be interpreted as meaning that I am satisfied that this is a complete answer to voter discrimination. Certainly this approach has relatively no effect on vote frauds, a subject which requires our earnest and prompt attention. Nor does it begin to approach other parts of the comprehensive attack which the Attorney General has proposed.

In his testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee, the Attorney General stated quite clearly that he was proposing amendments to the 1965 Voting Rights Act "designed to clearly strengthen and extend existing coverage in order to protect voting rights in all parts of the Nation."

In pursuit of this objective the Attorney General proposed the following:

First. A nationwide ban on literacy tests until at least January 1, 1974.

Second. A nationwide ban on State residency requirements for Presidential elections.

Third. The Attorney General is to have nationwide authority to dispatch voting examiners and observers.

Fourth. The Attorney General is to have nationwide authority to start voting rights law suits and to ask for a freeze on discriminatory voting laws.

Fifth. The President is to appoint a national voting advisory commission to study voting discriminations and other corrupt practices.

It is both unfair and inaccurate, in my opinion, to suggest that the Attorney General's recommendations are anything less than an attempt to strengthen existing coverage.

The Attorney General pointed out specifically:

There is little statewide disparity between the percentage of eligible Negroes registered in, say, Louisiana—a state covered by the 1965 Act—or Florida which is not covered. . . . There are dozens of counties in Texas where less than half of the eligible electorate voted in 1968 but only 9 in Alabama.

The Attorney General's testimony on these subjects is entitled to the fullest and fairest consideration by the committee.

It is my firm belief that that part of the Attorney General's recommendations for the appointment of a national voting advisory commission to study discrimination and other corrupt practices should be acted upon without delay—either as a part of the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 or as a separate measure, but at the same time.

As one of the sponsors of a simple extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a move in which I have joined with a number of other Republican Members of this House, I have endeavored to express a strong desire to further reduce discrimination in voting on the basis of race or color. In my opinion this position is consistent with the policy of this administration as expressed both in this House and in the White House. I am confident that any differences which may appear between the Attorney General's testimony and the position of the majority of the Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee will be resolved in the weeks ahead consistent with this objective.

I direct the Members' attention to the full testimony of the Attorney General and urge that we give thoughtful consideration to the recommendations which he has made.

DR. ANDREW D. HOLT

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in September 1970, Tennessee will lose the active services of Dr. Andrew D. Holt, when his retirement as president of the University of Tennessee becomes effective.

"Dr. Andy," as he is known to all of us in Tennessee, and to all who have had the privilege of becoming acquainted with this outstanding individual, states that he will be 65 on December 4, and that he feels the university deserves a younger president. There are many of us who will disagree with Dr. Holt on this issue.

But there are few, if any, who will disagree with the goals and objectives he set—and attained—for the University of Tennessee.

During the period of his presidency, from 1959 to the present, the University of Tennessee, both the Knoxville campus, and the medical school at Memphis, have reached major heights in both their academic standing and in their physical facilities. The University of Tennessee Martin Branch has been added; the graduate space school at Tullahoma, near the Arnold Engineering and Development Center, has been created; a branch of the University of Tennessee has been established in Nashville; and effective next year, the University of Chattanooga, formerly a private institution, will become a part of the University of Tennessee complex.

Dr. Holt attained national prominence in 1949 when, as president of the National Education Association, he played a major role in Washington in urging Congress to approve the Federal aid to education bill.

Dr. Holt's wit and humor was well known, and he was in demand, and will continue to be in demand, as a public speaker. An example of his humor is reflected in his retirement announcement which came, without advance notice, after he had reported to the university's board of trustees that UT students had rejected violence as a method of protest and deserve to be involved in processes leading to decisions affecting student life. In his retirement statement, he said:

I conclude this report with an announcement of dubious significance to the University, but of more than casual interest to me. At the end of the coming school year, I shall be retiring as President of the University. My sole motive for retirement is a cantankerous calendar and a birth certificate which stubbornly refuses to deny that on next December 4, I shall be 65 years old, UT deserves a younger President.

A new president will be found for the University of Tennessee, but there will never be a replacement for "Dr. Andy."

Fitting testimonials to Dr. Holt and his career are given in the following editorials carried in the Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville Banner, and in an exceptionally perceptive article by Mr. Joe Hatcher, political columnist for the Nashville Tennessean:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, June 20, 1969]

BEST WISHES, DR. HOLT

A vast majority of Tennessee residents, because of his long years of energetic service to education in general and to the University of Tennessee which he has headed since 1959, has come to know and respect Dr. Andrew D. Holt.

His thousands of friends across the state, and the region, will feel a deep sense of regret in the announcement that Dr. Holt will retire effective Sept. 1, 1970. At the same

time, those closest to the university and the proud record of growth and achievements it has attained under Dr. Holt's leadership will be happy for him.

Andy is retiring for the best of all reasons—"a cantankerous calendar and a birth certificate of disgusting integrity which stubbornly refuses to deny that on next Dec. 4 I shall be 65 years old."

Students, alumni, faculty and friends fully are aware that Dr. Holt has more than earned his announced retirement. They are reminded of this fact every time they look at the UT campus in Knoxville—which has grown into a city unto itself—and other facilities of the university in Chattanooga, Memphis, Nashville, Martin and in other areas of the state.

The assurance from Gov. Buford Ellington that Dr. Holt will play a prominent role in the selection of his successor does not minimize UT's loss. But it is comforting news that the veteran educator will remain to guarantee an orderly and successful transition.

Although Dr. Holt is stepping down officially, those who know him best expect he will never cease in his efforts to boost UT. As the No. 1 Big Orange fan, they fully anticipate he will be around on fall Saturday afternoons to root for the Volunteers. They also cannot envision a session of the legislature without Dr. Holt knocking at the door for more funds to build a bigger and better university.

The Banner joins a grateful citizenry which long will remember his devoted service in hearty congratulations to Dr. Holt. It extends to him its warmed wishes for many happy, fruitful years ahead.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, June 22, 1969]

A MAN TO REMEMBER: ANDY HOLT LED UT TO NEW HEIGHTS
(By Joe Hatcher)

(Note.—Political columnist Joe Hatcher has been a member of the reporting staff of the Nashville Tennessean since 1921. Over the years he has had a close acquaintance with Dr. Andrew Holt, who has announced his retirement as president of the University of Tennessee next year. In this article Hatcher recalls some fond memories of Professor "Andy" Holt.)

Dr. Andrew David Holt, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D., D.Sc., president of the University of Tennessee (1960-70) will go down in Tennessee history as one of the great educators, who built the University of Tennessee from a relatively small state school to the rank of 22nd in the nation.

But to those who knew "Andy" Holt best through all his years, he will rank perhaps first as an educator, but right up near the top as one of the greatest politicians of an era, and certainly one of the greatest lobbyists of the mid-19th Century in the state and to a degree in the nation.

Somehow we never ranked "Andy" as a great academic scholar, nor as the purely academic, ivory-towered type of college president—but as a genius of organization, a genius of getting what he wanted from governors, legislatures, and the public.

His speeches will not go down as great literature, nor his writings as great books nor great educational gems, but his accomplishments will set standards for all who follow him as an educator, politician, college administrator, and lobbyist for education generally, for the teachers and the institution of higher learning he represented.

It was a privilege to have known Andy Holt through many years—to have known him well enough to call him "Andy" as well as formally "Dr. Holt" is his later years.

NATIVE OF MILAN

He was born and raised in Milan, less than 15 miles from the scenes of our own childhood. We did not know him in those

days but we did know many whom he knew in that area of Gibson county, and to have been associated with the same folks with whom Andy grew up.

We knew him first when he was associated with the Tennessee Teachers Association, and when he paired with W. A. (Jiggs) Bass to represent the teachers, and work through those years of the great renaissance for the teaching profession.

Holt was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He worked for his education—firing furnaces, washing dishes, blowing a slide trombone and leading a jazz band on his way to his education at Memphis State Teachers' College, at Emory University in Atlanta, at Peabody College, and later at Columbia in New York for his graduate work.

ELEMENTARY TEACHER

He started as a teacher at Bluff Springs elementary school in Humboldt in his native Gibson county, and served as head of the demonstration school at Memphis State Teachers College. He was for seven years high school visitor and supervisor in West Tennessee, and became executive secretary of the Tennessee Teachers Association in 1937, succeeding W. A. Bass in that post.

Incidentally, he was getting his political foundations also. He had been closely allied to the Browning campaign of 1936 when he became governor, and thereby a natural to step into the TEA post during Browning's first administration.

He led the TEA to major progress under Browning in that first administration, but he was to crown his successes in 1947 when his leadership of the TEA actually brought into being the 2-cent sales tax for the first great forward leap for education. Gov. Jim McCord was generally credited in educational circles with making possible the sales tax, but actually "Andy" Holt was the "father of the sales tax." It was his mastery as a lobbyist that made the passage of the tax possible in the first place, and his lobbying genius in defending the tax through the wave of resentment that followed.

POLITICAL CRISIS

Governor McCord was to be defeated in 1948, and Andy Holt faced one of the greatest of his political crises, riding the fence between his long-time friend Gordon Browning and Governor McCord.

He was constantly on the spot in that campaign. He was quoting here as endorsing Governor McCord, and there as declaring his neutrality, and then again as defending Governor Browning's record for support of the schools.

But he was to ride that tumultuous era in politics out, and attain at the same time his highest recognition nationally. He was elected president of the National Education Association in 1949 with the principal goal of getting through Congress the federal aid to education bill which had been rejected in the previous Congress. But he had President Harry S. Truman on his side in that fight, and he was to win that one too, giving him rank as a national lobbyist.

SKY ROCKET

As President of the NEA he spoke in practically every state in the nation. * * * In his days as president of the university, he attained the heights as the most powerful lobbyist in the state's history. It seemed he had but to ask to bring about the greatest growth in the state's physical plant in history. Only in the last two years has the legislature balked at the Holt magic touch, and he has undoubtedly felt this loss keenly, probably as part of his stepping down process while he is so far ahead.

He has seen the university grow from around 10,000 to more than 20,000 enrollment and 22nd rank in the nation. He has seen the campus at Martin added, the graduate space school at Tullahoma, the consolidation with the University of Chattanooga which becomes

effective with next year, and the expansion of Nashville's branch as a night school.

IN POOR HEALTH

His health has not been the best in recent years. He has had bouts with ulcers in 1963 and again in 1966, but his activities have never lessened. He has never moved into an ivory tower of a college president but has remained available to the students and the public at all times. He is not likely to retire into limbo, but will remain active in an advisory capacity to the university and to schools in general for the years to come.

He ranks as one of the great story tellers of the time, probably the greatest on the political scene since the immortal Robert L. (Bob) Taylor. * * *

He took with him from the state government Dr. Edward J. Boling, who has served as his right hand and his alter ego in the administration of the university. Dr. Boling appears to be in line to take over from President Holt in orderly succession next year. Certainly he will have the Holt support and advice in the years that follow, as he may need them.

SHOWED THE WAY

Dr. Holt's regime has shown the way for bright, progressive administrative leadership in contrast to the cloistered academic figure.

Dr. Holt reaches the age of 65 on Dec. 4, 1969, and might have remained for another five years before compulsory retirement. But he apparently prefers to step down from the peak, and watch the blossoming of his dreams for the university.

Dr. Holt was probably the No. 1 "Big Orange" athletic fan, and the odds are he will be there Saturday afternoons during football seasons for years to come. Likewise, he will likely be available in years to come to speak to many school and civic groups in the inimitable Holt story-telling way. Certainly, the university will be asking his folksy approach to legislators and to the board of trust when problems are tough in the next several years.

There'll not be another "Andy" Holt likely within the next generation, at least. Long live the record of Dr. Andrew David Holt, and the happy memory of "Andy" Holt.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, June 2, 1969]

ANDY HOLT TO BE MISSED, AND DIFFICULT TO REPLACE

Dr. Andrew Holt's announcement that he will retire as president of the University of Tennessee in September, 1970, comes as a surprise and a disappointment.

Although he will be 65 next Dec. 4, Dr. Holt has shown no noticeable decline in health and vigor. It was hoped he would stay on to guide the university a few more years. But his sudden and apparently final decision to retire seems to preclude that possibility.

UT has experienced its greatest growth and expansion of service since Dr. Holt took over as president in 1959. Its physical plant has become one of the most attractive and serviceable in the South. The university's academic program has been broadened and improved under Dr. Holt's administration, and the athletic program has become the envy of universities all across the country.

So far, UT has weathered the wave of campus disturbances with a minimum of disruption. This is not to say there has been no dissent on the campus. There has been. But for the most part, the administrators have been able to achieve a delicate balance between student demands and the anti-intellectual reaction in the legislature and other public bodies:

One of Dr. Holt's most recent accomplishments was the negotiation of an open speaker policy which was approved by the

board of trustees Thursday. The policy, giving recognized student organizations full authority to select speakers of their choice, resulted from several months of earnest discussion among students, administrators, and board members. Without Dr. Holt's well-known tact and diplomacy, it is doubtful if this issue could have been resolved in such an amicable manner.

Some may feel that Dr. Holt is stepping down to avoid the even greater student unrest which is predicted for the future. This would be an unfair criticism of a university president who has absorbed his share of difficulty.

If more disturbances do come, they are likely to come next year while Dr. Holt is still president of UT. This final year of his administration—during which he should be relatively free of political pressure and uneasiness about his job may give Dr. Holt the opportunity to perform some of his most valuable service to the university.

Dr. Holt deserves much credit for bringing the University of Tennessee to its present high level of educational proficiency. He will be missed when he steps down as president.

The UT board will have to choose his successor with great care if the advances in academic achievement and academic freedom are not to suffer.

PATH OF UNITY PAVED BY NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, few Americans do not, to one degree or another, share the guilt implicit in the conclusion of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders:

Our Nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal.

In a quite literal way, the professions have reflected the divisiveness that is a part of our society. The legal profession, of which I am a member, has its separate Negro and white organizations, as do many others including the medical, clerical, and teaching professions.

To their credit, many of these professions have made great strides in recent years in uniting their dual associations. One in particular, deserves the applause of the entire Nation, and I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues today on the eve of their 107th annual convention in Philadelphia. It is the teaching profession, and in particular, the million-member National Education Association.

In 1857, Mr. Speaker—the same year the Supreme Court ruled that Dred Scott is a property—Robert Campbell, a Negro immigrant from Jamaica, became a charter member of the National Education Association.

In 1866, while the Southern States were still smoldering after the horrors of the Civil War, NEA President James Wickersham called for and got an association platform supporting a system of free public education for every boy and girl in America. Booker T. Washington, the great Negro educator, was a featured speaker at NEA conventions in 1884, 1896, and 1904.

Thus, long before the term "civil rights" came to mean, popularly, equality for Negroes and other minority groups,

NEA policy and programs were behind the Negro's cause.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that it was the National Education Association that held the first completely integrated convention in the South. It was the NEA that pioneered in staff appointments without regard to race and was cited for so doing in 1955 by the Urban League of Washington, D.C. The largest professional organization in the world, NEA in 1968 elected the lady who now heads the women's bureau, Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, as its president. Mrs. Koontz, a North Carolinian, is black.

But the teaching profession, perhaps even more acutely than other professions, is scarred by the sores of segregation. It, too, has suffered its separate associations divided by race.

Although the NEA never denied membership to Negroes, 17 border and Southern States did establish dual education and teacher associations along racial lines. Because it never had the direct power to set membership requirements for its largely autonomous affiliated State and local associations, NEA has recognized both Negro and white dual affiliates. But in recent years it has worked painstakingly to eliminate the last vestige of racially organized affiliates. The NEA is fast approaching that goal, with the merger of dual affiliates completed in all but three of the States. Mr. Speaker, I believe that educators, through the NEA, have made the most outstanding record in the Nation among all the professions in eliminating racial lines among members, and I would like to make this record known to my colleagues in the House.

In 1952—2 years before the historic Supreme Court ruling on school desegregation—a joint committee of the NEA and the predominantly Negro American Teachers Association recommended establishment of local and State joint committees in areas having dual associations to grapple with the common problems and to work toward integration of the teachers associations. Most of these potential mergers have come about, usually with NEA assistance.

When the Supreme Court struck down school segregation, the 1954 NEA Representative Assembly adopted a resolution reading, in part, as follows:

The principle embodied in the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States with regard to racial segregation is reflected in long-established provisions of the platform of the National Education Association. The Association recognizes that integration of all groups in our public schools is more than an idea. It is a process which concerns every state and territory in our nation.

In 1964, the NEA adopted a resolution—which was strengthened in following years, requiring the full merger of dual local, district, and State associations on penalty of disaffiliation from the NEA.

In 1966, NEA sponsored a workshop for officers of local associations that had merged or were considering such a step. This group discussed constructive ways of dealing with this problem and the roles of State and National associations in providing assistance.

By November 1966, all States had removed their racial restrictions on membership, and 41 of the 50 State associations were fully merged. This same year the American Teachers Association united completely with the NEA after more than 3 years of careful planning and negotiation. The Negro organization's staff people were hired by NEA to work in the newly opened southeast regional office in Atlanta, Ga.

Since that time, Tennessee, Texas, South Carolina, Arkansas, Georgia, and Alabama have erased racial lines in their respective State's professional education associations.

The path toward unity in many cases has been difficult. A good deal of courage, trust, patience, and determination has been required by both white and black teachers in the South to achieve a merger plan acceptable to both groups. The complications have been numerous: disposal of assets, assumption of new financial obligations, guarantees of a leadership role for the smaller Negro membership in the new organizations.

Through it all, the NEA has patiently but stubbornly prodded for unity, making its facilities, staff, and funds available to help its southern affiliates affect merger.

Only three States have not yet agreed upon mutually acceptable plans for merging their dual associations. They are Mississippi, where the white association rejected an NEA factfinder plan; North Carolina, where the Negro association refused another NEA factfinder plan; and Louisiana, where both associations have failed to vote on a plan for merger.

These NEA affiliates have been suspended by the NEA executive committee, and thereby have been denied the benefits and services of the national organization. But, I am told, Mr. Speaker, that there is reason for optimism that unity will be effected in these States in the near future.

Whatever the outcome—and I am hopeful it will be unification for these three States—it can be said that the teachers of America, through the National Education Association, have paved a path of unity for all of the professional organization of this land.

“THE BRIDGE AT REMAGEN”

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, numerous press statements have been directed at those war films which are made with the assistance and cooperation of the Department of Defense. Without passing any judgment on or commenting upon any other film, I would merely like to point out that the record is crystal clear on the use of American military equipment in the motion picture “The Bridge at Remagen.” All of the tanks, trucks, jeeps, armored cars, and other vehicles were rented from the Austrian Ministry of Defense and transported into Czechoslovakia, where the

bulk of the filming was accomplished from June 6, 1968, up until the very day of the Russian and Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia. This equipment had been sold many years ago by our Army as surplus material immediately following World War II. I can state categorically that no American equipment, no American military personnel, no free technical advice, and no expenditure of taxpayers' money went into the production of “The Bridge at Remagen.”

I have carefully avoided the use of the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to make any mention of “The Bridge at Remagen,” lest anyone draw the conclusion that I am using my position as a Member of Congress to employ an official document like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to comment on this motion picture. However, in the light of recent news articles and speeches on the floor discussing the use of American military equipment and taxpayers' funds in the production of other films, I feel constrained in the face of other press inquiries to make these facts available concerning the filming of “The Bridge at Remagen.”

Since it is impossible to set forward in a 1-minute speech the full details concerning the amount and nature of military equipment rented from the Austrian Minister of Defense, I intend early next week to spread upon the RECORD the full account of how this equipment was obtained and utilized in the film “The Bridge at Remagen.”

WILLIAM PRESSER HONORED FOR ISRAEL AID

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 25 more than 1,500 persons gathered at the grand ballroom of the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel to pay tribute to William Presser, international vice president of the Brotherhood of Teamsters for his efforts in promoting the sale of bonds for Israel among labor unions. Bill Presser is truly one of the most active, vigorous, and highly respected labor leaders in Ohio and this banquet in his honor was an expression of the deep admiration and affection felt for him by all who know him and those who are familiar with the scope of his philanthropic activities.

During the dinner it was announced that through Bill Presser's efforts more than \$1.5 million worth of bonds for Israel were sold. This was certainly a remarkable achievement by one person and the presentation to Bill of the Tower of David Award by the State of Israel indicated the importance attributed to such an accomplishment by the Israel Government. The Tower of David Award is one of the highest awards that the National Israel Bond Organization can bestow upon an individual. It recognizes the efforts made by the recipient to maintain an outpost of democracy in the Middle East by participating in the economic development of the State of Israel.

The award was presented by Col. Isaac Sella of the Israel Air Force to William Presser “in acknowledgment of notable participation in the campaign to provide a sound economic foundation for the rebirth of Israel as a tower of spiritual renewal and strength for the Jewish people.” Colonel Sella represented Prime Minister Golda Meir, who sent the following telegram:

Warm greetings occasion Testimonial Dinner in your honor. This symbolizes multiple causes linking Israel and the United States as individuals, as heirs of the Biblical heritage and as promoters of labor values in a just society. These links expressed in Israel Bonds help us maintain and expand our economy in face continuing refusal Arab states to enter into direct peace negotiations with us. Best wishes, Golda Meir.

The following excerpts from the remarks of Edward Wyner, chairman of the dinner, and an outstanding member of the legal profession, are also indicative of the high esteem in which Bill Presser is held.

Tonight we honor a man who for over 40 years has worked amongst us to improve the lot of the working man.

His skill and devotion as an advocate of the interest of labor has caused his services to be required in many parts of our country.

Recognition has come to him from all corners of his chosen field culminating in his election as Vice President of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

To each of his duties he brings a quiet thoughtful kindly approach.

A steady succession of problems involving people from all walks of life find their way to his office, where quietly, humbly and with apparent ease solutions acceptable to all seem to emanate from this slightly heavy set fellow who you sometimes think is dozing as you talk to him only to have him quickly and incisively go to the heart of the problem you have brought him.

What keeps him going with a program day in and day out frequently seven days a week—that seems backbreaking through periods of personal discomfort?

I believe it is a basic love of people—a basic desire to help others—and a willingness to be where he is needed and to stand and be counted.

Respected by his co-workers he is also held in the highest esteem by those with whom his work brings him into controversy.

And so friends I take great pleasure in welcoming you tonight to this evening devoted to Bill Presser and his interests, and it seems to me to be fitting and proper that those amongst whom he works should gather with the leaders from all walks of life to express their appreciation at this Labor Tribute Dinner when this affection for him is expressed by your being here and by your support of Israel, which is so close to Bill's heart.

This devotion to humanity is not confined to Bill alone, however. His wife, Faye, has consistently contributed her talents to the causes of the Teamsters Union and in 1967 was cited by the union for her outstanding service to the rank and file teamster member and his family. A member of the Cuyahoga County Board of Retardation and a director of the Parent Volunteer Association for Retarded Children, Inc., Mrs. Presser has also been the largest single individual fund raiser for retarded children and has tirelessly dedicated her energies to programs for the retarded.

Immeasurable benefit has been gained

by the Cleveland community because of the Pressers. I will not attempt to give individual recognition to Bill Presser's many and unique contributions to humanity but his singular success in the Bonds for Israel drive deserves special mention. I am proud to call to the attention of the Congress the tremendous accomplishment by one man.

LOW-INCOME ALLOWANCE

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss in some detail the low-income allowance, which was one of the foremost proposals included in the President's initial tax reform program sent to us on April 21, and which our Ways and Means Committee has incorporated into the anti-inflation bill which is before us now.

Treasury studies of our income tax system have revealed a paradox in our social policy: while we are publicly pledged to relieve the plight of all Americans who live in poverty, we are adding to their plight by imposing a tax burden on them. That is why a top priority has been given to eliminating the tax liability of persons whose incomes are at or below poverty levels.

The low-income allowance would remove from the tax rolls all taxpayers with incomes up to amounts officially determined as poverty levels for 1969. It would provide substantial tax relief for single individuals and families with income above poverty levels but still short of adequate levels.

In combination with personal exemptions and the minimum standard deduction, the low-income allowance would make the income of a single individual tax free up to \$1,700. A single individual with income over \$1,700 but less than \$3,250 would pay reduced taxes. In the case of a family of four, the income would be tax free if it did not exceed \$3,500, and taxes would be reduced if it did not exceed \$4,500. The effect would range up to a maximum of \$5,900 of tax-free income for a family of eight.

For families larger than eight persons, the minimum standard deduction together with personal exemptions now prevent tax liability at or below official designated poverty levels.

The low-income allowance would be built into the tax tables, so it would not require complicated computations by the low-income taxpayer. He would simply read the tax table, as he does now.

In aggregate, the proposal would affect nearly 12 million tax returns, providing them with an average individual tax saving of about \$50. It would relieve as many as 5.2 million tax returns, including some 2 million families whose total income is below the poverty level, of virtually all Federal income tax liability.

I would like to call your attention to tables prepared by the Treasury. The first table shows State-by-State benefits of the low-income allowance and the second gives a percentage ratio of benefiting returns. The tables follow:

TABLE 1.—RETURNS BENEFITING FROM THE ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME ALLOWANCE, BY STATES

[Thousands of returns]

State	Total with tax decrease	Returns made nontaxable ¹
Alabama	164.4	73.0
Alaska	6.9	3.1
Arizona	84.7	37.6
Arkansas	101.3	45.0
California	1,115.7	495.4
Colorado	115.7	51.4
Connecticut	166.5	73.9
Delaware	34.8	15.4
District of Columbia	48.3	21.5
Florida	353.4	156.9
Georgia	322.8	143.3
Hawaii	36.8	16.3
Idaho	29.4	13.1
Illinois	644.1	286.0
Indiana	290.3	128.9
Iowa	179.2	79.6
Kansas	146.7	65.1
Kentucky	140.8	62.5
Louisiana	160.7	71.4
Maine	64.5	28.6
Maryland	314.5	139.6
Massachusetts	420.6	186.8
Michigan	485.2	215.4
Minnesota	243.2	108.0
Mississippi	90.8	40.3
Missouri	246.8	109.6
Montana	41.7	18.5
Nebraska	84.8	37.6
Nevada	21.7	9.6
New Hampshire	54.6	24.2
New Jersey	378.6	168.1
New Mexico	51.2	22.7
New York	1,150.4	510.8
North Carolina	300.9	133.6
North Dakota	37.2	16.5
Ohio	626.0	278.0
Oklahoma	136.8	60.7
Oregon	117.4	52.1
Pennsylvania	706.8	313.8
Rhode Island	75.4	33.5
South Carolina	157.6	70.0
South Dakota	50.9	22.6
Tennessee	227.6	101.1
Texas	639.6	284.0
Utah	51.7	22.9
Vermont	41.7	18.5
Virginia	247.2	109.8
Washington	177.1	78.6
West Virginia	89.6	39.8
Wisconsin	243.6	108.1
Wyoming	17.0	7.6
All other areas	34.9	15.5
Total United States	11,770.0	5,226.0

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis.

¹ Estimates of returns made nontaxable within each State assume a constant ratio of nontaxable returns to benefiting returns for all States.

Note.—Detail may not add to total due to rounding. These estimates are subject to errors due to sampling variability within some States.

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED RETURNS BENEFITING FROM THE ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME ALLOWANCE AS A PERCENT OF ESTIMATED TAXABLE RETURNS, BY STATES

State	Percent
Alabama	19.7
Alaska	10.3
Arizona	19.0
Arkansas	23.1
California	17.2
Colorado	18.5
Connecticut	15.3
Delaware	19.5
District of Columbia	17.4
Florida	21.0
Georgia	24.8
Hawaii	16.3
Idaho	15.8
Illinois	16.5
Indiana	17.5
Iowa	20.4
Kansas	21.2
Kentucky	17.3
Louisiana	18.7
Maine	20.9
Maryland	21.1
Massachusetts	21.3
Michigan	16.7
Minnesota	21.5
Mississippi	21.3
Missouri	17.3

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED RETURNS BENEFITING FROM THE ADDITIONAL LOW-INCOME ALLOWANCE AS A PERCENT OF ESTIMATED TAXABLE RETURNS, BY STATES—Continued

State	Percent
Montana	20.0
Nebraska	18.5
Nevada	14.5
New Hampshire	22.2
New Jersey	15.5
New Mexico	20.7
New York	17.6
North Carolina	22.4
North Dakota	21.6
Ohio	17.4
Oklahoma	20.1
Oregon	18.0
Pennsylvania	17.7
Rhode Island	22.3
South Carolina	24.9
South Dakota	27.9
Tennessee	21.7
Texas	21.2
Utah	18.9
Vermont	30.2
Virginia	18.7
Washington	16.5
West Virginia	18.8
Wisconsin	17.7
Wyoming	17.1
All other areas	28.4
Total, United States	18.6

(Note.—These estimates are subject to errors due to sampling variability within some States.)

POSTAL REFORM AND MODERNIZATION LEGISLATION

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, addressing the House under special orders, I discussed at some length with my colleagues the important issue of postal reform and the various proposals which have been introduced. At that time, it was indicated that most of us favor postal reform and that I agreed with portions of the several bills now pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I rise today to reinforce that statement with the introduction of legislation which, in my estimation, contains the features of prime importance in our efforts to accomplish sound postal reform. I am fearful of the consequences of some of the proposals which have been offered, and especially do not want to gamble with the future of the civil service merit system and the futures of some 700,000 postal employees who are under the protection of that merit system.

Mr. Speaker, I wish therefore to offer a brief explanation of the provisions of the bill I introduce today.

This legislation will, first of all, remove the Postmaster General from the President's Cabinet and provide for a 12-year term of office. This serves several purposes. It provides for continuity in administration of the Post Office Department, which has been recommended by every major witness who has appeared before our committee. It also removes the Postmaster General from the realm of chief patronage dispenser of the President and assigns him to no other duties

except those of administering postal affairs. The measure also provided are 6-year terms for the positions of Deputy Postmaster General, six assistant postmasters general, and the general counsel. The legislation staggers the terms of the initial appointees to assistant postmasters general so that after the system is in operation, only one term will expire in any single year.

The legislation places with the Postmaster General the authority to appoint postmasters in all classes of post offices, and such appointments would not be subject to Senate confirmation. In making these appointments, the Postmaster General would be obliged to give first preference to qualified postal field service employees who reside within the county in which the post office is located. Otherwise, the appointment would be made through competitive examination. The same procedure would hold true for appointments to rural carrier positions. In addition, this measure provides that each qualified substitute rural carrier of record who has completed 3 years of satisfactory service will be eligible to receive a career appointment as a rural carrier without examination.

The legislation also deals with the problem of the use of political influence in the postal service. It sets forth strict prohibitions against the solicitation or use of such influence in connection with appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service. Any person who violates these prohibitions would be subject to disqualification.

The final feature of my legislation deals with what is probably the most outstanding deficiency in the present system, that is the failure to provide modern and efficient facilities for the ever-growing postal operation.

The language in the bill creates a Postal Modernization Authority, a body corporate, to act as a development and holding company, controlled by the Postmaster General, for all buildings, facilities, equipment, and machinery needed in postal operations. The Authority is authorized to acquire, hold, develop, and perfect buildings and equipment suited to postal needs, and to issue and retire bonds, up to \$10 billion worth, for these purposes. The Authority would lease needed buildings and equipment to the Postmaster General at rentals which will return the Authority's total cost.

This Modernization Authority would remove the obstructive handicap that has for many years deprived the Post Office Department of adequate facilities and has prevented it from developing long-range plans.

My bill has a feature which is not included in other similar legislative proposals. The language I propose would pledge the full faith and credit of the United States as well as the Authority behind the bonds. I believe this would enhance the marketability of the bonds and it would be a proper role for the Government to assume with respect to a postal modernization authority that serves the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, these are the features which I believe provide the necessary

steps to take toward the reform and modernization of our postal system. Perhaps additional steps will be necessary in the future, but I think we should be cautious in our efforts to restructure the Postal Establishment and not run the risk of killing the patient with the cure.

COSMOPOLIS: A NEW CITIES PROPOSAL

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, last year I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a proposal by a constituent of mine, Mr. Daniel W. Cook of Urban Development Analysts, entitled "New Metropolises." This proposal was aimed at a solution to the increasingly tragic problem confronting our Nation as its cities and population therein continue to deteriorate. Mr. Cook has now expressed some additional views on this serious problem and I am taking the liberty of sharing those views with my colleagues by including his article, entitled "Cosmopolis: A New Cities Proposal," as a part of my remarks:

COSMOPOLIS: A NEW CITIES PROPOSAL

(By Daniel W. Cook)

The people of the United States once lived on farms and in small towns. About seventy percent of their descendants now are gathered into 212 large metropolitan areas. This article proposes new cities as the third stage for the arrangement of population within the continental United States. Fiscal devices for smooth transition to an automated economy could be incorporated into new cities. For example, residents of a new city could own stock in automated enterprises located there.

Since the founding of the Republic, Americans have dreamed of building a great civilization, a society where people devote their energies and creative instincts to pursuing the good life for all. Today we are a metropolitan society. But our existing metropolitan areas display symptoms of disease and decadence. Our enormous megalopolises continue to expand but they are characterized by miles of slums, scattered suburban wastelands, snarled and snarling traffic, poisonous air, poverty, and depressing ugliness. As people from rural areas and smaller towns continue to pour into metropolitan areas, a host of new social and economic ills sprout. Our present attempts to cope with metropolitan problems chase people from their homes and businesses as the bulldozers of "urban renewal" replace slums with prison-like middle-income housing barracks. Parks and scenic areas are chewed up and spat out as super freeways push through the cityscape. Outer "new town" slubs sprawl across nature's land as exurbanites seek open space. Bureaucracy grows as people become cogs in the wheels of forward motion. Workers are laid off as machines and computers assume the tasks of production and control. In short, we are a sick metropolitan society.

Projections of our future urban population growth indicate that by the year 2000 about 90 percent of our 350 to 400 million people will be living within our *existing* metropolitan regions. Dr. Harrison Brown of the California Institute of Technology predicts a U.S. population of at least one billion people by the year 2075. He, along with many other experts in the field of urbanization, foresees two continuous urban conurbations, one running down the East Coast, the other along the West Coast. Other super strip "cities" are expected to emerge along the Gulf Coast, the

Great Lakes, and perhaps along the front range of the Rockies. This then, if we accept trends, projections, and expert prognoses, is the shape of the future—the horror of "monstropolis."

We don't have to accept this fate as inevitable. Nor should we consciously plan for it. We should not delude ourselves by thinking that the answers to our present and future urban messes will be provided by the magic of metropolitan planning, massive urban renewal, or even satellite new towns. What is needed is to chart a new course for building a new kind of urban civilization.

An alternative to the predicted spread of megalopolis could be the enactment of a *National Urban Policy* favoring the development of planned new metropolises. The objective of such a policy would be to encourage a substantial portion of our population growth away from present metropolitan regions to wholly new central cities. During the next half-century *at least 100 new metropolises* could be built in diverse locations throughout the United States. They could be developed upon surplus Federal Public Domain Lands and non-productive private lands in the west, the plains states, the east, and the south.

The new cities could be planned for populations ranging from 500,000 to 3,000,000. They could be constructed where land, water, scenery, climate, and accessibility suggest. At least two new metropolitan cities could be begun each year during the next 50 years. Fortunately, the more than 178 million acres of vacant Federal Public Domain lands in the western states offer many potential sites where new cities could be developed at no cost for land acquisition. With a projected population increase of 150 to 200 million people during the next half century, a minimum of 100 million people could be housed in these new cities if they averaged a million citizens each. This would still allow for substantial additions to our present metropolitan regions and viable smaller towns.

The concept of the *Cosmopolis* is that of a cosmopolitan city, conceived in the Space Age, with finite limits. Its economy would be organized upon the principle of private property ownership for all, equal opportunity for all to participate in the ownership of capitalistic production, and hence economic and social justice. It could be a city of universal affluence.

Within the continental western states we have a vast reservoir of land—land for living as well as for open space, recreation, wildlife, animal production, minerals, watershed, and timber. The United States Bureau of Land Management, part of the Department of the Interior, administers about 178 million acres of land in these states. Parcels of about 100,000 acres could be set aside for new urban growth and development centers. If 60 to 80 sites can be found in just the western states, then only six to eight million acres of the present inventory of 178 million acres would need to be converted to urban use. This would leave 170 million acres for additional new cities, open space, conservation, and other appropriate activities.

It is more economical to construct new cities than to attempt to rebuild existing cities in a "total urban renewal" program for the next 20 years. A reasonable estimate suggests that we can construct over one hundred new cities designed for an average population of 1,000,000 persons for a cost of about \$1,000 billion—much less than half the cost for a total urban renewal effort. This does not mean, however, that we should not continue to rebuild and revitalize our present cities.

A primary cost item for both renewal and fringe growth is land, and land for urban redevelopment projects is the most expensive. Cleared land in urban renewal project areas, after acquisition, demolition, and site preparation, usually sells for a minimum of \$100,-

000 per acre and can go as high as \$1,000,000 per acre. Raw suburban land, readily available for new development near the fringes of our major metropolitan centers, typically goes for \$4,000 to \$20,000 per acre. This price pattern is one of the major reasons for the suburban sprawl of the past 25 years. But if Public Domain lands were utilized, the land would be free. No bond issues or special taxes would be needed for acquiring school sites, park areas, or rights of way for freeways, streets, and utilities. Also, each new city could be preplanned for community facilities and transportation routes. Finally, special urban development corporations could have the primary responsibility for actually building each project city. The economic advantages of modern technology and management techniques, along with advanced planning, could provide further economies in the urbanization process.

The new metropolis program, if imaginatively executed, could:

(1) increase the efficiency of our economy by adapting production to market areas rather than tying it to natural resource deposits or cheap transportation areas;

(2) create millions of new property owners, jobs, and entrepreneurial opportunities;

(3) decentralize the concentrated pattern of decision making, now prevalent in our society. The concentration of economic power and political authority is a danger to political and economic freedom. Big government and big business directly and indirectly account for about 80% of the jobs, and nearly 70% of all productivity activity of the United States is lodged in the top 500 corporations. The Cosmopolis program, with its attendant economic reforms, could distribute economic and political power more widely;

(4) compete with existing cities and metropolitan areas, thereby accelerating action for massive improvement in all our major cities, as well as slowing their growth by attracting part of their population to new urban centers;

(5) distribute minority groups more evenly throughout the United States, and provide new "ground-floor" opportunities for the disadvantaged to participate in the economy.

Many economic and social innovations could be integrated into the development of each cosmopolis. For instance:

1. Initiation of an *urban homestead land grant system*. This program, after state acquisition of the city site, would grant free land to individuals and businesses for use as homes, apartments, businesses, office, industries, etc. Since the city would be totally preplanned, these homestead land grant parcels would have to be developed according to the Master Plan before title to ownership would be granted. This program would help the poor acquire land, diffuse the ownership of private real property, and aid in the creation of thousands of new capitalists—just as the original 1862 Homestead Act created many new capitalists in the agricultural sector of the economy.

2. Enabling legislation for chartering special Urban Development Corporations. New city building companies would operate like public utility companies. Their profits would be regulated, and their ownership broadly distributed. These corporations should be privately financed and owned by a broadly diffused stockholder group composed mainly of future citizens of each new city. The corporations could be charged with developing and precisely planning the new cities, constructing buildings for sale or lease, and operating as prime contractors. Their organization could be similar to that of the Communications Satellite Corporation, and similarly financed.

3. Participation of national industrial, financial, and construction corporations. American industry, when called upon, has responded to a variety of challenges. It will

respond to a new domestic program of urban development if it is given the proper incentives, governmental legislation, and public support.

4. Creation of a life expectancy renewal fund, or a sinking fund to depreciate the replacement cost of buildings for automatic private "urban renewal." Upon the issuance of a building permit, the estimated life expectancy of the building would be determined. If a structure had a 50 year life expectancy, 1/50th of the estimated future replacement cost (less 6% compound interest) would be deposited annually in a municipal trust fund for continuous investment in public improvements and mortgages. These replacement funds would be part of the value of the structure, so that ownership would transfer from property to property in fair exchange value. This fund could also be used for periodic maintenance and remodeling. The advantages of this are that all private structures would have a time limit on their existence; the money for replacement would be automatically accumulated for each owner, at a fair rate of earnings in a trust fund; and continuous private renewal would take place, thus eliminating the need for future Federal urban renewal or slum clearance projects.

5. Replacing our present system of annual property taxes with a local system of graduated capital gains taxes, primarily levied upon real property capital gains. A graduated scale geared to the magnitude of capital gains realized either through sale or trade could provide local revenues for financing functions of government at the local level. A graduated capital gains tax ranging from 10% to 90% would discourage speculation, would tax unearned increments of value rather than productive outputs of wealth, and would tend to maintain the price of real estate at a lower level. By controlling urban land inflation, the incentives for suburban sprawl would be checked and the necessity for overcrowding the land because of its high acquisition cost would be ameliorated. The graduated capital gains tax would also have the effect of discouraging excessive capital accumulations based on unearned increments of land value and of encouraging diffused ownership of real property.

6. A functional school system which would train a person how to be a businessman, how to build a house, how to acquire a saleable vocation, how to develop civilized skills for city living. The poor settler, given the "Homestead Land," the house plan, and the "sweat-equity" procedure for home-ownership, must also be given the values and the know how for living in a city, and the skills for either obtaining a good job or for going into business for himself. If the other programs, i.e., "grubstake," or "new capitalist" finance plans are to work effectively, the people must be educated for utilizing such programs.

7. The establishment of social adjustment centers in each community. These centers, properly staffed, would re-educate and rehabilitate deprived persons moving to the city from other areas. The objective would be to take the "slum" out of people through understanding and education before a new slum could develop.

8. Creation of a Capitalist Economic Development Exchange, to operate under principles similar to the "grubstake" system of the old West. This institution would finance or "grubstake" individuals in the development of new enterprises. It would provide capital for businessmen, inventors, scientists, artists and writers, in return for a share of future profits. This institution, however, would be required to keep investing funds in new enterprises. Earnings would be continuously reinvested in order to provide a continuous flow of funds to finance "new capitalists." In effect, a revolving fund of financial resources would be created for assisting the city's new citizens in becoming busi-

nessmen, owners of income producing private property, or successful creators.

9. Creation of a Capital Diffusion Insurance Corporation at the Federal level which would insure loans to workers and other qualified "non-capitalists" for the purchase of income producing security portfolios consisting of diversified stocks, bonds, mortgages, and real property. Its function would be to assist those who may not be able to participate actively in the economy (either as an employed worker or entrepreneur due to automation and economic change) to participate in wealth production as owners of income producing capital. In other words, this government corporation, similar in concept to the F.H.A., would insure loans made to the new city residents by the existing commercial banking system for the purchase of shares of stock. Citizens moving into the new cities would be eligible to purchase stock in those corporations locating facilities in these same new cities on a "financed-capitalist" basis. They would become co-owners of the industries creating the economic base of the new cities.

10. Encouragement, through proper legislative policy and tax inducements, of profit sharing and equity sharing plans in mature corporations which might establish new plants or other facilities in these new cities. This would primarily benefit employees who retire early because of automation. The corporation would benefit indirectly from the recirculation of these funds within the local community.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965 SHOULD BE PROMPTLY EXTENDED

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Attorney General Mitchell, after five previous postponements, finally appeared and testified before the House Judiciary Committee on legislation which the chairman of that committee (Mr. CELLER), as well as myself, have proposed to extend the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 for 5 additional years.

To the dismay of all of us who pointed out in our own testimony before the committee the gap between white and black political participation in the South which still exists, Attorney General Mitchell took a position which would have the effect of seriously diluting the impact of the Voting Rights Act on the Southern States now covered by the act. He also proposed that provisions of section 5 of the act, which require that States covered must obtain approval of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for proposed changes in their election laws or procedures, be replaced with a system which would place the burden on the Department of Justice to identify election laws, rules, or procedures which might have a discriminatory effect. In order to prevent the application of such laws, the Justice Department would have to obtain an injunction from the Federal district court in which the rules were promulgated. This means that in the South these petitions would be heard by southern courts.

It would also mean a return to the tedious "case-by-case" method, lack of progress of which was one of the principal reasons Congress adopted the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

By postponing his appearance before

Subcommittee No. 5, five times the Attorney General has already delayed the approval of the extension on the Voting Rights Act for many weeks. Now he would inject new elements into the subcommittee's considerations, which would delay action on the Voting Rights Act for an even longer period.

I am shocked by the Attorney General's apparent ignorance of the need to extend the Voting Rights Act. Had he carefully read the testimony of governmental agencies such as the Civil Rights Commission, I cannot imagine he could say, as he did yesterday, that there is no justification for "regional" voting rights legislation.

As the testimony from the Civil Rights Commission, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, our colleague from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and myself before the subcommittee clearly shows, there is ample reason for extending the Voting Rights Act. Although 62 percent of voting-age Negroes are now registered in the 13 States of the Old South, 78 percent of the white voting-age population is registered. In the six States covered by the act, only 57 percent of the nonwhite voting-age population is registered, as opposed to 79 percent of the white voting-age population.

Instances of political harassment and intimidation of blacks seeking to register or vote continue to be reported. The presence of Federal examiners and observers is essential to protect the right to register and vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Judiciary Committee to approve the extension of the Voting Rights Act and to send this legislation to the floor of the House for early passage.

The delaying tactics of the Attorney General and his desire to scrap vital parts of the machinery of that act should be promptly repudiated.

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING, DISTINGUISHED ALUMNUS, PENN STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, one of our most highly respected colleagues, Congressman GEORGE A. GOODLING, has been recognized and honored by the Pennsylvania State University. GEORGE GOODLING was granted the Distinguished Alumnus Award by the board of trustees and received the bronze medallion carrying the following inscription:

Presented to GEORGE A. GOODLING whose personal life, professional achievements, and community service exemplify the objectives of the Pennsylvania State University.

Our colleague, Mr. Speaker, also received the following citation:

To GEORGE A. GOODLING, for a career of legislative service to State and Nation; for nearly half a century of successful agricultural pursuits; for an exceptional record as a conservationist; and for community leadership in education and other public services.

I am proud to insert into the RECORD the full text of the Distinguished Alumnus Award as set forth in the brochure of June 21, 1969:

In his native State of Pennsylvania and in the Congress of the United States, Rep. George A. Goodling has enjoyed a distinguished legislative career. Beginning in 1942, he was elected to serve seven terms in the Pennsylvania Legislature, where in addition to his chairmanship of House committees, he was chairman of Joint State Government subcommittees. Now a member of the Agriculture and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees of the 91st Congress, Representative Goodling also held seats in the 87th, 88th, and 90th Congresses. His roots are deep in his York County birthplace, which he represents along with Adams and Cumberland Counties in the Nineteenth District. This south central Pennsylvania district has a population of some 425,000.

Representative Goodling attended York County Schools, the York Collegiate Institute, and Bellefonte Academy before enrolling at Penn State. His fellow students recall his considerable musical ability: he not only performed with the band but sang in the choir and the glee club. After obtaining a bachelor of science degree in horticulture in 1921, the future congressman taught vocational agriculture for two years; he then became the owner and operator of a fruit farm which he still maintains. His interest in education led him to become a school director, a post he held for twenty-eight years, serving as president of the board, treasurer, and a member of the building committee. In addition, he was one of the organizers of the Loganville Fire Co., and has been its secretary for thirty-two years.

An ardent conservationist, Representative Goodling succeeded against precedent—since he was a freshman congressman and a member of the minority Republican party—when a bill he introduced to protect the golden eagle was enacted into law. The population of the golden eagle, which is valuable to agriculture in the control of rodents, has declined at an alarming rate. The new law, Public Law 87-884, also provides a shield for the bald eagle, the United States' national symbol, which was often killed by persons mistaking it for the golden eagle.

During the last two sessions of Congress, Representative Goodling has introduced resolutions ranging from creating a select committee on ethics and standards for House members to permitting nondenominational and voluntary prayer participation in the public schools and other public institutions. He has also sponsored resolutions to broaden present federal control over oil pollution in coastal waters, a Human Investment Act to extend a tax incentive to employers providing training to upgrade workers' skills, and a resolution to reassert U.S. rights and privileges in the Panama Canal Zone.

A former member of the Civil War Centennial Commission and the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Representative Goodling served as a past president and is currently executive secretary of the Pennsylvania State Horticulture Association. His other memberships include the Agriculture Extension Association, Grange, Pennsylvania Farmer's Association, and Izaak Walton League.

**GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
ERROR**

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) called the attention of the House to the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, June 25, 1969, on rollcall No. 91, contained a printing error. The name of our late colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable William

H. Bates, was listed as responding and voting "nay." The RECORD was corrected on the request of the gentleman from Iowa.

This error, of course, is extremely unfortunate in view of our colleague's death and the discussions that have occurred concerning voting in the House. There have been recommendations for changes in the voting procedures, as we all know.

In the instance of rollcall No. 91, the name of our late colleague was not called and was not listed by the tally clerk on the tally sheet sent to the Government Printing Office. The error occurred in the processing of this copy for the RECORD.

The Clerk of the House, the Honorable W. Pat Jennings, asked the Public Printer, Mr. James L. Harrison, for an explanation of the error. The Government Printing Office has advised that it is "completely at fault."

I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the Clerk's letter to the Public Printer and the reply received today:

JUNE 26, 1969.

*Mr. JAMES L. HARRISON,
The Public Printer,
Government Printing Office,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. HARRISON: I wish to call your attention to a very serious error in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, June 25th, on page H5210, Roll Call No. 91, on the passage of H. Res. 357. The late Honorable William H. Bates is listed as voting "Nay". However, his name does not appear on the official tally sheets of the House because of his death, and it was not on the sheet submitted to the Government Printing Office from which the RECORD was prepared. This sheet is attached.

Will you immediately furnish this office an explanation of how the late Congressman Bates' name came to appear as voting "Nay" on this Roll Call. I shall appreciate your responding to this inquiry by mid-morning of Friday, so this information will be available when the House goes in session at 11 A.M.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely,

*W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1969.

*Mr. W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: In reply to your letter of June 26, requesting an explanation of how the late Congressman Bates' name appeared as voting NAY on Roll Call No. 91, page H-5210 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, June 25, the Government Printing Office is completely at fault.

The alphabetical list of Congressmen for some years now has been produced in advance by pre-punched tape. This tape is used to control an automatic line-casting device which manufactures complete sets of the congressional roster. Because of the need for both speed and accuracy, this procedure was developed, and it has served to expedite RECORD production.

When preparing a roll call for insertion in the RECORD, a compositor, using copy submitted by the tally clerk, is supposed to separate the names into YEAS and NAYS, and remove names of those not voting. It was at this point the mistake was made. The name of Congressman Bates was not removed. The mistake was compounded when during proofreading the error was overlooked. We have identified both the compositor and proofreader responsible for this carelessness, and each has been officially

reprimanded for unsatisfactory workmanship.

I know of no single publication among the thousands we produce each day of which we are more proud, or which receives more careful attention, than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I deeply regret this error which unfortunately is a source of embarrassment, not only to the Congress, but also to the Government Printing Office, and tarnishes our long-standing reputation for accuracy and promptness.

The galley of type containing roll call material have been corrected, and Congressman Bates' name has been removed from all standing type.

As a future precaution, I might suggest that an official notice be sent to the Government Printing Office each time a name is no longer properly a part of the roll call list. If this were done, it would provide double assurance that such a deplorable error could not be repeated.

If there is anything further you may require concerning this incident, please let me know.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. HARRISON,
Public Printer.

I take the opportunity, also, Mr. Speaker, to commend our House employees who tally our votes during the daily sessions of the House. They work under extreme pressure and often find it difficult to hear the responses of Members when the names are called. In the instance of rollcall No. 91, Tally Clerk John Jenkins properly recorded the Members, the reported tally was correct, and the copy sent to the Government Printing Office was correct. It was simply a printing error and we should accept it in that fashion.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we should endeavor to understand the problems of the Government Printing Office. I am certainly sympathetic with the Public Printer's problems of producing a correctly and promptly printed RECORD for the use of the Congress and the public. It is well done, and we should all be grateful for the effort involved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again commend our tally clerks, and trust this explanation ends the matter.

THE QUESTION OF CONTINUING THE SURCHARGE

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there are many persons—including some in this Congress—who say the economy is not slowing up, that the income tax surcharge enacted a year ago has not taken hold.

On the other side, we hear from some who tell us inflation cannot be controlled without extending the surcharge and passing the other tax measures, that the measures have been put into place and they must be given the opportunity to work.

This is an important economic question, one on which honest men will differ.

One important economic analysis on this subject has just been released by the Chase Manhattan Bank, one of the Nation's largest financial institutions. In its June "Business in Brief" newsletter the bank notes "signs that these policies

have begun to take effect have started to appear."

In the interest of having this timely economic analysis before us, I am inserting into the RECORD the bank's discussion:

BUSINESS IN BRIEF

The United States economy is, at last, set on a course that could eventually suppress inflation. Monetary and fiscal policies are both designed to that end. And signs that these policies have begun to take effect have started to appear.

The federal government is enjoying a modest surplus. A year ago, the deficit was running at a rate of over \$10 billion on the income and product account basis. With higher taxes and tighter control of spending, there should be a surplus in the next fiscal year.

Monetary policy has been tight since late last year. Rates of growth in the various monetary measures have slowed sharply.

Slower growth in basic demand is the first requirement for containing inflation. The current inflation is by no means entirely due to excessive demand. But strong demand is necessary to allow prices to rise; only if demand weakens will it become more difficult to pass higher costs through the economy in the form of higher prices. Signs of progress:

Growth in total activity has slowed sharply. In real terms, gross national product was growing at an annual rate of 2.9% in the first quarter of 1969, down from 3.4% in the last quarter of 1968, and sharply below the 6.4% rate of the first half of last year.

The leading indicators—strong for most of the past three years—have begun to show moderate weakness.

A number of specific measures of activity—industrial production, income, housing starts—are either growing more slowly or actually declining.

Prices are still rising rapidly, in spite of these favorable signs. Consumer prices recently have been increasing at annual rates of more than 7%. This is to be expected; the momentum built up over four years of inflationary pressures cannot be broken quickly or easily.

Progress in reducing the rate of price change will be slow in coming, even if present policies are maintained. It now looks as if the economy will go on expanding at recent reduced rates for the next few months, with the growth rate tapering off later in the year. But the pressures for higher wages and higher prices are still so great that the actual rate of price increase is likely to slow only modestly by year end. Major progress on prices is not likely to appear before 1970.

Nevertheless, given enough time, the present monetary and fiscal posture appears sufficiently restrictive to break inflation. The problem for the authorities from now on will be to stick to their guns—to resist the inevitable temptations to change policy prematurely. They may be tempted to ease too soon, out of fear of possible recession, or to tighten too much out of dissatisfaction with progress on the price front.

Premature ease would validate the current inflation and add impetus to rising prices. It would reconfirm the inflationary psychology that lies behind excessive wage demands and the boom in business investment.

Further severe tightening, especially on the monetary side, could bring on the recession that nobody wants. Interest rates are already at extraordinary levels. Tighter money would threaten the availability of credit for the ordinary and necessary operation of the economy.

Patience and courage are now key factors in the fight against inflation. Patience is required because it will take at least a year, and probably longer, to restore an acceptable price trend. Political courage will be needed to resist pressures to ease up prematurely.

TAX LEGISLATION STUDY

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker the issue which divides the House of Representatives on the surtax is whether meaningful revenue-raising tax reforms are a likely prospect this year. There are 102, or 42 percent, of the 245 House Democrats who have authored or cosponsored revenue-raising tax reform measures as of June 25, 1969. There are 26, or 15 percent, of the 188 House Republicans who have authored or cosponsored revenue-raising tax reform bills.

What is even more shocking is the determination that only one Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee has sponsored a revenue-raising tax reform measure, and that was a bill to prohibit Federal land banks and land bank associations for qualifying as being tax exempt. The record in the other body is equally distressing.

In view of this shocking record of disinterest in meaningful tax reform, how can we believe those vague promises of "surtax now—reform later." This record clearly speaks for itself.

The study follows:

STUDY ON REVENUE-RAISING LEGISLATION HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

All bills listed herein are those listed in the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee Legislative Calendar for the 1st Session 91st Congress through June 25, 1969 or the Congressional Record through May 8, 1969. Congressmen not listed have no tax reform bills producing new revenues on record through these dates.

Revenue measures—House

42% or 102 of 245 House Democrats have authored or co-authored tax reform bills producing new revenues.

15% or 26 of 188 House Republicans have authored or co-authored tax reform bills producing new revenues.

House Ways and Means revenue measures

Of the 15 Democratic members, 13 sponsor relief measures. The Democratic Committee members sponsor 6 revenue bills and 35 relief bills or 41 tax reform bills all together. In the revenue area, 3 members sponsor 2 or more bills.

Of Republicans 4 of 10 (40%) sponsor no tax reform measures, relief or revenue. Six sponsor relief measures (60%). The Republican members sponsor 14 tax reform bills, all relief measures.

33% or 5 of 15 Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee have authored or co-authored tax reform bills producing new revenues.

10% or 1 of 10 Republican members have authored or co-authored tax reform bills producing new revenues.¹

Democrats

15 Members total—33% or 5 of 15 sponsoring Revenue Reform.

Michigan, Griffiths, H.R. 9896.

Ohio, Vanik, H.R. 9479, 9896.

California, Corman, H.R. 12135, 12185.

Pennsylvania, Green, H.R. 9896.

Florida, Gibbons, H.R. 7585, 9896, 10339.

Republicans

10 Members total—10% or 1 of 10 sponsoring Revenue Reform.

California, Utt, H.R. 9242.¹

¹ A minor bill to prohibit Federal Land Banks and Land Bank Associations from being a tax exempt organization.

House of Representatives—Democrats

Adams, H.R. 2250, 9975.
 Addabbo, H.R. 7575, 10237, 11991.
 Anderson, William, H.R. 7575.
 Annunzio, H.R. 9896.
 Ashley, H.R. 9896, 10765.
 Barrett, H.R. 6721.
 Bennett, H.R. 11353, 12256.
 Bingham, H.R. 5250, 9975, 11991.
 Blanton, H.R. 8387.
 Blatnik, H.R. 7040.
 Boland, H.R. 9896.
 Brademas, H.R. 8144, 9896.
 Bracco, H.R. 10205, 11991.
 Brown, H.R. 9896, 5250, 1191.
 Byrne, H.R. 7585.
 Chisholm, H.R. 9896.
 Conyers, H.R. 7575, 7585.
 Culver, H.R. 4257, 7575.
 Daddario, H.R. 9975.
 Daniels, H.R. 1039, 9896.
 Dingell, H.R. 6206, 6207, 9896.
 Donohue, H.R. 7575.
 Dulski, H.R. 7575, 9730, 9896.
 Eckhardt, H.R. 7575.
 Edwards, Don, H.R. 5250.
 Elberg, H.R. 7585.
 Evans of Colorado, H.R. 4257.
 Evin of Tennessee, H.R. 11017.
 Farbstein, H.R. 7585, 9896.
 Foley, H.R. 7575.
 Ford, William, H.R. 5250.
 Fraser, H.R. 7980, 9896.
 Gallagher, H.R. 1119, 9896.
 Gaydos, H.R. 9896.
 Gialmo, H.R. 9896.
 Gibbons, H.R. 7585, 9896, 10339.
 Green, William, H.R. 9896.
 Griffiths, H.R. 9896.
 Hamilton, H.R. 4257.
 Hansen, H.R. 9896.
 Hathway, H.R. 7575.
 Hawkins, H.R. 9975.
 Helstoski, H.R. 6233, 9896.
 Hicks, H.R. 9896.
 Hollifield, H.R. 7575.
 Howard, H.R. 229, 10498.
 Hungate, H.R. 9896.
 Jacobs, H.R. 7575.
 Jelson, H.R. 4170, 4171.
 Jones, Robert, H.R. 10302.
 Karth, H.R. 7045.
 Koch, H.R. 7326, 7585, 10829.
 Kyros, H.R. 11991.
 Long, Clarence, H.R. 7585, 9896.
 Lowenstein, H.R. 9563, 9852.
 McCarthy, H.R. 4257, 6768, 9897.
 Macdonald, H.R. 263, 6770, 9975.
 Madden, H.R. 9195, 9896.
 Matsunaga, H.R. 7575.
 Meeds, H.R. 5250.
 Mikva, H.R. 7575, 7585, 9975.
 Minish, H.R. 6517.
 Mink, H.R. 9975.
 Monagan, H.R. 6254, 7744.
 Moorhead, H.R. 5250, 9752.
 Moss, H.R. 9897.
 Murphy, John, H.R. 9975.
 Murphy, William, H.R. 9975.
 Nedzi, H.R. 7585.
 O'Hara, H.R. 9975.
 Obey, H.R. 10253.
 Olsen, H.R. 7575, 9759.
 O'Neill, H.R. 7575.
 Ottinger, H.R. 307, 9975.
 Patman, H.R. 7053, 7336, 11545.
 Patten, H.R. 9762.
 Pepper, H.R. 8621.
 Pike, H.R. 7575.
 Podell, H.R. 7575, 7585, 9563, 9897.
 Price, Melvin, H.R. 9897.
 Rees, H.R. 5250.
 Reuss, H.R. 4257, 9897.
 Rodino, H.R. 9975.
 Rosenthal, H.R. 7585.
 Roybal, H.R. 7346, 9897.
 St Germain, H.R. 7575, 9897.
 St. Onge, H.R. 7585, 9975.
 Scheuer, H.R. 9897, 11991.
 Taylor, H.R. 8537.

Tiernan, H.R. 9897, 11991.
 Thompson, H.R. 7585, 9897.
 Tunney, H.R. 2142.
 Vanik, H.R. 9497, 9896.
 Vigorito, H.R. 7585, 9897.
 Wilson, Charles, H.R. 10628.
 Wolff, H.R. 9897, 10524.
 Wright, H.R. 7575.
 Yates, H.R. 10631, 10632.
 Yatron, H.R. 7575, 7585, 9975.
 Zablocki, H.R. 5250.
 Corman, H.R. 12135, 12185.
 Hechler, H.R. 11754.

House of Representatives—Republicans

Anderson, John, H.R. 10930.
 Berry, E. Y., H.R. 9270.
 Blackburn, H.R. 7432.
 Conte, S., H.R. 11782.
 Cramer, W., H.R. 1178.
 Dellenback, H.R. 7575.
 Denney, H.R. 8374.
 Edwards, Jack, H.R. 8157.
 Gross, H.R. 1131, 8952.
 Halpern, H.R. 9896.
 Hastings, H.R. 7575.
 Horton, H.R. 7575.
 Hosmer, H.R. 7575.
 Kyl, H.R. 9852.
 Lujan, H.R. 11991.
 Mayne, H.R. 8952.
 Robison, H.R. 9975.
 Roth, H.R. 11221.
 Sandman, H.R. 9897.
 Saylor, H.R. 345.
 Scherle, H.R. 7617.
 Schwengel, H.R. 10039, 10041, 10038, 10040, 10842, 8952, 9897, 10042, 10043, 10044, 10045.
 Thomson, V., H.R. 8982.
 Utt, H.R. 9242.
 Vander Jagt, H.R. 7788, 7789.
 Zwach, John, H.R. 8640.

Categories of bills considered to be revenue raising reform legislation

1. Reduce or eliminate oil depletion allowance.
2. Limit deductions attributable to farming which may be used to offset non-farm income.
3. Minimum income tax (corporations; individuals).
4. Limit on tax exempt status of charitable foundations.
5. Excess profits tax.
6. General Tax Reform (repeal: unlimited charitable reduction; stock option provisions; dividend exclusion; exemption on municipal industrial development bonds; reduction in percentage depletion rates; use of United States bonds to pay estate tax; farming deductions to pay non-farm income; 7% investment tax credit; capital gains untaxed at death; foreign oil depletion; and increase; gift tax rates to estate tax level).
7. Miscellaneous (eliminate special treatment for gains from the disposition of depreciable realty; Federal land banks not exempt from taxes.)

SENATE

All bills are those listed in the Senate Committee on Finance's Legislative Calendar for the First Session of the 91st Congress through June 6, 1969.

There are no other speeches listed in the Congressional Record dealing with tax reform other than those made by the sponsors of the bills listed here. Those Senators not listed are not on record on revenue-raising tax reform.

Total Democrats: 57; 37 Authors or Co-Authors of revenue-raising tax reform (65%).

Total Republicans: 43; 9 Authors or Co-Authors of revenue-raising tax reform (21%).

Tax reform issues producing new revenues and Senate Bills which deal with them: 15 Bills, 38% Democratic authors; author 2 or more, 9% Republican authors; author 2 or more; 24% Democratic Senate members author 2 or more, 2% Republican Senate members author 2 or more.

Senators authoring or co-authoring bills
Democrats

New Mexico, Anderson, S. 2277.
 Indiana, Bayh, S. 500.
 Nevada, Bible, S. 500.
 North Dakota, Burdick, S. 500.
 Nevada, Cannon, S. 500.
 Idaho, Church, S. 500, 2277.
 Connecticut, Dodd, S. 500.
 Missouri, Eagleton, S. 500.
 Arkansas, Fulbright, S. 2277.
 Tennessee, Gore, S. 2091, 2103.
 Alaska, Gravel, S. 2277.
 Oklahoma, Harris, S. 500, 1827, 1829.
 Michigan, Hart, S. 1829, 500, 1773, 1827, 2103, 2277.
 Indiana, Hartke, S. 500.
 Iowa, Hughes, S. 500, 2103.
 Hawaii, Inouye, S. 2277.
 Massachusetts, Kennedy, S. 500.
 Washington, Magnuson, S. 2103.
 Minnesota, McCarthy, S. 500.
 Wyoming, McGee, S. 2277, 500.
 South Dakota, McGovern, S. 500.
 New Hampshire, McIntyre, S. 2103.
 Montana, Mansfield, S. 2277, 500; Metcalf, S. 500.
 Minnesota, Mondale, S. 500, 2103, 2277.
 New Mexico, Montoya, S. 500.
 Utah, Moss, S. 2277, 500.
 Maine, Muskie, S. 500, 2103, 2277.
 Wisconsin, Nelson, S. 500, 2039, 2277.
 Rhode Island, Pastore, S. 2103; Pell, S. 2103.
 Wisconsin, Proxmire, S. 2103.
 West Virginia, Randolph, S. 2277.
 Connecticut, Ribicoff, S. 2103.
 Maryland, Tydings, S. 2103, 2211.
 Texas, Yarborough, S. 2277, 500.
 Ohio, Young, S. 500, 2103, 2277.
 Republicans

Massachusetts, Brooke, S. 500.

Kentucky, Cook, S. 1560.

Michigan, Griffin, S. 1560.

Oregon, Hatfield, S. 500.

New York, Javits, S. 1522.

Iowa, Miller, S. 1560.

Kansas, Pearson, S. 500.

Ohio, Saxbe, S. 500.

Delaware, Williams, S. 31, 2075, 2110.

*Senate Committee on Finance**Democrats—10 Members*

(7 of 10) 70% of members of committee sponsor bills:

Louisiana, Long.

New Mexico, Anderson, S. 2277.

Tennessee, Gore, S. 2091, 2103.

Georgia, Talmadge.

Minnesota, McCarthy, S. 500.

Indiana, Hartke, S. 500.

Arkansas, Fulbright, S. 2277.

Connecticut, Ribicoff, S. 2103.

Oklahoma, Harris, S. 500, 1827, 1829.

Virginia, Byrd.

Republicans—7 Members

(2 of 7) 28% of members of committee sponsor bills:

Delaware, Williams, S. 31, 2075, 2110.

Utah, Bennett.

Nebraska, Curtis.

Illinois, Dirksen.

Iowa, Miller, S. 1560.

Idaho, Jordan.

Arizona, Fannin.

Categories of bills

1. Oil Depletion Allowance—S. 31, S. 1522, S. 2091, S. 2103.
2. Investment Credit Suspension—S. 2110, S. 2039, S. 1829.
3. Minimum Tax:
 - A. Capital gains—S. 1773, S. 2211.
 - B. Percentage depletion—S. 1773, S. 2211.
 - C. Accelerated depreciation on real property—S. 1773, 2211.
 - D. Individuals—S. 1522.
 - E. Corporations—S. 1827, S. 2211.
 - F. Trusts—S. 1827, S. 2211.
 - G. Estates—S. 1827, S. 2211.

H. Unrealized appreciation in gifts to charity—S. 1827, 2211.
 I. Exercise of qualified stock options—S. 1827, S. 2211.
 J. Interest on state and local bond—S. 1827.
 K. Intangible drilling and development costs—S. 1827, 2211.
 4. General Tax Reform:
 A. Property from descendant—S. 2039.
 B. Repeal of dividend exclusion—S. 2039.
 C. Repeal of corporate multiple surtax exemption—S. 2039, S. 2211.
 S. 2211.
 Gift tax rates—S. 2039, S. 2211.
 D. Industrial development bond—S. 2039.
 F. Federal bonds to pay estate taxes—S. 2039.
 G. Deductions on farm income over \$15,000—S. 2039, S. 2211.
 5. Tax exempt status of: A. Private foundations—S. 2075.
 6. Excess profits tax on corporations—S. 2277.
 7. Status of Farm investments and incomes by non-farmers—S. 500, S. 1560.

A TECHNOLOGICAL ALTERNATIVE TO PESTICIDES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the widespread use of DDT and other chemical pesticides, which is attracting so much public attention these days, poses a complex dilemma.

On one hand, there is little doubt that these products are causing damage—perhaps even permanent damage—to the world's fish and wildlife resources, and there is concern that man may even be endangering his own health. As we wage war on the endless varieties of insects, bacteria and other small creatures which plague man, we have unwittingly created harmful side effects.

Perhaps even half of the pesticides sprayed on crops find their way to areas for which they were not intended, affecting plants and animals that were not their original targets at all.

Yet the very tangible benefits from the use of pesticides also must be recognized. These compounds have helped man raise and protect a plentiful supply of food products all over the world. With the population explosion threatening to outstrip the world's food supply, this daily becomes a more crucial objective. It is estimated that for every dollar invested in protection by pesticides, between \$4 and \$5 worth of agricultural production is saved.

In addition, the use of pesticides has saved countless lives through control of malaria, cholera, typhus, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, encephalitis, and other diseases. In fact, in terms of the total production, more DDT is used by health authorities around the globe for the control of disease than is used for all agricultural purposes combined.

Clearly, then, a worthwhile national objective should be the development of economical and efficient pesticides free of the dangerous side effects which can be employed in place of DDT. The U.S. Forest Service is working toward this end with a very unlikely ally—the staff of the molecular anatomy—MAN—pro-

gram at the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Together, they are separating and purifying insect viruses—or natural pesticides—which attack only a single insect or a very few species of insects without endangering fish, higher forms of wildlife, or man.

This program was initiated in 1967 when Dr. Mauro E. Martignoni of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station at Corvallis, Oreg., asked Oak Ridge to purify a particular virus known to be fatal to the caterpillar of the tussock moth, a destructive pest which kills Douglas-fir trees in that region.

Dr. Martignoni and an Oregon State University graduate student, John Carnegie, had performed a series of experiments and learned that the target virus always killed the caterpillar of the tussock moth yet was harmless to other insects. They determined that such a viral pesticide could be used without affecting valuable insects such as bees, wasps, and ladybugs.

The Oak Ridge National Laboratory has extensive experience in separating particles, based primarily on its classified work with centrifugation technology for the separation of uranium isotopes. From that work, the MAN program at Oak Ridge has developed a series of liquid zonal centrifuge systems specially designed to separate the individual particles of the human cell.

These centrifuges, in turn, led the MAN program to develop the highly successful K-11-C rotor systems which are now being used to develop super-pure human vaccines by removing the extraneous cellular material which is the cause of most unpleasant side effects of vaccinations, such as arm soreness, chills and high fever. This zonal centrifuge played a major role in the purification of the Hong Kong flu vaccine during the 1968 epidemic.

From this technological base, Dr. Norman G. Anderson and Dr. Julian Brellatt of the MAN program at Oak Ridge developed a centrifuge separation system to isolate the needed virus material from crude caterpillar homogenate in one step. Through the use of a continuous flow centrifuge rotor, similar to the ones being used by the pharmaceutical industry for human vaccines, enough purified virus was separated to justify consideration of use on a commercial scale.

Because the zonal centrifuge is so effective in producing a highly purified virus material, it is estimated that only 1 teaspoonful of viral insecticide would be required to protect 50 to 100 acres through aerial spraying. One centrifuge in a single day could produce enough material to be sprayed over 1,000 acres, whereas previous methods could produce only enough for small-scale research.

There are about 1,200 different insects which plague agriculture, and there are some 400 viruses which are known to affect these pests. Many of these viruses are specific to a single insect; others may kill five or six different but closely related species. It is believed that these insect viruses could be produced at a cost comparable to some of the newer pesticides on a cost-per-acre basis.

The material needed for the tussock moth pesticide is concentrated in particles called inclusion bodies which are located in the cells of infected tussock moth caterpillars. But since the crude caterpillar homogenate contains many unwanted bacteria, this presents an obvious danger if the virus is sprayed in watershed areas. Zonal centrifugation reduces the bacteria content from one bacterium per inclusion body in the unpurified state to one bacterium per 4 million inclusion bodies in the centrifuge-isolated material, sufficiently safe for use in watershed regions.

Protected within the inclusion body "capsule," the viruses are resistant to bacterial digestion, drying, weather extremes and moderate acid conditions.

The separation principles involved in the tussock moth experiments are now being applied to studies with inclusion bodies of the gypsy moth, European pine sawfly and bollworm. Caterpillars of all these insects are killed by specific viruses.

I am certain that all of us who are concerned with harmful side effects of DDT and other pesticides on man and wildlife will be watching for the results of this research and follow-on efforts with other natural pesticides. This is another example of the tremendous technological achievements which the Atomic Energy Commission's multidisciplinary national laboratories can produce.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, one-fifth of the Nation's population participates in some form of boating each year. The number of persons enjoying our countries' waterways has been steadily increasing. It was in recognition of this vast boating public that the 85th Congress passed Public Law 85-445, calling for the annual observance of National Safe Boating Week. In accordance with this law, the President of the United States has issued the following proclamation:

A PROCLAMATION

In a time of unprecedented opportunity for leisure-time activities, more and more Americans are discovering the benefits of boating. The ever-increasing traffic on the waterways has made it imperative that all boatmen observe the basic rules of boating safety.

Commonsense and courtesy are the two foundations of boating safety. An overloaded boat, failure to heed weather warnings or the taking of other unnecessary risks can, and too often do, lead to boating tragedy. If each boatman takes simple precautions, understands the capabilities of his craft, and exercises ordinary good judgment, tragic losses can be avoided.

Recognizing the need for emphasis on boating safety, the Congress, by a Joint Resolution approved June 4, 1958 (72 Stat. 179) has requested that the President proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as National Safe Boating Week.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning June 29, 1969, as National Safe Boating Week.

I urge the public to take advantage of educational courses in boating safety, and all

those who use our waterways for boating to exercise courtesy and apply safe boating practices.

I also invite the Governors of the States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and appropriate officials of all other areas under the United States flag to provide for the observance of this week.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this third day of March, in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and sixty-nine and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-third.

RICHARD NIXON.

SCOPE OF BOATING

The emphasis placed on boating by this proclamation is clearly necessary when we consider the scope of boating and all it encompasses. It is estimated that some 42 million persons participate in recreational boating using almost 8½ million watercraft. Nearly \$4 billion were spent last year for boats, associated equipment, and services. Boating is indeed big business involving a large portion of the population.

The U.S. Coast Guard is the Federal agency charged with the responsibility for the safety of the boating public on our navigable waters. The States, Coast Guard Auxiliary, U.S. power squadrons, American National Red Cross, National Safety Council, Boy Scouts of America, and many other organizations assist the Coast Guard in this enormous task by providing a most essential ingredient—education.

While education of the boatman is probably the most effective safety tool, it is by no means the only one. The Coast Guard enforces the various safety requirements called for by law. Unfortunately, the law in many cases is too specific to allow flexibility in adapting to new technological developments. Perhaps more important is that the law in almost every case places compliance responsibility on the boat owner or operator. Many boating experts believe that the boatman should reasonably expect that a boat he buys will meet established minimum safety standards. Present boating laws do not permit this.

On May 1 the Coast Guard released its annual boating statistics report as required by the Federal Boating Act of 1958. This act provides for a standardized system for the numbering and identification of undocumented vessels, including pleasure boats of more than 10 horsepower, uniform accident reporting, and participation in these programs by the States. Since the effective date of this legislation, April 1, 1960, every jurisdiction but the States of Alaska, New Hampshire, Washington, and the District of Columbia have provided for numbering systems which have been approved by the U.S. Coast Guard and meet the standards set forth in this act.

There was a slight increase in boating fatalities in 1968—1,342 as compared to 1,312 in 1967. In its annual report, the Coast Guard revealed that 22.2 percent, or 298, of the boating accident deaths last year involved watercraft not required by Federal law to carry lifesaving devices such as rowboats, canoes, sailboats, rafts, and other small craft. During the same period the boats numbered

in all States and territorial possessions of the United States reached an all-time high of over 4.7 million.

Capsizings, as in past years, still remain responsible for the largest number of recorded deaths. In 1968, capsizings resulted in 45 percent of the total number of lives lost in boating accidents. This figure is about the same as the 1967 percentage. Of the 1,342 fatalities, drowning accounted for 1,203 victims, and 828 of the drowned either did not have or did not use lifesaving devices.

Last year a total of 5,427 vessels were involved in 4,195 boating accidents involving at least \$100 property damage, an injury, or death, this is 82 more than in 1967; 1,062 of these vessels were involved in fatal accidents, while 879 were in accidents resulting in injuries. The amount of property damage was over \$6.6 million.

Since 1964 the estimated number of boats has grown 9.6 percent while the number of accidents has increased 7.2 percent. During this same 5-year period fatalities increased 12.6 percent. The increases shown by these figures, while not as alarming as other more dramatic boating statistics that have been used, are of definite concern to the Coast Guard.

What is significant to me is that the number of fatalities, accidents, and injuries has remained relatively small over the past few years even though the number of boats in operation has increased appreciably. This situation is probably due to the dedicated efforts of the Coast Guard, the States, and the many fine volunteer organizations working hard to keep our waters safe. I hope this trend continues as the number of new boatmen increases, but unless additional resources are made available it is unlikely.

COAST GUARD BOATING SAFETY ACTIVITIES

An indication of the increased importance the Coast Guard is placing on the problems of boating safety is the reorganization which took place within the service in 1968. An office of Boating Safety was created in Coast Guard Headquarters with a flag officer at its head. Increased organizational emphasis also took place at district and local command levels.

Several pilot programs have been initiated, all designed to better provide boatmen with valuable educational materials and information. Perhaps the most promising of these is the boating safety center concept. The centers provide a central location where the boatman can obtain environmental information, a safety check of his boat, information on local conditions, legal requirements, and advice from the experienced and knowledgeable.

To have really safe boating, the millions of individuals comprising the boating public must be reached. In an attempt to reach these boatmen, the Coast Guard is also continuing its present programs of education and persuasion. Through boating films, safety publications, Coast Guard auxiliary programs, and utilization of boating safety detachments in public education activities, the Coast Guard takes advantage of

every opportunity to stress the practical aspects of boating safety. The Coast Guard also has close coordination with the boating industry, the National Safety Council, and other such vital organizations. The safety patrol concept in recreational boating will continue to be stressed on all waterfronts this year. In the boating safety detachments, the Coast Guard has on-the-move safety patrols which visit navigable lakes, rivers, and other waters where boating activities are concentrated. The safety patrol is a roving waterborne patrol of boating areas for the purpose of deterring, detecting, and reporting unsafe practices. At the present time, there are 41 boating safety detachments and 164 shore stations which form the backbone of the safety patrol. More boating safety detachments are planned. These roving units have an effective broad impact because of their mobility and flexibility. Their primary mission is to minimize unsafe practices such as speeding in congested areas, overloading, improper loading, operating while under the influence of liquor, operating in swimming areas, and operating in posted dangerous waters through education and enforcement. In keeping with this mission, the policy of boarding for cause, begun in 1964, was reemphasized last year. The effectiveness of these mobile units is not to be measured in the number of boardings. The measurement of their effectiveness will be whether or not our waterways will be made any safer; whether the boating public is better educated in safe boating procedures by the apprehension of the reckless or negligent operator; and finally whether the accident rate decreases. The Coast Guard will educate, persuade, and enforce the law. Boating accidents and fatalities must be reduced.

The Committee on Governmental Operations has recommended that the Coast Guard triple the number of boating safety detachments in the next fiscal year. I strongly support this recommendation and urge those responsible to make every effort to increase the number of these detachments so vital to the boating safety program.

BOATING SAFETY A JOINT EFFORT

The Coast Guard auxiliary is extremely active in the education of the boating public in safe boating practices. As a voluntary nonmilitary organization, the auxiliaries' purpose is to promote safety in recreational boating. On June 23, the auxiliary observed its 30th anniversary. I congratulate the auxiliary on its dedicated and unselfish efforts to keep America's pleasure boaters safe. Its 26,000 members are experienced boatmen, amateur radio operators, or licensed aircraft pilots. The three basic programs carried out by the auxiliary are the courtesy motorboat examination, public instruction, and operations; 164,905 persons were instructed in three safe boating courses last year; 180,604 courtesy motorboat examinations were performed; over 4,000 regattas were patrolled; and almost 9,000 cases of assistance were recorded.

The States are also very much involved in boating safety and very concerned about what the future will bring.

Educational efforts by the States are increasing as rapidly as limited funds permit. The Coast Guard works closely with the States on every aspect of boating safety. This can be easily seen in the number of State jurisdictions—36 with five pending—that have signed cooperative agreements with the Coast Guard. These agreements directly affect the coordination and effectiveness of safety patrols and enforcement activities.

The encouragement of uniformity and comity among the different States in regards to these boating laws is of vital importance to everyone involved with boating. The Coast Guard encourages this, and the Congress, in the Federal Boating Act of 1958, endorsed this principle. The mechanics of uniformity however, are often complicated by the inadequacies of existing Federal laws.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

National Safe Boating Week—focusing attention upon the need of pleasure boatmen to know and comply with safe boating practices and regulations—begins June 29 this year as stated in the proclamation. Its objective is to emphasize efforts urging the more than 42 million people using boats on our waters to help "keep boating safe"; to teach important fundamentals of safe boating to newcomers; and to remind experienced operators as well as the novice to practice commonsense and courtesy afloat. The basic theme for this year's observance of the week is "Safety first, the golden rule of boating."

National Safe Boating Week also pays tribute to the many persons and organizations who have contributed toward maintaining boating's fine safety record. More than 1,500 Coast Guard auxiliary flotillas, U.S. power squadrons, boating clubs, and other boating and safety minded organizations are expected to participate in the National Safe Boating Week observance in communities throughout the country.

This year the National Safe Boating Committee distributed 7,500 promotional kits to local organizations all over the country. Promotional material has also been distributed to practically every news media organization. The Committee includes representatives from the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, the American Boat and Yacht Council, the American National Red Cross, the American Power Boat Association, the American Water Ski Association, the Boatowners Association of the United States, the Boatowners Council of America, the Boy Scouts of America, the Corps of Engineers, the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators, the National Boating Federation, the National Fire Protection Association, the National Safe Boating Association, the National Safety Council, the Outboard Boating Club of America, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the Yacht Safety Bureau, and the Young Men's Christian Association. To all of these organizations safety in boating is as important as it is to the individual and his family. To all of those national and local committees actively participating in National Safe Boating Week, I extend my congratulations. I

urge all others interested in boating safety to join in making this an even more effective National Safe Boating Week, I extend my congratulations. I urge all others interested in boating safety to join in making this an even more effective National Safe Boating Week than the successful ones in the past. Let us continue the good practices set forth by National Safe Boating Week throughout the year.

FUTURE EMPHASIS

One final point, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned previously, there are several inadequacies in existing boating law. I know that the esteemed gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ), and his committee are working on a new bill to remedy these defects. I support those efforts and urge that every Member of Congress do likewise when this legislation is offered for our attention.

HUNGARIAN-RUMANIAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, some interesting aspects of the issue of ethnic minorities and the Hungarian-Rumanian boundary dispute recently came to my attention. It raised some serious questions that prompted me to look further into the background of this issue. Because of the international interest in this issue and particularly the interest of vast segments of our own American population, I bring to the attention of the American people some research I have completed.

Mr. Speaker, the fate of the Hungarian minority in Rumania has been a frequent subject of congressional debate. But too often, concern for the plight of this minority has prevented an objective analysis of the question. The majority of studies confuse sympathy for a displaced minority with impartial study of the circumstance of the border revision. The perceptive speech of my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. O'KONSKI), delivered April 30, 1965, is an exception.

After belonging to Hungary for a thousand years, Transylvania and adjoining areas were annexed to Rumania in 1919. The issue deserves reexamination. The Hungarian minority has been a burning issue in the Rumanian press for 50 years. For example, the November 28, 1968, issue of *Tribuna* of Cluj—Kolozsvar—carried an article by Prof. Keith Hitchins of the University of Illinois. The study, titled "American Policy and Transylvania's Union With Rumania in 1918," is a biased account of the role of the United States in the annexation of Transylvania by Rumania. Dr. Hitchins mentions the American loan of armaments and food to Rumania during World War I. But his interpretation of U.S. President Wilson's position on Transylvania's annexation is slanted by his judgment of behind-the-scenes American diplomacy preliminary to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

The American position at Paris must be clarified. The Rumanian press cur-

rently charges that at the Paris Peace Conference, the United States sponsored the subjugation of ethnic minorities by newly created states. There is no basis for this argument. The correspondence of delegates and the records of the Supreme Council of the Conference and the Council of Foreign Ministers disprove this interpretation. There is evidence in these documents that the United States supported national self-determination for ethnic minorities.

First, let us examine the position of Professor Coolidge, a member of the Special Commission appointed by Colonel House under the direction of President Wilson. This group of scholars was assigned to prepare material for the coming Peace Conference. It forged Wilson's famous 14 points. On November 16, 1918, Coolidge was appointed Special Assistant to the Department of State and dispatched on a fact-finding mission to Eastern Europe. That Coolidge was amply qualified for his role has been attested by his colleague at Harvard, Prof. Robert Howard Lord—"Archibald Cary Coolidge: His Life and His Letters," page 192:

Coolidge's preparation for his work during the Peace Conference was, of course, the preceding thirty years of his life. No other American had specialized so much upon history and politics, the territorial and nationality questions of those regions of Central and Eastern Europe, that were to furnish the Conference with most of its hardest problems. By study and travel, judgment and insight, by his keen sense of justice and his sure instinct as to what was practically possible, he was admirably equipped to be of service to our government during the peace making.

Professor Coolidge surveyed the situation in Hungary and reported his findings to President Wilson. Coolidge opposed the splintering of Transylvania from Hungary. He recommended to Wilson the preservation of Hungary's historical economic and ethnic integrity. The text of the communication follows:

BUDAPEST,
January 19, 1919.

Re geographic and economic unity of Hungary.
The AMERICAN COMMISSION TO NEGOTIATE PEACE,
4, Place de la Concorde,
Paris.

SIRS: I have the honor to report that in support of their statements that the kingdom of Hungary forms a natural geographic and economic unity to a greater extent than any other state in Europe except Great Britain . . . The Hungarian state is made up of the basin of the middle Danube and its tributaries and of the surrounding hills and mountains. On the north, east and much of the south the frontiers of the wild Carpathians and of the Transylvanian Alps are about as good as could be desired. In the south until the loss of Croatia and Slovenia it has also been excellent. On the west, too, it is satisfactory. Hungary consists of flat, fertile plains and of the highlands about them. All the rivers (with some slight exceptions in Transylvania) ultimately flow into the Danube, which is thus the central artery reached by many tributaries. This great common river system now more than ever needs treatment as a whole. For instance, the Danube and its tributaries are subject to sudden rise and fall. What is needed is an elaborate storage system by which water should be preserved some times in one part, some times in another, and then used later in such measure as circum-

stances may require; but for such a system a central management is necessary.

The Hungarian plains are rich, flat lands, which in former times were a natural resort of nomad and pastoral peoples like the Magyars, and the Huns and Avars before them. Today they are chiefly devoted to agriculture and provide fine crops, although these often suffer severely of drought. The Piedmont or region of the lower hills seems to integrate rather than to separate the plains from the mountains, and it is here that many of the more important cities are to be found, cities which from their very position usually have a population belonging to several nationalities. In the more mountainous regions we find all the forests, all the mineral wealth and all the future considerable possibilities of water-power, of which the war has here as elsewhere shown the need. As the Magyars have been the men of the plains, in the mountains we find predominating in numbers Slovaks, Ruthenians and Rumanians (except in the secular (Szeckler) portion of Transylvania). The Germans have been numerous in the cities and are to be found scattered about in various places, but throughout the whole country the chief landowners have been Magyars, and they claim to have lived on good terms with the peasants.

Thanks to this diversity in the character of the different regions, Hungary has been from the earliest times a singularly self-sufficient state. The plains have furnished the food, the hills have furnished the wood and the mineral wealth, the Danube and its tributaries have brought the people together. The different parts of the country have been attached to one another by the countless ties that come from having formed parts of the same unity through long ages. With the development of modern industry and communication the unity of the Kingdom has been still further strengthened. In recent years mining has been carried on a much larger scale, and many new manufactories have arisen and thrived. These establishments are to be found in the hill regions, that is, the borderlands, but they have been financed and managed from Budapest, which has grown in the last half century from a comparatively small town into one of the capitals of the world, with a population of nearly a million people before the war. Here is the center for the railroads, the seat of the Government, the winter home of people from every part of the country, the great focus of national life. Even distant Transylvania is and always has been economically found more closely connected with the central plain into which most of its waters flow than it has with Rumania on the other side of the mountains.

As a final argument the Hungarians point to the historic unity of their state and say it could never have been preserved through all the ups and downs of history of a thousand years, despite the variety of nationalities that have lived in it, if its continuity had not been in the nature of things in obedience to geographic law.

We can understand then what a violent rupture in the economic life of the country has been produced by the occupation, whether temporary or not, of almost the whole Hungarian peripheral, by the Czechoslovaks, the Rumanians and the Serbians, and in their severing of all relations between the lands they have occupied and the heart of the country. We can appreciate, too, the anguish of people here when they face the possibility of a Hungary reduced to the dimensions of the present unoccupied territory, without wood, without iron, without coal, without manufactories, nothing but an agricultural region and a great city condemned to certain ruin.

I have the honor to be, Sirs,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

Rumanians overlook this important document. They often refer to a note of President Wilson's to the Rumanian Government dated November 5, 1918, to support their contention that the transfer of the Transylvanian-Eastern Hungarian territories was engineered by the United States. They quote from the context:

The United States will not neglect at the proper time to exert its influence that the just political and territorial rights of the Rumanian people may be obtained and made secure from foreign aggression.

Rumanians claim that this vague wording supports the secret Treaty of London of 1916, between England and France. The terms of the private agreement transfer more than 2 million Hungarians into the enlarged Rumanian state.¹

Turning to events in the territories themselves, Rumanians allege that the local citizens voted to belong to Rumania. They support this argument with the results of the plebiscite at Alba Julia—Gyulafehervar—of December 1, 1918, and of Transylvanian Saxons on January 8, 1919, at Medias—Medgyes. They assert that the plebiscite sanctioned the desire of these peoples to be incorporated into Rumania by exercising their right to national self-determination. However, the Rumanians fail to mention that the majority was denied free choice. A recent analysis by Prof. Sherman Davis Spector of Russell Sage College, who is very sympathetic to the Rumanians, analyzes the element of coercion—"Rumania at the Peace Conference of Paris," New York: Bookman Associates, 1962, pages 70-71:

The final act was at Medias in Transylvania on January 8 when the Saxon Germans requested incorporation into Rumania. This action and those . . . in the Bukovina and Bessarabia were carried out after Rumanian troops had occupied the regions . . . Rumanian troops seized most of Transylvania by the end of December. These moves raise the question: were the acts of union spontaneous, or were they arranged under the menacing or protecting guns of the Rumanian army?

The advance of the Rumanian Army into Transylvania was an illegal act, precluded by the Belgrade Armistice of November 13, 1918, concluded between Hungary and the Allied Powers. The resistance of Hungarian troops was overcome by the Rumanians with French connivance. The Rumanian aggression was condemned by the declaration of the Supreme Council of January 24, 1919. The document was personally drafted by President Wilson, who warned:

Possession gained by force will seriously prejudice the claims of those who use such means. It will create the presumption that those who employ force doubt the justice and validity of their claims and purpose to substitute possession for proof of right and set up sovereignty by coercion rather than by racial or national preferences or natural association. They thus put a cloud upon every

¹ In referring to the ambiguous statement above, Rumanians obscure the more basic tenets of Wilsonian democracy. The Secret Treaty of London of 1916 conflicts with Wilson's belief in "open covenants openly arrived at."

evidence of title they may afterwards allege and indicate their distrust of the Conference itself. (*Foreign Relations of the United States. The Paris Peace Conference 1919*, Vol. III, p. 715.)

The Rumanians had objectives other than securing the territories claimed. A secondary objective was to discredit the pro-Allied Karolyi government. By violating the Belgrade Armistice of November 13, Rumania wanted to prove to the Hungarians that they could not rely for protection on the Allied Powers. They wanted to demonstrate that they would not treat the Hungarians as a vanquished minority, but would welcome them into the Rumanian fold. If Hungarian hopes in the Allies were dashed, the current anti-Allied Bolshevik propaganda would find a fertile soil in Hungary. Rumania planned to turn this Bolshevik appeal against the Hungarians at the Peace Conference. Rumania encouraged the Allies to revise the boundary in her favor by placing the Hungarian Karolyi regime in an untenable position. The Bolsheviks supported Rumania's preventive action.

Professor Coolidge's report from Budapest, No. 26 of January 19, 1919, summarizes this insoluble dilemma of the Karolyi government resulting from Rumanian pressure. Both Coolidge and Wilson condemned Rumania's measures. Nevertheless, the American delegation to the Committee for the Study of Territorial Questions Relating to Rumania and Yugoslavia supported with limitations the majority of Rumanian claims. This factor is explained by the biased Rumanian presentation of facts to the Committee and the Supreme Council. The Hungarian Government was prevented from speaking in its own behalf.

The Rumanian barrage was led by Ion Bratianu, the head of the Rumanian peace delegation to Paris. On February 1, 1919, he told the Supreme Council that there were 2.5 million Rumanians and 1 million Hungarians in Transylvania proper according to the 1910 Hungarian census. However, the correct figures of the 1910 Hungarian census were 918,217 Hungarians and 1,472,021 Rumanians in Transylvania proper. Mr. Bratianu conveniently added 1 million Rumanians to the figures in order to support his request for the annexation of Transylvania to Rumania. The area finally awarded to Rumania in the Treaty of Trianon was somewhat smaller than the territories requested by Mr. Bratianu. According to the 1910 census there were 1,704,851 Hungarians, 2,800,073 Rumanians and 559,824 Germans in the territory. Mr. Bratianu stated before the Supreme Council that the population of the land demanded by Rumania included 55 percent Rumanians and 23 percent Hungarians. Again his figures were grossly incorrect. Hardly 50 percent of the population was Rumanian and over 36 percent Hungarian in the area delineated by the London Treaty of 1916.

Mr. Bratianu went on to assail the 1910 Hungarian census as untrustworthy, and asserted:

If an exact census could be taken, 2,900,000 Rumanians and 687,000 Magyars, or 72 percent and 15 percent, respectively, of the

population would be found to be the exact figures. (Excerpts from the Minutes of the Supreme Council, Held on February 1, 1919; Rumanian Territorial Claims.)

Again Bratianu was in error. It should be mentioned that the 1930 Rumanian census showed 826,796 Hungarians and 1,657,923 Rumanians in Transylvania proper despite the expatriation or expulsion of 197,000 Hungarians and the influx of sizable Rumanian masses from the other parts of the Rumanian Kingdom into Transylvania.

Fearful that the Allies might not consider the Rumanian numerical superiority large enough, Mr. Bratianu cited "the presence of near the Moldavian frontier, a race related to the Magyars numbering 450,000." Of course, these, the Szekelys, were really Hungarians who had been pro-Magyar in language and loyalty since the 12th century.

Yet Bratianu based his argument on the threat of anarchy in Hungary from Bolshevik influence. He stated:

In the territories not occupied by Rumania . . . conditions were very serious owing to the enemy having organized a violent agitation on Bolshevik lines. The division of wealth and the abolition of rank had been promised; Wilson's policy had been proclaimed to be nothing but a capitalist policy; people had been told to kill officers and to do away with the governing classes. (*Ibid.*)

Bratianu was not alone in warning of the danger of Bolshevik takeover in Hungary. Archibald Coolidge cautioned that, if continued, the present Allied policies and the Rumanian occupation would lead to the fall of the Karolyi government. George Creel, the Chairman of the Committee of Public Information, the predecessor of the OWI of World War II, was sent to Hungary in early 1919. His report to the American delegation is described in his memoirs, "How We Advertised America," New York: Harper & Bros., 1920, pages 423-424:

The Hungarian situation was deplorable to the last degree. Count Karolyi was in the President's chair, but it was plain that he could not last more than a couple of weeks unless the Allies decided upon some helpful action on his behalf. It was Karolyi who had agreed to the Franchet d'Esperey armistice, and it was the provisions of this armistice, that were now being violated daily. On three sides the Czechs, the Jugoslavs and the Serbs were making steady encroachments while on the fourth side the Rumanians were sweeping forward in utter disregard of what should have been sacred agreements. The food situation was also reaching a crisis and Bela Kuhn, plentifully supplied with Bolshevik money, was preaching the gospel of a new world.

The whole thing was tragic in the extreme . . . All that I could do was to send an instant report to Paris, outlining the situation and it was this report that brought a declaration from the Peace Conference to the effect that the boundary-lines laid down by Franchet d'Esperey must be respected. This helped tremendously for the moment, but as nothing was done to give force to the declaration, things became worse than before and in the course of four weeks Karolyi was deposed and Bela Kuhn rose to power.

The Rumanian advance into Hungary was closely related to the strength of bolshevism in Hungary and the weakness of its Government. But the Bolshevik Party of Hungary numbered not more than 4,000 or 5,000 on February 1, 1919,

and alone could not have exercised the great popularity ascribed to it by Bratianu. In spite of its limited membership, the Hungarian Bolshevik Party took power March 21, 1919—Rudolf Tokes, "Bela Kuhn and the Hungarian Soviet Republic," New York: Praeger, 1967, page 109. Such a small group could have never assumed power without the complete breakdown of governmental authority and the despair of the majority Socialists in the Allied inaction. Rumania precipitated the coup by having occupied, by March 21, most of the territory later allotted to it in Paris, or about one-third of historic Hungary. The appeal of communism was in fact very weak, especially in eastern Hungary, the area of interest to Rumania. No distribution of wealth had occurred, except for a moderate land reform. The Karolyi government had continued to appeal to the Wilsonian principles to its last day of rule. Not even the Social Democrats denounced the 14 points as a "capitalist" policy. Rather, Mr. Bratianu consciously sabotaged the Karolyi regime in the hope of a Bolshevik takeover in Hungary which would permit Rumania to occupy all claimed territories under the guise of "liberating" them from bolshevism. Under the impact of a probable Bolshevik takeover, the Supreme Council accepted the proposal of its committee for "the establishment of a neutral zone between the two proposed lines, to be occupied by Allied troops with a view of preventing the spreading of bolshevism, which was prevalent in Hungary."—Excerpts from the minutes of the meeting of the Supreme Council, held on February 21, 1919.

This resolution compromised Rumanian interests. Bratianu feared that the western delimitation of the neutral zone along the line promised to Rumania in the 1916 London Treaty would breed irredentism. It would be assumed that the final frontier was the western, rather than eastern end of the neutral zone. Bratianu suspected that the result would be an attempted, or completed Bolshevik takeover. On the other hand, both the Council decision and the occupation worked for Bratianu. In either case, he could prove his accusations about bolshevism in Hungary and appear the savior of democracy and Christianity.

Rumanian efforts were successful. The De Lobi Note, based on the decision of the Supreme Council of February 27, 1919, brought down the Karolyi regime, leading to the Social Democratic-Bolshevik coalition of March 21, 1919, in an Hungarian Soviet Republic, and rejected the terms of the Supreme Council. Exploiting the political instability in Budapest, Rumania renewed her military offensive April 16 and quickly occupied the Eastern Hungarian territories.

In the meantime negotiations about the frontiers were proceeding in the Committee. The Bolshevik coup had worked to Rumanian advantage. With Hungary turning Bolshevik, there was little opposition to allotting Transylvania proper to Rumania despite the protest of the Hungarian Transylvanians against the annexation and the belated accession of the Saxons to the annexa-

tion. The eminent Oxford historian of the era, C. A. Macartney, estimates that in a straight plebiscite the Rumanians would not have polled more than 60 percent in Transylvania proper. This plurality would not have been sufficient for annexation but would have led to partition similar to the 60-40 results of the Silesian plebiscite in 1921, which led to a partition of that province between Germany and Poland.

The American delegation was quick to recognize the untenability of the "neutral zone" decision. General Tasker Bliss criticized the decision on a number of counts. On March 27 he warned President Wilson *ex post facto*:

The present conditions in Hungary are the direct result of the action of the Supreme Council on February 26, 1919. That act, therefore, was politically unwise. It cannot be justified morally before the people of the United States . . . The line of the neutral zone which had been drawn was absolutely unjust, and we should not make matters worse by enforcing an extremely unjust decision by force of arms. (D. Miller, *My Diary at the Conference of Paris with Documents*, New York: Appeal, 1924; VII, pp. 259-261.

Bliss argued further that the entire zone was ethnically Hungarian. He felt that by changing the demarcation line, the Allies would sever a bond with Hungary established at the Belgrade Armistice of November 13, 1918. Bliss feared lest the Hungarians regard the demarcation line as validating Rumanian claims to the 1916 London Treaty.

However, the objections of the American delegates had little impact on the Council. For several reasons, the survival of bolshevism in Hungary overshadowed their views during the critical negotiations in the Committee in April and before the Supreme Council on May 8, 1919. First, neither the American, nor the other members of the Committee were aware that in practice they were drawing the final frontiers and that they were Hungary's court of last resort. The position of the delegates varied. Charles Seymour and Prof. Clive Day of the American delegation were more willing to accept compromises which they hoped would be modified in the Council. The French generally pressed for the London Treaty frontiers. The British and Italians were less adamant than the French. Although a compromise resulted in a partial revision of the boundary, the ethnic division between Hungarians and Rumanians was wholly disregarded.

In the report of the Commission, it was admitted that the nationality distribution was not one of the criteria used in defining the frontier. The account states that Magyar towns surrounded by Rumanian country districts were allotted to Rumania. But the report failed to mention that these were usually Magyar towns surrounded in the east by Rumanian, and in the west by Hungarian country districts. Five cities, with populations ranging from 30,000 to 75,000 fell into this category. Rumania was given the outlets to the valleys of the plain, and a railway connecting these outlets with each other and with the Danube. This meant again the inclusion of a long and narrow strip of technically Hungarian areas into Rumania. Finally, the Committee consid-

ered it advisable to facilitate the junction of the railways on the plains with the railway system of other Allied countries, which meant that the northern Banat area with its mixed Hungarian-German population was given to Rumania.

The U.S. position at the proceedings favored an ethnic division. At the May 8, 1919, meeting of the Supreme Council, U.S. Secretary of State Lansing asked where the ethnic line would be. Mr. Tardieu, the French Chairman of the Committee assured him that only in some cases would it lie "20 kilometers" to the east and pretended that such a line would cut railway lines and continuous communications. Lansing persisted, asking how many Hungarians would be placed under Rumanian rule and how many Rumanians under Hungarian rule. Tardieu estimated their respective numbers to 600,000 and 25,000. However, the actual number of Hungarians involved was closer to 1.7 million than to 600,000. Secretary Lansing protested:

This distribution does not appear very just; in every case the decision seemed to have been given against the Hungarians. (Excerpts from the Minutes of the Meeting of the Supreme Council, Held on May 8, 1919.)

The frontiers proposed by the committee were finally adopted by the Council of the Ten on May 12, 1919. The decision was communicated to Rumania and Hungary following the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting of June 12, 1919. The objections of Lansing and Bratianu to the frontier were overruled.

It can only be concluded that the United States consistently opposed the present Rumanian-Hungarian boundary. While sympathetic to Rumanian demands for national self-determination, all American parties to the decree of May 12, 1919, favored a decision based on the interests of the displaced ethnic minority. At the second Paris Peace Conference of 1919, the American delegation again raised the issue of the contiguous Hungarian areas. However, Russian opposition at this time made it impossible to maintain a revisionist position. The correct demographic statistics were disregarded by the committee and misrepresented by the Rumanian claimants as well as by the French chairman of the committee. The American delegation was deliberately misled as to the true ethnic distribution of these areas. Only American pressure prevented an even further westward push of the Rumanian frontier resulting in the inclusion of another 500,000 Hungarians into the Rumanian state.

American public opinion opposed the transfer to Rumania of the Hungarian minority. The country was still sympathetic to the people of Luis Kossuth, the Hungarian nationalist famous for his role in the Hungarian revolt of 1848. Shortly after the declaration of war against Austria-Hungary, New York Representative—and later mayor—Fiorello LaGuardia addressed the House of Representatives on July 23, 1917, as follows:

I know that the sympathies of the true Hungarian people are entirely with our cause. They are a liberty-loving people with a glorious history. There is no people in this world that could do more to bring this conflict to an end than the Hungarian people . . . It is advisable and prudent that we give all the

moral support we can . . . I am sure the lesson of Kossuth, the great Hungarian liberator, is not forgotten.

The settlement of the boundary dispute in Rumania's favor, then, cannot be attributed to U.S. promotion of unjust Rumanian claims. Other factors are to blame. These include Bratianu's intrigues at the negotiations and the Rumanian invasion of the territory in question. The Bela Kun interlude blocked the interests of the population of the transferred territory. Although Bolshevik rule lasted only 133 days, the coup occurred in the midst of the boundary negotiations. The United States was not involved in these events. While it could not control internal Hungarian developments, the United States consistently supported national self-determination in the Hungarian-Rumanian boundary dispute.

MCCARTHY DISPUTES KEY SECTION OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES POISON GAS DISPOSAL REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Department of Defense received the report of the National Academy of Sciences Committee on the U.S. Army's plans for disposal of large quantities of poison gas. This report, prepared by a committee of the Nation's top scientists and chaired by Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, recommends that most of the gas be rendered harmless at the Army arsenals and depots where it is now stored.

I wish to commend the National Academy of Sciences committee for its thorough and informed study of this problem. The committee brought together the scientific and engineering disciplines needed to consider a difficult assignment. The committee applied its knowledge to the problem and has made recommendations with which I generally concur.

The National Academy of Sciences panel has recommended that the 21,000 M-34 Air Force nerve gas bombs be destroyed at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal or at the nearby Tooele Army Depot. They point out that the dangers of moving this gas by rail and of contaminating the Atlantic Ocean at the dumping spot are too great to warrant the risk. I agree.

The panel recommended that the 12,600 1-ton tanks filled with mustard gas be unloaded and burned at the Army installations where it is currently stored. The panel warned against the possible dangers to the ecology of the Atlantic Ocean that might result from large-scale dumping of this highly toxic gas. I agree.

The NAS committee recommended that a special committee, including ballistics experts, be convened by the U.S. Army to consider whether there is a practical way of disposing of defective M-55 Air Force nerve gas rockets now encased in cement. These rockets pose a difficult disposal problem. If it is absolutely necessary, the committee recommends taking

it to either Earle Naval Ammunition Depot, N.J., or the Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, S.C., for burial at sea.

Here is where I disagree.

I urge that every conceivable means of disposing of these rockets at the Anniston Army Depot and the Blue Grass Army Depot be studied. An appropriate method most certainly can be found without disposing of them at sea. The sea disposal plan would require that the trains be given exclusive right-of-way on their trip to the sea. State and local health officials do not have the expertise to respond appropriately if there is an emergency.

The committee also made other recommendations relating to the disposal of contaminated containers and tear gas that seem appropriate.

The findings of the National Academy of Sciences committee on the U.S. Army's plan to dispose of this poison gas confirm my original suspicions that the movement of these deadly weapons of war across the country by rail and their subsequent dumping in the Atlantic Ocean was dangerous to the public and to the environment.

Their scientific expertise has pointed the way to a much safer way to dispose of these poisons.

Today the Defense Department announced it will follow the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences committee. I applaud this action but reiterate the need to find an acceptable method of disposing of the M-55 rockets.

I insert in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the report of Dr. Kistiakowsky's committee:

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1969.

Dr. JOHN S. FOSTER, Jr.,
Director, Office of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHNNY: I transmit to you herewith a report prepared by a committee I appointed on behalf of the National Academy of Sciences, in accordance with your request of May 14, to give technical advice on a plan developed by the Department of Defense and alternate plans, for the disposal of certain overage and surplus chemical warfare agents and munitions. The members of the committee were selected to bring a broad range of relevant expert scientific and engineering knowledge to bear on this matter, including chemistry, biology, toxicology, physiology, and oceanography, as well as practical experience in the manufacture, handling, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials, including explosives and chemical warfare agents.

I believe you will agree with me that the committee should be commended for the intensive study they have been able to give to this complex problem, in the interest of public service, on such short notice. I am confident the unanimous conclusions they have reached represent the best judgment of the scientific and engineering community, and trust their recommendations will be helpful to you in deciding upon a course of action.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK SEITZ,
President.

DISPOSAL HAZARDS OF CERTAIN CHEMICAL WARFARE AGENTS AND MUNITIONS

(Prepared by an ad hoc advisory committee of the National Academy of Sciences)

This Committee was appointed by the President of the National Academy of Sciences in response to a request of May 14,

1969 from Dr. J. S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, for an assessment of hazards involved in the execution of "Operation Chase" (and alternate plans) for the disposal of certain surplus chemical warfare stocks of the U.S. Army. Dr. Foster noted that, because of seasonal considerations, an early response would be most helpful.

This limitation on time precluded an exhaustive study by the Committee of all alternatives and factors involved. Prior to meeting, the Committee reviewed printed material submitted by the Department of Defense relating to Operation Chase, and additional relevant material from a variety of other sources. Individual members of the Committee studied the records of pertinent hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. House of Representatives, and consulted with a representative of the Colorado Committee for Environmental Information and with Mr. Louis Garona of Edgewood Arsenal. Various members visited Edgewood Arsenal, Rocky Mountain Arsenal, and Naval Ammunition Depot Earle (including a flight over the adjoining territory and the tracks of the Central Railroad of New Jersey to the city of Elizabeth). Personnel at these facilities were cordial and cooperative, and discussions with them were most helpful in providing the Committee with background information based upon experience in handling the agents and munitions concerned.

The committee met subsequently for two full days of briefings and executive sessions. Briefings, with responses to questions from the Committee, were given on various aspects of Operation Chase and alternate methods of disposal by the following personnel from the Department of Defense:

Army: Mr. Samuel Berlin, Mr. Paul R. Chagnon, Mr. S. Eckhaus, Dr. Joseph Epstein, Mr. Norman G. Hansen, Mr. Robert Hurt, Mr. E. J. Jordan, and Col. John J. Osick.

Navy: Mr. Frank Dunham and Mr. Alfred Fernandes.

The following representatives of the Department of Defense, who also attended the meetings, responded to many queries from the Committee members:

Army: Acting Assistant Secretary (R&D) Charles L. Poor; Brig. Gen. James A. Hebbeler; Dr. Van M. Sims; and Mr. R. K. Webster.

Navy: Assistant Secretary (R&D) Robert A. Frosch, and Dr. William P. Raney.

Messrs. W. C. Jennings of the Department of Transportation and T. P. McCormack of the Federal Aviation Administration responded to questions about railroad transportation and about flight patterns and regulations at the Denver airport. Officials representing other agencies of the federal government also were present.

The Committee appreciates the cooperative attitude of all these individuals and the wealth of technical and other factual information that they provided.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We are very much aware that continuing inaction will not reduce the hazards of eventual disposal of the chemicals and munitions intended for disposal in the 1969 Operation CHASE, and in some instances will increase them.

Furthermore we are aware that many activities of the federal government unavoidably involve some hazards to the personnel involved and also to private "bystanders". In this respect, government activities resemble those of private manufacturing and transportation organizations. We believe, however, that the government should set an example to private organizations and individuals of minimizing risks to humans and

damage to the environment, even though this may complicate and make more costly its own operations. Therefore we recommend that Operation CHASE as originally conceived be modified as follows. Five types of materials are included in the plan:

1. AF M34 bomblet clusters containing GB, a "nerve gas"
2. Bulk containers of Mustard
3. M55 rockets containing GB in concrete "coffins"
4. Contaminated and water-filled bulk containers
5. Drums containing cans of CS agent in concrete.

We recommend that disposal of these materials should be as follows:

1. A total of 21,108 M34 clusters, each containing 76 bomblets, each of which is loaded with 2.6 lb of GB (volatile liquid "nerve gas"), 0.55 lb of tetryl burster charge, and fuze, are stored now at Rocky Mountain Arsenal (RMA), the site of their manufacture some sixteen years ago.

Discussion: We consider the Army's plans for minimizing the hazards of possible GB leakage during railroad transportation, including prevention of accidents and provisions for treatment of injured people, to be well developed. However, we cannot exclude the remote possibility of a catastrophic explosion in connection with transportation of large numbers of M34 clusters. Conceivably a sniper's high-velocity bullet could initiate a burster charge, and tests have shown that this induces sympathetic detonation of several adjacent bomblets; or, the collision of a gasoline truck with the train on a grade crossing could start a fire that could detonate the contents of many clusters. Other possible hazards associated with rail transport could also release large amounts of GB from M34 clusters. This could cause casualties far beyond the capacity of the attendant medical staff to handle.

Moreover, the Navy's plans for loading and towing the CHASE ship to the disposal grounds and sinking it there cannot preclude the remote possibility of a collision at sea or some other major accident that could conceivably result in the release of large quantities of GB.

There is some possibility of a large detonation of M34 clusters upon sinking of the ship in the ocean. As already noted, limited sympathetic detonation in a cluster has been observed in a test in air. The better impedance match of water invites a massive sympathetic detonation should a bomblet detonate. We consider that this is a probable event upon the impact of the ship's hull on ocean bottom (7,200 ft deep), which it reaches at a speed that has been estimated from 10 to 100 ft/sec. While the consequences are impossible to predict precisely, lethal contamination of several cubic miles of the ocean (spread near the bottom downstream from the dump in a layer covering many square miles) for a period of many days is likely, on the basis of calculations involving the rates of hydrolysis (and thus of detoxification) of GB, its convective diffusion, and expected (very slow) sea currents. With no massive detonation, GB would be gradually released upon progressive corrosion of its thin-walled steel containers. Calculations such as those above suggest contamination of a small fraction (0.1 to 0.01) of a cubic mile of sea water as a bottom layer near the dump, lasting a few to many months, depending on the corrosion rate. In either case live fish are likely to be attracted into the contaminated layer by dead animals. The effects of these events on the oceanic ecosystem cannot be estimated but could be very serious. We are not fully convinced that a massive detonation upon the upending of the sinking hulk while still near the surface can be wholly excluded. If this were to happen, of course, the results could hardly be less serious.

We have considered and rejected (as the Army did earlier) various ways of entombing the M34 clusters on dry land. In essence, real disposal would thereby merely be postponed, while the stage would be set for an accident or even a major catastrophe for a future generation of Americans, when the records of such entombing would have been lost and human activities not now thought of would have been undertaken.

The burying of the clusters in a deep cavern, followed by the explosion of a small nuclear device there, could incinerate and detoxify the clusters. However, the hazards involved in various stages of this operation and the time required for its completion make this an undesirable plan.

Over a period of many years, RMA personnel have disposed of more than 2,200 leaky M34 clusters by disassembling them and chemically destroying or salvaging the GB without "lost time" accidents.

Recommendation: We recommend, therefore, that the M34 clusters be disassembled and the withdrawn GB be destroyed chemically either by acid or alkaline hydrolysis. This procedure would result in waste materials without "nerve-gas" properties and not more hazardous than larger volumes of industrial waste that are routinely discharged elsewhere.

On balance, weighing various hazards we recommend that this disassembly be undertaken at RMA because (i) the hazards arising from transportation by rail will be eliminated; (ii) RMA has an experienced staff that has already disassembled M34 clusters; (iii) RMA has facilities that can be fairly rapidly expanded for the recommended operation. We consider the addition of waste waters from hydrolysis to the sealed pond on the grounds of RMA not to be an issue since it would be only a small increment of similar waste now in the pond. If this recommendation is adopted, however, we urge the Army to proceed as rapidly as possible with the implementation of the plan, which may take from 18 to 30 months. In the meantime, immediate measures should be taken to protect the stores of M34 clusters from lightning and excessive direct sunlight, and also to distribute them so as to minimize the effects of the unlikely event of an aircraft crashing on the stores.

If, for any reason, the disposal of M34 clusters cannot be carried out at RMA, we recommend that they be moved by rail to the Tooele Army Depot and there disposed of by disassembly and chemical destruction of GB, as above. Tooele is recommended because (i) it offers a shorter haul by rail from RMA through a less-populated area (with the major exception of the passage through a part of Denver); (ii) it is located in a sparsely populated region and has a large land area; (iii) the Army has transported to Tooele other munitions containing "nerve gas" so that, when the time comes for their disposal, the disposal facilities that will have to be constructed at Tooele for M34 clusters would make further railroad transportation unnecessary.

As noted earlier, the probability of a catastrophic railroad accident involving M34 clusters is very low, but not zero. To reduce it further we recommend that, in addition to safety measures already planned by the Army, positive steps be taken to close grade crossings in inhabited areas during the passage from RMA to Tooele of trains loaded with explosive munitions containing "nerve gases".

2. A total of 5,311 one-ton heavy steel containers (like those used commercially for chlorine) filled with Mustard liquid were to be disposed of in Operation CHASE, and are stored at the Rocky Mountain, Anniston, and Edgewood Army establishments. Another 7,332 such containers that were to be disposed of later are at Pine Bluff and Tooele.

Discussion: The transportation of these

heavy steel containers by rail should be considered a hazardous operation subject to safety precautions practiced by the Army. However, we consider that such transportation of an almost non-volatile liquid (Mustard H or HD) would involve virtually no hazards of a catastrophic accident because even a strong fire would not rupture the tanks and boil off the Mustard. Hence the safety and security plans adopted by the Army to deal with accidents resulting in minor leaks and even larger local contamination are adequate. Similarly we can conceive of no likely *catastrophic* accidents occurring during the towing of a CHASE ship to the disposal area.

In the past, various chemical warfare agents have been repeatedly disposed of in the oceans by the United States and other nations (see, for instance, House of Commons Parliamentary Debates, Weekly Hansard, No. 484, 25 March—31 March 1960). We have no information regarding possible deleterious effects of these operations on the ecosystem of the seas.

Most of the one-ton containers of Mustard would probably not rupture upon the bottom impact of the sinking CHASE ship. However, their brass valves (forming an electrochemical couple) would cause moderately rapid corrosion of the steel containers, so that large numbers of cylindrical shapes of solid Mustard weighing about a ton each would eventually be exposed to sea water on the bottom. Considering the very slow rate of solution of solid Mustard in sea water at 3.5°C, the rate of its hydrolysis (and hence detoxification), and the effects of dissolved Mustard on fresh-water fish, we believe that the ocean volume made lethal to fish would in all probability be extremely small, although some pollution would continue for years. We are concerned, however, about the effects of Mustard on the germ cells of fish and on unicellular and larval organisms, concerning which no quantitative data were available. Thus the effects of these large masses of Mustard on the oceanic ecosystem are not predictable.

Mustard is readily combustible and, in the past, about 3,000 tons of it have been destroyed by burning in a special furnace at the RMA. Some of the products of combustion are air pollutants of the same type as those released in some industrial and electric-power-generating activities, namely hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide, and none have properties of chemical warfare agents.

Recommendation: We recommend that the Mustard scheduled for disposal in CHASE (and about 6,600 tons more in the 7,332 containers still to be disposed of, as mentioned previously) be burned in government establishments where storage is safe and *local* air pollution from the resulting SO₂ and HCl is not a serious problem. This procedure was successfully followed at RMA in an incinerator having a heat dissipation capacity of about 17(10)⁶ Btu/hr. The products of combustion were dispersed into the air from a 200-ft. chimney. Should maximum ground-level concentrations of pollutants prove to be excessive, a simple liquid scrubber should be added to the existing facilities and the effluent sent to the sealed lake. If for compelling reasons the disposal is at a site other than RMA, similar facilities are suggested, with thought being given, during design, to long-term use to incinerate other materials.

3. A total of 418 "coffins" containing M55 rockets are now at the Anniston (Alabama) and Blue Grass (Kentucky) Army establishments. The rockets are distributed evenly in solid blocks of concrete cast into heavy steel boxes with welded lids. Each such "coffin" weighs about 6.4 tons and contains 30 rockets. Each rocket contains 10.8 lb of GB liquid "nerve gas" and about 2.6 lb of Composition B burster charge, as well as rocket propellant and fuze. In previous CHASE operations during 1967 and 1968 1,706 such

"coffins" have been sunk in one location east of NAD Earle at a depth of 7,200 feet.

Discussion: The transportation of the "coffins" by rail should be treated as a hazardous operation, but we conclude that the probability of a catastrophic accident is essentially nil because (i) the "coffins" should survive the wreck of a slowly moving train (35 mph or less, according to Army plans); (ii) a fire would take a long time to heat the large concrete mass of a "coffin" to a temperature high enough to cause rocket explosion; (iii) a sniper's bullet could not penetrate to a rocket to cause explosion; and (iv) sympathetic propagation of the explosion of any one rocket is not likely.

As in the case of the one-ton Mustard containers, the probability of a catastrophic accident during the towing of a CHASE ship loaded with the "coffins" is vanishingly small.

We expect that most, if not all, of these "coffins" would survive intact throughout the sinking of the hulk. Upon the corrosion of the steel containers, sea water will penetrate concrete and corrode the thin aluminum bodies of the rockets, thus allowing GB to diffuse slowly to the outside. Some hydrolysis of GB will take place within the pores of concrete. Where alkaline pH due to concrete prevails, the products of hydrolysis will be polymeric. These and the gelatinous aluminum hydroxide of the corroded rocket bodies may seal the pores in concrete, slowing down diffusion of GB. Hence the time interval after which "coffins" cease to be toxic cannot be estimated. The GB that escapes will be hydrolyzed gradually by sea water. The resulting toxicity of the sea should be highly localized.

The Army considers the demilitarization of M55 rockets now encased in concrete to be impractical.

Burying of the "coffins" on land or in lakes is inadvisable in our view, as well as in the Army's because they would probably retain their toxic contents long after the records of their disposition have been lost. The possibility of a serious (or even massive) accident involving human lives in some more or less distant future is thus not excluded.

Recommendation: We recommend that the Army convene a group of technically qualified individuals, including demolition experts (which we are not), to consider whether a practically feasible way could be devised to dispose of the "coffins" on an Army establishment. This method should be safe to neighboring population and positive in the sense that toxic and explosive contents of the "coffins" would be destroyed within a predictable time. As a group, however, we are unable to formulate a definite proposal that satisfies these conditions.

If the proposed study does not produce such a method (and assuming that what is now being recommended is consistent with the international obligations of the United States of America, a matter which we as a group cannot assess), we recommend that the 418 "coffins" be transported by rail (choosing routes minimizing proximity of population) to NAD Earle and, through, Operation CHASE, sunk in the same disposal area (centered at 39°38'N, 71°0'W) where the other 1,706 "coffins" have already been dumped. The choice of this location is based on reasoning that the concrete blocks will remain on the bottom for a very long time after the loss of toxic ingredients, and it is preferable that all of them be in one location when, in some more or less distant future, technological operations at the depth involved (7,000 ft) will be common and the records of CHASE operations may have been lost. To accelerate the conversion of the additional "coffins" into inert blocks of concrete, we recommend brazing to each of the outer steel boxes several pieces of copper to

form electrochemical couples for accelerated corrosion.

If it is decided not to use NAD Earle for Operation CHASE, we recommend reconsideration of the use of the Naval Weapons Station-Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina, since, if these recommendations are carried out, only one CHASE ship would be required, and the local personnel and facilities at Charleston may be found to be adequate for its safe loading and towing to sea. The use of Charleston would entail a less serious rail-transportation problem and the ship could be sunk in the dump area (29°20'N, 76°0'W) already designated on charts as used for "explosives chemicals, and munitions," which is in a very deep ocean (about 15,000 ft) where disposal might be less undesirable.

4. At Edgewood Arsenal (Maryland) are stored 2,325 one-ton steel containers that, at one time, contained some unknown contaminant, and have since been emptied and filled with water.

Discussion: These water-filled containers present relatively minor railroad and other transportation hazards, since such hazardous materials as GB and Mustard would already have been hydrolyzed for a long time by water-filling. On immersion in sea water, these containers should be corroded moderately rapidly because of their brass valves. Their leaking contents will serve as only a very minor local contaminant.

We have been informed that these containers cannot be disposed of through commercial channels because the chemical nature of their contamination is unknown.

Recommendation: We recommend that, to ensure only insignificant content of toxic materials, these containers be drained and refilled with water at the Edgewood Arsenal, a procedure, we were told, that presents no serious problems. Thereupon, if they still cannot be disposed of through commercial channels, we recommend disposing of them through Operation CHASE.

5. Also located at Edgewood Arsenal are 86 drums of 55-gallon capacity filled with cast concrete in each of which has been embedded canisters containing 80 lb of a mixture of a solid riot-control agent CS and some pyrotechnic composition.

Discussion: We were informed that safe disposal of the contents of these drums at the Arsenal presents serious problems.

The rail transportation and ship towing of this material present no serious hazards, since explosive hazards are virtually nil and the agent is non-lethal. The thin-walled drums will be fairly rapidly corroded upon sinking to sea bottom. The CS agent is rapidly hydrolyzed by sea water and, therefore, whether or not the concrete blocks survive the bottom impact, contamination of the sea will be minor and transient.

Recommendation: Unless a procedure similar to the demolition procedure first recommended in Section 3 is developed, we recommend including in the same Operation CHASE procedure recommended as second choice in Section 3 the small additional tonnage here involved.

While the following comments are outside the terms of reference of the Committee, we wish to suggest to the Department of Defense that it adopt basically the same approach to chemical warfare agents and munitions that the Atomic Energy Commission has adopted toward radioactive waste products from nuclear reactors. It should be assumed that all such agents and munitions will require eventual disposal and that dumping at sea should be avoided. Therefore, a systematic study of optimal methods of disposal on appropriate military installations, involving no hazards to the general population and no pollution of the environment, should be undertaken. Appropriately large disposal facilities should be regarded as a required counterpart to existing stocks and

planned manufacturing operations. As the first step in this direction, we suggest the construction of facilities for gradual demilitarization and detoxification of remaining M55 rockets.

AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Frederick Bellinger, Chief, Chemical Science and Materials Division, Engineering Experiment Station, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

Kenneth P. DuBois, Director, Toxicity Laboratory, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

George B. Kistiakowsky (Chairman), Professor of Chemistry, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Carl M. Lathrop, Engineering Advisor, Esso Research and Engineering Co., Florham Park, N.J.

Stephen Lawroski, Associate Director, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Ill.

Colin M. MacLeod, Vice President for Medical Affairs, The Commonwealth Fund, New York, N.Y.

M. S. Meselson, Professor of Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

N. M. Newmark, Chairman, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Donald W. Pritchard, Director, Chesapeake Bay Institute, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

John H. Ryther, Chairman, Department of Biology, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, Woods Hole, Mass.

John C. Sheehan, Professor of Chemistry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

James L. Whittenberger, Associate Dean, Harvard University School of Public Health, Boston, Mass.

Martin A. Paul, Staff Director.

HEPTANOIC ACID AND CRUDE CHICORY ROOTS—THE PEOPLE BE DAMNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, this House today put its seal of approval on a back-room bargain, surreptitiously negotiated, by those whose programs have been and continue to be soundly repudiated at the polls.

The original purpose of the 10-percent surtax was sold as a tool to help fight inflation by reducing spending in the private sector. There was another key promise to the agreement. Spending in the public sector was to be materially reduced also.

We all know that this was not done. In a few instances, showcase cuts were made in such highly visible programs as postal service for which the people already pay, or highways, which are supposedly financed from trust funds, but on the whole, the important cuts promised did not take place. So inflation has continued—in fact escalated.

There is something patently asinine about the theory that it is inflationary for the man who earned the dollar to spend it on his family—but that it is not inflationary for the Government to take the dollar away from him and give it to someone else to spend.

The people understand this foolishness and have plainly spoken against any extension of the surtax. As I said earlier this week, the dishonest and unpopular Johnson surtax is about to become the

equally dishonest and equally unpopular Nixon surtax.

But suddenly something had to be done quickly, before the people could see what was going on. Although we have had 6 months to consider the matter, there had been nothing done. Suddenly there was a frantic cry to extend the surtax before midnight Monday, when it will expire. Then there were loud and newsworthy statements from many Members that they would not extend the surtax without what was called significant tax reform—relief for the taxpayers. Next came a postponement of action, because the votes for the surtax just were not there. Then there was the persuasion game in the name of "party loyalty," by both parties. Finally there was the political realization that the vote on the surtax extension must be taken before July 4 vacation when most Members would be at home and hear directly from the people in their districts.

And so, there was a political deal made. Some who had earlier demanded tax reform forgot the taxpayers. In consideration for more money distributed to the ever-growing, non-tax-paying, welfare class, they agreed to extend the surtax. This afternoon, by a constitutionally questionable device, without debate, the decent, hard-working, law-abiding taxpayers are stuck again—this time traded out for the direct benefit of the ever-growing parasitic class who pay no taxes, but who vote in ever-increasing numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a constitutionally questionable measure. The Constitution, in article 1, section 7, clause 2, plainly provides:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

This clause was put there for a purpose—to keep the real taxing power close to the people. This House has complied with demands to deliberately evade this constitutional command, because the safeguard it erects would work. The people do not want an extension of this surtax under present conditions and the Members of this House know it.

We have acted on a minor bill extending the duty exemption on a substance called heptanoic acid—but to which, without hearings, the other body hastily engrafted significant tax provisions. These provisions have never been accorded the courtesy of a hearing in committee in this House. The trading horse—a removal of the ceiling on the funds to subsidize illegitimate children—was tacked on to a simple measure removing the duty from crude chicory roots. The public is not even aware of what we are doing.

We have not extended the surtax—that will come Monday, we are told. We have only extended a law saying that employers must continue to collect, and to send to the Treasury a tax which has expired.

This hand in the pocket of taxpayers does not even extend to all taxpayers—just to the workingman for whose paycheck it can be withheld. The self-employed and the employer himself are excused from this seizure of wages in advance of a tax law.

The principle is the same as if we said that, Since the Government needs money, we will just have employers withhold all of the July pay, and get around to adjusting the tax later to cover the operation. Suppose the surtax fails Monday—then what? The employers would continue withholding for 30 days without a law.

The Constitution has something to say on this subject also. In addition to the due process clause, which certainly implies more than a backroom political bargain, in enacting tax measures the fifth amendment, commands:

Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

This is exactly what we have done—by voice vote. We have taken private property, the dollars from workers' paychecks, with no compensation whatsoever.

We did not act on the tax. We acted only on the collection mechanism. We have required the taking of money from those we may get around to taxing later, on the appealing argument that to fail to do so would cost employers money by requiring them to change their book-keeping, and then to change it back if we ever pass the tax.

I say that this is a totally phony argument for two reasons. First, employers who felt entitled to abide by the law, have already prepared for the end of the surtax according to the very withholding tables we are now asked to amend, and must now do the very thing we claim to avoid. Second, the expense of change to the employer is a tax deductible business expense, although the withholding of wages from the employee who earned them gives that employee no deduction, no interest on his money, no other advantage.

Mr. Speaker, we again have been asked to act in the teeth of the desires of our constituents, and against all logic or commonsense. In the name of political power we are asked to go along with a corrupt bargain, where we take more and more from those hard-working, productive Americans who are the backbone of this Nation, in order to redistribute their earnings to another class of people who are productive of nothing but the fourth and fifth welfare generation—and votes.

The people whom I represent do not approve of this sort of transparent scheme. I ask my colleagues who represent other taxpaying, working, Americans to stand up and be counted for their constituents and to join in preventing another such contemptible fraud on the American people. The people want and deserve the end of the surtax measure.

Mr. Speaker, I include a recent editorial outlining the behind-the-scenes maneuvering:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 26, 1969]

RESPONSIBILITY AND THE SURTAX

The prospects for extending the surtax took a sudden turn for the better yesterday, thanks to Minority Leader Gerald Ford and the Republican Party.

Ford was able to inform the Democratic leaders that 170 of the 188 Republicans in the House were prepared to vote for a full-

year extension of this crucial measure. This represented a dramatic 40-vote increase over the accepted Grand Old Party nose-count up to that time. One explanation for the shift was the President's reportedly effective lobbying efforts behind the scenes. Also, Ford was likewise successful in his urgent appeal for party responsibility.

As a result, Speaker McCormack and Majority Leader Carl Albert agreed to schedule a vote on the surtax this Monday before the July 4 holiday break. Had the House gone ahead with its original plan to delay matters until after the recess, the chances for the surtax extension would, of course, have worsened accordingly.

Now that the Republicans have shown a commendable willingness to vote their consciences rather than their districts, the responsibility for the fate of the government's anti-inflationary program rests squarely with the Democratic majority in Congress. The American public is sophisticated enough nowadays to know when the party in control of Congress—rather than the man in the White House—is at fault. If a delay in extending the surtax rocks the standing of the dollar abroad, or causes panic in the domestic money markets, the voter will know that the Democrats are to blame. Moreover, he may be expected to figure out for himself that many Democratic Study Group members who now oppose the surtax extension unless a firm commitment is made for tax reform this session are, in fact, hiding behind that excuse as a way of avoiding a vote for the surtax.

This Friday, the House will have the opportunity to vote for a one-month extension of the surtax. All indications are that this stop-gap measure will pass. But this move hardly can be expected to solve the crisis in confidence that doubts about the full-year extension of the surtax will engender here and abroad.

The responsibility of congressional Republicans and Democrats is altogether clear. The surtax must be extended for a full year—now.

THE PROBLEM OF DRUG USAGE AMONG TODAY'S YOUTH

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are living in the psychedelic age. It is an age which came upon us very quickly, with little warning, and has overtaken us at a pace which is difficult to keep up with. Because of this, a tremendous amount of confusion, concern, fear, and misunderstanding on the part of parents who find their children a part of a world they themselves do not know or understand, has resulted. Aside from the overriding necessity for detailed research on the effects of drug usage, there is a need for public education about the effects of drugs, the reasons for which youth are drawn to them, and what can and should be done about it. Western Electric Manufacturing and Supply Co., in Sunnyvale, Calif., has recognized this need and taken the responsibility upon itself for this education process.

In May, with the cooperation of Station KNTV in California, which kindly gave prime TV time for a public service broadcast, Western Electric presented a program entitled, "Marijuana, the Growing Grass Fire" which was designed to inform the public of the issues involved in the use of marijuana. The response to this broadcast by the public was very enthusiastic and Western Electric re-

ceived hundreds of letters praising the show and requesting copies of a booklet which Western Electric had published in conjunction with the broadcast called "Parents Guide to Marijuana." I think the efforts of Western Electric to take on the responsibility of helping our society understand and adjust to its new problems are to be highly commended and should serve as an example to others in our country. I include the following portion from the above-mentioned booklet as a part of the RECORD and as an insightful commentary on the problem of drug usage among today's youth:

Today's young people are a lot more idealistic than we were at their age. They have an awareness of social justice, world peace and other national and international problems. They are not easily fooled by hypocritical parents. Or tolerant of them, for that matter. In all fairness, we can't preach about drugs if we ourselves are hung up on tranquilizers or are partial to three martini lunches. We as adults must get off our duffs and earn our children's respect by setting good examples in what we do, think and feel in all our relationships.

We forget young people need—and even desire—authority. They say we now live in a permissive society. You don't have to be a policeman to recognize this is true. Children, the experts say, want strict parents, but at the same time want the discipline to be fair, not tyrannical, and discipline left up to the father, not sloughed off to the mother.

A little education on both sides won't hurt. Unfortunately for parents, teenagers know more about the drug scene than their mothers and fathers. What parents need to do is learn all they can about marijuana—and other drugs, too. Goof up one small fact about drugs and a child can make a big thing of it. A parent's point of view must be from a position of level headedness and factual knowledge. Hopefully, this booklet will assist you.

The times they are a-changing. Our youth are certainly aware of it. Too many of us are out of it as far as our children are concerned. And that's because we're not listening. Trite but true, few of us communicate. Maybe a little two way communication will help break down the barriers between parents and child.

INTRODUCTION OF FOOD STAMP BILL

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a companion bill to the Food Stamp Reform Act of 1969 introduced by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN.

I am introducing this bill because of certain specific complaints from the congressional district I represent.

The Ninth Congressional District includes the fertile lands of southern Alameda County, the Santa Clara Valley and a small portion of San Mateo County in California. The Santa Clara Valley is one of the most famous agricultural valleys in the Nation and, even today in the age of urbanization its crops are still a rich resource. Farms are still producing lush yields and good profits in San Mateo and Alameda Counties. There is no lack of food here.

All three of these counties brag about the wealth of their inhabitants. In particular the greater San Jose area regu-

larly advertises that the income level of its population is one of the highest in the Nation.

Thus, the Ninth Congressional District of California is fortunate enough to be in an area which produces an abundance of food and whose inhabitants earn far more than the national average.

The problem of hunger should be absent from my district.

It is one of the deep ironies of this Nation that instead there are those who go hungry in the Ninth Congressional District, those who go hungry in rich Alameda County, those who go hungry in the lush Santa Clara Valley, and those who go hungry in green San Mateo County.

I do not know how many these hungry number. No one has ever investigated fully, another irony.

I do know an official of the Santa Clara Valley Headstart program told me that of the 4,000 children served in that program last year she estimates 2,000 of them were hungry.

I also know Frederick B. Gillette, director of the welfare department of Santa Clara County reported on May 6, 1969, in testimony before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs in San Francisco:

In Santa Clara County today there are families with children suffering from the effects of diagnosed malnutrition. These are the families that cannot afford to buy food stamps.

Hunger in the Ninth Congressional District is a hidden problem.

We in the district have grown so fast that we failed to look back, we have failed to notice those who have not traveled our road to prosperity. There is, I believe, no one within the district who would allow a child to go hungry, if he or she could help. However, only a few have ever looked and recognized the face of hunger hidden among signs of prosperity.

The problem of hunger in the Santa Clara Valley is now being examined through a governmental study, yet this study made up of cold statistics cannot tell the full story of human misery. The study will serve a worthy purpose, but I am afraid it will not mobilize the total resources of the area in such a way that hunger can be fed through the warmth of private action.

I would hope the people of my district will help us find the hungry, discover where they live, and determine what can be done to help. Specifically, I would hope the Santa Clara County Council of Churches, through its task force on hunger, the Santa Clara County Medical Society, Metropolitan San Jose, other private organizations, and the minorities, would cooperate in a study of hunger in the area. School districts could play a vital role in such a study. Finally, I would hope the press, the newspapers, radio, and television would conduct their own independent and impartial investigations of the problems of hunger.

This kind of cooperative study could reveal, not only to Government, but also to the people of the area, the extent of the problem and the solutions to it.

Governmental programs have failed in

this area of hunger. Better solutions must be found, which involve all sectors of the area and of the Nation.

The Federal Government cannot eliminate hunger, but its programs can be improved. In particular there are reforms in the food stamp program which can help, and help now.

Mr. Gillette, in pointing out the problems within Santa Clara County, said many of those eligible for the food stamp programs cannot afford to purchase the stamps:

A household of nine with a net take home pay of \$491 per month and an adjusted net income of \$426 a month must pay \$122 for \$166 worth of food coupons each month.

Expenses for the family, including house payment, utilities, medical bills, furniture payment, car payment and gasoline are \$400 per month, leaving them only \$91 for food, incidentals and clothing. Obviously, they cannot pay \$122 each month for food stamps.

As Mr. Gillette points out, one of the major problems in the present program is that food stamps are an all or nothing proposition. The recipient must buy every stamp he is eligible for, or none.

In the Ninth Congressional District this problem is extreme. Costs are high. Rents are among the highest in the Nation, if a rental can be found. A car is a necessity, for there is no public transportation worthy of the name.

A mother and three children with no income other than welfare payments, receives in Santa Clara County \$221 per month. In order to obtain adequate housing, she must pay at least \$100 a month in rent—and for that amount she would be lucky to obtain a two-bedroom old apartment in a deteriorating neighborhood. A modern, unfurnished three-bedroom apartment costs at least \$240 a month, a three-bedroom unfurnished house with termites and a sagging bathroom floor, \$180 a month.

This mother and her children face the choice of either inadequate housing, clothing or food supply, and a possible combination of all three.

It is my belief that many of those who depend on welfare payments, or social security for sustenance, go hungry.

The legislation I am supporting will not cure this hunger, but it will help.

It changes the present all or nothing law to read:

A household may, if it so elects, purchase any amount of coupons less than the full coupon allotment it is entitled to purchase.

Mr. Gillette pointed out another inequity in the present law:

Many older persons have three to five thousand dollars in the bank as a reserve against possible illness, funeral expense or other emergencies. Because they are sorely afraid of their savings dwindling and because they don't want to end up as a burden on their loved ones, they often live on marginal incomes which do not allow adequate funds for food.

To meet this problem, the legislation I support says of the standards for eligibility:

Such standards shall also place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households, but such limitations shall apply to the income, if any, realized from such resources and not to any income which might be realized through liquidation of such resources.

There are a number of other portions of the act pertinent both to my congressional district and my State.

First, it would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to use private local agencies or other governmental agencies to operate the food stamp program, when local officials, as some have in California, refuse to operate such programs.

Second, the Secretary of Agriculture would set the maximum income for participation in the food stamp program, but the States on the basis of local needs could increase that maximum income level, if necessary and if the Secretary of Agriculture approves.

Third, any household whose income is less than two-thirds of the minimum cost of purchasing a nutritionally adequate diet will receive its coupon allotment free.

At present the Agriculture Department has established the cost of a low-budget diet at about \$1 per day for each member of the family, a budget of \$120 a month for a family of four. Thus a family of four with an income of less than \$90 would get free coupons. There are presently 5.2 million Americans in such families.

Fourth, the maximum income level for participation—eligibility to buy stamps shall be no less than three times the cost of purchasing a minimum adequate diet.

Under present standards the maximum income level for a family of four would be \$360 a month.

Fifth, recipients of food stamps would be permitted to purchase products necessary for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation.

While I believe this legislation will aid in fighting hunger in my congressional district, I do not believe it answers the basic problems.

Let me use as an example again, the mother and three children on welfare in Santa Clara County, who receive \$221 per month.

On this sum she must feed, house, clothe, and provide transportation for herself and her children. I, for one, do not believe she can feed herself and her children for \$120 per month, leaving \$101 for rent, clothes and transportation. Adequate housing of any sort is all but unavailable. She must report any additional income she receives, on the penalty of going to jail.

In Santa Clara County a family of four cannot live today on \$221 per month.

I believe this legislation will help her, and her children.

I believe we in the Ninth Congressional District must investigate and find new solutions to the problems of hunger in a place where hunger has no right to exist.

Senator McGOVERN in introducing his bill said:

Are we to believe that our nation can afford 11 trips to the moon, a new multi-billion dollar manned bomber and a dubious anti-ballistic-missile system, but that we cannot afford a penny more to feed hungry children because this would cause inflation? This is nothing less than disgraceful—the use of the threat of inflation to persuade a person who is suffering from hunger to wait a few more years for food.

I would add that we can afford napalm for Vietnam, we can even afford to feed hungry Vietnamese, but we are now told

we cannot afford the money to feed hungry Americans.

A French queen once said, "Let them eat cake."

Today, we in the United States must find a better answer, or we too will lose our heads, and deservedly so, if we allow our own children to go hungry.

THE SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM MUST HAVE HELP NOW

(Mr. SIKES was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with the plight of the small business investment program. At the direction of the President, the Bureau of the Budget has declined to release the full \$30 million appropriated for the SBIC program for the current fiscal year. In fact, only \$8.7 million has been released to fund SBIC loan applications of pending but not funded from the prior fiscal year, 1968. Today 45 SBIC's out of a total 350 active licensees have approved loan applications on file with SBA totaling \$28.7 million. These companies are in desperate need of matching funds if they are to continue to service the financing needs of small business concerns throughout the country. What is more, the very survival of many of these SBIC's is at stake. Unless the Bureau of the Budget releases the remaining \$22.3 million in appropriated funds, the entire SBIC industry can be placed in jeopardy, for it will become apparent to all SBIC's that they no longer can count on SBA funds in time of need and therefore have little reason to continue in the program.

I am aware that officials at SBA and Budget Bureau as well as industry representatives have been diligently working to find alternative funds through guaranteed borrowings from the private money market. Several proposals have been advanced, but because of the rising cost of money and legal complications with other Federal agencies, none has proven feasible. Thus the only remaining alternative of maintaining these 45 SBIC's as viable financial institutions is to release the \$22.3 million frozen by the Bureau of the Budget before this fiscal year expires.

The administration has stated it has not released the entire appropriation, because it must comply with title II of the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that a modest reduction in the allocation of appropriated funds might be understandable, but the refusal to fund any applications filed since the beginning of this fiscal year is inconceivable for it may ultimately lead to the destruction of the only organized source of venture capital available to small business in this country. The release of the remainder of the appropriation, \$22.3 million, will have a minimal impact upon the Federal budgetary picture, but it means the difference between solvency and insolvency for hundreds of small business concerns dependent upon these SBIC funds. Inaction by the Budget Bureau will also

mean the loss of several million dollars already in the program as several SBIC's awaiting funds may be forced to liquidate. I believe we could also realistically anticipate the departure of dozens of other SBIC's as it will be apparent they can no longer rely on the Federal Government to comply with its end of the bargain by supplying money when needed.

Eleven years ago Congress passed the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 which promised to match SBIC private capital with Federal funds at a ratio of 2 to 1 up to certain maximum amounts. Thousands of individuals were induced to invest their savings, time, and effort in hundreds of SBIC's. The Federal Government must not now break its good faith agreement with these entrepreneurs and arbitrarily cut off their source of funds.

We can keep faith; we must keep faith with our private partner. It is incumbent upon the administration to release these funds immediately. No other feasible solution to the SBIC money crisis is imminent and action is needed now.

HALT DDT ADVERTISING

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, recently I have joined with colleagues in efforts to curb the poisoning of our environment with chemicals used as pesticides. My action stemmed from a long interest in protecting our citizens, as well as wildlife, from the dangerous effects of these substances.

Of particular urgency is the need to halt the accumulation of the chemical DDT in our environment. This poison does not dissipate in the normal processes of nature, but instead continues to collect in greater concentrations as it is used ever more widely in agriculture. The result is that we are slowly poisoning the entire world by its use.

The threatened extinction of the American bald eagle from DDT best symbolizes the ravages that this chemical is making on our environment. All of us have a common stake in stopping this race to disaster.

Although efforts to control such pollution usually meet with public apathy, it is heartening to note that some responsible groups in our society are working diligently toward a sounder policy on poisonous chemicals. One example of this was the recent action of *Sunset* magazine in placing an immediate ban on advertising of DDT and related chemicals.

Sunset acted only after a long, careful study of the situation. Its conclusions—concerning the danger of these chemicals to all of us—are worthy of attention by all Members of Congress as well as other concerned citizens and public bodies. This magazine's action is especially significant since it currently carries more insecticide and pest-control advertising than any other nonfarm magazine in the United States.

In addition to banning advertisements for these products, the magazine is publishing a major article urging readers to use substitute products. Some 19 accept-

able products for home and garden use are listed, along with recommended methods for getting rid of present supplies of the insecticides. A revision of *Sunset* garden books is also planned for this fall.

Since these are positive steps that put the public interest ahead of monetary gain, I commend this magazine for its concern for the public welfare. For the benefit of my colleagues, I place an announcement of the magazine's actions at this point in the RECORD.

The announcement follows:

SUNSET MAGAZINE MOVES AGAINST DDT AND FIVE OTHER INSECTICIDES

MENLO PARK, CALIF.—*Sunset* Magazine announced this week an immediate ban on accepting advertising for products containing DDT and five other insecticides, and is revising all of its *Sunset* gardening books to recommend substitute products, according to Lane Magazine & Book Company president, L. W. (Bill) Lane, Jr.

The move came after a continuing concern and a six-month intensive study convinced the magazine's gardening staff and management that damage to wildlife and the eventual possibility of harm to humans is far too great to offset the product advantages for use in home gardens.

The announcement is especially significant in view of the fact that *Sunset* currently carries more insecticide and pest-control advertising than any other non-farm magazine in the country.

Lane also announced that the magazine will publish a comprehensive report on the subject in its August issue, listing 19 acceptable substitute products for use around the home and recommended methods for getting rid of present supplies of the insecticides. He emphasized that many of the substitute products have been included in recent and all current printings of *Sunset* publications. The magazine's ban on product advertising goes into effect with the same August issue, which is the first issue going to press following the announcement.

Sunset's garden editor Joseph F. Williamson said that research and checking with all responsible authorities convinces him that the new restrictions imposed by the California Department of Agriculture are a step in the right direction, but that more controls are needed.

Sunset's decision not to accept advertising precedes the January 1, 1970, ban ordered by the State of California directive on only two insecticides—DDT and DDD.

Three other states—Arizona, Wisconsin, and Michigan—have passed or proposed legislation to control the use of DDT and related chemicals.

The *Sunset* article will also recommend that four other insecticides immediately be taken off the market for home gardening—aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, and toxaphene. They are also included in the ingredients not acceptable for *Sunset* advertising. Williamson explains that the major problem with these stems from what scientists call "nondegradability." Other kinds of insecticides "break down" or change into harmless substances within hours or days after application. These retain their chemical potency, wherever nature may take them, for years after application.

Williamson reports that manufacturers are actively cooperating in the drive to market substitute products that offer the benefits of insect control without the hazards of DDT and its related compounds. Some have voluntarily eliminated DDT products from their lines. Nevertheless, according to a *Sunset* survey of retail outlets, it still is currently contained in 35 products in the Western garden supply market.

Scientists report that certain forms of wildlife (California brown pelicans, peregrine

falcons, bald eagles, and Dungeness crabs, to name a few) have taken enough DDT into their systems to make many adults no longer capable of reproducing, thus threatening their species with extinction.

Lane noted that not accepting certain categories of advertising is not new to *Sunset*. The publication, with a circulation of close to one million in Western America, has a long list of products that it does not accept in its advertising pages. "In the case of tobacco and hard liquor, we dropped advertising of such products 25 years ago," Lane said, "not because we set ourselves up as crusaders, but because we felt they didn't fit in the atmosphere of our family-oriented magazine. But in the case of insecticides, our readers expect us to be authorities; we can't very well accept advertising for products we would not endorse or recommend in our editorial pages."

In addition to publishing *Sunset* Magazine, the company is a major book publisher. Melvin B. Lane, publisher of *Sunset Books*, reports that revisions already are being made on all of the firm's garden books to conform with the new findings on insecticides.

A VOTE AGAINST H.R. 7906

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 7906, a bill to impose Federal regulation on State and local taxation of commerce.

While unfair burdens are undoubtedly being placed on such trade by the States, the evidence indicates that the States are speedily moving to correct these difficulties by themselves. In my own State of Hawaii, for example, the legislature in 1967 enacted the Uniform Division of Net Income for Tax Purposes Act which was a uniform law proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

In 1967 the Hawaii Legislature also passed a law preventing "double taxation" on the same sales transaction if completed on an interstate basis. Under this law, Hawaii gives credit to sales or use taxes paid to another State or local government.

Also, many States are adopting the multistate tax compact which seeks to redress the same ills which are the subject of this bill. I feel that the States should be given further opportunity to solve these problems before Federal regulation takes place.

The Honorable John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii, opposed H.R. 7906 because it would result in a loss of revenue to the State and would place intrastate businesses at a substantial competitive disadvantage with interstate firms.

Governor Burns said:

The provisions of the Multistate Tax Compact already provide a better method of resolving multistate problems of taxation.

This bill has been before Congress in various forms for quite a few years. As originally proposed, it drew criticism from some Members of this body as being directed against small business. Subsequently it has been "toned down," and the committee report on H.R. 7906 assures us that the measure will help end the multiple taxation fears of small and medium-sized businesses.

I hope that this is true, if the bill is enacted. Yet it is difficult to see how re-

moving taxes on transactions by a firm located in another State will fail to harm small businesses operating in only one State. These small firms have difficulty now in meeting the competition from "outside," and if a tax "break" is given to interstate firms then they will have a further advantage over local business.

While the bill excludes corporations with more than \$1 million in average annual sales from the proposed limits on State income taxes, I further hope that this will not work to the advantage of big concerns which are segmented into small units. Who reaps the profits from reduced State revenues that are contemplated?

In view of these dangers, I feel that the benefits of H.R. 7906 are outweighed by its drawbacks.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL DESCRIBES HOW A BILL IS MARKED UP

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Banking and Currency Committee reported out a bill in the general subject area of one-bank holding companies.

Many people, both inside and outside of the Congress, have asked what happened on this legislation during an open markup session, Thursday, when the critical votes were taken.

Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of this morning, Friday, June 27, carries a lengthy article which accurately reflects what happened.

Mr. Speaker, for those interested in the activities of the Banking and Currency Committee, I place this article in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 27, 1969]

BANKING INDUSTRY SCORES IN HOUSE PANEL AS EASIER ONE-BANK HOLDING BILL ADVANCES

WASHINGTON.—The banking industry won a major victory in an embittered House committee on legislation to extend Federal regulation to holding companies controlling one bank apiece.

With the help of five Southern Democrats, Republicans on the House Banking Committee gained tentative approval for a measure that would regulate the one-bank holding companies more loosely than a rival bill backed by Chairman Patman (D., Texas) and the committee's Democratic majority.

The key effect would be to specify that affiliates acquired by one-bank holding companies before last Feb. 17 won't be affected by the new regulatory statute being drafted.

That date is much more recent than any that was thought to be under serious consideration. The Nixon Administration had suggested a June 30, 1968, cutoff date, and until yesterday morning that was the date contained in the bill sponsored by committee Republicans.

The Patman measure contained no such "grandfather clause." Instead, it would require one-bank holding companies to divest themselves of affiliates that the Federal Reserve Board deemed insufficiently related to banking.

The decision stunned and angered several committee Democrats, who maintained that such a recent cut-off date will make almost meaningless any one-bank holding company bill Congress eventually passes.

They argued that the main purpose of the holding-company bill being drafted is to extend regulation to the many big banks that in the past year or so have become one-bank holding companies in order to enjoy unregulated diversification. The Feb. 17 cutoff date would exempt most of these companies' acquisitions from regulation.

Currently, only the banking subsidiaries of one-bank companies are Federally regulated; the holding companies themselves are free to acquire other businesses far afield from banking. In contrast, holding companies controlling two or more banks are tightly regulated by the Federal Reserve Board under a 1956 law.

"I don't mean this in any personal way," Chairman Patman told the committee as it prepared to vote, "But this (Feb. 17) date is a disgrace. It is a disgrace which will haunt this committee forevermore. . . ."

Mr. Patman noted that in four weeks of hearings the only witness who testified in support of the Feb. 17 cut-off date was Nat S. Rogers, vice president of the American Bankers Association.

In response, Rep. Widnall of New Jersey, the committee's senior Republican and the sponsor of the adopted measure, said Feb. 17 was picked because it was the date the first one-bank holding company bill was introduced in the current Congress and thus "was the first time companies were put on notice there probably would be legislation in this area."

The Widnall substitute bill also specifies that one-bank holding companies would be allowed to acquire only those affiliates that the Reserve Board had determined to be "functionally related to banking."

The Patman measure uses the phrase "closely related to banking," and then lists various activities bank holding-company affiliates could engage in.

A Patman aide said substitution of "functionally related" for "closely related" might result in a new series of administrative interpretations to replace the Reserve Board's past rulings regarding the "closely related" standard in the 1956 law regulating multi-bank holding companies.

The dramatic 20-to-15 roll-call vote was taken in an extraordinary public session, as the press and a roomful of lobbyists watched. "We had \$70 billion of assets in this room today," a committee aide remarked after the vote.

In urging its defeat, Mr. Patman called the Widnall substitute the "S&H Green Stamp amendment," because Sperry & Hutchinson Co., one of many concerns that would benefit from its passage, reportedly has been intensively lobbying the committee.

Outside the hearing room following the vote, Robert Oliver, a Washington lobbyist who said he represents Sperry & Hutchinson, commented that he hadn't been surprised by the outcome. "I knew we had anywhere from 19 to 23 votes," he remarked.

Mr. Oliver said that if the Patman measure had prevailed through final Congressional passage, Sperry & Hutchinson would have been required to divest itself of State National Bank of Connecticut, which he said it acquired last September.

Adoption of the Widnall measure isn't the committee's final action, but it appears unlikely the decision will be reversed before the committee sends the bill to the House floor.

Chairman Patman said in an interview he intends to do all he can to strengthen the bill before it's sent to the Senate, where hearings haven't begun on the bank-holding company issue.

Rep. Briscoe (D., N.Y.) said he may offer a floor amendment to delete the Feb. 17 cut-off date. "If we accept this grandfather clause," he commented before the vote, "we might as well forget the legislation. If we're going to lock all these people in, then we're just wasting our time here."

In his statement, Mr. Patman made his first, albeit indirect, reference to the con-

flict-of-interest problem existing in the committee because of the ownership of bank stock by several members.

"Every member is well aware of the criticism that has appeared in the public print about this committee," he said before the vote. "I have steadfastly refused to discuss this criticism and to do anything to add fuel to the fire. But this committee is being watched for its actions on bank legislation. I hope nothing that we do here today will add to the criticism."

This was an apparent reference to newspaper accounts, based on Representatives' filings with the House Ethics Committee recently, that showed several Banking Committee members own stock in banks.

The Banking Committee, as well as the House generally, operates under a rule prohibiting a member from voting on an issue if "he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question." All members of the committee voted yesterday, and Rep. Patman conceded in an interview it thus would appear that some members had violated the committee's rules.

He said, however, that the committee would have to hold "an investigation" to determine whether that was true, and that he didn't intend to call such an inquiry. "That's difficult for me to do," he explained, "because I'm the chairman of this committee and I try to work with these fellows. We have other legislation coming up besides this."

The conflict-of-interest question within his committee is believed to be a source of considerable embarrassment to the chairman, who has mounted a one-man crusade in recent months to force Treasury Secretary Kennedy to sever his ties with the Chicago Bank he once headed if he's to remain in the Cabinet.

The five Democrats who joined the committee's 15 Republicans in support of the Widnall amendment were Reps. Stevens of Georgia, Gettys of South Carolina, Galifianakis of North Carolina, Bevill of Alabama, and Griffin of Mississippi.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for today, on account of critical family illness.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MESKILL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HICKS (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for June 27, on account of official business.

Mr. GOODLING (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for the week of June 30, on account of official business.

Mr. McEWEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders herefore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McCARTHY, for 30 minutes, today.
 Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
 Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.
 Mr. TUNNEY, for 15 minutes, on June 30.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN to extend remarks made on House Resolution 455 and include a statement he made before the Ways and Means Committee.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZWACH.
 Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.
 Mr. COUGHLIN in two instances.
 Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. LANGEN.
 Mr. SCHWENGEL.
 Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. MCCLURE.
 Mr. BROOMFIELD.
 Mr. BLACKBURN.
 Mr. HOGAN in three instances.
 Mr. O'KONSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.
 Mr. BLATNIK in three instances.
 Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.
 Mr. ALEXANDER in two instances.
 Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.
 Mr. MINISH.
 Mr. VANIK in two instances.
 Mr. NIX.
 Mr. POWELL in three instances.
 Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.
 Mr. WOLFF.
 Mr. HOWARD in two instances.
 Mr. RARICK in four instances.
 Mr. DIGGS.
 Mr. EILBERG.
 Mr. STOKES in six instances.
 Mr. KOCH in four instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. PICKLE in three instances.
 Mr. RYAN in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 621. An act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1076. An act to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1708. An act to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 ('78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1932. An act for the relief of Arthur Rike; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that

committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 265. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies; and

H.R. 4229. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid, and to continue for 1 month the existing rates of withholding of income tax.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 26, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 790. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 30, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 91st Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: JOHN MELCHER, Second District, Montana.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

893. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting several plans for works of improvement prepared under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, none of which involves a structure which provides more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to the

provisions of the act (16 U.S.C. 1005); to the Committee on Agriculture.

894. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report on architectural and engineering fees in excess of \$25,000, for the period of July 1-December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 102 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

895. A letter from the general counsel, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting a report on the examination of the accounts of the council as of December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 14(b) of Public Law 88-376; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

896. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting several plans for works of improvement prepared under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, each of which involves at least one structure which provides more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to the provisions of the act (16 U.S.C. 1005); to the Committee on Public Works.

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. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 2. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as to provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 780. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 91-332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California: H.R. 12468. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS: H.R. 12469. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12470. A bill relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for judicial reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina: H.R. 12471. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: H.R. 12472. A bill to require the licensing by the States or the Federal Government of operators of certain vessels on navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. O'NEILL of Massa-

June 27, 1969

chusetts, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. VANIK, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 12473. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12474. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12475. A bill to revise and clarify the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H.R. 12476. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 12477. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12478. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the granting of authority by the Federal Communications Commission for the broadcast of pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 12479. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLORY:

H.R. 12480. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 12481. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional pro-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gram for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12482. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights in and under lands in Dunn County, Wis.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12483. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 12484. A bill to establish certain rights of professional employees in public schools operating under the laws of any of the several States or any territory or possession of the United States, to prohibit practices which are inimical to the welfare of such public schools, and to provide for the orderly and peaceful resolution of disputes concerning terms and conditions of professional service and other matters of mutual concern; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 12485. A bill to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of juries, to further promote equal employment opportunities of American workers, to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission, to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests and devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 12486. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the only son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12487. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if certain relatives of such member died or became totally disabled while serving in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 12488. A bill to restrict the mailing of credit cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12489. A bill to reform and modernize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 12490. A bill to establish fee programs for entrance to and use of areas administered for outdoor recreation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 12491. A bill to supplement the anti-trust laws of the United States by providing for fair competitive practices in the termination of franchise agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12492. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to permit the duty-free entry of certain personal effects of servicemen assigned to combat areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 12493. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit a State, under its agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission for the control of radiation hazards, to impose standards (including standards regulating the discharge of radioactive waste materials from nuclear facilities) which are more restrictive than the corresponding standards imposed by the Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 799. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. 12494. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Orsola Miceli and minor son, Vito Miceli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12495. A bill for the relief of Annibale Cuozzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12496. A bill for the relief of Polberto Obias Baranuelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 12497. A bill for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act and in the interest of Mrs. Kathleen Alice Heinze; 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:

157. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Roger Sherman Bandy, Decatur, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

158. Also petition of Geraldine M. Vickers, Lawndale, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent from the First Congressional District of Arkansas recently sat down to record his ideas on "America's Heritage of Freedom." The resulting article on the price and responsibilities of freedom is worth the serious consideration of all of us as we approach the 193d birthday of our Nation.

The article, written by Mr. Rudy

Thomas of Caraway, Ark., was printed in the local newspaper in Caraway. I commend it to the attention of each of my colleagues and include it in the RECORD at this point:

AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

(By Rudy Thomas)

Another Glorious Fourth of July is just around the corner. It is a day remembered and celebrated as the birthday of our nation. Come next July 4th our nation will be 193 years old. This may sound as if ours is a very old nation, but quite the contrary, it is still a relatively young nation.

As we pause from our daily routine of life to once again celebrate our national birthday let us examine in all candor some of the basic elements that have made our America

the greatest nation in the world today. Freedom as men know it under American government is indeed new. It has come to us only after men struggled for centuries to exercise their rights to be free, to throw off the fetters of tradition. Throughout most of the world's history men have lived their daily lives under rigid rules.

From birth to death primitive people obeyed tribal custom and taboos. As civilization arose, despot kings held the power of life and death over their subjects. In the middle ages merchants gained some business rights, but the poor peasant remained in bondage to his feudal lord. The turning point in these deplorable social conditions seems to have been steered by the hand of God. The spread of Christianity began to undermine the ancient idea that men were

merely servants of the state. Christianity preached "the importance and dignity of the individual", that a man had reason and a conscience and so the right to live his own life. Then the bold discovery of our continent opened new chances to break bonds. Our precious forefathers in due time quit the Old World for a fresh new world where they could nurture the seeds of freedom. To do this they had to conquer a wilderness, fight some six years of Revolution, and build their own nation on a raw continent. That is what they did earn freedom, to earn the chance to think and act for themselves and enjoy the fruits of their own labor and risks. The history of the Colonial and Revolutionary days show how dearly they paid for it. Our American forefathers knew how hard freedom was to earn. They were not going to take it lightly. To safeguard it they created a new kind of government. They wrote the constitution of the United States with the Bill of Rights—the first government in history to serve, not the state, but the people. Now that they were free they knew they could work out their own destiny. Their tools were courage, work and risk—the tools of free men.

This then is basically our American precious heritage of freedom. If it be just, if it be righteous, if it be Godly, let us all in America think on these things as we approach another glorious 4th and give due thanks to men of each generation who have been willing to pay the price to sustain such a noble heritage.

Now just a word about the future in our land of the free and the home of the brave. If we are to have and to hold our national honor we of this generation must assume serious responsibilities based upon high and noble character. Freedom is a hard-won prize. We have to work to keep it. Let a people become indifferent or greedy and that people is in danger of losing freedom. Freedom demands responsibility. It demands courage and hard work. It demands knowledge, thinking. It does not promise equal gains for all. It does however, promise equal rights, equal risks. Individual freedom is ours only as long as we earn it. The work starts in our own actions and behavior. We can keep freedom by respecting the rights of others—family, neighbors, community, and minority groups in race, religion and politics.

In conclusion, let us challenge the youth of our land to position your life, based on courage and character to hold these elements of freedom ever so high where it can be said by all generations of Americans to follow—you have passed to us the torch of freedom inherited from the glorious men of yesteryear.

Now that you have read these facts concerning our heritage of freedom please go out to your favorite picnic come July 4th and help celebrate one of the greatest days ever known to man.

SURTAX IN DANGER

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of tax reform, I am quite naturally deeply disappointed with the income tax surcharge bill which is scheduled to come to the floor of the House for a vote on Monday.

Last year we were told that if we approved the 10-percent income tax surcharge as proposed by then President

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Johnson, we would get tax reform. Some of us, including myself, refused to merely listen to promises and demanded performance. We did not get it and refused to support the tax proposal. A year later we are again being asked to vote favorably on the income tax surcharge and again we are hearing promises about tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, the time for tax reform is now. If we are to pass a tax bill at all, it should be coupled with meaningful tax reform, particularly the tax-giveaway, 27½-percent oil depletion allowance.

To those who are hinting that we will get tax reform in return for passage of the income tax surcharge proposal on Monday, I ask you to commit yourselves now—before the tax vote on Monday—on the following question: "Are you prepared to vote in favor of the elimination or at least a drastic reduction of the 27½-percent oil and gas depletion allowance?"

Those who cannot answer with a loud yes, should not be asking anyone else to vote in favor of the income tax surcharge on Monday.

Possibly those of us who have fought for tax reform have been taken for granted too long. Possibly there are those who feel that we can be bought off by the insignificant proposal contained in the tax bill which covers the working poor. I assure them that they are wrong.

This morning's New York Times contains a very interesting editorial in relation to the current controversy over tax reform. I hasten to add that the New York Times supports the tax proposal as a way of throwing water on the fires of inflation. Nevertheless, its remarks about tax reform should be of great interest to everyone concerned with tax reform.

At this point in the RECORD, I place the Times editorial:

SURTAX IN DANGER

Prospects for extension of the 10 per cent income tax surcharge all by itself are not very bright.

The Democratic leadership in the House, fearful that their party would be tarred with the brush of "fiscal irresponsibility" have now scheduled a Monday vote on the Administration's bill, a measure conspicuous for its failure to embody substantive reforms. But if despite strong liberal opposition the bill is approved, an even taller hurdle will be encountered in the Senate, where the Majority Policy Committee has adopted a resolution rightly insisting "that meaningful tax reform should be passed simultaneously" with the surtax. Thus, as a consequence of the Administration's unwise decision to abandon tax reform, the surtax itself is in serious danger which means that business uncertainty and the likelihood of disturbances in the financial markets will be greatly increased.

The Nixon Administration and the Democratic House leadership made a serious miscalculation when they thought that the proponents of genuine tax reform could be appeased by an ineffectual provision to lighten the tax burden on the working poor. They failed to reckon with a new fact of political life.

Americans, with a splendid record for voluntary compliance in matters of taxation, bitterly resent the notorious loopholes in the revenue code that permit the wealthy to avoid taxes altogether or to pay far less than is warranted by their incomes. That resentment will subside only when there is genuine progress in reducing the 27.5 per cent oil de-

pletion allowance, nailing down such escape hatches as make it possible to avoid all capital gains taxes on bequeathed assets, and eliminating the tax exemption on bond issues of state and local governments.

In the absence of reduction in expenditures, which would be a more effective means of dampening inflation, the surtax is needed to avoid a budgetary deficit and return to an inflationary monetary policy. But the Administration should by now be reconciled to the fact that it cannot get the surtax extension without pressing for genuine tax reforms.

If the Administration bill is defeated on Monday, the House can follow the Senate precedent and temporarily extend the tax. If it passes, another battle will begin in the Senate. The blot created by the gaping tax loopholes can no longer be easily expunged from the conscience of the Congress.

INTELLECTUAL EXHIBITIONISM IN EDUCATION IS DEPLORED

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as one of 22 Congressmen who visited college campuses last month to learn the causes of student unrest, I am most concerned with the course our universities take in preparing students to assume leadership in years to come.

I understand student desire to hear all points of view. I agree with student concern for better communication with college administrations, more voice in relevant curriculum and campus affairs, community problems such as housing, and national problems such as economic injustice.

Some colleges, however, are busily misinterpreting the valid student concerns into the terms demanded by a small minority of highly trained revolutionaries.

In my congressional district, Bryn Mawr College recently disclosed that it has retained as a visiting lecturer Dr. Herbert Aptheker, admitted Communist and Communist Party functionary, described as the leading theoretician of the Communist Party in this country.

When I learned of the appointment, I expressed my disagreement with the necessity and the wisdom of appointing a doctrinaire lecturer. The final decision as to whether or not Bryn Mawr should, in fact, retain Dr. Aptheker rests with the trustees, administration, students and faculty, and, perhaps, the alumnae who contribute and parents who pay tuition to send their daughters there.

I am weary of the cries of academic freedom as a cloak to cover any act that draws criticism. I am particularly disturbed at what appears to be a growing intellectual exhibitionism that institutions must outdo their peers in catering to demands for Marxism to the neglect of a system that has produced more things for more people than any society mankind has ever known.

It is a question of balance.

Just as I would protest a plethora of campus lecturers expounding authoritarian, racist, or Fascist theory, I as vehemently protest the parade of Marxist and revolutionary teachers onto our

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

campuses to "instruct" the students. I can hear the anguished screams from the academic community if colleges were to hire Democrats to espouse the theories of the Democratic Party and Republicans to promote the theories of the Republican Party.

This question of balance is critical. On many of our college campuses young men are being denied the opportunity to take ROTC even as an elective course in an attempt to cater to the demands of some students.

Yet, in direct contradiction to the elimination of ROTC, the institution will put "culture" courses into the curriculum and hire new instructors. This lack of balance can, in the long run, only hurt the education of a majority of students—black and white—who must learn also on the college campuses that life in an orderly society does not permit only your indulgences, but allows others equal opportunity.

I insert for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this editorial of June 19, 1969, from the Main Line Chronicle, published in Ardmore, Pa., which says some things that have to be said:

EDUCATION OR INDOCTRINATION?

Bryn Mawr College is a free-loading guest in the community. It pays no taxes but shares our municipal services. If the college administration assumes that the community will accept academic arrogance as academic freedom, it had better be set straight.

It has become increasingly noticeable of late that the college has lowered its standards and is going in more for indoctrination than higher education. You see it in the product.

None of the faculty will admit he is a Communist—which is, by the way, a libelous word, unless party membership can be documented. But too many members of the faculty are Marxist in effect and, as we have often said, equals to the same or equal things are equal to each other.

We have had to live with this, and there is nothing the Township can do but to accept the fact that we are playing host to an institution that is corrupting the minds of young people and working with the enemies of our government.

The administration now feels bold enough to appoint one of the leading Communist Party activists to its lecturing staff. This is an affront to the community, and to the alumnae of Bryn Mawr College as well.

The real significance of the appointment is what this means to the Red Party. Dr. Herbert Aptheker, the appointee, expressed it in the following words: "It is thrilling, with wide national significance for the Communist Party." And noting that the request for his appointment was made by black and white militants, he added: "It also reflects something of what the student movement is all about, which many people have failed to understand."

The meaning we are to take from this is that the "student movement" is aiming for a Communist takeover. Non-Communists have been saying that all along.

Dr. Aptheker's life has been devoted to the spread of Communism by indoctrination of students. He is a member of the party's National Committee and a director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies.

He successfully indoctrinated his own daughter, who, with Mario Savio, started all the trouble at Berkeley.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a whole dossier on the man, going back more than 30 years.

His call to Bryn Mawr must not be taken lightly. It has given his whole party a lift,

and its members are saying that it now puts them on a level of acceptance with the Republican and Democratic parties.

Residents of the community should let the college administration know what they think of this affront, this show of contempt for decent American opinion.

Resentment should be shown, first of all, by the alumnae, either by voice or—what is more expressive—by holding back on gifts.

Alumnae tell us that when they are solicited for gifts and when they mention with dismay the pink hue the college has acquired, they are told: "Oh, yes, but this can be changed by continued loyalty." Oh, yes? The appointment of Dr. Aptheker proves that the administration values what transient black commies want above what the public thinks of the college.

They may go in for "intellectualism" at Bryn Mawr, but they don't show much intelligence.

POWELL MAY "JUST TRY TO BE REASONABLE" WITH THE HOUSE

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the historic decision rendered June 16 by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is a subject of broad interest to Members of Congress and the general public. In addition to the resolution, House Resolution 443, which I introduced June 19, 1969, proposing to restore the pay, allowances, and seniority now declared unconstitutional taken away from him during the 90th Congress—1967-68—a delineation of his further legal options is also worthy of sober and objective reflection. It was thoughtful of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS) to submit the majority opinion rendered by Chief Justice Warren, additional views by Justice Douglas, and the dissent by Justice Stewart in the RECORD, June 25, pages 17326 to 17342. I would like to add the following which is an excellent article by William Greider, staff writer for the Washington Post, outlining Congressman POWELL's current legal position:

POWELL MAY "JUST TRY TO BE REASONABLE" WITH THE HOUSE

(By William Greider)

According to those who counseled with him in Bimini in his hour of triumph, Rep. Adam Clayton Powell genuinely seeks accommodation with his old brethren in the House of Representatives, the men who tossed him out. He would like to settle matters, not entirely on his own terms, but in a way that would avoid a nasty confrontation between the House and the Federal courts.

This present mood is subject to change without notice, of course. It is certainly out of character with the flamboyant man everyone remembers, whose defiance led to his exile from Congress. But that is how he is said to feel as of now.

Judging from the current sentiments among his colleagues, it seems unlikely that the House will be willing to settle the dispute quietly with a little something for Adam like back pay or seniority.

Aside from the political benefits of attacking him, there is a special feeling toward the Harlem Congressman, even among some of the liberals who supported him. It is a

personal animosity which they do not direct at other committee chairmen who have taken their secretaries on trips around the world or put their wives on the payroll at the taxpayers' expense.

They regard him as an unreformed scoundrel. More important, he has been an indiscreet scoundrel, continually calling the public's attention to congressional practices they all know exist. The other day, a Texas Congressman introduced a resolution to begin a counter-claim to recover the money Powell allegedly misappropriated in his days as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. That would seem just to the public and it might seem just to Powell if the same standard were applied to all chairmen.

The Supreme Court decision which declared the House exclusion of Powell unconstitutional has put him in a position where at last he has a little leverage in the matter. He can offer the House something which most members undoubtedly want—a chance to avoid an embarrassing showdown between the Federal court and its co-equal, the Congress. No one can predict precisely how this confrontation of powers might unfold, but nearly everyone agrees that it would not enhance either institution.

For Powell the situation poses a delicious irony—the possibility that the House might be placed in the position of defying a court order. Even if Powell never collected a penny in back pay that would be a poetic turnabout. For the central element in the indictment against him was his defiance of a contempt order in a New York State court. As one of his supporters said, "It's just like they all say—it's a simple problem of law and order."

A lot must happen before the case gets that far. In his low-keyed press conference in Bimini Powell said he would meet first with the House leadership and the implication was that he would explore the possibilities of avoiding the clash.

Here is the legal situation from the challenger's position: Powell could seek a declaration from the District Court that the original House resolution on March 1, 1967, which excluded him was void. By amending his suit, he could easily apply the Supreme Court's reasoning to argue that a second House resolution, adopted Jan. 3 of this year, was also unconstitutional because it allowed him to be seated with conditions. The court held that the House doesn't have the power to keep a member from being sworn in if he meets the three constitutional qualifications—if he's a citizen, a resident and old enough. (That doesn't prevent the House from punishing him or expelling him afterward.) Powell's lawyers could argue that the House was again adding to the constitutional qualifications this year when it required a \$25,000 fine and a loss of any seniority status as conditions for Powell's readmission.

If Powell won a court declaration that both of these resolutions were illegal, it would do two things for him. First, he could then argue for a court order (directed at the House staff officers, not its elected members) to recover \$55,000 in lost pay, not to mention the \$25,000 fine which they have been deducting from his paychecks. More important to Powell, he could then argue among his colleagues that his House seniority of 24 years was, in effect, restored.

Though many have forgotten this fine point, the original action taken against him by the House Democrats in January of 1967 did not strip him of his seniority. It merely ordered him removed as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. That action was intended to head off the more drastic punishment of ouster which the House eventually took. If Powell's current status is determined by the January, 1967, punishment (which everyone agrees is beyond the reach of the courts), he could claim that he is not at the bottom of the seniority ladder—but

June 27, 1969

merely an ex-chairman with 24 years of seniority.

In terms of settling amicably, Powell's lawyers could win a declaration from the District Court of the Congressman's rights—but then drop the matter without seeking the court order to enforce a remedy for the damages—the order which would force the showdown.

It would then be a matter for the Democratic caucus and its Committee on Committees to resolve. Powell himself has said that he has no illusions about regaining the chairmanship, but he hasn't given up hope that his seniority could be restored. That would make him No. 2 on the committee and presumably chairman of a subcommittee.

It would also have the effect of pushing every other Democrat on the committee down a notch—including liberals who have spoken in his defense. Simple arithmetic suggests that their opposition—plus the Southerners and Powell's other natural enemies—would be enough to prevent any restoration movement in the Democratic caucus. All of his legal arguments will be academic if his fellow Democrats insist he is still a freshman.

These are the considerations which the House leaders will have to deal with if they wish to avoid a clash with a court order. Conceivably, we will be treated to the spectacle of an Adam Clayton Powell just trying to be reasonable, baby, while his congressional colleagues will be the ones insisting they are above the law.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF MADAGASCAR

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to President Philibert Tsirenenene, of Madagascar, and Madagascar's Acting Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Reneg Ralison, on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of Madagascar's independence.

Nine years ago today the island of Madagascar joined the family of nations as the independent Malagasy Republic. On this ninth anniversary of their independence, I would like to pay tribute to the leaders, Government, and 6 million people of the Malagasy Republic for the peace, harmony, and stability they have created in pursuit of their nation's motto "Liberty, Country, Progress."

Known as the "big red island" in recognition of its natural beauty, Madagascar is the fourth largest island in the world. Madagascar forms a cultural bridge between the African and Asian worlds as its people are of Indonesian-Malay, Arab, and African heritage. Though the 6 million people of Madagascar are members of 18 different tribes, a cultural cohesiveness—not yet attained by many African nations—exists as a result of a common language, Malagasy.

The economy of the Malagasy Republic is in the early stages of development. Problems of underpopulation and lack of capital forestall rapid industrialization. However, the economy enjoys a certain degree of self-sufficiency. Ninety percent of the people are engaged in agriculture

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and 90 percent of Madagascar's exports are agricultural products. The island's principal crops are rice, tapioca, coffee, vanilla, cloves, and tobacco.

The Malagasy Republic has been a staunch friend of the Western World and an old friend of the United States—relations between the United States and Madagascar date back more than 100 years. At present a NASA satellite tracking station very vital to the American space program is located on Madagascar. The United States is also the Malagasy Republic's second largest customer as it buys about 10 percent of the island's exports.

At a time when racial strife and international conflict is the norm, it is a pleasure to note that in a state such as the Malagasy Republic the worlds of Africa and Asia can come together and create a nation which peacefully pursues the goal of "Liberty, Country, Progress."

CITIZENS' CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a coalition of some three dozen private conservation organizations, labor unions, consumer groups, professional societies, and associations of local governmental officials has launched the "Citizens Crusade for Clean Waters" in a massive effort to alert the American public to the need for controlling water pollution. I was privileged to participate in the first organizational meeting of the crusade.

Initially, the crusade is directed at getting in fiscal 1970 an appropriation of \$1 billion, as authorized, for Federal grants to local governments for helping in the appropriation of municipal waste treatment plants. On June 6, 25 of the private groups sent a joint wire to President Nixon, asking that he request the full \$1 billion for waste treatment plant construction grants. Since that time, the number of organizations in the coalition has risen to 38, with two more taking independent action in a similar vein.

The crusade was kicked off on June 9 with a press conference at the National Press Club. Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America and chairman of the Natural Resources Council of America, which initiated the crusade, presided over the meeting and explained the organization of the coalition.

Louis S. Clapper, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation and a member of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, then explained the background of need for waste treatment works. A copy of the remarks of Mr. Penfold and Mr. Clapper follows:

REMARKS BY LOUIS S. CLAPPER, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, BEFORE PRESS CONFERENCE CALLED BY THE "CITIZENS' CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER"

People interested in clean water and concerned about contamination of the environ-

ment were distressed at a report issued earlier this year by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration on the cost of abatement and control.

This report indicates that, if costs continue to rise, the total bill is expected to amount to \$26 to \$29 billion in the next five years. Broken down, this is \$8 billion for municipal works, \$6.2 to \$4.6 billion for industrial waste treatment, with another \$1.8 billion for industrial cooling, and from \$5.3 to \$5.7 billion for municipal and industrial operating and maintenance costs.

There is a growing money gap between what the Congress has authorized and what is appropriated for Federal grants to local governments for the construction of waste treatment plants. For fiscal 1968, only \$203 million of the \$450 million authorized was appropriated. For fiscal 1969, the authorization was for \$700 million, yet only \$214 million was appropriated. Finally, this coalition was formed with the Nixon Administration joining the Johnson Administration in recommending only \$214 million, or less than a quarter of the authorized \$1 billion for fiscal 1970.

We view the Federal grants as being tremendously important. Unless the Federal Government helps, it is a poor position to require high standards of water quality from the States and local governments. And, unless the governments handle municipal pollution, they are in a poor position to point a finger at polluting industries. And, so the whole water pollution control program is in jeopardy.

We are confident that the people want clean water and are willing to pay for it—if given the chance.

A survey conducted by the Gallup Organization, Inc., for the National Wildlife Federation earlier this year revealed these statistics:

About half (51%) of all persons interviewed expressed the opinion that they are "deeply concerned" about the effect of air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, and destruction of wildlife in our natural surroundings. An additional one-third (35%) are "somewhat concerned."

Nearly three-fourths of those interviewed were willing to pay something in additional taxes to improve our national surroundings.

Three of every four persons favor setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, etc.

The public is almost evenly divided on whether or not it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population if present living standards are to be maintained.

Summarizing this survey, we conclude that the American public *appreciates* quality in the environment, *deplores* what is happening to it, and *stands ready to support* corrective measures, even to the extent of paying for it—as they will, one way or another, in the end.

The Conservation Foundation, as a matter of fact, has compiled data which shows that voters have expressed themselves in this manner. Since 1964, the voters of nine states have had the opportunity to vote in statewide elections on water pollution control bond issues. Seven of the nine state bond proposals were approved and even the other two attracted majority voter support. Of 17,625,254 citizens who participated, 11,725,444 voted "yes", an average "yes" vote of 66 per cent.

I should like to report to you that the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, of which I am a member, has recommended that the Federal Government meet its obligations. The following was adopted in the December, 1968, meeting of the Board:

The Board recommends that continued efforts be made by the Secretary to ensure that the Federal Government lives up to the commitment made to the States under the municipal grants program administered by the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 27, 1969

Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. A failure to press for adequate appropriations can be construed by the States as

evidence that the Administration and the Congress were not sincere in their concern for the problem of water pollution control.

TABLE 1.—RESULTS OF STATE ELECTIONS ON BOND ISSUES FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL, 1964-1969¹

Election date	State	Amount (in millions)	Vote	Pass/fail	Percent "yes" vote ²
Nov. 3, 1964	Maine	\$25	222,242 (No 81,469)	Passed	73.2
Nov. 2, 1965	New York	1,000	3,373,700 (No 718,398)	do	82.4
May 16, 1967	Pennsylvania ³	250	1,163,779 (No 677,808)	do	63.2
June 29, 1967	Rhode Island	12	16,461 (No 12,439)	do	56.9
Nov. 5, 1968	Illinois ⁴	400	1,656,600 (No 1,216,847)	Failed	57.6
Do	Michigan	335	1,906,385 (No 796,079)	Passed	70.5
Do	Ohio ⁵	100	1,732,512 (No 1,550,759)	do	52.7
Do	Washington	25	845,372 (No 276,161)	do	75.4
Apr. 1, 1969	Wisconsin ⁶	144	808,393 (No 569,850)	do	58.9
Total		2,291	11,725,444		66.5
Less Illinois		-400	No 5,899,810		
Total passed		1,891	17,625,254		

¹ State water pollution control agencies, State election agencies, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are sources for the information summarized here. The table may not be complete; although each of the 50 States has been contacted, all have not yet responded to our inquiry. All reported bond issue election defeats, as well as approvals, are summarized here.

² The percent "yes" vote is the percentage of "yes" to total "yes" and "no" votes.

³ Pennsylvania's 1967 bond issue totaled \$500,000,000. Of this, \$250,000,000 was for water pollution control (\$100,000,000 for construction of sewage treatment plants, and \$150,000,000 for acid mine drainage pollution control). In addition, \$225,000,000 was for "elimination of land and water scars created by past coal mining practices" and closure of abandoned mines, and \$25,000,000 for air pollution control.

⁴ Illinois' 1968 proposal totaled \$1,000,000,000, which was designated for open space-outdoor recreation land acquisition and air pollution control, as well as for water pollution control. Although no fixed amount was officially earmarked for water pollution control, there was general agreement that \$400,000,000 would go for this purpose. Despite a majority of "yes" votes, the proposal was not approved due to an Illinois law which requires a "simple majority of votes cast for all State legislature candidates" to pass.

⁵ Ohio's 1968 proposal totaled \$120,000,000, which was divided into 2 parts: \$100,000,000 for sewage and water treatment, and \$20,000,000 for water management.

⁶ Wisconsin's proposal totaled \$200,000,000 and included \$56,000,000 for open space-recreation land acquisition. This was an advisory referendum only; the legislature is to make the final decision.

Notes: In 1966 the Massachusetts Legislature authorized a \$150,000,000 bond issue for an accelerated water pollution control program. Massachusetts has no law which requires either State or local bond issues to be referred to the voters for approval. In 1967 the Connecticut Legislature approved a \$150,000,000 bond issue for water pollution control. The legislature took final action on this proposal; there was no referendum by the voters.

TABLE 2.—UPCOMING STATE ELECTIONS ON BOND ISSUES FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Election date	State	Amount (millions)	Vote	Pass/fail	Percent "yes" vote
November 1969	New Jersey ¹	\$190.6			
Do	do ²	222.0			
May 1970	Oregon ³	50.0			
November 1970	Maine ⁴	50.0			

¹ In January 1969 the New Jersey Legislature placed on the November 1969 State ballot a referendum on a proposed \$190,600,000 bond issue for "expanding public sewage facilities to eliminate pollution of surface waters."

² In April 1969 the New Jersey Legislature placed on the November 1969 State ballot a 2d referendum on a proposed \$222,000,000 bond issue for "controlling and eliminating pollution of tidal and surface waters."

³ In April 1969 the Oregon Legislature voted to refer to the voters at the May 1970 primary election a proposed change in the State constitution to authorize the State to issue bonds to finance grants and loans to local governments for sewage works construction. Under the proposal the amount of bonds issued cannot exceed 1 percent of the value of all real property and the amount outstanding at any one time cannot exceed \$50,000,000.

⁴ In March 1969 the Maine Legislature placed on the November 1970 State ballot a referendum on proposed \$50,000,000 bond issue for construction of pollution abatement facilities.

JUNE 6, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Conservation, labor, and many other citizen-civic organizations representing millions of interested and concerned persons firmly believe water pollution is one of the most important domestic problems, involving serious health hazards and waste of beneficial uses of water.

State-approved applications for matching grant funds totaling \$2 1/4 billion from States and local governments are now on file with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

The proposed Federal budget for fiscal 1970 requests only \$214 million to assist local governments in the construction of sewage treatment plants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Our groups believe that your administration should seek for fiscal 1970 an appropriation of \$1 billion for Federal grants to local governments to help them in the construction of these despera-

ly-needed waste treatment plants. We consider it imperative that the \$1 billion authorized be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969.

CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER.

MEMBERS

- American Association of University Women.
AFL-CIO.
American Fisheries Society.
American Institute of Architects.
Association of Interpretive Naturalists.
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
Consumers Federation of America.
Izaak Walton League of America.
National Association of Counties.
National Audubon Society.
National Fisheries Institute.
National Rifle Association.
National Wildlife Federation.
Sport Fishing Institute.
The American Forestry Association.
The American Institute of Planners.
The Conservation Foundation.

The League of Women Voters of the United States.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

The Wilderness Society.

The Wildlife Society.

United Auto Workers.

United States Conference of City Health Officers.

United Steelworkers of America.
Wildlife Management Institute.

VOTERS AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(By Joseph W. Penfold)

Most Americans not only want clean water but are willing to pay for it.

This is indicated by a summary of results of recent statewide elections on bond issues for water pollution control. The summary was released today by the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a coalition of some 30 organizations concerned about the lagging national water cleanup program.

"The record of the last five years shows that when voters are asked directly in state bond referendums whether they want clean water and are willing to tax themselves to help pay for it, two out of three say 'yes,'" Joseph W. Penfold, coordinator of the Clean Water Crusade, said.

The summary reports that:

Since 1964 the voters of nine states have had an opportunity to vote in statewide elections on proposed water pollution control bond issues.

Eight of the nine proposals were approved and the ninth also was supported by most of those who voted on it.

Of the total of 17,625,254 citizens who voted on the nine proposals, 11,725,444 voted "yes"—an average "yes" vote of 66 per cent.

(Most states have not held elections in this field; their legislatures make the final decisions to issue bonds or to finance pollution control through regular appropriations.)

The state elections involved were in Maine in 1964, New York in 1965, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island in 1967, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio and Washington, all in 1968, and Wisconsin in 1969.

(Of the nine proposals, all were officially approved except the one in Illinois. Although supported by 57 per cent of those who voted on it, the Illinois proposal failed because of a requirement of Illinois law that such proposals must be approved by a "majority of votes cast for all state legislature candidates" in the same election.)

In commenting on the election summary, Penfold emphasized that "these state bond financing proposals were predicated on the assumption that the Federal government would keep its commitment, as declared by the Congress in the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, to match the state money."

"If we are to turn the tide and begin to clean up our polluted rivers, streams and lakes, it is necessary for the Federal government to keep this commitment that the states and local communities have been relying on by putting the Federal money on the line in the form of grants at the level authorized by Congress," he said.

The Clean Water Crusade group is asking President Nixon and the Congress to provide \$1 billion—the amount authorized by Congress—in matching grants for community sewage treatment plant construction during the 12 months beginning July 1. The Nixon Administration has asked the Congress for less than a quarter of that amount—\$2 1/4 million.

Penfold said "the inadequacy of \$214 million for this program at this time is put into perspective by the size of the backlog of grant applications from local and state governments already received by the Interior Department's Water Pollution Control Administration: \$2 1/4 billion."

The official Federal-state estimate of state

clean-up costs over the next five years is more than \$10 billion.

Penfold noted that in many instances water pollution control bonding proposals passed comfortably at the same time that voters were rejecting bond proposals for other purposes. "In the November 1968 general elections, as Engineering News-Record magazine has reported, voters across the country continued to approve most pollution control bond issues even though they rejected 49 per cent of all bond proposals," he said.

Penfold is conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. Other organizations cooperating in the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water include the League of Women Voters of the United States, the American Institute of Architects, Consumer Federation of America, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, U.S. Conference of City Health Officers, National Audubon Society, AFL-CIO, United Auto Workers, National Wildlife Federation, Sierra Club, and American Fisheries Society.

The summary of state election results was prepared by the Conservation Foundation at the request of the Clean Water Crusade. Sources for the election results reported in the summary are state pollution control and election officials, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

CAMPUS UNREST

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, 22 concerned Members of the House of Representatives, who also happen to be Republicans, recently issued a 37-page report on the subject of criticisms of life in the United States by young people, particularly college students. This attitude often is euphemistically referred to as "campus unrest." But often it has been plainly destructive and has quite properly created widespread concern among the American people. While acknowledging the legitimacy of criticism, almost all Americans believe that the road of violence as a way to cure injustice is historically demonstrable as in reality a detour to political reaction. Grotesque remedies offered by some in this Congress and in the country sustain this observation.

In my view the report of my 22 colleagues is a useful and thoughtful one that draws its strength from the fact that it is based upon visits to several dozen institutions of higher learning—not upon guesses, preconceptions, and newspaper photographs. The report, among its other strengths, points out that radical students strive to prevent successful reform by moderates. But the report does not gloss over the fact that there exists a large, and perhaps growing, body of students who are extremely disgruntled and dissatisfied with both the inadequacies of their institutions of higher learning and society in general. Importantly, in this regard, the report points out that the "crucial factor in the widening gap between students and others is the student's perception of reality. This must be understood by all those who seek solutions. This requires of us comprehension and of the student, understanding."

This report, in its entirety, is worth

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

reading. There are passages that are open to dispute but for the most part the report is helpful and those who took their time and made this effort are to be commended.

YOUTH'S CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIETY

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, while everyone has been complaining about hippies and the SDS, a great majority of today's youth is making substantial contributions to society. My observations show that our youth want to help remodel our "establishment" into a viable apparatus that is more in tune with the needs existing today rather than to destroy the fabric of our democratic way of life. I have personally known many of our youth who have taken on responsibilities far beyond their years, and I commend them for meeting the challenges that are put before them.

I share the sentiments of a very fine writer who wrote the following editorial which appeared in the *Fargo, N. Dak., Forum*:

DON'T WRITE THEM OFF

(By Lloyd W. Sveen)

Adults suffered a terrible shock last week [April 13-20]. They discovered they had written off teenagers and college students too soon.

"Students Fight Dakota Flooding" screamed the big black headline across the top of page 1 of the *San Diego Evening Tribune*. You could almost feel the amazement of California readers at the thought of schools closing because students were out sandbagging a river instead of a college president.

This is understandable in a state where student revolt was born at Berkeley in 1964, but the same stunned surprise was reflected here. A typical comment was that of Minnesota Gov. Harold LeVander: "The youth are said to be anti-establishment but when the chips are down they come through."

Why should we be so surprised that kids are eager to meet challenges? Maybe because we've taken away all the challenges that used to be normal in the process of growing up?

We're a smart generation which survived the spiked malt, Betty Coed, and Joe College age to establish a technological era where miracles are so common it is difficult to get excited about plans to land a man on the moon. We're so smart we've made it almost impossible for a child to develop into a man or a woman without wrenching experiences.

We preach about the virtue of work to our kids, but we have invented just about everything that can eliminate work.

We tell of the hardships we underwent during the depression while we hand them their own credit cards.

We teach them that the great heroes of history were individualists who dared to stand alone, but we lay down rules on length of hair and skirts so all will look alike.

We build schools to teach our kids to think and to reason, to weigh and consider; but when they arrive at a judgment that differs from ours we call them rebellious.

We call them hippies when they wander from place to place in search of happiness but we applaud and envy the millionaire jet set which does the same thing.

We tell them that delaying a present pleas-

ure brings a far greater reward in the future but we can't wait to buy another luxury so we charge it.

We who once gloried in the lurid movies of the '30s before the Legion of Decency cracked down now are righteously indignant at the new wave of nudity and double entendre.

We tell kids to be patient with us because problems can't be solved overnight—but we give them instant bottles when they're babies, instant food when they're growing up, we take instant pictures of them at high school graduation, and give them instant entrance to a college.

And now when Mother Nature gives them an instant challenge we don't know what to do about it. We are so happily surprised that the electronic talk shows are full of suggestions about thanking the kids—give them a big party, set up scholarships, give them more opportunity for recreation.

We're in danger of flubbing it again. Why not just say, "Thanks. You did a good job," and then start to figure out a way to give them more ways to work off their energy and use their talents.

A LETTER OF PROTEST FROM A STUDENT WITH REGARD TO THE CUT IN TEACHER'S SALARIES

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a letter which I recently received from one of my constituents, a student at Surrattsville Senior High School, Prince Georges County, Md. It is, I believe, eloquent testimony to the concern which the youth of today have, not only about their own future, but for the problems which face our society. The student, Mr. Steve Kane, has asked that I discuss with my colleagues the problem involving cuts in teachers' salaries. I am most happy to comply with his request by calling Mr. Kane's letter to their attention:

CLINTON, MD.

DEAR MR. HOGAN: I am a student at Surrattsville Senior High and I am writing in to ask you if you could speak to some of the other representatives about the salary cut of our teachers. Our teachers here really work hard to put things across to us and with the large classes, I and many other students feel that the salary cut of our teachers for next year is very unjust. Would you please see if you can do something about this for our hard working teachers?

Thank you.

STEVE KANE.

Mr. Speaker, I feel a sense of frustration because in the face of all of the money which the Federal Government expends each year on various programs and the billions of dollars spent across our Nation in matters far less important than education, we as a nation, have been unable or unwilling to see that our teachers receive the kind of compensation which they so richly deserve.

I confess that I have no immediate answer to the problem and so I call upon you to join with me in making a better effort to see that the teachers of our Nation are at least as well paid as others rendering comparable service to our society.

YUGOSLAVIA GETS FDA GRANT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last week HEW announced a \$120,000 grant to a university in Yugoslavia to study spastic people.

This week, the FDA announces a grant of \$200,000 and a second one for \$130,000 for research in Yugoslavia. The purpose of the grant is announced for the study of any relationship between use of birth control pills and cancer of the cervix. An estimated 10,000 Yugoslav women are to be involved in the 6-year study.

Of course, it is understandable that with the high standard of living in the United States we could not expect to employ 10,000 women for 6 years for \$200,000, but it does seem ridiculous—even if only counterpart funds—that our country must help subsidize the Communist economy of Yugoslavia.

It is possible that some in our Government are aware that the Red Yugoslav leaders have embraced the Vietcong government in South Vietnam in the killing of American boys, and see in this research project a chance to control the future population of Yugoslavia.

And all of this while the American taxpayers are being asked to continue the surtax because of excessive, frivilous, uncontrolled governmental spending.

In include a pertinent news release:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 26, 1969]

YUGOSLAVIA WILL STUDY PILL FOR FDA
(By Morton Mintz)

The Food and Drug Administration is contracting with Yugoslavia for two major studies on the safety of oral contraceptives—the first FDA research projects in an Eastern European country.

The larger study is intended to shed light on whether there is a relation between use of the Pill and cancer of the cervix.

A second objective is to gather data on the almost unexamined question whether the Pill in any way imperils the offspring of women who have used it. The study also will investigate whether use of the Pill affects fertility—an issue about which there are differing medical reports.

In an interview yesterday, Dr. John J. Schrogie, director of the Division of Research and Liaison in the FDA's Bureau of Medicine, said that the 6-year study will begin within several weeks and will involve about 10,000 Yugoslav women—about half of them controls who will use non-chemical or no contraception.

The cost is estimated at \$200,000—much less than it would be in the United States, the FDA official said. The bill will be met with counterpart funds that are available to repay the United States for foreign aid, but that can be spent only in Yugoslavia.

The study awaits final approval which is expected, shortly from FDA Commissioner Herbert L. Ley Jr. and C. C. Johnson Jr., head of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Association.

Already approved is a second study that will cost \$130,000 in counterpart funds and will last four years. This investigation will concern a suspected relation between use of the Pill and, in some users, diabetes.

Population research is an approved use for counterpart funds under Public Law 480.

The issue of a possible link between the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Pill and cervical cancer flared into controversy last September, when it became known that a major—and still unpublished—study done in New York City had shown a higher rate of precancerous changes in the cervical tissue of women on the Pill than in controls using a diaphragm.

The FDA's Advisory Committee said last Nov. 1 that the data "do not confirm or refute a causal relation. . . ." The agency's hope is that the Yugoslav study—and another being planned in this country—will yield definitive answers.

THE PRESS ETHICS COMMITTEE

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, elements of the news media have been most insistent that there be an ethics committee established for the House, the other body, and for the Supreme Court. The clear implication has been there is dire need for such a committee because of a handful of incidents of misconduct, at least as far as Congress is concerned.

Yet, the national and international news media has no such ethics guardian of its own. However, a group of journalists and writers, concerned over the one-sided and slanting reporting, is attempting to at least throw some light on the sickening and disgusting attempts to brainwash us.

These distinguished journalists and writers have formed a press ethics committee, and in the RECORD of May 26 I commended them for it. Yet, even before this committee could issue its first statement the subjective peddlers hastened to attack it, seeking to destroy it and leave it stillborn.

They did not accomplish this, however, and the press ethics committee has distributed its initial statement—one that hopefully will encourage the two-sided, objective coverage of the news so badly needed if the public is to have a sound basis for decisions.

I urge my colleagues to read this first statement of the press ethics committee carefully. I do not know what prominence it was given around the country, but I do say it deserves the full attention of every American at this crucial moment in our history. The statement follows:

THE PRESS ETHICS COMMITTEE

The Press Ethics Committee issued the following statement today:

News reporting against the ABM defense missile system for the U.S.A. has been so one-sided that the right of 200 million Americans to be defended has been largely ignored.

Typical of the extreme media attacks against minimal U.S. defense from the new Soviet 25 megaton war-heads is the following from the Washington Post of April 15, 1969:

"It is still far too small to knock out more than one (U.S.) ICBM site.

"It is instead a large war-head designed to destroy large 'soft' targets—such as cities—in other words a second strike weapon, and that is all."

On the Huntley-Brinkley TV-show, where the proposed anti-missile defense has been

June 27, 1969

attacked very frequently, the ABM system was even assailed in the newscast on President Eisenhower's death. TV quiz programs and TV shows are loaded with ABM opponents. One of the favorite gadgets in what seems to be leading toward a TV "blitz" against defensive missiles is to emphasize their cost and follow this immediately with the need for funds for domestic poverty programs.

This cacophony has reached such a pitch that in Foreign Affairs magazine D. A. Brennan has spoken of lopsided reporting which causes lopsided thinking. Columnist William S. White has not criticized the Press but has charged that the anti-ABM lobby is operating "one of the most richly financed propaganda campaigns in recent history."

News reporting on the new "Safeguard" missiles has almost entirely by-passed the simple fact that—at the very worst—they are better than no defense missiles at all.

The Press Ethics Committee, on the basis of a volume of press reports and TV-casts, warns the public that its safety seems endangered by the increasingly one-sided and virulent reporting against a missile defense from the new Soviet aggressive rockets.

We urge each American to be alert to this dangerous propaganda barrage and to ponder any favorable, as well as adverse, reports respecting the proposed anti-Soviet rocket defense system.

Americans should keep in mind that—on the basis of full information—the present Republican President and his predecessor, a Democratic President, have both recommended a missile defense against new offensive missiles in the hands of Communist regimes.

MEMORIAL DAY, 1969

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last month we celebrated with the usual pagentry and holiday atmosphere Memorial Day, 1969. It is truly unfortunate that despite its name Memorial Day has lost its true meaning for millions of Americans and instead has become the unofficial beginning of summer. In a rush to the beaches and golf courses too many Americans forget why it is that there is a day away from work. It is not a day to celebrate, it is a day to mourn.

This point was brought home to me when, immediately after Memorial Day, I spoke with a constituent, Mrs. Andrew McCarthy, of Sea Cliff, N.Y., whose son had just been killed in Vietnam.

Mrs. McCarthy is a proud American. She was terribly sad, as only a mother in her situation could be. She was not angry at her country.

But Mrs. McCarthy was understandably distraught by our failure to observe Memorial Day for what it is—a day to remember our men of this and previous wars who have died in combat. She asked me, "Can we not have a real Memorial Day?"

Mr. Speaker, we should have a true and serious Memorial Day. Not a holiday weekend, but day in memory of tens of thousands we have lost in the history of our Nation. I would hope that in the future that Mrs. McCarthy could have her very small and very human request—a real Memorial Day.

POSTAL LABOR RELATIONS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Operations Subcommittee has concluded its hearings on the subject of labor relations in the postal service. During this past month and a half Members of this House have been aware of the delegations of postal unions from home who have made their presentations on the subject of labor relations by law in the postal service. Four days of hearings were held in response to this interest in which testimony was taken from all postal unions, the administration, and a large number of experts in the public employee relations field.

The hearing record will be kept open for a short time in order to accommodate Members of Congress and others who would like to go on record in this matter.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LABOR RELATIONS PROGRAM

At the present time, labor relations problems in the Federal Government are governed by a program started by President Kennedy during his administration under an Executive order, which is an in-house Government regulation based on the authority of the President as the manager of the Federal Government. At the time President Kennedy signed Executive Order 10988, the present labor program, it was a great progressive step in the public employee field, an Executive order was the device used as authority for the program because many Federal managers were afraid that legislation would be passed by the Congress which would severely restrict their authority.

The effect of President Kennedy's Executive order was very worthwhile. The organization of Government employee unions expanded so that today there are more Federal union members outside the postal service than in postal unions. In the early 1960's the vast majority of Federal Government union members were in postal unions.

THE IMPASSE PROBLEM

President Kennedy's program though has outlived its usefulness because of the breakdown in employee contract negotiations. Federal personnel managers are able to decide what issues they will negotiate with unions about and what interpretation is to be placed on contracts once they are signed. The only appeal from these decisions is to the department head of the agency involved, whose orders personnel managers are following in the first place. In short, management sits as judge in its own case.

Postal unions during their 1968 negotiating sessions had this kind of experience with postal management. Post Office Department negotiators declared thousands of contract items nonnegotiable as management prerogatives, including many items that were in previous contracts. They did this because they felt that local department negotiators in previous negotiations had given up too

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

much of management's authority. Negotiations reached an impasse in the spring and continued until the fall, when Postmaster General Watson declared that as far as he was concerned all items were negotiable. This decision of his may have prevented a postal strike, since contract negotiations had completely broken. This situation cannot be allowed to happen again. What is more, the ironic thing about the negotiations is this. Once a contract is signed it is not enforceable in the courts like any other contract. Today no neutral party can judge a dispute over contract terms between management and labor in the Federal Government. The courts have declared that an Executive order is nothing more than the personal policy of the President, it can be changed between breakfast and lunch and back again by dinner. It is no different than any other instruction a President issues, and the courts will not sit in judgment on the way the President runs the Government. Therefore, the only appeal from an adverse interpretation of the contracts worked out by the Post Office Department and postal unions is the Post Office Department itself. It sits in judgment in its own case. Therefore, in any new Federal program there must be access on the part of labor to the courts and arbitration for less important individual matters.

A NIXON EXECUTIVE ORDER?

Federal personnel managers realized that extensive changes had to be made in Executive Order 10988 if legislation was to be forestalled. Congress had been alerted to the breakdown in contract negotiations. The Wirtz committee made up of important Cabinet officers and assisted by their staffs, heard witnesses, took testimony and reported to President Johnson by mid-1968. Nothing was done with the report. Chairman Hampton of the Civil Service Commission convened a new committee to examine the possibilities of a new Executive order on Federal labor relations soon after the Nixon administration took office. Chairman Hampton's group has been meeting ever since. Newspaper columnists at the beginning of our hearings had stated that a new Nixon administration Executive order was expected by May 1, when the Civil Service Commission testified on April 25, their witness stated that a new Executive order would be issued within 60 days. A White House letter to the subcommittee dated in mid-May backed up this estimate. June 25 has come and gone and there is no Executive order, nor will there be for some time. There have been charges made by some Government union officials that this program is being studied to death.

I do not agree with that charge. The delay in issuing a new Executive order is brought about by the awareness on the part of those studying the problem that a new Executive order will not be helpful. The problem today is the enforcing of public employee contracts. A strike against the Government is a criminal act. There is no way to enforce these contracts in the courts because Executive orders have no more legal standing and are no more binding than a letter from the President. There is only one

answer and that is legislation by the Congress. The long delays in action on an Executive order is I believe an admission that an Executive order at this stage of Government unionism will not give access to the courts where serious contract questions should be settled—*Manhattan Bronx Postal Union v. Gronowski*, 350 F. 2d 451, and *National Association of Internal Revenue Employees v. Dillon*, 356 F. 2d 811.

WHAT HAS CONGRESS DONE?

The Subcommittee on Postal Operations began its hearings on this problem and took up the consideration of the bills dealing with labor relations in the postal service. The consideration of bills was limited to the postal service because the postal service is the only Federal industrial operation with long standing and almost complete union representation. In addition, working conditions in the Post Office Department are terrible, and labor relations in the postal service have reached a critical point. What is more, the Postmaster General and his staff seem to realize more than other Government officials that something must be done and soon. They have suggested in their corporation plan the most far-reaching labor relations program ever suggested in Government circles, with direct reliance on the National Labor Relations Board. This is important because Federal personnel managers have always resisted using National Labor Relations Board cases as precedents, let alone using the services of the Board itself.

The bills taken up for study by my subcommittee were in general agreement on the need for access to the Federal courts, on the need for arbitration of disputes, on the need for mediation assistance from the Federal Mediation Service, on the need for the establishment of a Postal Labor Relations Board to sit on judgment in contract disputes. This is a large area of agreement. Both the Post Office Department and postal labor unions are in agreement on these items.

The bills supported by postal unions differ on the question of what types of postal unions should be represented before a postal disputes panel and share in the benefits of any new program. Some bills, for instance, exclude all but AFL-CIO craft unions from their provisions. This would be a death sentence for the industrial postal unions such as the National Postal Union and the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees. The National Alliance, for instance, has large numbers of minority group employees as members. Their problems are different from those of other employees. Yet these special problems would be ignored by their unions in some sections of the country because they are a smaller part of the work force than other groups.

The bills supported by the Post Office Department are unique in that they provide for collective bargaining on all issues including wages. These bills substitute the right to a form of arbitration through a Postal Labor Relations Panel instead of the right to strike, which would remain under Federal law a crime. In addition, the National Labor Relations Act would be binding in all matters not spe-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cifically set out in the bill. The setting of wage rates is sought by the Post Office Department so that they can exchange promises of wage increases in return for concessions on labor's part on working conditions and other matters. What concessions the Post Office Department seeks from postal unions remains to be seen. What is more, since a postal corporation would be self-sustaining, wage rates would be tied directly to postal rates and postal unions would find themselves directly pitted against the interests of large mail users. The administration bills do have great merit in that they recognize the need for binding contracts, arbitration, a Postal Labor Relations Board, and the application of as much labor law from the private sector as possible in a Government setting through the application of the National Labor Relations Act—title 29, United States Code.

H.R. 7916, a bill introduced by Congressman DULSKI, has much to recommend it. It provides for a complete postal labor relations program by including within its protection both craft and industrial unions, and both local and national unions. It does not include postal supervisors, but H.R. 4, introduced by Congressman DULSKI, which is the postal reform bill, does protect the postal supervisors union.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee was able to obtain a wide range of agreement between all of the parties, including the Post Office Department. There is agreement that there must be legislation, that there must be access to the courts, a Postal Labor Relations Board which will decide contract cases, and arbitration procedures.

I believe that if we direct our attention to the main problem we have to face, which is the breakdown in contract negotiations, and provide the means for parties to settle as many problems as possible in negotiations between themselves in contract negotiations, we will have done the job that is necessary. For instance, grievances should be defined by contract and violations of contract provisions in regard to individuals should be settled by procedures set up by contract. Grievances, for instance, should be settled quickly on as low a level as possible, so that they do not pile up by the thousands at the Department level, with no decision one way or the other for long periods of time.

Applying the National Labor Relations Act to all matters involving postal employees where their situation is similar to workers in private industry would be helpful. If we avoid at the same time onerous regulation of Government unions by the National Labor Relations Act where it has not been proven necessary for Government unions. National Labor Relations Board cases could be useful in determining the fairness of election procedures, unfair labor practices, jurisdictional disputes and appropriate unit cases. The use of the National Labor Relations Act could if necessary be limited to specific matters and I know the committee would be open to suggestions on this point.

CONCLUSION

The postal labor jurisdictional disputes arising from the introduction of different bills has obscured the need for postal labor relations by law. The jurisdictional disputes raised by witnesses before the subcommittee have obscured the real body of agreement between all the parties, and the national president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. James Rademacher, pointed this out in his testimony.

The members of my subcommittee will meet at some future date to discuss the wide area of agreement among all of the parties so that we can discuss a new bill. A report on the subject of postal labor relations will be issued. There is a great opportunity to accomplish something of value here that we can all be proud of as Members of Congress. I would welcome additional written statements from Members of Congress and others. Our hearing record will be open for a short time.

DON JOHNSON NEW VA ADMINISTRATOR

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday Donald E. Johnson was sworn in as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

As you know, Don is an Iowan, from West Branch, the hometown of the late President Herbert Hoover.

At the ceremony Monday, the Veterans' Administrator spoke eloquently about the role of the Veterans' Administration and his determination that the challenge it faces would be met.

We in Iowa are proud of Don Johnson. We are confident of his ability; assured by his determination. We know that under his leadership the challenge will be met.

Mr. Speaker, I place Don Johnson's remarks of Monday in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY HON. DONALD E. JOHNSON

JUNE 23, 1969.

If some of you suspect there is a slight Iowa flavor today, you are entirely correct. We in Iowa are proud of our heritage and while we are compassionate people and people dedicated to the welfare of mankind everywhere, there are occasions when we do stick together and are, in fact, quite clannish. This ceremony today is certainly a time of celebration, but I find that celebration to be tempered by President Nixon's words of June 5 at the time he made the announcement of my appointment, and I quote:

"There is no agency that has greater impact on more Americans than the Veterans Administration. The veteran population from World War I, World War II, Korea, and now Viet-Nam, runs into the millions, and the Veterans Administration has the primary responsibility for dealing with the needs of all veterans."

As I heard those words that day and as I have re-read them on several occasions, I have been sobered by the responsibility that is now mine and so while we will celebrate today and commemorate this day, at the

June 27, 1969

same time we will recognize the responsibility that lies ahead.

But I look forward to the challenge that is ours and that we are going to meet because I find the Veterans Administration to be a unique government agency. It is unique because it is the agency that does what the electorate wants it to do. The electorate recognizes an obligation to those servicemen—to those men and women—who answered the call of their country and who have served, suffered and sacrificed. I find, too, that the VA is unique because of a special partnership that exists between the Legislative and the Executive Branches of Government. It's the one agency in which there is close liaison at all times. We work together—and this we pledge—that this agency and those committees in particular on the Hill which have charge of veterans affairs will continue to work together. I think that it should be said that the House Veterans Affairs Committee in particular, with which we have more of our dealings, has for many years been led by a strong exponent of veterans rights, the Honorable Olin E. Teague of Texas.

The VA is also unique in another way. It is a Federal agency that maintains close liaison with the veterans' organizations and this, too, we pledge to continue and expand.

And lastly, the Veterans Administration is unique because it is an agency staffed by compassionate, dedicated and hard-working public servants. I have found this to be true in my past dealings with the agency and also during the past two weeks when I have been rather unofficially on the job. I look forward to joining the 170,000 VA employees.

I think, too, that this is a fitting day for this ceremony because this week marks the 25th anniversary of the first G.I. Bill of Rights. Since the President's announcement on June 5 of a special committee to look at the problems of the Viet-Nam veteran and the G.I. Bill of Rights, many words have been spoken and written on the adequacy of the present G.I. Bill. I am pleased, of course, about the assignment given me by the President to chair that committee and both as Administrator of the VA, and as chairman of that committee, I look forward to the assignment.

It is not my wish to pre-judge the work of that committee, but I want to tell you here that raw statistics do not always tell the story. In these days of a different sort of situation than we had in 1946 and 1947—with a gradual demobilization, with a high employment rate, and with many men completing their educational work before they are inducted into the services, there are, indeed, differences and we do, indeed, need to take a look at the problems that exist. But I can tell you that we will—this committee—find the answers to those problems.

In the interim, I want to pay tribute to the Veterans Administration for carrying out its mission. One of the things that we are specifically charged with in the formation of that committee is to reach out to the educationally disadvantaged. The VA "out-reached" program to the educationally disadvantaged has been a success. VA achieved a 79% effectiveness in the big city target areas. One of the problems that exists is how we are to reach the men in the rural areas of America. This VA found to be difficult and even with the help of the veterans organizations we have only been able to reach 14% of them.

And so I think it is implicit in what I am saying, and I speak now to the veterans organizations represented here, that because your strength often lies in rural America, we need your help more than ever, and we cannot afford to wait for the outcome of this committee report. We need to have renewed efforts on your part and also the VA to reach these people we're seeking in rural America.

And so I would pledge to you that this

committee will find the answers. And I ask at this time for assistance from the Congress, from the White House, from the veterans organizations and from educators.

This new team looks forward to the assignments ahead. The President is determined that we recognize new problems in this different time frame in which we find ourselves. I ask for your advice and counsel. As Judge Whitney Guilliland indicated to you, the family Bible was open to what I think is one of the most beautiful Jewish prayers—it asks for wisdom to govern. I trust that wisdom will be given to us.

Finally, I know all of you join with me as I express the fervent prayer that efforts now underway under the direction of President Nixon will bring about the earliest possible termination of the present hostilities in Viet-Nam through a just and honorable peace.

As we look to the future, I know that I express the hope of all Americans as I pray that the day may come when there will be no Veterans Administration because there are no more wars, and that mankind the world over will have learned to live peacefully side-by-side in an enduring climate of mutual respect and compassion and trust.

Thank you for honoring me with your presence here today.

A NATIONAL COLLEGE FRATERNITY TAKES FIRM STAND ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, disruption and violence on our college campuses is a matter on which a great deal of attention has been focused, and a matter which concerns us all.

Recently Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity, which has chapters on 75 campuses—several of which are in my congressional district—issued a most refreshing position paper on "freedom and order" which I feel is of interest to my colleagues.

I would like to share their recent statement with you, and also point out that this statement has been supported by more than 3,000 undergraduate members of Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity:

STATEMENT OF SIGMA TAU GAMMA FRATERNITY

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—Sigma Tau Gamma, a national college fraternity with chapters on 75 campuses, has taken a firm stand on campus disorders in a statement release from its headquarters in St. Louis.

In a position statement on "freedom and order" adopted by college chapters and endorsed by a large majority of its more than 3,000 student members, the fraternity reaffirmed its commitment to the "maintenance of an academic environment conducive to learning and scholarly development."

Citing the intrinsic rights of free inquiry, the fraternity insisted that they must be exercised "in a manner which does not diminish, abridge, or destroy the rights of others."

"We cannot condone the disruptive influences and activities which contemptuously deny to others their freedom to pursue truth in an atmosphere which permits reflection, debate and study."

Dr. Ronald W. Roskens, president of the international organization, noted the inconsistency of students who insist upon being

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

heard often deny the same privilege to others through vulgar and abusive clamor.

"It is paradoxical to me that certain members of the most educationally privileged generation in history would advocate destruction of the educational process which nourished their minds and enhanced their freedom," said Dr. Roskens, who is vice president for administration at Kent State University.

Many of the fraternity's collegiate chapters have inaugurated programs designed to foster constructive leadership on their respective campuses, according to Dr. Roskens.

LOCATION OF COLLEGIATE CHAPTERS

Arizona

Northern Arizona University.

Arkansas

Arkansas A & M College.
Henderson State College.

State College of Arkansas.

Illinois

Eastern Illinois University.
University of Illinois.

Indiana

Ball State University.
Valparaiso University.

Iowa

University of Northern Iowa

Kansas

Fort Hays Kansas State College
Kansas State College of Pittsburg.
Kansas State Teachers College.

Louisiana

Nicholls State College.
Northeast Louisiana State College.
Northwestern State College.
Southeastern Louisiana College.

Maryland

Frostburg State College.

Michigan

Central Michigan University.
Eastern Michigan University.
Western Michigan University.

Minnesota

Moorhead State College.
St. Cloud State College.
Winona State College.

Missouri

Central Missouri State College.
Harris Teachers College.
Northeast Missouri State College.
Northwest Missouri State College.
Southeast Missouri State College.
Southwest Missouri State College.
University of Missouri-Kansas City.
University of Missouri-Rolla.
University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Nebraska

Chadron State College.
Kearney State College.
Wayne State College.

New Jersey

Seton Hall University.

New York

St. John's University.

North Dakota

Minot State College.

Ohio

Cleveland State University.
Youngstown University.

Oklahoma

Central State College.
East Central State College.
Northeastern State College.
Southeastern State College.
Southwestern State College.

Oregon

Southern Oregon College.
Alliance College.

Pennsylvania

California State College.

Clarion State College.
Edinboro State College.
Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
Mansfield State College.
Shippensburg State College.
Slippery Rock State College.
West Chester State College.
Pennsylvania State University.

South Dakota

Black Hills State College.
Northern State College.

Texas

Stephen F. Austin State College.

Utah

College of Southern Utah.

West Virginia

Concord College.
Fairmont State College.
Salem College.

Wisconsin

Northland College.
St. Norbert College.
Stout State University.
Wisconsin State U.-Eau Claire.
Wisconsin State U.-La Crosse.
Wisconsin State U.-Oshkosh.
Wisconsin State U.-Platteville.
Wisconsin State U.-River Falls.
Wisconsin State U.-Stevens Point.
Wisconsin State U.-Superior.
Wisconsin State U.-Whitewater.

Canada

University of Windsor.

TRUTH IN LENDING

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, one of the major accomplishments of the 90th Congress was the enactment of the landmark Truth-in-Lending Act. I am most proud of the key role played by the Democratic members of the Consumers Affairs Subcommittee, on which I am privileged to serve, in securing the first Federal truth-in-lending law in history—and a strong and effective one at that.

It is propitious that this measure which will give an additional dimension to our people's freedom and well-being goes into effect the week we celebrate the Fourth of July. But, as pointed out in an editorial in the Newark News of June 25, the value of the law will depend upon the extent to which consumers take advantage of the information that must now be made available to them. This perceptive editorial "Truth in Lending" is printed in full below:

TRUTH IN LENDING

A new federal law designed to improve customers' ability to compare credit terms will take effect next Tuesday. But its usefulness will be impaired unless consumers learn to take advantage of it.

Today, about one family out of two owes some kind of installment debt, totaling more than \$90 billion. Yet few households have any clear idea of how much they pay in finance charges.

The law taking effect Tuesday, known as the Truth in Lending Act, was finally passed by Congress last year to make available to borrowers a clearer picture of the cost of credit. It does not regulate rates. It requires lenders to use uniform methods of stating

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 27, 1969

credit charges so consumers can compare deals.

An auto buyer, for example, finds it difficult today to find his way through a maze of unfamiliar terms when he borrows from a bank or sales finance company. One loan is described as add-on, another as discounted. One lender wants a service charge, another an investigation fee, a third demands credit life insurance premiums. But starting Tuesday, installment credit sources must disclose the total finance charge and the annual percentage rate or its equivalent, a yardstick by which different credit methods may be evaluated.

Full disclosure of credit costs will be of little help to consumers, however, unless the information is used. In addition to learning the amount of monthly payments, prospective borrowers should consider the length of time they'll have to pay, the annual percentage rate, the type of loan they choose and, perhaps most important, how much more it costs to buy on credit than to pay in cash.

MARINE MIDLAND COMMENDED FOR SERVICE TO PUBLIC

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Truth-in-Lending Act—Title I of the Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act—affects virtually everyone who issues credit. It requires the nearly half a million creditors in the United States to clearly and completely disclose all costs in a credit transaction and in every advertisement. Businesses as divergent as savings and loan associations, department stores, credit card issuers, credit unions, banks, automobile dealers, hospitals, consumer finance companies, plumbers, electricians, doctors and any other individuals or groups which extend or arrange for credit must comply with the legislation by July 1, 1969.

In an effort to inform the public as to the provisions of the "Truth-in-Lending Act," Marine Midland Banks, Inc., has launched what I consider to be a most commendable public service program.

In the June 25th edition of the American Banker, Marine Midland was recognized for its role in advising the public about the Truth-in-Lending Act.

The American Banker article follows:

MARINE MIDLAND MARKETS TRUTH-IN-LENDING THROUGH PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMS, MANUAL

BUFFALO, N.Y.—Communicating and interpreting the provisions of Truth-in-Lending to the many people and organizations affected by the legislation is a difficult and time-consuming undertaking which many banks have taken on as a responsibility and as an opportunity to create good will.

One of the many has been Marine Midland Banks, Inc., which has been conducting a public service Regulation Z program in the area served by the Marine Midland System.

When Federal Reserve Board Regulation Z, which implements the legislation, was issued on Feb. 10, 1969, with an effective date of July 1, 1969, Marine Midland assigned a team of three attorneys to study the legislation and the regulation, with special emphasis on the inherent consumer and commercial applications. From their studies a 76-page manual has been prepared that interprets, through narrative and sample forms, how Marine Midland Banks will comply with

the law. The guide has been made available through Marine Midland personnel to other organizations and individuals to help them in establishing systems to comply with Truth-in-Lending. Marine Midland has also made sample forms available to other banking organizations for use as prototypes and has offered assistance in preparing forms when requested.

A series of fourteen (14) statewide seminars was conducted by the team of attorneys for all Marine Midland executives from the bank's 240 offices in 150 New York state communities to cover legalities and ramifications of Truth-in-Lending. William J. O'Connor, of the Buffalo law firm of Buerger and O'Connor, discussed the legislation's effects on Marine Midland's Master Charge, custom credit and time plan programs. Frank J. Laski and Waldron S. Hayes, Jr., of the Buffalo law firm of Phillips, Lytle, Hitchcock, Blaine and Huber spoke on the personal, commercial, farm and mortgage lending applications of the Consumer Credit Protection Act.

Marine Midland has informed its merchant customers of the new credit changes through a series of news bulletins during the past few months. In addition, the bank's employees have been informed, through a similar publication, of the new developments, so that they can help both merchants and consumers who are interested in credit with a full understanding of the meaning of the new legislation.

Marine Midland Banks have taken great care to inform customers about potentially confusing terms, such as the Annual Percentage Rate and the Finance Charge. The annual percentage and dollar and cents costs, which form the basis for comparison credit shopping, are explained in terms of computation and conform to the Truth-in-Lending credit-contract and agreement forms. Through a series of mailings, bill-stuffers and the like aimed at 750,000 persons, Marine Midland believes it has made it an easy matter for the credit purchaser to be pre-informed about the new legislation, and to understand from the new invoices what he is being charged, how, why, and how much.

Financial and business editors of the press have been supplied with an information kit to help them interpret the complexities of the new information that consumers will be confronted with at the time of credit purchases and loans when they receive bills on and after July 1. Individuals, farmers and real-estate buyers will also benefit from the information that Marine Midland has so freely made available.

To further assist the average consumer who uses credit financing, Marine Midland has a program underway to provide leading credit spokesmen for television and radio interviews, as well as for meetings with community groups. These public service programs will be of great help in bringing the understanding of credit, what it costs and how it works to many thousands of individuals.

"The fourth generation may be descending on us quietly," Mr. Bradburn said. Its changes may seem relatively mild compared with yesterday's technical drama, he added, but under the surface lie the problems of an "industry in transition."

IMPROVING FOREIGN AID

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, America's commitment to less-developed nations should undergo major re-

vision. Over the last few years, I have consistently voted against the current structuring of our aid program—not because I am opposed to assisting development in low-income countries, but because I feel our present attempts are patronizing and ill-conceived.

As long as the practice continues of including military aid in with economic assistance, I shall not support any foreign aid legislation. Congress must realize that massive military aid programs rarely are positive actions toward overall development in recipient countries. Military aid tends to reinforce misallocations of resources away from areas of infrastructural economic growth and into wasteful assemblages of military paraphernalia.

In addition, I believe that "tying" much of our aid to U.S. exports creates a situation in which certain projects may be approved not because they are of a high priority to a recipient country, but instead because they have a high import content.

I favor general reorganization of our aid programs, with much more emphasis on multilateral assistance, and with greater help in the key area of population and family planning.

A good introduction to the type aid approach I would like to see Congress approve was published in the June 22 Los Angeles Times. The distinguished UCLA economist Neil H. Jacoby wrote this important article, "A Better Way of Extending Aid," and I would like to place it in the RECORD at this point:

A BETTER WAY OF EXTENDING AID

(By Neil H. Jacoby)

(NOTE.—Neil H. Jacoby is professor and former dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at UCLA. He is currently a Visiting Fellow at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.)

Recent events raise hope for the realization of the long-desired American withdrawal from the war in Vietnam. They allow us to contemplate a reduction of the appalling burden of that conflict. We can at last begin to consider how to apply the released resources to more humane and valuable purposes. Among them is assistance to the poor countries of the world.

Thoughtful men everywhere are distressed by the deprivation in which most of the human community continues to exist. Malnutrition is the lot of 2 billion of the world's 3 billion people. Famine and epidemic disease stalk their lives. Their babies die with a frequency many times as high as in advanced nations. Those who survive receive little formal education. Their adult life span is little more than half that of Americans and northern Europeans. In 100 of the world's 125 nations, average income per person is less than \$500 a year; for most people it is under \$150 a year.

POPULATIONS HAVE EXPLODED

During the 25 years since World War II advanced countries have helped to change these somber conditions. Progress has been made, but at too slow a pace. A population explosion has cancelled out much of the anticipated increase in production per head.

The time required by traditional societies to move into the contemporary world has been grossly underestimated. Today, there is widespread frustration and disillusionment; foreign aid by advanced countries has been much reduced. It is timely to make a reassessment. What have we learned that can be applied to speed up the progress of peoples in the future?

One fact we have learned is that development is an extremely long and complex process, whereby a country changes from a static traditional mode of life into a modern dynamic society. It is a process that, even with substantial foreign aid, requires at least two generations to complete. This process can only be initiated and sustained by the government and the people of the poor country; development cannot be imposed upon them from the outside.

PHILOSOPHIES MUST CHANGE

We have found that development is far more than economics or politics. At its heart it calls for a change in the philosophic values of the people of a low-income country—a willingness to embrace new beliefs, habits of mind, and ways of life. Farmers must learn new methods. Landlords must often accept lower rents, higher taxes or land reforms. Businessmen must open up protected markets to new competitors.

Another lesson of history is that development requires a union of the governing group and the masses of the people. The Alliance for Progress has not succeeded because in too many Latin American countries the ruling elite have blocked essential economic and social reforms that threatened their privileged position. All segments of society must unite in purpose and action behind an orderly program of change if violent revolutionary movements are to be avoided.

History also demonstrates that external assistance, when effectively used, can produce self-sustaining progress, as the examples of Greece, Taiwan, Iran and the Philippines testify. The successful experience of these countries helps us to formulate a fresh philosophy and policy of development with external aid.

The concept of a partnership between the aiding agency (an advanced nation or an international body) and the low-income country is central to the attainment of faster progress in the future. Both partners commit something to the development venture; both hope to gain something of value in return.

The developing nation commits itself to make, according to a definite time schedule, necessary social and economic reforms that will increase domestic savings and make investment more efficient. The aiding agency commits itself over an extended span of years to provide capital goods, technology and modern skills. The aided country hopes to realize a better life for its people from this partnership, and the aiding agency seeks to attain a more prosperous and peaceful world environment. Development assistance is thus a partnership for mutual gain; and is neither charity, obligation, nor indemnity.

Even under the heaviest foreign aid programs, external assistance does not apply more than one-third of the capital needed for development. Hence it is vital that the poor country take strong self-help measures to increase the productivity of the capital it must itself generate. It can do this in many ways: by freeing markets from government regulation and improving the conditions of enterprise; by fostering basic and technical education of its people; by raising productivity in agriculture through land reform and adequate credit facilities; by installing an equitable tax system, and by managing its money to prevent price inflation.

Advanced countries can also help to speed progress of the poor countries by opening their markets to the latter's products. Expanded trade can be a substitute for foreign aid. Less developed countries prefer to earn their own way through rising exports. The advanced countries should therefore be prepared to lower their tariffs and quotas against products of low-income countries, with or without reciprocation.

Population control must be an essential policy in all future strategies for development. This is the clear lesson to be learned from our postwar experience.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

When one examines the annual growth of real gross national production since 1950, one finds that the less developed countries as a group have expanded their economies as fast as the advanced countries—between 4.5% and 5% a year. But when one looks at growth of real GNP per person—a truer measure of betterment in the material conditions of life—one finds that during recent years, it has been expanding 3.8% a year in the advanced countries and only 2.6% a year in the low-income countries.

Population has been rising 2.5% a year in the poor lands versus 1.1% in advanced nations.

The conclusion is inescapable: A commitment to family planning should be incorporated into the partnership agreement between the aid agency and every aided country wherein excessive birth rates are impeding development. Population control measures should be a condition of eligibility for external assistance.

Another needed change in development policy is to "d-politicize" foreign aid—to extend most aid through international organizations supervised by the United Nations, thus preventing it from being a tool in the "cold war" between capitalist and Communist countries. Competition between the United States and the Soviet Union in seeking to mould developing countries in their own images has led to wasteful duplication of aid. It has led governments of poor countries to believe that aid is politically inspired to serve the interests of the granting country. Many play off the United States and the U.S.S.R. against each other.

The idea of competitive coexistence between Communist and capitalist powers offers a basis for specializing the functions of multilateral and unilateral aid.

SOCIETIES MUST COMPETE

Different social systems should be allowed to compete with each other, and be judged by the welfare they produce for people. If the people of a poor country desire state-owned and operated enterprises and central planning of their economy, they have a right to choose that system. If they believe that a competitive market economy based upon private enterprise is the most flexible and efficient means of satisfying society's wants, no one should interfere with that choice. Let time judge the performance of both systems. Americans need not fear the outcome, in the light of the superior performance of our own economy in recent times.

We propose, then, that external aid to provide social infrastructure (railroads, highways, communications, power facilities) as well as to develop human resources (education, training, research and technology) should be supplied multilaterally by the International Development Assn. and agencies of the United Nations. These are governmental functions in nearly all countries.

Aid to agricultural and industrial enterprises should be supplied unilaterally by the advanced countries, because in these sectors advanced countries with different economic systems have opportunities to apply their special expertise. If a poor country elects collectivized agriculture, Communist countries are best prepared to assist it. If it opts for private enterprise in agriculture and industry, capitalist nations are best qualified by experience to assist.

DIVIDING THE BURDEN

The annual net flow of developmental assistance from developed to poor countries has been \$7.5 billion to \$9 billion a year, including private investment. Assuming that the low-income countries take measures to improve the efficiency of their use of foreign aid, under the partnership concept, their total need for assistance can be estimated at about \$13 billion a year. Of the total step-up of \$5 billions, the U.S. share would be

no more \$2.5 billions—well within our capacity to supply.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon offered cooperation with other nations "to reduce the burden of arms, to strengthen the structure of peace, to lift the poor and the hungry." With the wisdom distilled from experience, let the United States lead all nations in a fresh cooperative effort to lift the world's poor and hungry up to a humane condition of life.

POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a very meaningful bill today to amend the Atomic Energy Act. This bill amends the act of 1954 to permit a State under the agreement provision with the Atomic Energy Commission, to establish standards for the discharge of radioactive material from an atomic-fueled powerplant.

This issue has developed in Minnesota on a proposal to build two atomic energy electrical supply plants on the Mississippi River. The citizens of Minnesota are proud of our 14,000 lakes and of the slogan that is often attributed to our area as being "The Land of the Sky Blue Waters." They have therefore promulgated emission standards within the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency that are much lower than the AEC level of tolerance. The builder of the proposed plants has received the permission to do this from the Atomic Energy Commission. However, the work is now delayed because our State believes that the rate of discharge allowed by the AEC is too high.

While I am not quarreling with the maximum tolerances of the AEC, I am convinced that if the people of a State believe in the need for more rigid regulations, then that State ought to have the right to be responsive to their citizens. I will grant further, that all this should be done within the safety guidelines as established by the AEC.

The bill simply states that no State shall be refused the right to enter into an agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission, simply on the basis of having developed standards that permit a lower level of discharge than presently set as the maximum levels by the AEC.

The Mississippi River originates in Minnesota. It is the source of much of the water needs for many great cities in central United States as it flows southward across our continent.

As we well know, much of our pollution problems are caused by a continued buildup of the wastes from mankind. Like many of the present plant pesticides and herbicides that are commonly used, the residue does not disappear. It stays in the water, the air, or the soil and accumulates. We have probably all read of the tragedy this week on the Rhine River.

In all fairness to the citizens in every State, and especially to those who live

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in those States served by this great river, they should be allowed to develop those standards for plants located within their boundaries, in full compliance with the maximum tolerances as established by the Atomic Energy Commission.

SPORTS EDITOR HONORED FOR ATHLETIC EFFORTS

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

MR. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, one of my friends and constituents, Mr. Harley Bowers, sports editor of the Macon Telegraph, Macon, Ga., was recently selected to receive an award from the National Coaches Association for community service and promotion of high school athletics.

This honor for Mr. Bowers is of special note since he is the first newspaperman ever selected by this organization for such an award. But his record of achievements clearly reveals the National Coaches Association could not have made a better selection.

For years Mr. Bowers has provided outstanding coverage for all types of high school athletic events in the Macon area, a fact which has contributed greatly to enhancing the already excellent school athletic programs. He has been an active member of the Macon Recreation Commission. In recent months he has been greatly responsible for bringing to Macon the National AAU basketball tournament and the international tennis tournament.

Mr. Speaker, I think this award for Mr. Bowers is certainly deserved, and I extend my sincere congratulations to him. I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD a short article about Mr. Bowers from a recent issue of the Macon Telegraph:

SPORTS EDITOR HONORED FOR ATHLETIC EFFORTS

Harley Bowers, Macon Telegraph Sports Editor, has been selected by the National Coaches Association to receive one of their eight annual district awards for community service and promotion of high school athletics.

Bowers, the first newspaperman in the country to receive the award, was selected for his record of high school athletic coverage and for his participation on the Macon Recreation Commission and work in importing the national AAU basketball tourneys and international tennis tourney.

The award, only given to one other Georgian, will be presented June 20 in San Francisco, Calif.

Bowers, Telegraph Sports Editor for 11 years, is a native of Moreland.

He graduated from Newman High School in 1938 and from the University of Georgia in 1942, after being named the outstanding graduate of the Journalism class.

Following college, he spent three and a half years in the Air Force and then returned to the University of Georgia for a year of graduate work.

Prior to coming to Macon, he was associated with the Atlanta Constitution, Columbus Ledger, and Albany Herald.

He resides with his wife Joyce and their three children, Cliff, Jack and Martha Claire,

at 2644 Northwoods Drive. He is a Sunday School teacher at First Presbyterian Church.

STUDENT DISORDERS AND VIOLENCE ON CAMPUSES

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

MR. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the questions of student disorders and violence on campuses throughout the Nation have occupied the attention of the news media, campus administrators, Government officials, the Congress, and the public for many months. The problem has been studied, talked about, and worried about. But, for the most part, there has been too little really constructive, forthright action to solve the problem.

Nearly 2 weeks ago I proposed that association of colleges and universities hold national and regional conferences directed solely at this problem and specific practical steps which might be taken to solve it. I urged that these conferences take place in cooperation with the administration and the Office of Education with Federal officials to serve as resource personnel. These conferences would be designed to develop a creative interchange of ideas on the procedures and approaches which had been successful on some campuses for dealing with the legitimate discontents of moderate students without bowing to the extremists and violence.

I do not envision the conferences to establish standard regulations or practices, since each college community is diverse and must be governed by its own environmental factors. I do envision these conferences as a means to open new channels of communication within the university community and between the university and the public.

I must make it absolutely clear that we cannot condone or tolerate violence either on our campuses or in our cities and I support efforts of National, State, and local law-enforcement officials to maintain law and order.

The American people are rightfully concerned with the violence on the campus, and it is my conviction that, unless the campus community takes constructive and immediate action to quell disorder and violence, repressive legislation and a drastic reduction in college funding will result. The educational community must take voluntary action now.

In line with this conviction, I was extremely pleased at the overwhelmingly favorable response which my proposal received from the associations of colleges and universities as well as from the Nixon administration. Both in personal conversations and letters, the associations have indicated to me their willingness to participate in conferences and their belief that such symposiums would serve a useful and constructive purpose. Assistant Secretary James Allen testified before the Education and Labor Committee last week in support of this concept and offered the coopera-

tion and assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in setting up such a program.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this response speaks clearly of the dedication and recognition of responsibility which the educational community has. I am confident that campus disorders can be brought under control and that channels of communication can be opened without direct and repressive Federal interference.

Under permission granted, I include my letter and the representative responses which I have received at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 11, 1969.

DEAR Sir: I write to you, a leader in the higher education community, urging you to take immediate action which might contribute constructively to the problems associated with the present unrest on our college campuses.

Having served on the Education and Labor Committee and having visited college campuses during the past two months and having constant contact with the public constituency, I believe the time is fast approaching when every representative organization must reappraise its efforts in responding to student unrest. The problem on the campuses is more structured and of greater potential intensity than many of us are aware. The results of continuing disorders and the resultant publicity are finding a restive audience in the American people.

For some time politicians, columnists, the news media, professional observers, and government officials have been berating, commenting or praising the motives and actions of our campus youth. If nothing else, this inconsistency is creating a demanding and an active majority in the American people who want to know what is or is not acceptable behavior in their society. In time, if allowed to continue in this manner, campus disorders may well result in the appearance of restrictive state or federal legislation which will have the ultimate effect of controlling the operating procedures of our colleges and universities. Further, as evidence has shown, the public reaction will curb the expenditures of local, state, and federal funds used to support the finest educational system in the world.

I will not support, nor will I vote for repressive legislation nor do I believe that the majority of students should be penalized by the cutting back of operating funds in order to punish a few.

Currently under consideration before our Education and Labor Committee is H.R. 11941. While I believe that the role of this bill is laudable in that it attacks the major problems inherent in our college campuses today, I am nonetheless concerned that it may set an unhealthy precedent.

Therefore, at this time I am calling upon your Association and urging that you join with others and convene a series of national and regional conferences of college and university administrators. Such meetings can have a positive effect upon this growing crisis. They would help to create better communication and understanding on the part of the American people, aid administrators in developing practices regarding discipline and conduct of students and faculty, and establish new means of communication with students. The interface which could be obtained by such a meeting would be most valuable to college leaders in providing an experience base for dealing with student problems. It would provide suggestion for solidifying the support of the large silent majority on our campuses and ideas for isolating the behavior and motives of militant reactionaries.

June 27, 1969

In general their purpose would be to develop concepts which would replace the current atmosphere of disruption and disorder on our campuses with a new positive force of creative interchange. I do not envision the conferences to establish standard regulations or practices as each college and university community is diverse and unique and must be governed by the factors within its environment. The independent operating integrity of each institution must be protected. Voluntary efforts on the part of the educational community must begin now.

I also recognize the limitations of such a conference and that there is no panacea for today's unrest.

The leadership your Association has shown in developing informal and overt actions in regard to this problem is most assuredly recognized. However, the urgency of this crisis requires the efforts of a massive coordinated breakthrough to bring about positive results.

It is my opinion that the National Administration is concerned about protecting the operational autonomy of our colleges and universities and they will be willing to participate cooperatively in any voluntary effort toward this end. I have written the President and members of his staff requesting this support.

I urge your consideration of my proposal and await your urgent response.

Sincerely,

MARVIN L. ESCH,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,
Washington, June 19, 1969.

The Honorable MARVIN L. ESCH.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ESCH: I want to thank you for the concerns expressed in your letter of June 11. As your staff member, Mr. Bob Jones, doubtless told you last Friday afternoon I informed him of our Board of Directors' meeting to be held on Monday and Tuesday and the expectation that we would issue a statement, with copies to be circulated Tuesday morning to members of the Education and Labor Committee. In the event that your copy may have been misplaced, I am enclosing a second copy of it.

Now let me mention some of the things that the Council has been doing and is intending to do with regard to campus disruptions. In the spring of 1968 we conducted jointly with the University of Denver Law School a conference on "Legal Aspects of Student-Institutional Relationships." To this conference we invited a number of students, administrators, professors, and legal experts on the subject. The outcome was a special issue of the *Denver Law Journal* which we distributed without charge to all of our members. In addition to the *Law Journal* was widely circulated in the legal profession.

For the past year or two I and other members of the Council staff have been speaking in various parts of the country on varied aspects of this whole problem. For your information I am enclosing a copy of the several addresses I have given. They have all been published except the two papers I gave some weeks back at the University of Nebraska. These will appear in a book to be published by the University of Nebraska Press.

Also, I am enclosing a copy of a paper prepared by a former staff member of the Council, Otis A. Singletary, which we circulated to all of our members and to many others who requested it.

Our Office of Research is now conducting what is probably the most intensive empirical research being carried on anywhere with regard to this general problem. We expect to begin publishing results within a few weeks.

This afternoon we are having a meeting of the executive officers of many of the principal associations here in Washington in the field of higher education to get moving on our

Special Committee on Campus Disruption. We have promise of some foundation funds to hold a number of regional conferences during the latter part of the summer, and likewise we may collaborate with some other agencies in facilitating large, national conferences to be held—possibly in Washington—during the early fall. In these conferences, let me say, we do not intend to engage in endless talk about such broad matters as the generation conflict, the malaise of our era, and so on. We expect to get down to particulars about how to uphold both freedom and order on the campus.

In closing, let me say that we very much appreciated your being present during dinner at the Hotel America on Monday evening.

Sincerely yours,

LOGAN WILSON.

(Note.—Also, I am including a statement issued as a result of a conference the Council held some weeks ago in Chicago.)

EXPLANATION OF "A DECLARATION ON CAMPUS UNREST"

This statement was formulated by a group of educational administrators, trustees, and foundation officers who met April 4-5, 1969 in Chicago under Council auspices. Those present were three Council officers—President Logan Wilson, Vice-President Kenneth D. Roose, and David C. Nichols II, assistant to President Wilson—and the following:

Louis T. Benezet, president, Claremont Graduate Center.

Landrum R. Bolling, president, Earlham College.

Herman R. Branson, president, Central State University.

Robert D. Clark, president, San Jose State College.

Fairfax M. Cone, trustee, University of Chicago.

Thomas H. Eliot, chancellor, Washington University.

Robben W. Fleming, president, University of Michigan.

David D. Henry, president, University of Illinois.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

James M. Hester, president, New York University.

Ralph Hetzel, trustee, Pennsylvania State University.

Roger W. Heyns, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley.

Joseph F. Kauffman, president, Rhode Island College.

William R. Keast, president, Wayne State University.

Malcolm Moos, president, University of Minnesota.

Mrs. Henry Owen, trustee, Washington State University.

Harvey Picker, trustee, Colgate University.

Alan Pifer, president, Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Wesley Posvar, chancellor, University of Pittsburgh.

Nathan M. Pusey, president, Harvard University.

John Ritchie, dean, Law School, Northwestern University.

John S. Toll, president, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Edmund A. Stephan, trustee, University of Notre Dame.

F. Champion Ward, vice-president, The Ford Foundation.

Herman B. Wells, chancellor, Indiana University.

Charles E. Young, chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles.

Edwin Young, chancellor, University of Wisconsin, Madison Campus.

The statement was subsequently approved by the Council's Board of Directors, comprised of the following individuals:

Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers-The State University, chairman.

Anne G. Pannell, president of Sweet Briar College, vice-chairman.

Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., secretary.

Fred Harvey Harrington, president, University of Wisconsin.

Grayson Kirk, president emeritus, Columbia University.

Frederic W. Ness, president, Fresno State College.

Alan Simpson, president, Vassar College.

Thomas A. Spragens, president, Centre College of Kentucky.

Sharvy G. Umbeck, president, Knox College.

Kingman Brewster, Jr., president, Yale University.

G. Homer Durham, president, Arizona State University.

Samuel B. Gould, chancellor, State University of New York at Albany.

Darrell Holmes, president, Colorado State College.

Kenneth S. Pitzer, president, Stanford University.

Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., president, University of Virginia.

Joseph P. Cosand, president, Junior College District of St. Louis.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

Roger W. Heyns, chancellor, University of California, Berkeley.

Martha E. Peterson, president, Barnard College.

Calvin H. Plimpton, president, Amherst College.

Willis M. Tate, president, Southern Methodist University.

A DECLARATION ON CAMPUS UNREST

The unprecedented, comprehensive, and often unpredictable changes that are taking place in this age both disturb and alarm large segments of our society. Most of the changes and attendant alarms affect the operations of our institutions of higher learning. They are also related to the values, concerns, and behavior of our young people. In coming to grips with the compelling issues, all who would think seriously about them must recognize that present-day society—in America and in many foreign lands—is in serious trouble on many fronts. We see around us racial conflict, continued poverty, and malnutrition amidst unparalleled prosperity and seemingly unlimited promise. We are confronted by pollution of our environment, decay of our cities, the continuation of wars and the threat of war, and everywhere a vague but widespread discontent with the general quality of life.

These problems affect all of society, not the university alone or the young alone. We must all be concerned to deal intelligently and responsibly with these problems that are neither the exclusive discovery, nor the sole responsibility of the young. Yet the depth of feeling among young people in many countries today about the issues, their general dissatisfaction with the slow-moving ways of society, and the extreme behavior of a small minority of students are evidence of the profound crisis that involves our entire society and, specifically, the university community.

The university itself has often become the immediate target of student discontent, sometimes couched as legitimate complaints about the deficiencies of the universities, sometimes devised as a softening-up exercise for assault on the wider society.

How to deal with campus crises arising from the widespread protests has become a major public issue and the cause of confused and angry debate. That there should be deep anxiety about the course of the conflict and its possible outcome is understandable. No social, racial, or age group that perceives itself and its values to be seriously threatened will fail to strike back. Increasingly there are backlash temptations to enact strong, often ill-considered, and largely futile measures to cope with a youth rebellion that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

none of us fully comprehends, not even the youth themselves.

Certain balanced judgments are proper to make, however, as we search for understanding and solutions:

1. It is important for the public to understand that, despite the nationwide publicity given to student disorders, the great majority of American campuses have remained peaceful. On campuses where conspicuous disorders have occurred, educational programs generally have gone along their normal ways. Most students and faculty have continued to carry on their regular work. In the main, good teaching and good research, as traditionally defined, have been uninterrupted.

2. On the undisturbed campuses and among the majority of orderly students, however, there are widely shared discontents which extremists are at times able to manipulate to destructive ends. Moreover, even in the absence of violence, there has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strains attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communication. Within this cult there is a minute group of destroyers who have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university, and in the processes of orderly discussion and negotiation to secure significant change. Students and faculty are increasingly aware of the true nature of this group and are moving to deal with its destructive tactics. The necessity to deal with extremists, however, is placing an extraordinary burden upon the whole educational enterprise and upon those who man it. Consequently, universities are having to divert their energies and resources from central educational tasks in order to deal with student unrest in its various forms.

3. The spectacular events precipitated by the extremists should not be allowed to obscure the recent accomplishments of those students, faculty, and administrators who have serious interest in constructive changes in society and in the university. They have broadened the curriculum and improved teaching. They have moved toward a more open and participating pattern for university governance. And they have begun to make the work of universities more meaningful in dealing with the problems of society. Those efforts must continue. Reform and self-renewal in higher education are ongoing imperatives.

4. Meanwhile, the speed and scale of social change have imposed many kinds of demands upon educational institutions for which their programs, their capabilities, and their funding are not always adequate. Moreover, universities are increasingly asked to perform functions for society, particularly in reshaping the behavior, values, and lifestyles of the young, on which the family and other social institutions have already had major influence or lack of influence. Some of society's expectations for universities are quite unrealistic. Insofar as these expectations can be dealt with, they involve a sharing of responsibilities among diverse social institutions. Many of society's demands require new resources and fresh approaches to old and new problems.

5. Recognizing the right of and even the necessity for constructive dissent and allowing for inevitable arguments over what is in fact constructive—certain axioms must be accepted as basic to the operation of any university.

(a) Disruption and violence have no place on any campus. The academic community has the responsibility to deal promptly and directly with disruptions. If universities will not govern themselves, they will be governed by others. This elementary reality is increasingly understood by all components of the university community. Student and faculty groups, including the American Association of University Professors and the National Student Association, have recently joined in efforts to improve disciplinary pro-

cedures and to formulate clear and realistic codes for dealing with misconduct, and more particularly with violence and disruption. Also, by involving students and faculty effectively in the governance of the university, it can be demonstrated that there are better ways of getting views considered and decisions made than by disruption.

(b) The historic concern of the university community with academic freedom needs to be restated, reaffirmed, and vigorously defended against all, within or without the university, who would obstruct the right of scholars to investigate, teachers to teach, or students to learn. This reiteration is not to claim for the university special privileges that put it above the law or that free it from critical public appraisal—rather it affirms that the university must maintain a basic institutional integrity to function as a university.

(c) Violations of criminal law must be dealt with through the ordinary processes of the law—and universities must attempt to deal with disruptive situations firmly before they reach the stage of police action. Governmental attempts to deal with these problems through special, punitive legislation will almost certainly be counterproductive. Meanwhile, students and faculty whose consciences demand that they express dissent through law violation must be prepared to accept the due processes and the penalties of the law. They should not be encouraged to expect amnesty from the effects of the law. Such an expectation would be the ultimate use of the *in loco parentis* concept against which many young activists passionately protest. Nor should they expect amnesty from academic discipline, which is the most effective sanction in disruptive incidents.

6. The education community needs to undertake a far more comprehensive effort than ever before attempted to study the underlying bases of youthful discontent and alienation and the broad social problems to which they are related. As social critic, the university must help society understand and solve such problems.

7. All universities should give particular attention to a continuing search for ways, including new social inventions, by which the life of rationality and civility, share concern, and mutual respect must be supported and strengthened within the university community. The survival of the university and its long-term contribution to society depend upon the ability of the institutions to make their everybody life reflect that spirit and pattern.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1969.
Hon. MARVIN L. ESCH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARVIN: Since receiving your letter of June 11th, members of our staff have been in touch with you and your office several times concerning information at least partially responsive to your inquiry and suggestions. Because of the urgency of affairs in the Committee on Education and Labor, we have all wanted to act as quickly as possible in any and all ways that might be helpful to you and other Committee members.

Meanwhile our giving attention to these matters has delayed this more formal response in writing to your letter itself. We are grateful for your constructive posture and ideas on the very complex questions of student unrest and related legislation. More specifically, your idea of timely conferences strikes a very responsive chord. It would be inappropriate and inefficient for us to proceed alone on this, and my understanding is that several other national associations are also giving active consideration to the idea. A number of us are meeting together this afternoon, and I believe the proposed confer-

June 27, 1969

ences are one of the principal topics on our agenda. None of us wants to delay any action that promises to be of any assistance to the colleges.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. SULLIVAN,
President.

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
UNIVERSITIES,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.

Hon. MARVIN L. ESCH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ESCH: I wish to acknowledge with appreciation your letter of June 11, 1969 in which you express concern about current campus disorders and particularly for your desire to have order restored without resort to federal or state legislation which conceivably might be repressive.

With reference to your specific request that the Association of American Universities join with others in convening a series of national and regional conferences of college and university administrators, I shall refer this question to our Association's Executive Committee for consideration. You are aware, I am sure, that some conferences have been held already and it is my guess that if additional meetings are needed, the American Council on Education should take the initiative in convening them. I may say that in the case of the Association of American Universities, which meets semi-annually and is an organization of university presidents, I cannot recall a single meeting of the Association since October, 1964 when a great deal of consideration has not been given to these very matters which are of concern to you. These discussions and exchanges have been helpful to all of our members and will doubtless continue in the future, but I believe most if not all of our members firmly believe that remedial action can and should be taken at each institution by its own trustees, administrators, faculty and students. We are already encouraged to believe some institutions are proving the efficacy of this procedure.

I thank you again for your discerning letter which I know will be studied with care by the members of our Executive Committee and who may wish to comment upon it more extensively than I have.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. McCURDY, Jr.,

MADISON, WIS.,
June 17, 1969.

Congressman MARVIN L. ESCH,
501 Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As President NASULGC, I commend your positive approach to campus unrest problems outlined in letter of June 11. Understand you have talked with our Washington office. We offer continued assistance in your efforts to prevent repressive legislation. NASULGC will cooperate with American Council on Education in discussing proposed national conferences. We agree that broad support from national education organizations will be positive step towards preventing repressive legislation and solving the crisis. Your continued interests and efforts appreciated.

FRED H. HARRINGTON,
President, National Association of State
Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.

The Honorable MARVIN L. ESCH,
Second District, Michigan,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Room No. 501, Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ESCH: In response to your letter of June 13th and in anticipation of the

House hearings this morning before the Committee on Education and Labor, I have taken the liberty of doing two things over the weekend.

Firstly, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities has asked Chairman Perkins if a member of our Board of Directors, Dr. Darrell Holmes, President of Colorado State College, might be allowed to testify this morning about the concerns of your letter. Secondly, I have prepared, along with President Holmes, a statement which he will present if given the floor by Chairman Perkins. I enclose a copy of that statement along with material which the statement alludes to.

I trust this strategy on our part is adequate in terms of the intent of your letter, Mr. Esch.

If I may be of further assistance at any time in the future, please call on me.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. CIPRIANO,
Executive Assistant.

NEWS RELEASE BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON EDUCATION

WASHINGTON.—The American Council on Education today (June 16) announced establishment of a Special Committee on Campus Disruption which will propose ways to strengthen procedures of self-regulation by colleges and universities.

In announcing the board action, Council President Logan Wilson said the committee "will focus on more effective decision-making, appropriate means of presenting grievances and proposing changes, clarification of due process and the use of campus and civil authority in response to disorder, and improved communication both within the academic community and between it and the public."

The action was taken by the Council's Board of Directors at its regular June meeting. As the nation's major coordinating agency for higher education, the Council has a membership of 1,538 colleges, universities, and education associations.

President Wilson said he is proceeding at once to name the chairman and members of the special committee in consultation with leaders of representative higher education associations.

A specific objective of the committee will be to formulate ways to deal effectively with campus disruption while protecting the academic or constitutional rights of members of the academic community and avoiding resort to repression or counter-violence.

The special committee will be asked to begin its work as soon as it is appointed and to report its findings to the Council's president and board at the earliest feasible date.

Establishment of the committee is one of a number of actions initiated within recent months by the Council in its concern about campus disorders and its historic interest in critical problems of campus governance.

In May 1968 the Council, acting jointly with the University of Denver Law School, sponsored, and distributed the proceedings of, a national conference on "Legal Aspects of Student-Institutional Relationships." The Council's Office of Research is conducting extensive research into the causes of campus unrest. In April the Council issued "A Declaration on Campus Unrest," a statement formulated by prominent educational administrators, trustees, and foundation officers. Most recently the Council published and distributed to its members the June 9 statement on campus disorder issued by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. In October the Council's Annual Meeting in Washington, will focus on "The Campus and the Racial Crisis."

Directors present at the June 16 board meeting were the following: Gustave O. Arit,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, *Secretary*; Mason W. Gross, President, Rutgers—*Chairman*; Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame; Roger W. Heyns, Chancellor, University of California (Berkeley); Darrell Holmes, President, Colorado State College; Grayson Kirk, President Emeritus, Columbia University; Martha E. Peterson, President, Barnard College; Kenneth S. Pitzer, President, Stanford University; Calvin H. Plimpton, President, Amherst College; Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., President, University of Virginia; Thomas A. Spragens, President, Centre College of Kentucky; Willis M. Tate, President, Southern Methodist University; Sharvy G. Umbeck, President, Knox College.

Unable to be present were: Kingman Brewster, Jr., President, Yale University; Joseph P. Cosand, President, Junior College District of St. Louis; G. Homer Durham, President, Arizona State University; Samuel B. Gould, Chancellor, State University of New York; Fred Harvey Harrington, President, University of Wisconsin; Frederic W. Ness, President, Fresno State College; Anne G. Pannell, President, Sweet Briar College, *Vice-Chairman*; Alan Simpson, President, Vassar College.

TRIBUTE TO EARL WARREN

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we have a saying in California, from a poem, "The Coming American," which says: "Bring me men to match our mountains."

As we reflect on the record of Earl Warren, we cannot help but feel that here, indeed, is a man who matches our mountains—he is and has been the fulfillment of California's need as attorney general and as Governor, and the fulfillment of the Nation's need as Chief Justice.

Most Americans will remember him as Chief Justice, but those of us from California will remember him as a great Governor who was many years ahead of his time. Many of the causes for which young men in this House are laboring today were advocated many years ago by Earl Warren. Prepaid health insurance, an adequate income for every family, fair employment and civil rights protection, equal educational opportunities, to mention but a few, were part and parcel of the legislative programs advocated by this great American.

Two particular virtues seem to me to be especially worthy of mention on this occasion.

The first of these is his readiness to joust the centers of power and authority for what he believes is right, irrespective of the odds against him or of the chances of success. In his mind, right is an absolute, not a relative, quality—a compass by which you can guide your life.

The second of these is his kindness and the humility he brought with him to every public task assigned to him. He is dignified without being pompous. He is considerate without being condescending. And as a politician, he understood the difference between party responsibility and partisanship.

I have been proud to know Earl War-

ren, and I am proud that as a Californian I can claim a share of credit for the many contributions he has made to this great country. I wish him and Mrs. Warren the very best of a happy retirement and I join millions of others in saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

HUE AND KATYN—LESSONS IN COMMUNIST TERRORISM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the terrorism of the Communists in South Vietnam ranks with that of the Communists in Eastern Europe during World War II.

During the Tet offensive early in 1968, the Communist forces slaughtered thousands of civilians for alleged "crimes." Mass graves have been discovered near Hue, ancient capital of Vietnam and a city long known for its scholarship and devotion to the arts.

Hue was not a well-armed city. Its population consisted largely of teachers, poets, students, artists, and priests.

As the allied and South Vietnamese forces have pieced together information about the atrocities that were committed by the Communists during Tet, they have discovered that the overwhelming majority of the murdered civilians were guilty of no larger "crime" than living in the imperial city of Hue, itself.

The bodies of priests, nuns, Vietnamese civilians, teachers, foreign residents of the city—more than 3,000 of them—have been found in mass graves, their arms bound. It is obvious that many were forced to kneel before being shot in the back of the head. Hundreds were buried alive, their mouths filled with dirt or rags.

This crime against humanity ranks with the Katyn massacre in Poland in September of 1939 when 15,000 Polish army officers were slaughtered by the invading Communist troops.

The world community, though reluctant to learn the extent of Communist terrorism in South Vietnam, is now being compelled to hear the silent voices that call from beyond these mass graves.

Mr. James Cary of the Copley news service has written a stark and graphic description of the horror which took place at Hue last year. I call this chronicle of terrorism to the attention of my colleagues with the sincere hope that it will increase their awareness of the inevitable consequences of Communist domination of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cary's moving article follows:

MASSACRE AT HUE (By James Cary)

WASHINGTON.—On the night of Jan. 30, 1968, reconnaissance elements of South Vietnam's crack 1st Division were on an area surveillance mission in the Viet Cong infested countryside southwest of the old imperial capital city of Hue.

A regional forces company was probing the area to their east.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 27, 1969

Neither expected to find much evidence of Communist activity. The annual lunar new year or Tet truce was under way.

Suddenly, about 10 p.m., a large Communist force hit the regional forces company hard, brushing it aside and driving straight ahead into the inner walled portion of the city called the Citadel.

That was the beginning of the battle for Hue, highwater mark of Communist strength in the now famous Tet offensive of 1968.

It was not until 25 days later that the last Communist troops were forced out. And it is only now, after months and months of interrogation of prisoners and survivors, and the finding of mass graves, that the world is learning what happened in and around Hue during those 25 days.

The picture that is emerging is one of massacre, mutilation and terror.

Of 3,000 persons missing, bodies of more than 2,200 have been discovered in shallow trenches at more than 25 locations.

Some were buried alive, standing, eyes open. Some were beheaded. Many were bound and shot in the back of the head. Some had dirt or cloth stuffed in their mouths to stifle their screams.

There were at least three death marches. A number of victims were lined up and machine gunned.

Nationality, occupation or political background was no protection. Scores of Buddhists in Hue's strong, anti-government resistance movement were slaughtered. So too were American and German civilians, French priests, South Vietnamese government officials, anyone with relatives in the South Vietnamese army, village chiefs, political leaders, anyone who worked for the Americans, and particularly anyone who was known for his opposition to the Viet Cong.

The Communists have admitted responsibility for the killings. A Communist document, captured in the delta area last November, instructed Viet Cong units to punish "reactionary" South Vietnamese who fell into their hands, claiming:

"We paralyzed the enemy machinery when we killed 2,000 reactionaries in Hue."

Again on April 27, 1969, a Hanoi radio broadcast boasted that the bodies then being discovered in the Hue area were "Hooligan Lackeys who had owed blood debts to the . . . Hue compatriots and who were annihilated by the southern armed (Viet Cong and North Vietnamese) forces . . . (last) spring."

The agony of Hue began almost with the first shots that were fired. After the regional forces company was shattered by the Communist advance guard more and more North Vietnamese battalions, supported by Viet Cong guerrilla and local force units, poured into the city from the south and west.

At 3:40 a.m. two salvos of enemy rockets came shrieking down on the city, setting widespread fires.

By dawn, the Communists controlled all of Hue except their two prime objectives—the 1st South Vietnamese Army Division headquarters in the northern corner of the Citadel, and the American military assistance compound south of the Perfume River. Attempts to capture both were thrown back with heavy Communist losses.

For two days after that the Communists left the population alone. Then VC cadres began to move from door to door.

Some confiscated radio receivers. Others, working from prepared lists, sought out South Vietnamese Government officials and invited them to political indoctrination meetings. They never returned, but it is now known what happened to some of them.

At the Gia Hoi High School and in a field behind the Tang Quang Pagoda, 33 mass graves containing 200 bodies have been found.

A monk at the pagoda told South Vietnamese interrogators that during the first two weeks of February he heard Communist execution squads at work nightly. The victims cried out, pleading for mercy. A volley

of pistol and rifle shots would follow. Then silence.

Nguyen Ngoc Ky, leader of the Vietnam Nationalist Party, was among the victims found here.

Another band of 80 to 100 civilians took refuge in the Redemptorist church in Hue. On Feb. 8 the Communists forced them to leave and started them marching east, across the Perfume river. Bodies of 20 of the group were found at Ap Lang Xa Con, a hamlet 4 kilometers from the church. National police said they had been buried alive with hands bound. The body of Tran Dien, one of five elected senators in the national assembly from Hue, was among them.

At the university of Hue, three German doctors on the medical faculty tried unsuccessfully to wait out the Communist occupation. The Viet Cong arrested them on Feb. 5 at their homes. On April 2, 1968, the bodies of Dr. and Mrs. Horst Gunther Kainick, and Dr. Raimund Discher and Dr. Alois Altekoester were found buried in a common grave in a potato field behind the Tu Quang Pagoda, two kilometers south of Hue. Their arms had been bound with wire. All had been shot.

Two French priests at the Thien An Mission suffered a similar fate.

Their monastery was located on a hill top surrounded by pines. When fighting engulfed the area 3,000 to 4,000 peasants sought refuge there.

Communist troops suddenly appeared. Many of the peasants attempted to flee. Two pleaded with the Communists to spare the building, but as one Vietnamese priest who escaped said later:

"They took over the whole building, firing from the ground level at first, and then mounting into the upper stories."

The bodies of the two resident French priests, Father Urbain and Father Guy, were among 201 bodies found later on the slope of a scenic overlook above the Perfume river.

Father Urbain, 52, had been bound hand and foot and buried alive with 10 others. His body was identified by a laundry number on his underclothing and by his silver denture and bald head.

Father Guy, 48, was stripped of his cassock by the North Vietnamese, forced to kneel, and shot through the back of the head.

Americans suffered similar fates. A U.S. report to the International Committee of the Red Cross reveals.

Stephen H. Miller's hands were bound behind his back. He was shot in the back of the head.

Kermit J. Krause and Jeffrey S. Lundstedt were cornered by the enemy in the bedroom of their house. They were shot in the face. Their bodies were dumped in bathtubs.

Thomas M. Gompertz, Courtney Niles and Robert T. Little were shot in the back of the head, apparently executed. Niles' arms were bound.

It went equally hard with the South Vietnamese.

On Feb. 9 Viet Cong came to the home of Maj. Tu Ton Khan, commanding officer, provincial revolutionary development (pacification) cadres. They ordered his wife to tell her husband to report to VC authorities. They threatened to burn the house if she did not do so.

Frightened, Mrs. Kahn called her husband and two other revolutionary development workers who were hiding in the attic. Maj. Kahn was tied up and taken away with all his belongings. His body was found Feb. 28, pierced by 200 bullet holes.

There are many similar stories.

Tran-Hy, a popular forces member, was arrested by the VC on Feb. 20 and buried alive with 20 others near the An Ninh Ha bridge.

On the night of Feb. 18, a Viet Cong group appeared at the home of Ho Tan Sy, a teacher, and invited him to attend a meeting. He was shot and killed as he left his house.

On Feb. 10 Le Van Tru, chief of the Thua Thien program for Communist defectors, was arrested and shot near the Dong Ba gate.

Nguyen Van Dong, a resident of the Hue Citadel, was arrested Feb. 17 and buried alive at Gia Hoi.

Viet Cong soldiers broke into the home of Miss Hoang Thitam Tuy on Feb. 22, and led her to Gia Hoi high school with four other persons. They were buried alive in the same grave, arms and legs bound. Of 200 bodies found at the school, Vietnamese authorities estimated more than half were buried alive.

By mid-February, the fighting for Hue had turned decidedly against the Communists. The enemy commander had been killed and his replacement, it was learned later, had asked and been refused permission to withdraw. Now the killing became if anything even more vicious as the Communist grip on the city weakened.

A Vietcong unit assembled more than 200 South Vietnamese civilians and local administrators at the town of Ton Nam Duong. They were marched north along a canal toward the sea. Just outside Ap Tong Gi Tay, nine kilometers east of Hue, 75 of the captives were taken into nearby rice paddies and shot.

Other similar marches began.

Nguyen Tan Chau, of the South Vietnamese Army's Medical Corps, was in Hue visiting his family during the Tet holidays when the Communists attacked. He was captured and held with 30 other prisoners. They were started south, bound together in three groups of ten.

He told South Vietnamese investigators later that when the column halted for a rest, he freed his hands and slipped away in the darkness. From a hiding place he witnessed the following scene:

"The larger prisoners were separated into pairs, tied together back to back and shot. The others were shot singly. All were dumped into two shallow graves, including those who had been wounded but were not dead."

Winter and early spring rains washed away the more obvious signs of the slaughter but the bodies were found later in the Phu Thu district about 20 kilometers south of Hue.

A similar story is told by Phan Duy, a key official of Anha hamlet, seven miles east of Hue. He knew his name was on the Vietcong's execution list after the Communists seized Hue. He slipped away from the hamlet to a small house on the outskirts of Hue, hoping to escape detection. The ruse almost worked.

It wasn't until Hue was virtually recaptured by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces that enemy troops discovered him as they pulled back through the area where he was hiding.

On Feb. 28 five Vietcong entered Duy's house, bound his hands and marched him seven miles to a row of houses near an area of sand dunes east of the city. He and four other prisoners were locked in one of the houses for seven days. They were allowed outside only to relieve themselves. But this was long enough for Duy to realize that some 100 prisoners in the other houses were being systematically shot.

On the seventh night Duy and nine other men were lashed to a bamboo pole and marched for 300 yards. Their hands were untied. They were told to remove all outer clothing. As he was undressing Duy heard his guards talking to a group of Vietcong laborers.

"Did you dig the trench yet?" they asked.

"No, not yet, there are too many people and not enough time," the laborers replied.

Three of the guards left to help dig while the prisoners' hands were retied. Duy managed to work his hands free, then made a run for it.

"I ran about 300 meters and I saw a pool," he said. "I fell into the water and covered myself with reeds."

Hours later, half frozen, he emerged and began walking toward the lights of the Hue radio tower beacon. He stumbled into the Phuoc Long district headquarters and reported what had happened.

Many others were not so lucky. So far 356 bodies have been found in the San Duan graves that Duy escaped. Investigators have reported the victims were killed in groups of 25 to 40. Cartridges from Russian-made AK47 rifles used by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese were found nearby. Some of those who died had been bludgeoned to death. Others had been shot.

Despite all these accounts the story of the Hue massacres is still not complete. Hundreds of other case histories are already known and reports are still being collected at the combined interrogation center in Hue.

The investigation has pinpointed the location of many still-unopened mass graves. Consequently there is little hope for the 800 citizens of Hue who are still missing.

They, too, are believed to be a part of the grisly record the Communists left behind the one time they have occupied a South Vietnamese city.

TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM ACTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. James O. Hall and Pfc. Charles G. Gray, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARYLAND SERVICEMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM ACTION

A Montgomery county Marine and a Charles county Army private first class have been killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

They are:

Marine Pfc. James O. Hall, Jr., 20, of Wheaton, who was killed Saturday when his helicopter was shot down about 24 miles northwest of Da Nang.

Army Pfc. Charles G. Gray, 25, of Waldorf, Md., who was killed Saturday by small arms fire while on patrol in Long An province, southeast of Saigon. A 1967 graduate of the John F. Kennedy High School in Wheaton, Private Hall enlisted in the Marines last July after attending Montgomery County Community College for a year.

He had been stationed with a reconnaissance company of the 3d Marine Division near Da Nang.

An accomplished athlete, Private Hall filled a cabinet in the family living room with trophies he earned as a basketball player, golfer and bowler, a relative said yesterday.

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James O. Hall; a sister, Susan and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Virgil McCallister, of Virginia.

WITH 9TH INFANTRY

Private Gray had been stationed with the 9th Infantry Division since coming to Vietnam in May. He was drafted by the Army last October.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Doris Gray, of Waldorf, and his mother, Mrs. Annie L. Gray, of Brandywine, Md.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PHILADELPHIA ORCHESTRA IN ARKANSAS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the quality of rural life has been under much discussion in recent weeks and months. For the consideration of my colleagues, I would like to give an example of the type of people who are contributing so much to improve the quality of life in Arkansas.

Miss Lily Peter, who is from Marvell in the First Congressional District of Arkansas which I represent, recently spent about \$60,000 of her own funds to finance an appearance of the Philadelphia Orchestra in Little Rock. To do this, she mortgaged 4,000 acres of her plantation in eastern Arkansas.

The orchestra, which played to two sellout crowds on successive nights in Little Rock, premiered a three-movement suite which Miss Peter had commissioned by Pulitzer Prize-winning Norman Dello Joio.

It is this kind of selflessness, Mr. Speaker, which is helping to improve the quality of life in Arkansas. It is this spirit of dedication and determination which is making Arkansas a great place in which to live and work.

At this point I would like to include an article from the Jonesboro Sun written by Associated Press reporter, Robert Shaw, concerning the performance of the Philadelphia Orchestra and Miss Peter's contribution to it:

MISS LILY THINKS CONCERT WORTH ALL

(By Robert Shaw)

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.—The Philadelphia Orchestra played Miss Lily Peter's concert Tuesday night and she figures that it was worth the \$60,000 she paid for it.

"It was worth every penny," Miss Lily, as her friends know her, said after the performance in Little Rock's Robinson Auditorium, jammed with 3,000 persons for the event.

"I know a good many adjectives, but none would fulfill this occasion."

The orchestra, which is to play tonight to a second sellout, premiered Pulitzer Prize-winning Norman Dello Joio's "Homage to Haydn," a three-movement suite commissioned for \$8,900 by Miss Lily.

Miss Lily mortgaged 4,000 acres of her plantation in the rich Delta plain of Eastern Arkansas to commission the work and to bring the orchestra to Little Rock as part of the observance of Arkansas' 150th anniversary.

She will receive none of the money from the ticket sales. It is to go for music scholarships at Arkansas State University and the University of Arkansas.

Miss Lily, who admits to being past 70 "but not quite 100 yet," shared the spotlight Tuesday night with works from Wagner, Debussy and Brahms.

At intermission, she received a standing ovation when Mayor Haco Boyd called her to the stage to present her with a bouquet of roses. Lt. Gov. Maurice Britt then told her that Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller had designated Tuesday as a day to honor Miss Lily.

"I hope you will remember this to be one of the happiest memories of your life as it has been one of the happiest memories of

mine," responded Miss Lily, blowing kisses at the audience.

"I hope you will go home and take with you the enrichment of this beautiful music."

Miss Lily, a sometime poet and photographer and fulltime farmer who sometimes clammers aboard one of her tractors, says she wanted the people of Arkansas to be exposed to good music.

"Miss Peter is a new lady in my life, but very close to my heart already," said orchestra conductor Eugene Ormandy. She "somehow became an idol in our eyes, an angel," he said.

Miss Lily stayed in the auditorium long after the concert greeting well-wishers and accepting congratulations. "It is gorgeous," she said.

She had originally expected to spend about \$45,000 for the orchestra's appearance here and \$8,000 for Dello Joio's commission, but incidentals—such as buying her own ticket and those of many friends—brought the total to about \$60,000. She also is now talking about asking the orchestra to record Dello Joio's work.

Is she spending a trifle too much?

"Oh, I had the most beautiful cotton crop this year," she says.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF THE CONGO—KINSHASA

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to the Lt. Gen. Joseph Desire Mobutu of the Congo—Kinshasa—and the Congo's—Kinshasa's—Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Cyrille Adoula, on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of the Congo's—Kinshasa's—Independence.

Since the Portuguese navigator Diego Cao first reached the mouth of the Congo River in 1482, the territory now encompassing the Democratic Republic of the Congo has symbolized for the Western World the vast unknown potential of Africa. The twisting turns of the 2,718-mile-long Congo River, the names of Stanley and Livingston, and landmarks such as the Mountains of the Moon have for the armchair traveler almost spelled Africa itself. Today, the Democratic Republic of the Congo is celebrating its ninth anniversary as an independent state in the family of nations. The desolate days of early independence when the state was on the verge of collapse and its people were caught in the violence of civil conflict are gone; a new mood of order and security now embraces the land and the Congo once again represents the tremendous potential of Africa for the development of a prosperous economic future and the creation of a stable and peaceful society.

The long strides toward stability taken by the Congolese Government under Gen. Joseph Mobutu are chiefly responsible for the new mood of optimism toward the Congo. Firmly in control of its own economic policy, the Government has launched a concerted effort to put the country on a sound financial footing. Monetary reform and other fiscal meas-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ures have contributed to the recent relative price stability and a foreign investment program has attracted new capital. Such American firms as Union Carbide, Continental Grain Co., and Pan American World Airways have demonstrated their confidence in the Congo by recently making large investments there. In 1969, more than 10 percent of the Government's budget will be devoted to infrastructural improvements which will strengthen the base of the varied Congolese economy. The hydroelectric project at Inga, financed by an international consortium, when completed will be the world's largest power complex. With 12 percent of the world's copper reserves, the Congo expects to increase its copper production in 1969 by more than 10 percent; in 1968 the Congo produced more than 330,000 metric tons of copper. Kinshasa, the Congolese capital, is one of Africa's fastest growing urban centers.

Political progress has also been made under the Mobutu government. A constitution has been approved by a national referendum and in 1970 national presidential and general elections are scheduled to be held. The Congo has been an active participant in inter-African affairs and in 1967 hosted the Organization of African Unity's conference for heads of state. Advancements in education have also been made as can be seen in the fact that while the Congo had only seven university graduates in 1960, today, 9 years after independence, half of her 22 Government Ministers and provincial Governors are university graduates.

On this anniversary of its independence, the Democratic Republic of the Congo is to be congratulated for its great progress in pursuit of its national goals. As one Congolese official has predicted, the Congo—once Africa's sick man—may become Africa's superman.

YOUTH PHYSICAL FITNESS

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, every year the U.S. Marine Corps sponsors a youth physical fitness program in secondary schools throughout the Nation. This program, conducted in support of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, is based on the five-exercise physical fitness examination used in marine recruit training.

There are six regions and competition is conducted among high schools within these areas in order to determine who will compete in the national championships.

In this regard, I would like to commend a group of young men from Caldwell High School in Caldwell, Idaho. This team was one of 12 high school teams from the six regions who competed in the national championships last week. Team members include Jerry Shaffer, Marc Stone, Mike Collsen, Joe Baumer, Carl Koprowski, and Gary Marcus. The coach of the squad is Caldwell high's

basketball coach, Sam Willard, who is well known around the State of Idaho for his fine handling of young athletes.

Idahoans and Caldwell, in particular, are proud of these fine representatives of our State.

The importance of physical fitness cannot be overemphasized. Sometimes in the hustle and bustle of our modern lives, we tend to neglect our bodily well-being. This program and the participation by the young men involved is a step in the right direction. The important thing for our young people to remember is that getting older and assuming different responsibilities does not diminish our need for exercise.

VATICAN SELLS TO ROCKEFELLERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement that the Vatican is selling its holdings which include the luxurious Watergate apartment complex overlooking the Potomac River in Washington, D.C., is only exceeded by the announcement that the purchaser was Rockefeller interests in New York City. Let us hope it is individually and not one of the tax-free foundations.

It seems that the Italian Parliament has declared that the Vatican must pay taxes on its earnings from investments.

Meaningful tax reform to U.S. taxpayers could likewise be achieved by taxation of church investments and businesses in the United States.

I include a clipping from the Washington Post, for June 19, and a report from Dixieland This Week magazine:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1969]

VATICAN SEEN SELLING SHARE IN WATERGATE

Several Italian newspapers reported yesterday that the Vatican is selling out its holdings in the Societa Generale Immobiliere that include the Watergate complex, the luxury apartment development overlooking the Potomac River here.

The firm, an international construction and real estate company, owned the site and financed construction of Watergate.

The Associated Press quoted Rome financial sources as saying the Vatican was negotiating the sale of its stock to Rockefeller interests in New York.

Aldo Samaritani, general manager of the Societa, left for the United States Friday for an extended stay, but the firm declined to discuss the purpose of this trip, the AP said.

The AP also quoted Msgr. Fausto Vallainc, press officer of the Vatican, as stating he had been instructed "from high up to reply with a 'no comment'" to queries about the reports.

Some sources linked the transaction to rumors that Bishop Paul Marcinkus, an American who recently became secretary of the Vatican's prefecture for economic affairs has inaugurated a plan in which the Vatican will liquidate many of its Italian holdings in favor of new investments in the United States and elsewhere.

Last year the Italian Parliament revoked a long-standing exemption and declared the Vatican must pay taxes on its earnings from its Italian stocks.

June 27, 1969

The size of the Vatican's holdings in the Societa Generale Immobiliere has never been made public, but it is estimated by some sources to be between 20 per cent and 25 per cent of the firm's outstanding stock.

[From This Week magazine, June 22, 1969]

AMERICA'S CHURCHES: BILLION DOLLAR BUSINESSES

(By Alfred Balk)

"Dropping, dropping, dropping, dropping, see the pennies fall." Sunday School youngsters used to sing as the offering plate was passed, and this image of the Church as a small-change enterprise persists. Some parishes, to be sure, are poor. But collectively America's religious community is richer than any counterpart in recent history, richer than even most ecclesiastical leaders are willing to concede, and it is growing richer so rapidly that thoughtful churchmen are becoming alarmed.

Indeed, one of the nation's most eminent clerics, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, has warned

"When one remembers that churches pay no inheritance taxes (churches do not die); that churches may own and operate business and be exempt from the 52 per cent corporate income tax, and that real property used for church purposes (which in some states are most generously construed) is tax exempt, it is not unreasonable to prophesy that with reasonably prudent management, the churches ought to be able to control the whole economy of the nation within the predictable future."

Consider these points:

Contributions and bequests to churches (taxfree) now exceed \$7 billion a year, about half of all U.S. charitable giving.

Though less than half of our populace attends church on an average Sunday, there now is one house of worship for every 600 Americans and at least \$1 billion is spent on church construction annually.

Churches' "visible assets" (land and buildings), according to a study sponsored by Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, total at least \$80 billion, almost double the combined assets of the nation's five largest industrial corporations. (Of this sum, about \$45 billion is held by Roman Catholics; \$28 billion by Protestants; and \$7 billion by the Jewish faith.)

Denominational pension funds, mortgages, and annuities now total more than \$2 billion, much of it invested in dozens of blue-chip corporations.

Through subsidiaries and feeder corporations, churches own myriad numbers of businesses, including hotels, office buildings, shopping centers, radio-TV stations, luxury apartments, industrial plants, even a brand-name women's undergarment firm.

Moreover, because churches, unlike most other nonprofit institutions, are not required to issue public financial accountings, the above estimates of their wealth probably are conservative. As the Rev. R. John Fry, former news editor of *Presbyterian Life*, has noted, most church officials and members still "share the fantasy that they are not an ecclesiastical business juggernaut."

One of the most conspicuous evidences of their wealth is their buildings. In suburbs in particular, the norm now is not only the upholstered but often the air-conditioned pew. Peter de Vries perhaps best depicted the prototype in *The Mackeral Plaza*: "the first split-level church in America," with an elaborate clinic for psychiatric treatment and an interior "convertible into an auditorium for putting on plays, a gymnasium for athletics, and a ballroom for dances. There is a small worship area at one end."

Nor is this "edifice complex" peculiar to suburbs. In Dallas, for example, a Baptist

church's property includes a seven-story parking and recreation building with a skating rink, gym, and four bowling lanes. In Florida, a complex called Bibletown, U.S.A. encompasses a 2,500-seat auditorium, two education buildings, employee quarters, parking lots, a motel used for retreats, mass dining facilities, and 15 acres of recreation area, including a swimming pool and tennis and shuffleboard courts.

So much church wealth now is devoted to property, a recent General Assembly of the National Council of Churches was informed, that U.S. Protestant and Orthodox churches now spend only \$500,000,000 a year on services to those outside the churches, "only 41 cents a month for everyone who belongs to a church in America."

Even more striking is the churches' accelerating involvement in profit-making business. Almost every commercial field now has church-owned components.

Christ's Church of the Golden Rule near Willits, California, for example, operates a \$500,000 motel and other enterprises; the Mormon Church in Utah owns, among other properties, a Salt Lake City newspaper, a radio-TV station, a department store and the Hawaii tourist attraction Laie Village; the Self-Realization Fellowship owns a chain of Mushroomburger restaurants, and the Societa Generale Immobiliare, an Italian-based real estate firm in which the Vatican is said to be controlling stockholder, is financing the new \$70,000,000 Watergate shopping center-hotel-apartment project near the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C.

Possibly the most ecumenical portfolio, however, is that of the Ohio-based evangelical Cathedral of Tomorrow. It owns a shopping center, apartment building, electronics firm, wire and plastics company, even the Real Form Girdle Company, as *Women's Wear Daily* revealed under the headline "Rock of Ages on Firm Foundation."

"A church owns Real Form? This is preposterous!" the executive secretary of the Associated Corset and Brassiere Manufacturers exclaimed when informed of the purchase. But the pastor of Real Form's new parent organization cheerfully acknowledged the acquisition.

"There is nothing unusual about our owning business firms," he said. "What's the difference if it's a girdle company or an airplane company?"

Miscellaneous minority stock investments of religious organizations are almost beyond enumeration. The United Methodist Board of Pensions, for instance, recently reported assets of \$257,000,000, most of it in corporate stock. The \$300,000,000 portfolio of the Knights of Columbus, which includes the land under Yankee Stadium, holds similarly select stocks, and the Roman Catholic Jesuits reportedly own sizable shares of National Steel, Boeing, Lockheed, Douglas, Curtiss-Wright, the intercontinental DiGiorgio Fruit Company, and other firms.

Why have churches suddenly become active business entrepreneurs?

One reason is our tax laws. Since 1950, universities, secular charities, and most other nonprofit organizations have been discouraged from headlong commercial forays by a requirement that they pay taxes on all "unrelated" business income. Churches and church organizations, though, remain exempt from federal tax on any income property or business—even if totally unrelated to their *sacerdotal functions*.

A church, in fact, need not even amass a large down payment or procure specialized management talent. Because it is tax-exempt, through a "sale and leaseback" it can arrange a "bootstrap purchase"—that is, the business literally buys itself. The church simply pledges payment out of future tax-free profits, then leases the firm back to the original management, which not only re-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ceives a higher sales price than is available from taxpaying bidders but, along with this inflated capital gain, also retains its management status at an attractive salary.

Andrew D. Tanner, a Nashville attorney who conducted a study for the National Conference of Christians and Jews, estimates that a church can generally recover the entire cost of a property, plus interest, within 20 years.

Such exploitation of tax law, of course, severely affects taxpaying competitors. In Dayton, for example, one company complained that it had been underbid on an Air Force contract because the low bidder, a branch of the Roman Catholic Society of Mary, was tax-exempt. And in New Orleans, where a network TV station is owned by the Roman Catholic Loyola University, a spokesman for a taxpaying competitor laments:

"When I pay talent or buy feature film, I've got to use after-tax dollars. They use before-tax dollars. If they spend \$100,000 on promotion during rating periods, I need \$200,000 to match it. The university and its station are good citizens in our community, but I can't believe this is a fair thing."

Government officials are openly troubled about such situations. Stanley S. Surrey, until recently an assistant secretary of the Treasury, in 1966 asked Congress, at minimum, to eliminate exemptions for bootstrap purchases, and a bill to this effect was introduced by House Ways and Means Committee leaders, but it never reached a vote.

A National Council of Churches study in 1965-66 found notable religious sentiment for taxing church business operations, and a Southern Baptist Study Paper declares: "Federal income tax exemption on unrelated business income tends to (1) encourage promotion of or participation in secular business to the detriment of the principal mission of the church; (2) encourage morally unjustified business arrangements with businessmen or companies to reduce their income taxes, and (3) discourage financial support of church activities by voluntary contributions of all members." The United Methodist Church, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., American Lutheran Church, and Episcopal Guild of St. Ives have made similar policy declarations. Some groups have petitioned Congress for reform.

As property taxes have mounted, debate also has intensified over other church tax concessions. In Boston, about half of the city's real property valuation now is off the tax rolls; in Harrisburg, Pa., more than 40 per cent; in New York City, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and other cities, at least one-third. And, according to one survey, in the state of Minnesota, tax exempt valuation is growing twice as fast as that of taxable property.

"This is serious," says Paul V. Corusy, executive director of the International Association of Assessing Officers. "The property tax base is being eroded."

As a stopgap, congregations in Cleveland, Des Moines, and several other cities have voted to make payments "in lieu of taxes" for police, fire protection, and other local services. Policy statements of United Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and American Lutheran Church have urged other congregations to do likewise.

In New York City and Kansas City, Mo., former "rival" congregations now share facilities to avoid costly duplication of plant. Episcopal Bishop Horace W. B. Donegan, out of concern over "the whole urban crisis," has halted a \$12,000,000 fund drive for completion of the immense Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City "until there is greater evidence that the anguish and despair of our unadvantaged people has been relieved." And the Most Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, upon becoming the Bishop of Rochester, N.Y., declared:

"There never should be a new church built here that costs more than, say, \$1,000,000.

If a diocese insists on spending more for a church, it ought to pay something like a 20 per cent tax for missions."

Christianity was founded by a poor man who spent His life among the underprivileged and admonished against privilege. Since then, His church has been weakest and most divided in precisely the periods of its greatest material success. Indeed, at times it has become so rich that governments have had to expropriate its properties, in France, Germany, Mexico and elsewhere.

This, then, is the challenge facing America's churches: to disengage from the trap of "earthly treasure." For, as Dr. Eugene Carson Blake has cautioned, "The economic power that will increasingly be wielded by ever richer churches threatens to produce not only envy, hatred or resentment of non-members, but also to distract from the purposes of the church members and leaders themselves."

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY: A DECADE IN PROGRESS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, among the millions of words spoken and written this month in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the St. Lawrence Seaway, there are the recurring themes of its broad acceptance as a basic fact of our economic life and of confidence in its future.

Amid these optimistic predictions and ambitious projects, it is difficult to recall that this link between the Atlantic Ocean and the heart of North America was ever the subject of doubt and derision.

Yet, it was a little more than a decade ago.

It took more than 50 years of troubled and often bitter debate to bring the 2,342-mile waterway into existence. More than anything else it was the resolute determination and faith of a few farsighted men that was responsible for the eventual creation of the seaway.

One of the most resolute and influential of these men was my mentor, my close friend, and my predecessor for 24 years in representing the 18th Congressional District of Michigan, the late Honorable George A. Dondero, of Royal Oak, Mich.

Among Mr. Dondero's many contributions to the progress and well-being of our Nation was his single-minded devotion and belief in the concept of the seaway as the water link between the industrial Midwest and the rest of the world.

He persisted in that steadfast dedication during the early years when the naysayers and doubters were in a majority. Those same qualities helped bring the concept of the seaway into being in the 1950's when Mr. Dondero served so capably as chairman of the House Public Works Committee.

Mr. Dondero never wavered during those years of skepticism. Critics contended that the concept was unfeasible from an engineering standpoint. Even if it were possible to create this vast ditch, they argued, it could never possibly be worth the immense cost.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The answers have long since been delivered as year after year the seaway, despite a number of built-in limitations and artificial restrictions, has regularly exceeded dollar and volume predictions of the experts.

In the 10 years since Queen Elizabeth II, then-President Eisenhower, and other dignitaries dedicated the seaway a great international partnership has been forged joining the States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin with the Canadian Provinces of Ontario, Manitoba, and Quebec.

The seaway began slowly but traffic has increased steadily transforming cities such as Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Toronto into world ports to their own and to America's increasing benefit.

Not the least of the seaway's achievements is the opportunity it affords the United States and Canada to demonstrate once more what nations working together in friendship can accomplish for their common good.

The dividend from this international partnership can be defined in cultural and human as well as economic terms.

While the still-infant seaway has demonstrated its vigor and potential, its horizons are just beginning to take definite form. There is a long way to go.

Yet, for that potential to be realized fully the seaway must become less a regional facility and more of a truly international asset—a fully integrated part of the national transportation plan and development program.

It was in that image that men of Mr. Dondero's vision saw the fully matured seaway.

The need for such full and complete use of the seaway is self-evident.

In a speech in Detroit not long ago, former Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd described it this way:

Transportation is one service which Americans need across the board. Without it, you can no more fight a war than you can mail a postcard—and there is little you can do in between.

America's system of transportation is by any standard mammoth. It represents an investment of some \$500 billion. It meets needs as diverse as the 200 million people who use it. It accounts for one of every six dollars in the economy; provides jobs for nine million people; and unites a continent.

Yet the increasing demands on the system already strain its capacity in some areas, and the growth to come—compounded by concentration of that growth—could bring its near collapse. Take the year of 1975 as a yardstick for growth—a good year because it is so close you can almost reach out and touch it.

By then the number of private aircraft will have nearly doubled. Commercial air travel will have tripled. Automobile traffic will be up 40 percent. Railroads, which now haul 750-billion ton miles a year, will be hauling one-trillion ton miles. Trucks, now carrying 400-million ton miles will carry 50 percent more.

In fact, if the demand for transportation continues to match America's economic growth, we will have to double in less than two decades the capacity of a system that has taken the lifetime of a nation to build.

In reference to Secretary Boyd's remarks, Mr. Herbert P. Doan, President of the Dow Chemical Co. of Michigan added this:

Mr. Boyd *** says to the people of mid-continent North America ***: the St. Lawrence Seaway must play its role in the national transportation system; it cannot be stifled; it must be used and nurtured; it is a natural asset which we cannot afford to waste.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the America which has produced men with the vision of George A. Dondero will not allow such waste to occur.

In commemorating the waterway's first decade, it is important to recall the qualities of men like Mr. Dondero, who fought so long to bring it into being.

It will require the same sort of undeviating devotion that Mr. Dondero brought to the project during his 24 years as a Member of this distinguished body for the seaway to realize its full potential and proper place in the national and international transportation network.

A PROGRAM TO PROTECT THE SENIOR CITIZEN AS A CONSUMER

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and Senate will, I am sure, agree that few Americans have made more contributions toward helping solve some of the many domestic problems that face our country than the distinguished former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen.

At present, Mr. Cohen is professor of education and dean-designate of the School of Education at the University of Michigan.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of a recent address by Mr. Cohen on "A Program to Protect the Senior Citizen as a Consumer," delivered on May 9, 1969, at the 22d annual Conference on the Aging Consumer at Ann Arbor, Mich.

A PROGRAM TO PROTECT THE SENIOR CITIZEN AS A CONSUMER

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, professor of education, dean-designate, School of Education, University of Michigan)

As we look toward the White House Conference on Aging we must move now into a bolder, broader, more dynamic program for all older Americans.

I propose the following program to protect our senior citizens:

1. IMPROVE SOCIAL SECURITY

Raise the general benefit level—by 50 percent and increase the minimum benefit from \$55 a month to \$100 a month for an individual and \$150 for a couple—over the next four years thus moving over 4 million persons out of poverty.

An immediate 15% across the board increase with a minimum benefit of \$80—thus moving over a million persons out of poverty.

Pay benefits based on average earnings over an individual's 5 or 10 consecutive years of highest earnings, rather than on his lifetime average.

Liberalize the retirement test for those individuals who must or want to work after age 65.

June 27, 1969

2. IMPROVE MEDICARE

Extend Medicare to cover part of the cost of prescription drugs where the patient has recurring drug needs.

Extend coverage of Medicare to all disabled social security beneficiaries.

Simplify the entire Medicare program by consolidating both the hospital and physicians' insurance parts and financing both of them from contributions from employer and employees and a matching grant from government during the working life of individuals so they will have a paid-up policy at age 65 on a non-cancellable basis.

3. REFORM THE WELFARE SYSTEM

Replace the present hodge-podge of 50 different State programs by a system entirely financed by the Federal government with eligibility determined on a national basis.

As a first step toward this goal provide a minimum budgetary standard in the Federal law of \$150 a month for a needy aged person.

4. EXTEND ADULT EDUCATION

Provide for courses and institutes in elementary and high schools for adults in every community so that information and learning will be conveniently available to every older person.

Provide for institutes and training courses in gerontology in universities and colleges.

5. PROVIDE SERVICES WHERE AND WHEN THEY ARE NEEDED

Strengthen homemaker and home health services in urban and rural areas so that aged persons can have health services in their own homes and aid in reducing mounting institutional costs.

Organize community self-help and friendly visitor services to keep in touch with the home-bound and to aid aged persons in an emergency.

Establish local and state agencies in cooperation with professional health personnel to assure the availability and reasonable costs of nursing homes, intermediate care facilities, and other services for the chronically-ill aged which will provide the services they need at prices which are reasonable.

Expand housing programs to meet the needs of older persons.

6. STRENGTHEN FEDERAL CREDIT UNION SERVICES FOR LOW-INCOME PERSONS

Aid the low income aged person by encouraging saving of small amounts, credit at reasonable rates, and advice and counsel on consumer prices, products and services.

7. SIMPLIFY AND LIBERALIZE THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX PROVISIONS ON THE RETIREMENT CREDIT

Simplify and liberalize the Federal income tax provisions for the middle-income taxpayer and make it feasible to compute and obtain his full tax advantages.

8. REFORM THE STATE AND LOCAL PROPERTY TAX

Reduce the impact of the property tax by exempting aged persons with modest and low incomes.

Reduce the property tax for all persons by enacting state income taxes and closing the loopholes in the Federal tax structure.

9. STRENGTHEN CONSUMER PROTECTION SERVICES

The Federal Government should publish information on products and services which are developed through research paid for by the taxpayer.

Federal financial aid should be provided to strengthen State consumer offices, and to provide educational and legal services to stop practices that short-change low-income people and perpetuate antiquated and inequitable laws relating to contracts, sales, and credit.

Make available comparisons on the costs and benefits of all kinds of insurance so the consumer knows what he is buying and can

obtain adequate protection at reasonable costs.

Publish a U.S. compendium on prescription drugs which would give the brand and generic names with all pertinent information on each drug, including a supplement on prices, to be available in every post-office and social security office in the United States.

10. PROVIDE WIDER OPPORTUNITY FOR OLDER PERSONS TO BE USEFUL AND CREATIVE

Expand senior centers, recreational and cultural opportunities.

Expand the Foster Grandparent program so that the aged may assist children who need help.

Appoint broad-gauged retired persons on appropriate Federal, State, and local boards where they will help to overcome the generational gap by contributing their ideas with emphasis on idealism, altruism, and the future of our nation.

Enable individuals when they reach age 55 to have a 3 to 6 month sabbatical to determine how to plan their future.

MAKING HISTORY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of today's session, I spoke in defense of the faculty, students, and programs of Northeast High School in Philadelphia.

Northeast High is in my district, the Fourth, of Pennsylvania. It is currently being subjected to considerable scorn in a film "High School" being shown around the country. Sadly, Philadelphia Schools Superintendent Mark Shedd and the film's director-producer, Frederick Wiseman, refuse to show the film to our community.

From secondhand accounts received from around the country and from reports in the press, I have become convinced that the film is certainly a gross misrepresentation of the school's fine performance and program.

Indeed, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the filmmaker, in order to serve his own purposes, approached his project with singleminded preconceptions. This, of course, required that he show no evidence of the constructive, imaginative, and innovative work that goes on at the school.

The school abounds with exciting programs in counseling, advanced curriculum, individualized student programs, music, mathematics, child psychology; programs not found at most "typical, white middle-class schools," as Wiseman described Northeast.

One of these pioneering programs was a remarkable research project undertaken by history students at Northeast. Using original sources at historical societies and in city records, these teenage historians traced the history of Northeast Philadelphia from 1609 to 1854.

Now part of the fourth largest city in America, Northeast Philadelphia then was a loose quilt of separate townships and boroughs, churches and farms, in which crossroads served as commercial and community centers.

When the research was completed, the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

school's printshop published a handsome, spiral-bound 200-page illustrated book.

While I have not been given a chance to see the film, "High School," I have read this book. It is a remarkable achievement, one of the many conveniently overlooked by the filmmaker.

I applaud the work of Mrs. Cora Hurwitz, the teacher who coordinated this project, and Dr. Mabel Haller, principal of Northeast.

I must say I am impressed by the students who did the research, writing, illustrating, and printing of this book and I congratulate them. I enter in the RECORD an account of their achievement which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of Thursday, June 26: TEENS TOP NE Roots, WRITE BIG HISTORY BOOK

(By Barbara Murphy).

In the minds of many people, Northeast Philadelphia is something new, something strictly post-World War II, something without deep roots in the distant past.

But a group of teen-age historians at Northeast High School have written a book which tells quite a different story about this community with all of its suburban subdivisions, supermarkets and super highways.

"If the book 'Old Northeast Philadelphia County, 1609-1854' has taught its writers one thing," said Mrs. Cora Hurwitz, who supervised the project, "It has shown them that instead of being a brand new section, this is an area with roots deep in the past."

CHURCH HERE SINCE 1711

"They have learned, for instance, that there is a church—Trinity Episcopal Church in Oxford—that has been here since 1711.

"They have learned that there is a house on Pine road, the Ury House, part of which was built by the Swedes as a fort in 1645.

"They have learned that the Society of Friends has two still-functioning congregations here that were started in the 1680's.

"They have learned that Washington's Army came through here on its way to Yorktown and that several skirmishes in the Revolutionary War were fought in the Northeast."

THE FIRST HISTORY

Mrs. Hurwitz said the students' book is the first history of the Northeast ever written as far as she knows.

She said credit for the original idea goes to Dr. Mabel Haller, principal of Northeast High School.

"Dr. Haller saw an historical map of some sort in one of the papers one day in the fall of 1967," Mrs. Hurwitz said, "and she suggested a history of the Northeast might be written as a class project."

Mrs. Hurwitz, who became the school's college counselor last February, was teaching American history at the time and she put the idea to one of her junior classes.

The pupils were enthusiastic and set to work. They divided into six communities. Two worked on the area as a whole and the four others on the individual townships and boroughs which made up the "Old Northeast County." They were Bridesburg, Frankford, Whitehall, Oxford, Lower Dublin, Delaware, Byberry and Moreland.

Mrs. Hurwitz explained that the title of the book refers not to a separate county since there never was a "Northeast County" per se, but to the Northeastern part of the old Philadelphia County which existed as a separate, much larger entity before the city and county consolidated in 1854.

"The students went everywhere looking for information," she said. "And in the process they learned an awful lot about research. They consulted unpublished manuscripts, and city records and interviewed people."

PICKED BEST PAPERS

When each of the committees had finished its work, the committees exchanged papers and the class as a whole picked out the best papers in each group.

This was at the end of school year and Mrs. Hurwitz figured that was the end of the project.

"But some students were so interested," she said, "that they wanted to go on with the project. So all that summer this group came to my house in Frankford every Thursday night and rewrote and edited and organized the research into a single, coordinated work."

Last fall, the papers were mimeographed and presented as a completed project to Dr. Haller.

But that was not to be the end either.

GOOD ENOUGH TO BE BOOK

"Dr. Haller thought it was so good, we should make a real book of it," Mrs. Hurwitz said.

So the young people set to work again, doing more research, rewriting and editing and then turned over the project to the school print shop.

The result—published just before the end of the recently concluded school term—was a handsome, spiral-bound 200 page book, complete with introduction and illustrations.

WRITERS, EDITORS

Mrs. Hurwitz said the actual writing of the final version was done by Steve Aaronson, Howard Cobert, Louis Karchin, Arlene Levit, Neil Nameroff, Beverly Narod, Rhona Nerenberg, Michael Pearlman and Michael Raitman.

The editors were Sally Battilana, Elizabeth Berryman, Larry Carson, Rosalyn Chanin, Lona Cogan, Barbara Cohen, Marjorie Gottschalk, Robert Lankins, Steven D. Morise and Anita Solow. Marc Cohen did the art work and Larry Carson the cartography. William Nell supervised the printing work.

NOT DRIED UP, AFTER ALL

In doing research for the work, Mrs. Hurwitz said, the students discovered some errors in existing books.

Some books for instance said Byberry Creek had dried up many years ago, she said, but a group of researchers went to see for themselves and discovered the creek is still there.

In another instance, she said, it was found that a map dated 1681 by most books could not possibly have been made then since it contained names of settlers who did not arrive until 1682.

By careful checking, it was discovered the map had been made in 1687, some printer having mistaken a 7 for a 1.

Mrs. Hurwitz, a veteran teacher who came to Northeast in 1957, said she has been in charge of a lot of involved student projects, but this, she said, "is the first one ever put out for the world to see."

ONE HUNDRED COPIES FOR PUPILS

She said 100 copies of the 200 printed went to pupils involved in the project.

Most of the others, she said, will be placed in local libraries.

"But we are interested," she added, "in suggestions as to how we can make this available to people who might have an interest in the history of the Northeast."

Those with suggestions are asked to call Mrs. Hurwitz at Northeast High.

GUN CONTROL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia's firearms registration

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 27, 1969

law recently went into full effect. The deadline for registration of firearms by residents of the District has passed, and what is the result? The Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1969, carried an editorial entitled, "This Is Gun Control?" which answers this question fully. So that my colleagues may be advised of results of the District's firearms registration drive, I include the text of the Star's editorial at this point in the RECORD:

THIS IS GUN CONTROL?

At the last report the formal deadline for registering firearms under the District's new gun-control law has passed with less than a third of the estimated number of weapons in the city signed up.

So what does the city government intend to do now? Launch a house-to-house search, perhaps, for the missing items? The silence from the District Building on the subject is quite deafening.

No doubt the exceedingly cumbersome and time-consuming requirements of the new ordinance contributed in large degree to the poor statistical performance, for the Washington public is not this contemptuous of any reasonable law. The basic failure, however, results from an erroneous premise that this regulation might prove to be of productive help in keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals.

Obviously no such ineffective law can be left unattended, and we await with interest the inventiveness of the city government as to what comes next. As to crime deterrence, however, the City Council should, as a first step, shift its focus on guns from registration to the support of some means of imposing really strong penalties upon anyone who actually uses a gun in the commission of a crime.

ADDRESS BY CAPT. FRANK A. MANSON, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED, DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND'S 49TH VFW CONVENTION IN BALTIMORE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of addressing the department of Maryland's 49th annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Baltimore.

Capt. Frank A. Manson, U.S. Navy, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also addressed this convention. Captain Manson discussed his observations and suggestions following a 27,000-mile fact-finding trip around the world. While many of Captain Manson's points are his subjective opinions, I think they warrant the attention of my colleagues. I am therefore setting forth his speech.

ADDRESS BY CAPT. FRANK A. MANSON, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am honored to present the greetings of our Commander-in-Chief, Richard Homan, to the state of Maryland whose membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars continues to grow at a fantastic rate. You are noted for your champions

in football and baseball and now you are membership champions in the VFW!

Your membership growth speaks for many things. It means you have attractive ongoing programs. It means that you have many workers. It means that you have imaginative and dedicated leaders. It means that you are looking at the future of our country as well as the present and past which should never be forsaken.

On a material basis you will be pleased to know that the V.F.W. has had a steady membership growth for 17 consecutive years. The V.F.W. is the only veterans organization that can make this claim and, in fact, I know of no other national organization that has established such a record.

Maryland represents one of our nation's best V.F.W. organizations and I compliment you on your record of achievement.

In this convention, I read your resolutions for the coming year, and I can see why your membership continues to grow. It is because you stand for, and you support, a strong, stable and harmonious country.

All of your resolutions would serve as models on a national basis, but I would especially like to commend you on Resolution No. 3. This resolution supports our Secretary of Defense and all those in authority in their efforts to continue religious training in character guidance to service personnel. I would like to read this resolution. Quote: "Supporting Secretary of Defense, and all others in authority, in their efforts to continue religious training in character guidance programs to service personnel."

This matter became a hot issue only a few months ago when a group was trying to force God out of the Army training manuals. This issue represents the heart of America's greatness, the heart of our Armed Forces. This issue represents the difference between America's leading the world as a nation under God or America competing as a secular power with material things representing the power of persuasion.

We pledge allegiance to our flag under God.

Our constitution is based on a national faith in God.

The V.F.W. derives its strength from a faith in God.

The Secretary of Defense made the decision in favor of God.

The V.F.W. helped expedite the decision.

The reason why it is so difficult to deal with the Soviet Union is because that government does not recognize the existence of God nor does it recognize the Bible as a rule book for man's conduct on earth.

Without basic agreement on right and wrong, what then is good and evil?

America must keep faith with its idealism, with its flag, and its constitution which guarantees freedom and justice for all.

After completing a 27,000 mile fact-finding trip around the world, visiting 14 countries, including three of the most sensitive areas—the Far East, Southeast Asia and the Middle East, and after talking with those in high places and the man on the street, I am convinced the most obvious threat to the United States' national security is the production of Soviet armaments and the deployment of those armaments, along with trained military and technical personnel, to any area or country which shows promise for increased communist influence.

A more subtle threat, and in the long view probably more effective, is the continuing export of communist agents, trained subversive revolutionaries, trained in teaching, killing, psychology, theft, and all the other talents required to completely disrupt the harmony and stability of a society.

Mr. Herbert Rainwater, our VFW Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief, and I traveled completely around the Sino-Soviet periphery. We found the Sino-Soviet split to be real and the split seems to be deepening and wid-

ening. But both the Red Chinese and the Soviet government continue to export trained killers, people trained to kill village chiefs, trained in the use of the firing squad, and trained in torture and terrorism. The Soviet Union continues to export heavy military armaments on a massive scale to those countries where marginal chances for their use and influence exist.

For example, North Korea receives a continuous supply of first-line MIG aircraft, tanks and small, fast boats. The North Korean Navy has been recently supplied with high-speed diesel engines which make it possible for North Korea to build infiltration boats capable of speeds between 35 and 40 knots, faster than any surface craft the U.N. forces have in that part of the world. This new high speed boat resembles a fishing trawler until it starts to move. I suppose if the new boat is capable of carrying armed agents into South Korea, it is also capable of carrying automatic guns, mines, bombs and small rockets. In any case, the ambitions of North Korea's aging Kim Il Sung to dominate South Korea still exists. His ambition continues to be fed by the supply of arms from the Soviet Union.

South of the DMZ the Republic of South Korea's free enterprise system is making rapid economic development. The mayor of Seoul told us that he expects to completely eliminate slums in Seoul within the next three years. Every 90 days he builds new high rise apartment buildings, places 400 slum-dwelling families in each and charges each family \$7.00 per month rent. The new apartment buildings are complete with swimming pools, recreation facilities and modern in all respects. This is truly a revolution in urban development programs. It is taking place in a civilized manner under a free enterprise system operating in an open society.

Almost everyone who goes to Vietnam makes a report. So I will be no exception. South Vietnam and her allied helpers, including the United States, South Korea, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines have a preponderance of power. North Vietnamese Army regulars forces could not hope to gain a battlefield victory under present circumstances. South Vietnam and the United States, Thailand and South Korea have made heavy national commitments. For example, Thailand sent 1/3 of her total armed forces into battle when that country entered the conflict. The allied powers have lost thousands of young men in their struggle to give the ballot privilege over the firing squad as a means of governing the Republic of South Vietnam.

I believe the formula for allied victory has at last been found. I refer to the pacification program of destruction and construction, cleansing the villages of communist agents and replacing them with responsible human beings from South Vietnam who are now being trained in vast numbers to administer to their individual community needs with dignity and just and justice. South Vietnam's ability to self-determine, self-govern and self-sustain is improving with each new day.

Now, if North Vietnam persists in her tactics, it may be necessary for our armed forces to organize "surprise" tactics such as the U.S. used in World War II. In that war, the surprise department was known as "Dirty Tricks", but it worked.

Let us all hope that the cause for humanity can persevere at the peace table and that South Vietnam can follow in the footsteps of the Republic of South Korea, a government and a people we can be proud to stand alongside. South Vietnam is now miraculously built up with new harbors, new port facilities, new airports, new training facilities and equipment of all kinds which stagger ones imagination. The military structure is now built for the transformation of South Vietnam into one of the strongest economic nations in Southeast Asia. It would be an utter

shame to permit all the death and human suffering in this land, all the new harbors and buildings built by the world's greatest builders, America, to be lost in a web of communist political dialogue. The Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Richard Homan, has frequently urged President Nixon, in view of the continued shelling of civilians in South Vietnam to continue to reevaluate all of his options for bringing about a peaceful and prompt settlement of the conflict. I am sure President Nixon knows as well, if not better than anyone in the world, that peace will be achieved through unity and strength here at home. Communist leaders understand strength and unity.

But the Soviet government and the Red Chinese have problems of their own and they have problems with each other.

If the communist powers are going to continue to exploit the problems we have, then I say we should explore their problems. If they continue to pour sand into the machinery of our society then I feel it is only fair that we do some pouring of sand ourselves. One only has to look at our sand pouring talents among ourselves on domestic issues to know we can be the international champions.

The Soviet Union has some real weaknesses from within. She has boundary disputes with China. Some of the Soviet colonies don't like colonial rule, and some are saying so publicly. Some of the communist parties don't like the life of a parrot. Some of them like to say what they think and none of the communist nations except the Soviet Union seem to like what is now happening to Czechoslovakia. Many millions of people inside the Soviet Union don't like to speak Russian. Many of the Soviet people want to speak their own native language. Many want to worship their own God. Many want to publish books criticizing those in power. Many want the right to vote for a choice. Many want less poverty and more food.

The point I wish to leave with you is this: Life in the Soviet Union is not all vodka and caviar. Red China has problems, too. These problems may get worse because they each lack the spiritual base which America has.

The thing we must do is to keep our faith, believe in ourselves, work to the limit of our talents and I know we will remain America the beautiful, America, the symbol of justice and freedom and compassion for all men . . . everywhere.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH McCAFFREY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of his 25 years as a Washington correspondent, Joseph McCaffrey is deserving of a special tribute, not only from his listening public but particularly from the Members of the Congress. He is fair and factual in his presentations, and is very knowledgeable of the workings of Congress. He does a real service in keeping our fellow citizens well informed.

We are all well aware of the power of the communications media, and of the capabilities which it possesses in shaping the opinions of our citizens. The responsibility of reporters of the news, then, bears great significance on the future course of our country, and demands that nothing but honest, unbiased reports be presented.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Joseph McCaffrey is such a reporter. He does honor to his profession, for he has never had to resort to sensationalism nor distortion to retain the interest of his listeners, and he is most deserving of the great respect he enjoys. I wish to express my warm congratulations to Joseph McCaffrey, and my appreciation for the great service he has rendered.

EXPLANATION IN ORDER ON RELAXING NURSING HOME STANDARDS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the relaxation in standards for nursing homes which are serving Medicaid patients.

If there is validity to the charges made by the head of the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., it seems to me that an investigation is in order by the Congress as well as a reassessment of the situation by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

Congress has sought through legislation to give assistance and consideration to our senior citizens. We have an obligation in this regard. A reduction in standards represents a backward step that merits prompt investigation.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the statement making the charge by the head of the senior citizens' organization: *NEW MEDICAID REGULATIONS REPRESENT GIVEAWAY TO NURSING HOME OPERATORS*

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 25.—A senior citizens' spokesman today denounced the new Medicaid nursing home regulations as "a give-away of Federal funds to the nursing home industry."

Nelson H. Cruikshank, President of the 2,500,000-member National Council of Senior Citizens, said "Congress set up Medicaid to help the needy and not to guarantee huge profits for private nursing home operators—the most predatory of health care suppliers."

The cutback in Medicaid nursing home standards was announced by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Monday through publication of the reduced standards in the *Federal Register*.

Medicaid is the three-year-old Federal-State program of health care for the needy.

Cruikshank accused the American Nursing Home Association of putting heavy pressure on officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to get them to order a relaxation of care standards for large numbers of men and women receiving nursing home care paid for under Medicaid.

The senior citizens' spokesman said: "The main concern of the American Nursing Home Association is to increase profits of its members and it is unfortunate that Department of Health, Education and Welfare officials caved in under this pressure."

Until today, Medicaid regulations required that a nursing home receiving funds under Medicaid have one registered professional nurse in charge on one shift and that licensed practical nurses who have graduated from State-approved nursing schools be employed on other shifts.

The new regulations allow employment in nursing homes receiving Medicaid funds of nurses who have never attended nursing

school and are licensed regardless. This is called licensing by "waiver."

Cruikshank said delegates to the National Council of Senior Citizens' recent annual convention in Washington had protested the undue influence of the nursing home industry on Medicaid administrators.

The resolution condemned "actions of Federal Medicaid administrators in employing a paid representative of the nursing home industry to write regulations for nursing home participation in the Medicaid program."

Newspapers have reported that Harold G. Smith, a nursing home consultant, was hired to help draft the Medicare nursing home regulations.

Cruikshank urged that humanitarian organizations concerned with problems of the elderly protest this surrender by Medicaid administrators to the nursing home industry."

Cruikshank declared: "It is a sham and a fraud for the Federal Government to pay for skilled nursing home care, then permit untrained nurses to provide the care."

"This will prolong the widespread disregard of professional standards of nursing home care and continue the exploitation and neglect of unfortunate nursing home patients."

NEW JERSEY ISSUES TEMPORARY INJUNCTION AGAINST INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE SERVICE OF THE MID-ATLANTIC, INC.

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to the subject of deception and misrepresentation in the sale of magazine subscriptions, I would like to call attention to a temporary injunction issued yesterday against one magazine sales company doing business in New Jersey.

Superior Court Judge Alexander P. Waugh yesterday granted a preliminary restraining order against International Magazine Service of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., to prohibit the sales company from continuing certain sales practices which the New Jersey attorney general contends violate New Jersey laws.

The order directs IMS to refrain from misrepresenting that certain magazine subscriptions are free when in fact they are not, that monthly payment amounts were less than they turned out to be, and from failing to reveal the total contract price until after the consumer had signed a contract.

Judge Waugh set a final hearing on the case for October. The New Jersey attorney general has asked that at that time the court order IMS to stop all operations in New Jersey, to rescind all contracts, to return all money obtained through misrepresentation, and be fined \$100 for each illegal transaction. Nineteen consumers were identified in the complaint.

The preliminary restraining order is expected to be made effective by July 2. It represents a significant step to wipe out unscrupulous sales practices where they exist in the magazine sales industry.

The *Easton Express*, an Easton, Pa., newspaper, deserves a great deal of

June 27, 1969

credit for the uncovering of magazine sales misrepresentation through its public service feature, "Action! Express." Complaints received by the newspaper from New Jersey readers led to the attorney general's action to seek an injunction.

I invite my colleagues' attention to the account of yesterday's decision as reported in the *Easton Express*:

NEW JERSEY COURT CURBS MAGAZINE SERVICE
(By F. Alan Shirk)

MORRISTOWN, N.J.—Superior Court Judge Alexander P. Waugh today decided to issue a preliminary restraint against International Magazine Service of Mid-Atlantic Inc. to prohibit it from continuing certain sales practices which the New Jersey attorney general says are in violation of the state consumer laws.

Judge Waugh reached the decision on a show cause order of the attorney general as to why an interlocutory injunction should not be granted against IMS to suspend certain operations in the state.

The case was heard in the Morris County Courthouse here.

The action against IMS resulted from consumer complaints mailed to the attorney general by *Action! Express*, a public service column of the *Express*. These and other complaints have prompted a nationwide investigation of the magazine subscription sales industry.

The restraint expected to go into effect by next Wednesday, will prohibit IMS from misrepresenting that certain subscriptions are free when in fact they are not, that monthly payment amounts are less than they turn out to be, and that the total contract price is not revealed until the consumer signs the contract.

Judge Waugh set a final hearing on the matter for October. The attorney general in the final action wants IMS to stop all operations in New Jersey and rescind all contracts and return all money obtained through misrepresentation. He also asks that IMS be fined \$100 for each illegal transaction.

The hearing today was continued from last Friday when it was adjourned on a legal technicality concerning the rules of evidence.

IMS contested the attorney general's action on the basis that the court did not have the jurisdiction because IMS was a Maryland based corporation with independent franchises doing business in New Jersey.

Douglas J. Harper, deputy attorney general, contended this morning the franchise agreement between IMS and the independent franchises proved that the defendant had too much control and therefore the state's complaint was proper.

Harper said that IMS controlled the independent franchises because it had the right to accept or reject subscriptions, could alter commissions, could make cash advances to the franchises, provided that all contracts automatically became the property of IMS, issued the monthly payment booklets and ran all subscriptions through a central collection agency.

Harper also said the contracts carried the name of IMS.

DEFENDS FRANCHISE PLAN

Barry Mowrer, attorney for IMS, argued that the violations charged by the attorney general were committed by the independent franchises and not by IMS.

"The independent franchises are just that—not employees or agents," Mowrer said.

He also argued that the contract language was not misrepresentative, but the oral portion of the salesmen's talk might have been.

Judge Waugh said the arrangement between IMS and its franchises was "merely a facade," and that the franchising agreement was unusual because IMS did have so much control.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

He said that in the correspondence and letters sent to consumers who signed contracts, the name IMS appeared frequently.

"Based upon your showing before me, there is not this independent franchise between defendant and Bernstein to insulate the defendant from restraint," Judge Waugh said. The Judge referred to Stanley Bernstein, one of the independent franchisers mentioned in the complaint.

The judge said he reached his decision primarily on the basis of Harper's argument about the close relationship between IMS and the independent franchisers and also on a state statute regarding habitual violation of a state law.

HANOI VISITOR REFUTES CLAIM THAT BOMBING HALT IS HELPING UNITED STATES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are deeply indebted to Mr. Andrew Borowiec, foreign correspondent for the *Washington Star*, for his recent dispatch from Paris in which he quotes a recent visitor's visit to Hanoi.

Mr. Borowiec points out that the bombing halt has not reduced tensions in the North as some observers have recently indicated in the American press and that on the contrary, the North Vietnamese seem to have profited from the halt of the air war to improve their production techniques and transportation system.

I have seen naive statements in some publications that the bombing halt has created great morale problems in Hanoi because since the bombing attacks have stopped, Ho Chi Minh is having difficulty maintaining a war spirit among his people.

Mr. Borowiec offers us the first authoritative report on the situation in Hanoi and from his article we immediately see how misleading are those who insist the bombing halt has in some way helped our war effort.

The Communists continue to keep their people in a state of permanent tension by warning that America will resume its bombings. I am deeply concerned that the bombing halt has obviously given Hanoi an opportunity to build up its defenses and as the article points out, should the raids ever resume, North Vietnam would be in a much better position to cope with them.

While it is true that Mr. Borowiec points out there is little damage to be seen from the bombing, I think it should be remembered that more than a year has elapsed since we started the bombing pause and the Communists have had ample opportunity to repair the damage.

The article by Mr. Borowiec follows:

HANOI VISITOR SAYS REGIME STIRS TENSIONS

(By Andrew Borowiec)

PARIS.—Communist authorities in North Vietnam are keeping the country in a state of permanent tension, warning that the "Americans may attack any time."

This was reported by a highly placed neutral observer who visited North Vietnam re-

cently. The visitor asked to remain anonymous.

He said the state of tension was apparently aimed at preventing the population from lapsing into apathy, harming the war effort.

Thus, all raid alerts are sounded periodically, although the United States has stopped bombing the North. While certain emergency measures have been relaxed, industry, schools and all governmental activity remain highly decentralized and on a permanent war footing.

"The war is not over, keep fighting until final victory," is the main theme of official propaganda.

NO SLACKENING

The visitor, who toured large portions of North Vietnam, said he had not noticed any signs of slackening vigilance. The country remains in the grip of a powerful and all-embracing Communist machine, he said, and it would be highly premature to speculate on any slackening of the war effort due to the halt of U.S. bombing.

On the contrary, he said, the North Vietnamese seemed to have profited from the halt of the air war to improve their production techniques and transportation system.

"Should the raids ever resume, they would be in a much better position to cope with them," he said.

BOMBING MINIMIZED

The visitor appeared unimpressed with the results of the bombing. It failed to disrupt life and industrial activity in the North, he said.

"One sees comparatively little damage as one travels through the country," he said. "The North Vietnamese like to capitalize on attacks on civilian targets but they are often quite close to military objectives. Invariably, the military targets seemed to have suffered less."

While, on the whole, impressed with the organization, determination and loyalty of the North Vietnamese, the visitor saw "staggering examples of inefficiency."

Thus, he recalled, at one stage during the air war, factories and some port installations of Haiphong were dismantled and hastily evacuated. Even today, specially formed teams are looking for various components.

Boilers, machinery and other pieces of equipment can be seen literally strewn in the fields, unguarded by anybody, he said.

He was unable to determine the impact on the population of the losses suffered by North Vietnamese regulars in the South. However, he did see large numbers of young men in the cities and villages and concluded that North Vietnam is not faced with any dramatic manpower shortage at this time.

TRUMAN WARD—A GREAT LOSS TO THE CONGRESS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, all of us were greatly shocked and saddened by the passing of our dear, esteemed friend, Mr. Truman Ward, who as majority clerk for so many years served the House and its Members with such outstanding efficiency, fidelity, and cheerfulness.

His loss is indeed a great one to all of us, and in a real personal sense, especially those of us who knew Truman well during his long years of faithful service and looked up to him and relied upon

him to perform tasks for us which he always did so effectively and well.

Truman Ward was respected, admired, and loved by all who knew him. He was an honorable, God-fearing man, devoted to his church, his family, his friends, and his very important work on this historic Hill.

Indeed, these are the things that really were his life, and he centered his attention upon them.

I had no inkling that Truman was seriously ill, and therefore the shock of his passing came upon me with special impact, shock, and deepest grief.

My heart goes out to his devoted wife and family, who have sustained such an irreparable loss, which all of us prayerfully share.

I join them in mourning Truman's passing. He will be missed here in the Congress, where he rendered conspicuous assistance to the Members of the House for so many years far beyond the call of duty.

He will be missed wherever he was known for his amiable personal qualities, his loyalty to his friends and his country, the skill and conscientious effort that he put into his work, and his warm friendship that was so deeply appreciated by so many people.

A great American has passed from the earthly scene, from these honored Halls, where he spent so many years of his life, from his friends and dear ones to his eternal, heavenly reward.

I express my most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Ward and her family and hope and pray that the good Lord will bring them reconciliation and peace in their most sorrowful bereavement.

Truman's memory will always remain with us. He has left us a real legacy of loyalty, hard work, the meanings of friendship and attention to duty that will endure for many years.

May he find happiness, peace, and rest in his heavenly home, and may his dear ones be sustained and helped by the mercy and compassion of the living God to bear their truly grievous loss with true fortitude, faith, and courage.

BATTLE KILLS GLEN BURNIE MARINE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. William M. Stone, Jr., an outstanding young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

MARINE DESCRIBES BATTLE DEATH OF GLEN BURNIE MAN

"The North Vietnamese troops threw a grenade, and he jumped on it to try to save everyone else from getting hit. He tried to jump on it, but he missed it and the fragments just tore him up.

"We had two guys wounded by the grenade besides him. He was a real good guy."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

That is how a Marine described the death of his friend, Lance Cpl. William M. Stone, Jr., 18, of Glen Burnie, whose death was announced yesterday by the Defense Department.

SQUAD AMBUSHED

The friend, Cpl. Emmet D. Close, of Brooklyn Park, said their squad was ambushed June 17, about four miles south of the Demilitarized Zone.

"The grenade was thrown from a tree line just in front of us. . . . Just before he died he asked me to come over and see him [in Glen Burnie], and I told him I would, but he died right there on the spot," said Corporal Close.

"He couldn't understand why we were fighting there," said the Brooklyn Park Marine who was the dead man's squad leader.

Corporal Close, who is home on an emergency leave, said he was nominating his friend for a silver Star. The two had known each other for the past 10 months only in Vietnam, even though their houses were but four miles apart.

SURVIVORS NAMED

According to Corporal Stone's mother, Mrs. William M. Stone, Sr., he enlisted in the Marine Corps last year after working at several odd jobs. He had dropped out of high school in the ninth grade.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his father; a brother, James A. Stone; and two sisters, Donna Lynn Stone, and Beverly Ellen Stone, all at home.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SPEAKS OUT AND TAKES ACTION ON PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an example of clear thinking on some of today's problems by the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce. I commend the members of the Prince Georges Chamber for their conscientious concern as responsible citizens to help find solutions to some of our perplexing problems.

I could not let the occasion pass without bringing this fine program to the attention of my colleagues, so I am setting forth a letter from Mr. Charles Belinky, president of the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce:

HYATTSVILLE, Md., May 13, 1969.

Hon. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOGAN: As a result of the recent discussions between our Executive Committee and yourself, the Board of Directors of the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce on May 5, 1969, gave special consideration to the problems arising from vociferous persons advocating the seizure and control by force and violence of some of our public and private institutions. We coupled with this discussion our concern regarding current activities reaching from the college campus to the ghetto where violence is employed to accomplish ill-conceived objectives. This letter is being written at the direction of our Board and with the unanimous approval thereof.

We do not believe that the solution to these problems will result from either a single or simple solution. On the other hand, we are not dismayed by the belief that such problems have no solution at all. We feel that democratic capitalism is not only a political-economic system which is good for this country, but which can and will work effectively in the interest of all of our citizens. We are indeed anxious to contribute our part and are pleased with your efforts and your concern for making our political-economic system more viable and appealing to all.

There are obviously large numbers of people in our community who, with justification, feel that they are out of the main stream of our economy and who feel that they do not have a reasonable opportunity to promote their own economic and political well being. If our system is to work properly, such people must be given the incentive and encouragement to feel that they do have a welcome place and an important role to play. It is quite obvious that the dream of Henry Ford in manufacturing goods that his own workers could afford contributed greatly towards setting the high and prosperous pace of our society. We who are more successful in our personal lives can obviously expect to gain if we can transfer citizens from welfare rolls into productive employees who bear their own share of taxes and who become paying customers and avid consumers.

With this spirit, the Chamber of Commerce has established a Committee for Opportunity which is intended, as the name implies, to provide opportunities for those who sincerely wish to better their economic well being. It is hoped to provide opportunities in the fields of both education and employment.

On the other hand, we feel that it is imperative for the preservation of our society that certain fundamental standards of conduct be clearly recognized, that all our citizens be encouraged to abide by these standards, and if they fail to do so, that the law deal firmly, swiftly, justly and equally with such deviations. Obviously inciting to riot, advocacy of violence and use of violence is included within such standards. In short, respect for law, settlement of controversies by the Courts and modification of law through orderly legislative processes is an uncompromising essential element of democratic capitalism and to domestic peace and prosperity. These principles we are prepared to defend against all those who would seek to ignore, disregard or overturn them.

The Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce is prepared and, indeed, is actively engaged in providing opportunities for those who wish to better themselves and who are willing to comply with the simple standards of recognition of the rights of other persons to the security of their person and property. We are, indeed, anxious to do more for our County, State and Country within the framework of these principles and we are encouraging you and others to suggest what else we may do.

Very truly yours,
PRINCE GEORGES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
CHARLES D. BELINKY, President.

LAW AND ORDER EVERYONE'S CONCERN

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for inclusion in the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECORD remarks made by an outstanding public servant of the State of Alabama recently. Sheriff Mel Bailey, of Jefferson County, was speaking to a meeting of the Blount County Democratic Women's Club, and the text of his address is as follows:

LAW AND ORDER EVERYONE'S CONCERN

"In our nation where peace under law is a cherished way of life, all agencies and officers of law enforcement face a challenge of paramount importance.

"The problem of crime in our streets and in our cities has reached unprecedented proportions, and law enforcement must find a way to discharge its basic responsibility: The protection of society.

"The ability of law enforcers to do this depends in large part upon the cooperation and support of law-abiding citizens; and unfortunately, that ability has been hampered to some extent in recent years by misunderstanding or deliberate distortion of the facts.

"Some people have tried to make the phrase 'law and order' somehow synonymous with prejudice or repression, and this is not an honest position.

"Enforcement of the law and maintenance of order are essential if justice is to be assured all citizens. If any citizen's rights are violated by a law enforcement officer, then that officer is not enforcing the law. He is exceeding and abusing the power of his office, and he should be disciplined appropriately.

"I have emphasized this ever since I became sheriff of Jefferson County.

"On February 28, 1967, I formally reaffirmed the policy of the Sheriff's Department.

"The state law imposes the duty to effect a legal arrest where the situation warrants it." I said then, "and reasonable and necessary force may be legally used to prevent the escape of a felon, to effect his arrest or to protect citizens and in defense of the life or safety of the officers."

"I also made it clear that any deputy who was wanton in his use of force would be subject to disciplinary action commensurate with the findings of any investigation establishing that fact. That remains the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department's policy.

"So does the following, also quoted from my 1967 statement:

"The policy of the Sheriff's Department is to enforce the laws of the State of Alabama fairly and impartially without regard to race, color or situation in life.

"In the carrying out of this policy, our deputies are expected to be courteous in the performance of their duties and are so instructed. A lack of courtesy on the part of an officer is construed as a weakness and will not be tolerated by this department. No deputy shall willfully mistreat any person, prisoner or otherwise, and shall not use profanity or derogatory language in the discharge of his duties."

"I think that says it as clearly as it can be said.

"Lest there be any doubt whether this still represents the policy of this department, I restated it, as reported in the newspapers, only last week.

"If any citizen or any member of the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department still has any question, then I reaffirm here and now that even-handed, impartial, professional enforcement of the law and equal protection of the rights of all citizens of whatever race or social status or persuasion are the criteria by which I expect to be judged and by which the deputies assigned to this department will be judged.

"Now, let me repeat here that there is another side to his coin, and that is the side of public responsibility to give the law enforcement agencies full support in the performance of their duties.

"Even with the notable advances in police efficiency and scientific crime detection, law enforcement agencies cannot grapple alone with the crime problem and hope to succeed.

"Lawmen must be aware of our responsibility to the people we serve. But we also have a right to expect and get the respect and the support of those same people.

"Without that kind of cooperation and mutual respect, the lawless minority will continue to prey on the honest, law-abiding majority of all races and economic classes. No one's rights, property or life itself will be safe.

"Good law enforcement comes down finally to the men who are charged with providing it, of course: But it begins with You and all citizens who believe in a just and lawful society.

"Furthermore, there is a responsibility on the part of the city, county and state governments to make as diligent an effort to help prevent crime as police agencies are expected to make in apprehending and prosecuting criminals.

"Too often there can be found in the three levels of government and in their various departments a lack of attention to the needs of the poor, in such areas as welfare, food stamps, school and parks, housing and health, and so on.

"Out of this sometime lack of diligence in tackling social problems have come street demonstrations, campus unrest, rioting and, consequently, additional pressure on police forces.

"All systems and levels of government must do their part to provide and maintain social stability and peace in the community.

"It is not good enough to leave one segment—the law enforcement agencies—to face the brunt of attack because of failure of other departments of government to do their part of the job.

"So I hope you can see that if we are to enjoy peaceful, lawful communities in which the rights of all citizens are secure, we all—law enforcement agencies, other government departments and private citizens and organizations—have to shoulder a part of the responsibility.

"I can tell you, and all other interested citizens, that the Sheriff's Department of Jefferson County intends to accept its share of the load.

"I expect from my men high standards of professionalism and, above all, moral integrity. They and I in return expect the understanding and support of the community.

"I can think of no better way to end this than to quote one more paragraph from my 1967 statement:

"It is the sworn duty of every member of the Sheriff's Department to protect the rights of every citizen. It is the duty of every citizen to cooperate with an officer when he is carrying out his sworn duty."

"Neither the situation nor this department's policy has changed since then."

CUTTING OF FUNDS FOR PORT OF NEW YORK AND NEWARK BAY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 25, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly protest the administration's discriminatory proposal which singles out New York-New Jersey Port projects to absorb a grossly disproportionate share of the cutback in harbor improvement projects.

June 27, 1969

Of the \$13.7 million reduction in funds, the ports in our area are cut \$5.4 million, or 39 percent. At the same time eight seaport projects sustained no cuts at all.

The value of the Port of New York's oceanborne foreign trade in 1967 amounted to nearly \$13 billion, divided almost equally between exports and imports. In addition, a total of some 786,000 passengers entered and departed the port by ship in that year. This commerce was carried by nearly 23,000 vessel trips, which in turn generated over \$816 million in customs revenues—about 30 percent of the total customs revenues for the entire Nation for both air and sea transportation.

A port's ability to function successfully is in no small measure controlled by the adequacy of its piers and docks, and the waterways leading to them. This is not to minimize other port handling, transportation, and administrative services. However, unless a ship can enter a harbor safely, and load and unload its cargo efficiently, there will be no traffic and commerce to support these other services.

From 1946 through 1965, private terminal operators and waterfront industry in and around New York Harbor, together with the city of New York and the Port of New York Authority, spent nearly one-half billion dollars to build and rehabilitate marine facilities to accommodate this area's massive oceanborne commerce. More recently, the city and port authority have agreed to construct a long-needed \$60 million modern passenger ship terminal on the North River waterfront.

The magnitude of ocean commerce handled by the New York Port, and the local self-help improvements instituted by New York City Port interests, calls for most careful consideration of any cutbacks in port projects which might have an adverse effect on the continuing economic progress in this area.

I strongly urge that full funding of New York Port projects be favorably considered.

ON THE EDGE OF THE MOON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry LeVine, Jr., of the General Electric Co., recently brought to my attention several articles in a special section of the London Times of June 3, 1969. Because of their significance and the indication of international interest in our Apollo program, I am including these outstanding articles in the RECORD. I commend the reading of these articles to Members of Congress and to the public:

[From the London Times, June 3, 1969]
1,800 YEARS OF SPACE TRAVEL: FROM DREAM TO REALITY

Man has been traveling to the moon for centuries; to dig the gold, eat the cheeses, explore the forests or wrestle with Dan Dare's

Mekon. His transport has been romantic, ingenious, foolish and brilliant; chariots of swans, giant guns, artificial clouds and enormous metal springs; even rockets.

These journeys, dreams that ranged between ludicrous fantasy and prophetic imagination, are not recorded much before the second century A.D. But later, as writers discovered science fiction and the appetite men had for it, the stories proliferated.

At times, either by luck, reasoning, knowledge of science, or uncanny inspiration, they foresaw details of voyages like Apollo 10's and that planned for next month.

In 1646 Cyrano de Bergerac, accomplished wit, swordsman and satirist, imagined himself lifted towards the moon in a flying machine propelled by rockets. But tales of space travel can be traced back at least as far as 160 A.D., when the Greek satirist, Lucian of Samasota, wrote *Vera Historia* (True History), which had all the basic ingredients of space travel fiction: the outward journey, the moon landing, a description of the moon, and the journey home. It set the pattern for many that followed.

Lucian's hero found himself on the moon by accident. His sailing ship was caught in a violent whirlwind that snatched it from the sea and carried it through space. On the moon the traveler found lunar inhabitants called Hippogypi, who rode on three-headed vultures with wings that were "bigger than the mast of a ship".

Until the end of the middle ages apparently little was written of man's dream. Then in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries works by Kepler, Copernicus and Galileo started what has been described as a "veritable astronomical revolution". Johannes Kepler's work, *Somnium* (The Dream), a space fantasy, spoke of transportation by demons who abhorred the sunlight and could travel only by night. Travellers were given an anaesthetic potion as protection against the ill effects of rarefied air.

Another weird fantasy was that of Francis Godwin, a seventeenth-century bishop of Hereford. His *Man in the Moone* travelled by a chair-like device drawn by 25 geese. Like modern man, he used an animal for the test flights—a lamb. He found on the moon a "huge and mighty sea", "herbes, bestes and birds", but none was like anything he had seen on Earth.

Cyrano de Bergerac in one of his schemes "planted my selfe in the middle of a great many glasses ful of dew, tied fast about me; upon which the Sun so violently darted his rays that the heat, which attracted them, as it does the thickest clouds, carried me up so high that at length I found my selfe about the middle region of the air". The voyage was a failure—Cyrano landed not on the moon but in Canada.

His next attempt, by a rocket-powered "machine", was also a failure. Firecrackers were tied to a large wooden box, the fuses were lit and Cyrano jumped on board. He swept through the clouds to a great height but the fireworks went out and he plunged back to Earth.

David Russen in *Iter Lunare* (Voyage to the Moon), writing at a time when space travel was becoming increasingly popular, imagined a giant launching spring constructed on the top of a mountain. Other writers bizarrely devised great ladders.

CAPSULE SHOT FROM A GUN

However, ideas for leaving the Earth were changing. Readers were becoming more aware of science, and writers were becoming more sophisticated as they struggled to make their fiction more realistic. Some machines were fitted with "anti-gravity" devices; space travellers even tried balloons.

Jules Verne in *De la terre à la Lune* was as scientifically accurate as knowledge at the time permitted. His scheme to shoot a capsule at the moon from an enormous gun was

not feasible because its occupants would have been crushed by the acceleration. However the story was good enough to excite his readers into wondering whether it was a possibility.

Columbiad, the name Verne gave his spaceship, was fired from a place called Stone Hill, Florida, little more than 100 miles from what is now Cape Kennedy. It was 9 ft. wide and 15 ft. high. Made of aluminum, it was luxuriously furnished and had gas to provide light and heat. There was an ingenious system for smoothing the impact of take-off, and a chemical plant to produce oxygen.

H. G. Wells' great science fiction works—including *War of the Worlds*, published first as a magazine serial in 1897—came at the end of the long line of fiction that had searched for a method of leaving the Earth. Towards the end of the nineteenth century fantasy was increasingly overtaken by reality—the rocket engine was the solution. Although the dreams of space travel did not falter, science began to dictate terms to the writers.

The exact date of the rocket's invention is lost in history. Stories and legends suggest it was in use before the thirteenth century, but these are hard to confirm. Most authorities point to 1232 when the Chinese were besieged in the town of Kai-Feng by Mongols. They tied rockets, apparently used by them for signalling, to flaming arrows.

Certainly in 1258 a war rocket was used at Cologne, Germany. The Paduans apparently employed them to attack the town of Mestre, near Venice, in 1379. Two years later Bologna, which was under siege, was destroyed by a "fearful device".

In following centuries rockets were continually used as battle weapons. Spewing fire in all directions, they at least caused severe psychological damage. But they were inaccurate. Unless the gas flow from a rocket's tail were directed straight backward, it would curve in flight wide of the target. Guns were much more effective, and impatient military inventors tended to concentrate on these.

The potential of the rocket first began to fascinate European military strategists in the late eighteenth century, mainly because it was being used effectively by their oriental enemies to resist the encroachment of imperialism.

Troops of the Indian state of Mysore had used rockets on British colonial troops in the battles of Seringapatam, in 1792 and 1799. Weighing between 6lb. and 12lb., their casing was made from iron piping and they had a large stick attached for stability. They had a reported range of up to a mile.

Accounts of these battles differ, but one young officer named Bayly wrote: "So pestered were we with the rocket boys that there was no moving without danger from the destructive missiles." He added: "... every illumination of blue lights was accompanied by a shower of rockets some of which entered the head of the column passing through to the rear, causing death, wounds, or dreadful lacerations from the long bamboos of 20 or 30 feet which are invariably attached to them."

Passed over by the military, the reaction rocket gradually took shape in the minds of scientists around the turn of this century. Its potential for space travel was realized independently by three men: Konstantin Eduardovitch Tsiolkovsky, of Russia, Robert Hutchings Goddard, of the United States, and Hermann Oberth, of Germany.

Tsiolkovsky, born in 1857, was of humble origin. He showed an early talent for mathematics and physics, and had an inventive mind. The germ of the idea of interplanetary travel occurred to him while he was still in his teens. Most of what he learnt in the early days was self taught. In 1878 he became a "people's school teacher" and moved to Borovsk. In a home laboratory he started

experimenting. On the basis of papers he later produced he was elected to the Society of Physics and Chemistry in St. Petersburg.

In 1903 Tsiolkovsky published in the journal *Nauotchnoye Obozreniye* (Scientific Review) an article entitled "The probing of space by means of jet devices". The first to understand and develop the use of rockets in space travel, he created the mathematically precise theory of rocket propulsion.

The spaceship that Tsiolkovsky planned was to be powered by heated gases produced by mixing liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen—the basic chemical formula that powered the upper stages of the Saturn 5 rocket and enabled it to send nearly 50 tons to the moon.

Tsiolkovsky's theories on escaping from the Earth's atmosphere and gravitational field place him, in the view of many historians, at the head of all rocket scientists. But he confined himself mainly to the conception and development of theories.

Robert H. Goddard devoted most of his work to the practical application of rocket propulsion. Born 25 years after the Russian, his interests in rocketry also started in his youth. From the age of 16 Goddard started keeping notes of his ideas. Though his work almost certainly had enormous influence on the rocket research, he did not receive the recognition due him until after his death in 1945.

IT MIGHT COST A MILLION DOLLARS

Until 1920 most of his research was devoted to powder and solid propellants. His most famous work, published in 1919, was "A method of reaching extreme altitudes." In it Goddard speculated that it would be possible to send a rocket to the moon with enough magnesium powder for the impact to be visible from the Earth through telescopes.

After a great deal of calculation and initial experimenting, Goddard launched on March 16, 1926, the world's first liquid fuel rocket. It rose 41 feet from the ground at a maximum speed of 60 m.p.h. and was in the air for about 2½ minutes.

Three years later he told Charles Lindbergh, the aviation pioneer that it was possible to send a multi-stage rocket to the moon. "But he smiled a little bit and said it might cost a million dollars—and of course that was out," Lindbergh recalls. The 1969 budget for the Apollo programme will be many times Goddard's estimate.

During the Second World War Goddard worked under contract with the U.S. Navy Bureau of Aeronautics and the Army Air Corps. The principles he developed were applied to missiles used by the Navy.

After his death Goddard received a number of honours and awards. In 1960 the United States Government paid the Guggenheim Foundation and Mrs. Goddard \$1m. in settlement for government use of more than 200 of the pioneer's patents.

Hermann Oberth's interests in space travel started at the age of 11 when his mother gave him Jules Verne's famous books. It set him on a series of experiments into weightlessness and propulsion. In one he even went to the extent of taking drugs, to deaden his nerves, and immersing himself in water. The feeling of weightlessness, he concluded, would at first be very frightening.

His interest in combat rockets drove him to propose to the German war department, in 1917, the development of a liquid-propelled, long-range bombardment missile.

Oberth's first book, *Die Rakete zu den Planetenräumen* (The Rocket into Planetary Space) was published in Munich in 1923. It became a classic. He discussed thoroughly almost every aspect of rocket travel, including the effects of pressure and weightlessness on the human body. The book, only 92 pages of text, was packed with reasoned thought: how a rocket could operate in a void, that it

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

could move faster than the velocity of its own gases, and that it could launch a payload into orbit.

Six years later Oberth published a 423-page expansion of *The Rocket into Planetary Space*. Retitled *The Road to Space Travel*, it earned for Oberth what is believed to be the first international aeronautics prize, instituted by Robert Esnault-Pelterie and André Hirsch.

During the Second World War Oberth worked on rocket developments including the V-1 and V-2 at Peenemünde and Reinsdorf. After the war, before retiring, he worked for a few years in the United States with Wernher von Braun, his erstwhile pupil and the man who completed the bridge between the early rockets and today's giants like Saturn 5.

Tsiolkovsky, Goddard and Oberth did much more than is recorded, however. Their work inspired many to follow, and the impetus provided by their publications attracted numerous scientists and engineers to rocket and space travel research.

Space travel, like rockets and rocketry, owes much to fear and war. Had there been no Second World War, no east-west arms race and no nuclear weapons, it is doubtful that man would have achieved so much so soon.

If there is one other man whose name is likely to loom as large in space history as those of Oberth, Goddard and Tsiolkovsky, it is Dr. Wernher von Braun. Now 57, he lives and works in America, where he is Director of the Marshall Space Flight Centre. It was he who turned Hermann Oberth's idea of long range bombardment missiles into reality. Luckily for Britain and the rest of Europe his V-2 was not ready until the end of the war. In spite of successes at Peenemünde, Hitler could not be persuaded of the value of von Braun's weapon.

Nevertheless, southern England and the Continent were to experience the horrors of rocket warfare in 1944 and 1945. Some 4,000 V-2s, each carrying a one-ton warhead, were fired during those two years. Traveling at speeds faster than sound, they gave little or no warning of their approach.

Both Russia and the United States were quick to realize the value of the V-2. As they invaded Germany at the end of the war they competed in capturing rockets, plans and the men who designed them.

Von Braun went to the Americans.

Though it was probably the Americans who won this scramble for German minds and machinery, it was Russia that was first off the mark in the space race.

Sputnik 1 went into orbit on October 4, 1957. It caused bitter disappointment in America, and recriminations in Washington. The U.S. Army had planned to put a satellite into orbit in September but apparently red tape had prevented it. The world marveled at Russian technology.

A month after Sputnik 1, the Russians launched the dog Laika in Sputnik 2 and demonstrated that life in a spaceship was possible.

America launched Explorer 1 three months later but by this time Russia's success had made a jarring impact on the West. Americans and Europeans were thinking of space as an advantage in the battle for nuclear superiority . . . and Russia seemed to have that advantage. It seemed that the man with superiority in space had superiority in missile power. Many people envisaged the Russians planting the hammer and sickle on the moon and declaring it their own. The Russians would dominate the world. They would be able to aim a rocket at the earth and they would be invincible.

We now know that in a nuclear war the time it takes a missile to reach its target is critical. A missile launched from the moon would probably arrive when the war was over.

Somewhere in the race that followed Sputnik 1, the Russians adjusted their sights.

Whether they raised them from the moon to the planets or kept them on the moon but fell behind in shooting capacity we may know only when the Russians land elsewhere in the solar system.

FIRST GLIMPSE OF THE DARK SIDE

If, as now seems certain, the Americans are the first to step on to the moon's barren surface, it will not mean that the moon is American. Thanks to an agreement signed by some 60 nations in 1967, the moon is international territory.

In 1961 President Kennedy set the target for a moon landing "within the decade", but it was not until the mid-60s that the Americans seemed to be catching up.

On September 13, 1959, Russia's Lunar 2 crashed into the moon's surface. A month later Lunar 3 provided the first glimpse of the moon's dark side. On April 12, 1961, they put Yuri Gagarin into orbit. One month later the Americans put Alan Shepard into space, but it was a short, 15-minute, sub-orbital flight. The Russians sent back the first television pictures in August, 1962. In 1963 they achieved a flight of over 100 hours, in 1964 they put three cosmonauts up together, and in 1965 they made the first space walk.

But by 1965 the Americans were only a few months behind, and midway through their Gemini programme they started to take the lead. They managed a successful docking—the linking of two space vehicles—essential for reaching the moon by the American method of separate "excursion module".

By 1967 the space commentators were saying that America was ahead. The two-man Gemini flights had been such a success that there was even an air of over-confidence. It may well have contributed to the disastrous fire of January, 1967.

Three astronauts, Edward White, the first American to walk in space, Virgil Grissom, who had made two flights, and Roger Chaffee were doing a simulated countdown for the first manned Apollo flight. At this time the Americans were using pure oxygen for the atmosphere of their space craft.

A small spark from the electrical system is thought to have started the fire: the men were sealed in the capsule and had no chance of escape. They died within seconds.

Apollo underwent sweeping design changes. The atmosphere was changed and new, quick-opening hatches were fitted. The added weight ran into hundreds of pounds and the work on reducing this put the programme back.

Apollo 7, the first Apollo flight, flew in October, 1968. It stayed up for more than 260 hours, making 163 Earth orbits. Two months later Frank Borman, James Lovell and William Anders piloted Apollo 8 on two Earth orbits and 10 moon orbits. They came within 70 miles of the moon's surface and travelled farther from Earth and faster than any man before.

They demonstrated that man could travel through space, and that the dreams of Lucian of Samasota, Kepler and Verne—of going to the moon and of looking back at the Earth—were not to remain dreams forever.

Man has been to the moon, the next problem was to land on it.

For this task, the Americans developed the lunar module, a spidery-looking vehicle which, like a flying bedstead, cannot glide. When tested in the Earth's gravitational pull, six times stronger than the moon's, it proved to be one of the biggest stumbling blocks in the whole Apollo project.

The Russians had decided on a jumping-off platform in Earth orbit. The Americans, after years of debate, had chosen to have their platform circling the moon. Thousands of millions of dollars made the decision irreversible. No wonder those who were sniffing the first hints of victory were shocked when the lunar module, crashed repeatedly during Earth tests and seemed uncontrollable. But

its designers stood by it and were vindicated by the inflight trials of the Apollo 9 and 10 missions.

Man is expected to stand on the moon's surface in little more than a month. He will owe much of his achievement to the science fiction writers and the rocket men. But it will not be the end of the dream. Fiction tells too of journeys to Mars, Venus, and to other solar systems. The men who devoted themselves to the science of space travel looked on the moon only as a first step.

[From the London Times, June 3, 1969]
How Two Men Will Walk on the Sea of Tranquillity

The perilous journey to the moon of Apollo 11's marvelous ironmongery began, at a grinding speed of less than half-a-mile-an-hour, while Apollo 10 was blazing a triumphant trail in space.

Since superlatives are inseparable from space pioneering, it was the world's largest tracked vehicle, "the crawler", that carried the 3,000 tons of Saturn 5 rocketry from its lofty assembly building to launchpad 39A. It took some six laborious hours, the most laggard progress it is likely to make.

Apollo 11 makes its thunderous, fiery exit from Earth at teatime on July 16 with its three-man crew: Mr. Neil Armstrong, a civilian who is destined to be first on the moon, Lieutenant-Colonel Edwin Aldrin, who will walk the surface with him, and Lieutenant-Colonel Michael Collins, who will stay in the orbiting command module.

Following the flight of Apollo 10, the lunar voyagers will orbit the earth one-and-a-half times before firing their third stage Saturn 4B rocket that shoots them on to their moon course.

Ninety-eight hours into the flight the 16-ton lunar module will extend four spidery legs, and part from its mother craft to begin its descent to the moon. Its two-man crew, held only by a safety harness, will stand at the controls, peering through canted triangular windows.

For a quarter of an orbit Apollo 11 and its offspring will fly cautiously in formation a few hundred feet apart, in case a quick rescue is necessary. The two moon-walkers will be in the lunar module's upper, or ascent stage. The lower, descent stage will become a launching pad from which they will take off after their 22-hour stay.

The module will take an hour to drop to 50,000 ft. (eight nautical miles). Its descent engine will be fired and in eight minutes it should land on a chosen site in the Sea of Tranquillity.

To the men on the previous mission, the spot, from a distance less than twice the height of Everest, looked firm enough. According to Colonel Tom Stafford, the Apollo 10 commander: "There's plenty of holes there. The surface is actually very smooth like a very wet clay . . . with the exception of the bigger craters."

Automatic radar will continuously measure the angle, speed, altitude and range as the lunar module approaches. The pilot takes over, manually, only in the final seconds. He can hover, if he wishes, and take it up again without landing, if necessary. Pads on the module's legs take the touchdown impact.

The module must land cleanly and evenly if it is not to jeopardize its take-off later. As soon as they are down, Mr. Armstrong and Colonel Aldrin will spend two hours checking the module's systems. Then they will stop for a meal, and a four-hour rest. They will eat a second meal before they depressurize their craft and open its hatch for the first time. In fact they will have been on the moon for 10 hours before Mr. Armstrong ventures outside, and into the world's history books.

Wearing a bulky space suit and a special thermal garment over it to protect him from radiation, temperature extremes and parti-

June 27, 1969

cles of meteoroids, and carrying a life support system on his back, Mr. Armstrong will climb down the ladder attached to one of the module's legs.

Colonel Aldrin will televise and photograph the moment from the module before following Mr. Armstrong down the ladder 31 minutes later. Because of the moon's curvature, the astronauts standing on the surface will be able to see only two miles, rather than the 20 they could see on Earth. Under a cloudless black sky the landscape will glare whitely.

They will set up a television camera to send pictures of the module back to Earth. Then the astronauts will rig a solar wind collector—which they are to take back with them—and seismic equipment and a laser reflector which will be left behind.

The wind collector, developed and paid for by the Swiss Government, is a thin sheet of aluminum on a frame like a window screen. It will trap rare gases like argon, helium and xenon from the sun's rays.

The 100 lb. seismic station will collect power from the sun which it will use to radio volcanic movement or lunar activity below the surface back to Earth for perhaps a year.

The reflector, which weighs 70 lbs., will reflect laser beams directed from Earth. These will enable the distance between the Earth and the moon to be measured with great accuracy and any variation to be recorded. Measurements will be repeated several times a day for a year or more. This should enable scientists to refine their knowledge about the shape and size of the moon.

Perhaps the greatest prize awaited from the journey is the 50 lbs. of lunar rock and soil the astronauts are expected to gather for international distribution to scientists.

When Mr. Armstrong first descends the ladder it will be to familiarize himself with the surface and its stability. He will climb back then for a contingency sample bag into which a handful of rock or soil can be thrust quickly in case they need to leave in an emergency.

The astronauts' life support systems allows them four hours air. They will work for three, with an hour in hand as a precaution. Though the moon's gravity is one-sixth of the earth's, movement in their enveloping suits and equipment will be slow and awkward.

Simulation tests have improved ways in which they can go about it. One astronaut, for instance, will carry both experimental packages because his balance is improved, in the same way as when a suitcase is carried in either hand. The packages have to be moved about 70 ft. from the lunar module and on the Earth weight a total of some 160 lb. Special design has made them relatively simple to set up. Lanyards are pulled, releasing springs holding the instruments together as a parcel.

Adjustments are then made to solar panels capturing the sun's rays to provide electrical power for both pieces of experimental equipment. Radio aerials connected to the units will be adjusted so that they send a continuous stream of information back to earth. The equipment starts to operate as soon as the panels are unfurled.

The astronauts will have three prospecting tools for collecting samples. One is a scoop to gather loose soil, another is a pair of tongs for picking up rocks, and the third is a boring instrument. This is hammered into the ground to take a 12 inch core sample, which it automatically ejects into a container. It will give scientists material uncontaminated by man or rocket exhaust. While they are on the surface the astronauts will stay within 300 ft. of their craft.

At 7:32 a.m. on July 21 Colonel Aldrin and Mr. Armstrong will climb back into the lunar module. They will eat two more meals, with a rest of nearly five hours between be-

fore blasting off from the moon at 5 p.m. The lower half of their craft, which now becomes a launching pad, remains on the moon. It may be useful to subsequent visitors for fuel or spare parts.

The ascent stage, just 12 ft. high, weighs under a ton on the moon. The astronauts must fire themselves into an elliptical orbit between 15 and 36 miles high and then make this circular with another burn. The lunar module will be travelling in a lower, and therefore faster, orbit than the command module. They will narrow the gap for two hours before they dock.

The two spacecraft must equalize pressure before the hatches are opened for the two moon-walkers to return to the command ship. The lunar module will then be jettisoned.

The mothership will circle the moon twice while preparations are made for the return. To leave lunar gravity its speed must rise from 3,600 m.p.h. to about 5,400 m.p.h. to begin the long journey home and the dangerous reentry procedure.

Apollo 11 is due to splash down at 5:52 on July 24, eight epoch-making days after they set out. But their personal welcome by an incredulous world will be delayed. They will go into isolation for 21 days from the time they left the moon to be minutely examined by scientists.

Before they leave their spacecraft they will even vacuum clean the inside to prevent possible contamination of the earth by particles from the moon, which may be dangerous. As soon as the astronauts emerge from the spacecraft they will don isolation garments and be sponged off with organic iodine.

[From the London Times, June 3, 1969]
WHAT THE SCIENTISTS ARE HOPING TO LEARN
FROM THE MOON

If the engineering of the Apollo project passes its final test with the flight of Apollo 11 in July, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration planners will have the moon in their grasp. In deciding what to do with it, their first goal will be to explore the lunar terrain. The results of this may be crucial to the longer term schemes envisaged by enthusiasts for man's role in space, such as manned lunar bases, the construction of telescopes and the use of the moon as a launching pad for flights to the planets.

The geology of the moon is not only of great interest in its own right but will also help in reconstructing the early history and structure of the Earth. This is not just because two planetary bodies will be easier to understand than one. Whatever the origin of the moon, its crust may still retain the fossil evidence, long since vanished from Earth, of events that occurred at the dawn of the solar system. The geological forces that continually remould the face of the Earth have destroyed all but the vestiges of its primordial crust and left a gap in the record from time of the Earth's formation, some 4,900 million years ago, until the appearance of the first sedimentary rocks nearly 2,000 million years later.

The scale of geological activity on the moon has been much smaller, and the moon's surface, perhaps not greatly altered since the time of its formation, may help to make good the pages missing from the early history of the Earth. Nonetheless, the occasional eruptions seen in lunar craters and the volcanoes spotted by the Apollo 10 astronauts suggest that the moon may not be the fossil planet it is sometimes supposed.

The astronauts of Apollo 11 will spend 2½ hours outside their landing module, long enough to set out a package of instruments and scoop up some samples of lunar soil. Ten more flights are planned with existing Apollo equipment or slight adaptations of it, the pattern of which will be to allow progressively more time on the lunar surface.

Apollo 12 will allow two excursions of 2½ hours each, and the astronauts of Apollo 13 will have up to three days on the moon. But short excursions, even at different landing sites, will bring back diminishing returns. In further flights the lunar module will be equipped with extra oxygen tanks so as to prolong the stay to a week, together with some kind of transport which will give the astronauts a range of five to 10 miles from the module.

One proposal, still very much in the air, is to combine the payloads of two Apollo flights. The lunar module of the first would be replaced by an unmanned capsule capable of landing some 7,000 lb. of logistic support for the astronauts who would arrive on the second flight. The extra equipment would probably include shelter and life systems for a fortnight's stay, and a roving vehicle to explore the surface.

The flights after Apollo 11 will probably be interspersed with unmanned flights designed to reconnoiter the best spots for manned landings. The first landings are planned for sites along the moon's equator. These are easier to attain than polar landings and the orbit of the spacecraft is least at risk there from disturbances by the curious gravity anomalies of the moon. But unmanned spacecraft suggest that the lunar poles may promise more surprises for the explorer.

Just how interesting the moon turns out to be will determine the rate at which it is explored and exploited after the first Apollo landings. If President Kennedy had not made the landing of men on the moon before 1970 a national goal it is unlikely that the scientific aspects of the mission alone would have commanded the necessary funds—the return tickets for the two Apollo 11 astronauts will have cost some \$10,000 each.

After Apollo, space flight will have to be justified by scientific rather than political considerations, and in present circumstances scientists will choose to devote a large slice of what funds may be available to making unmanned flights to the planets. But priorities could change overnight if the moon were to yield any big surprises, such as if, for example, an astronaut were to pick up a fossil skull from the lunar soil.

Apart from exploration, the other possible uses of the moon will depend on the tempo of space activity, and particularly on the demand for manned flights around the solar system. It requires very much less energy to launch a planetary probe from the moon than from Earth, and the economics of doing so might become attractive if rocket propellants such as hydrogen and oxygen could be extracted from the moon. This is why advocates of manned space flight, and science fiction writers before them, have pointed out the advantages of maintaining a manned lunar base which, it is hoped, would be largely self-supporting and need only a minimum of supplies to be ferried from Earth.

Nobody envisages that a manned base would be set up on the moon before the 1980s, but even this date may be too optimistic if the Apollo landings fail to find water, which is the key to any large-scale exploitation of the moon. Water can be separated by electrolysis into oxygen and hydrogen and these three substances between them would provide the bulk of the material needs of a lunar colony. But does water exist on the moon? One possibility is that there is a layer of frozen water, like the permafrost of Siberia, a few feet below the lunar surface. Another is that water molecules may have been trapped in the permanently shaded craters at the poles of the moon and over millions of years have grown into glaciers perhaps 100 ft. deep.

Even if both these suggestions are proved false, and there is no positive evidence to support them, it may conceivably be economic to extract oxygen from the lunar rocks for the benefit of a lunar colony.

A lunar base, which would be an economic alternative to more than a certain number of individual return trips, would be manned by some 20 to 60 people living in prefabricated aluminum chambers. A small nuclear power station, machinery for exploiting lunar water, and a hydroponic farm would be the essential supports of the colony's existence. Geological exploration would be a major part of the colony's role, but there might also be opportunities to construct an observatory, for which the moon offers several unique advantages. The moon has no ionosphere and its far side is the only place in the solar system that is permanently shielded from man-made electromagnetic disturbances by 2,000 miles of solid rock, which makes it an ideal site to pitch a radio-telescope.

X-ray observations, which at present can be made only from balloons and rockets launched to the top of the Earth's atmosphere, could be carried out on a more permanent basis from the surface of the moon. Optical astronomy would also benefit. Without the interference of an atmosphere telescopes could be designed and operated to the theoretical limit of their resolution. Their structure would be far less massive than on Earth because of the smaller pull of the moon's gravity. The 200-inch reflector on Mount Palomar weighs 500 tons whereas a 200-inch telescope constructed on the moon's surface would probably weigh only 10 tons.

An observatory on the moon would be able to reach farther out into space than Earth-based telescopes, with incalculable advantages for astronomy. The counting of various types of very distant stars might help to resolve the debate about the origin and structure of the universe. The precision of astronomical measurements would be extended so as to put the determination of stellar distances on a much firmer basis. A lunar telescope might also be able to detect the planets of the nearer stars. Nevertheless the benefits to astronomy would afford only a marginal justification for a lunar base because many of the advantages offered by lunar sites can be gained far more cheaply by telescopes put in orbit round the Earth.

The costs of running a lunar base have been estimated at around \$1,000 million a year for a 20-man base. Labour costs on the moon are expected to work out at nearly \$100,000 an hour, and the price of transporting supplies from Earth to moon would be of the order of \$10,000 per kilogram. If these estimates are even approximately correct, it is clear that a manned lunar base will be justified only as part of a space programme much larger than what is envisaged for the immediate future, and too large, perhaps, for the resources of any one nation.

But this has not stopped Mr. Barron Hilton, for example, from putting forward his ideas for a three-floor hotel beneath the lunar surface, or Mr. Arthur Clarke, who predicted communications satellites some 20 years before the event, from giving a warning that in two centuries conservationists will be trying to save what little is left of the lunar wilderness.

SALUTE TO AMERICA

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Robert M. Freedman, has composed a "Salute to America," which he feels should be

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

adopted to replace the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. I place Mr. Freedman's salute in the RECORD at this point for the interest of my colleagues:

SALUTE TO AMERICA

This is my country and, as an American, I shall defend it with my life. I will never lose sight of my heritage. I will stand with the giants of this land, for no one country, no one person, near or far, shall deprive us of God's will, for man to be free.

THE NATIONAL COMMITMENTS RESOLUTION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, earlier this week the other body voted—70 to 16—in favor of the advisory, sense-of-the-Senate resolution which, though ambiguous and presumably without force of law, is being regarded as an attempt by the other body to reassert some of its constitutional prerogatives in the field of foreign policy to the possible effect that future Vietnams might be avoided.

Whether or not this would prove to be the case is, I suggest, somewhat conjectural and one can rather easily imagine that, resolution or no resolution, American Presidents will probably go on conducting American foreign policy largely as they see fit as long as the Constitution—vague and ambiguous though it, too, may be in this same respect—seem to make that possible and practicalities, especially in a nuclear age, are deemed to make it necessary.

The debate on this matter in the other body makes for some interesting reading but will probably leave constitutional scholars still pretty much in the dark as to what, exactly, was accomplished by this bill's passage—on which, of course, the House does not have to act. There can be no question, however, but that this action springs from our unfortunate experience in Vietnam. And there can equally be no question but that this entire matter ought to be explored further and, in my judgment at least, some better approach sought for putting Congress—both Houses thereof—more actively back in the arena where far-reaching foreign policy decisions are to be made.

I have been interested in this problem for a long time—as I know a goodly number of my colleagues have, too. Recently, I ran across two items in the same general area that are worth consideration. The first of these is a rather lengthy discussion of the so-called national commitments resolution, as written by Arlen J. Large and appearing in the June 20 edition of the *Wall Street Journal* and, under leave granted to do so, it is now included as a part of these remarks:

SENATE WEIGHS U.S. GLOBAL COMMITMENTS
(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—Congress has never voted directly on the merits of waging the kind of

war that ultimately evolved in Vietnam. Indirectly it endorsed a much smaller military effort by voting for the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin resolution. And indirectly it sustained the ballooning conflict by voting arms appropriations for it.

Now the Senate is once again acting indirectly, debating the merits of an intervention U.S. foreign policy that produced the unhappy experience of Vietnam. It's being done in the guise of considering a fuzzy sense-of-the-Senate resolution that attempts to define a "national commitment." The resolution says the Senate doesn't want U.S. troops sent abroad to back up future defense commitments that haven't been specifically approved by Congress.

The ambiguity probably attracts votes for the resolution, with different Senators supporting it for different reasons. There is always some automatic support for anything asserting Congressional prerogatives in rivalry with the Executive Branch. The Nixon Administration, which opposes the resolution, at one point seemed content to let it pass unnoticed as a meaningless exercise in Senate parochialism. Now its resistance is stiffening, with Senate GOP Leader Everett Dirksen trying to persuade the sponsors to change the wording to something less offensive to the Administration. The debate could easily deteriorate into a partisan scrap between the Democratic Senate and the Republican White House.

A NATIONAL WEARINESS

But there are Senators in both parties who want to debate the resolution at a deeper level of meaning, symbolizing some measure of national weariness with the U.S. global role since World War II.

A view of America over-committed diplomatically and over-extended militarily around the world is held by the resolution's principal backers, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman William Fulbright of Arkansas and Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana. Sen. Fulbright explains the resolution would "inhibit the President from making politically significant foreign commitments solely on his Executive authority, with any foreign country or organized force without the prior and explicit authorization of Congress."

The whole thing "smacks of neo-isolationism," says Democratic Sen. Gale McGee of Wyoming, who is an unreconstructed Vietnam hawk and an advocate of strong Presidential authority over foreign policy. Sen. McGee thinks many of his colleagues are bemused by the legalistic arguments over Senate foreign-policy prerogatives, failing to see the more subtle assault on U.S. policy itself. "This may not be the hottest issue going, but it could be one of the most important," he says.

The gap between the viewpoints represented by Sens. Fulbright and McGee was widening well before President Nixon himself denounced the "new isolationists" two weeks ago. The national commitments resolution was first introduced in 1967 and directed against the Johnson Administration, which also opposed it. Then as now, it was offered in terms of a stale dispute in Constitutional law, with the Senate wanting to reclaim treaty-ratifying and war-declaring powers it feels have been surrendered to the Executive. But then as now, it was an indirect reflection of growing unhappiness with the nation's global role.

For much of the post-World War II era it was an agreeable role for Americans. It conferred the title of "leader of the free world" on Presidents, and allowed Congressmen to boast of creating the most powerful nation on earth. Literally millions of American citizens have gone abroad since the late '40s to serve in the armed forces or in diplomacy.

and for a lot of them—where there was no shooting—it was fun.

Congress and the public soured on offshore adventures only when the going got tough. It was inevitable that the going would get tough. Mixing deeply into other peoples' political disputes means bumping some day into some locals who care more deeply about the outcome than most Americans do. Endless casualties in Korea and Vietnam produced demands that policymakers show clearly that the foreign enemy was indeed a threat to citizens at home. The Administrations in office at the time could not do it, at least to the satisfaction of millions of voters.

It would be different if light had burst through the entire length of the Vietnam tunnel in, say, the summer of 1966, with the other side shriveling in discouragement. There would be no "national commitments" resolution pending in the Senate today. Global policing, having worked cheaply, would remain high adventure and the military-industrial complex would be as popular as a paycheck.

Instead there's a backlash against both the diplomatic and military establishments of the Executive Branch. Sen. Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee, in a report explaining the "national commitments" resolution, takes an unaccustomed swipe at the diplomatic profession, complaining in effect that the U.S. has become saddled with *too much* foreign policy, made by too many policymakers.

It's doubtful that, by itself, the resolution would have much impact on Presidential foreign policymaking. The turgid language would have no force of law, merely expressing the Senate's opinion that: "A national commitment by the United States to a foreign power necessarily and exclusively results from affirmative action taken by the Executive and Legislative branches of the United States Government through means of a treaty, convention or other legislative instrumentality specifically intended to give effect to such a commitment."

The Foreign Relations Committee's report mentions Thailand, Israel and Spain as nations that have no such ironclad, Congressionally sanctioned U.S. defense pledge. But oral promises of support by Executive-branch officials or the presence of U.S. military bases, or both, inspire the committee's fears that defense obligations to these countries have been created without anyone's asking Congress.

Cutting Congress into defense commitment decisions, it's theorized, would help avert U.S. involvement in marginal foreign quarrels. A defense treaty presumably would be ratified only when a broad cross-section of Senators agreed a commitment was vital, ultimately justifying U.S. battle casualties. Such nations as Israel, Biafra and Rhodesia, for example, all have passionate friends in Congress, but each rooting section could prove too small to pass a "legislative instrumentality" that would put GIs into trooperships.

AN UNACCEPTED DARE

The problem is that this is no guarantee against U.S. involvement in wars that later become unpopular. Congress after all did pass a "legislative instrumentality"—the Gulf of Tonkin resolution—authorizing Lyndon Johnson to use armed force to defend South Vietnam. Sen. Fulbright and others bitterly claim they were misled, but they never accepted President Johnson's dare to repeal it. The North Atlantic Treaty, ratified by the Senate two decades ago, could still trigger U.S. defense of the military government in Greece.

Thus if the Senate passes its "national commitments" resolution, it will be primarily a symbolic act—a complaint against the unsuccessful Vietnam war and a warning against more of the same. Sen. Fulbright himself has conceded that "neither Senate reso-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

lutions or any organizational or procedural devices are likely to restore Congressional authority in foreign affairs. The restoration of Constitutional balance will depend on decisions of a more fundamental nature, decisions as to the kind of country we want America to be and the kind of role we want it to play in the world."

"A veritable army of foreign-policy experts has sprung up in government and in the universities in recent years," contributing greatly to our knowledge and skill in foreign relations but also purveying the belief that foreign policy is an occult science which ordinary citizens, including Members of Congress, are simply too stupid to grasp," says the committee report. There is a trenchant reminder to the State Department that:

"Foreign policy is not an end in itself. We do not have a foreign policy because it is interesting or fun, or because it satisfies some basic human need; we conduct foreign policy for a purpose external to itself, the purpose of securing democratic values in our own country."

At least some Senators who have been turned off by the Vietnam war believe Americans can remain global-minded in terms of trade and travel, but should leave the guns at home. Marlow Cook, Kentucky's new Republican Senator, openly applauds a national mood of "neo-isolationism," which he defines as "not economic or cultural but military." The new mood, he said in a speech, "is born of a frustration with excessive militarism, whether it takes the form for costly missile systems which increase international insecurity or ill-advised unilateral intervention in foreign countries which take the lives of thousands of young Americans."

IDEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

Whether there is "excessive militarism" depends upon an assessment of the threat to Americans from Russia, China, the Vietcong or whomever. The argument tends to be heavily ideological, often with side quarrels over diversion of arms money to civilian uplift, but not always. Here are two Democrats, both domestic liberals, assessing the world around them in recent speeches:

Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri: "I am confident every American would agree that, when Mr. Stalin was alive, the cold-war aspect of our foreign relations was far more serious than today. Then there was a monolithic structure behind the Iron Curtain, and a man running things whom we all know was interested in taking over the world. That is far from true today."

Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut: "We are now heading into the most perilous period in the history of our republic. . . . If we succumb to the neo-isolationism and anti-militarism that have become so prevalent in our society, if we appear to lack the will to defend ourselves and our allies, then I truly fear for the future."

Not surprisingly, Sens. Symington and Dodd are more or less on opposite sides in discussions of Vietnam and the anti-ballistic missile. But it's a sign of the ambiguity of the "national commitments" resolution that both of them voted for it in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as you will note, it is Mr. Large's conclusion that passage of this Senate resolution is "primarily a symbolic act—a complaint against the unsuccessful Vietnam war and a warning against more of the same."

And, then, Mr. Large goes on to quote from the chief sponsor of the resolution, and we find him coming more or less to the same conclusion but adding:

The restoration of Constitutional balance will depend on decisions of a more fundamental nature, decisions as to the kind of

country we want America to be and the kind of role we want it to play in the world.

Precisely so, Mr. Speaker—but, then, how do we go about injecting the congressional influence more than it has been into the arena where those kind of decisions are made?

The answer does not come easily, but one of the most intriguing suggestions along these lines is that made by the respected columnist, Roscoe Drummond, in a recent issue of the *Christian Science Monitor*. And Mr. Drummond's suggestion—which I consider most worthy of developing further—is for Congress to match the National Security Council, the President's major instrument for achieving a coordinated global view of foreign policy, military policy, and domestic policy, with a joint Congressional Security Committee of its own.

The Drummond column, under leave also granted, is now set forth as a part of these remarks, and I would hope that my having brought it to the attention of others will give this idea the consideration it so richly deserves:

HOW CONGRESS CAN RECLAIM ITS POWER

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is always fretting about its loss of power and initiative to the President and the Supreme Court.

It should. Something needs to be done and can be done. The time is ripe for Congress to repair the balance.

But, first, it needs to be understood that Congress has not lost powers because anybody has taken anything from it, but because Congress has failed to exercise powers it possesses.

Every activist president from Franklin Roosevelt to Lyndon Johnson has enlarged the role of the executive by using more decisively the powers the Constitution gives him—a process enhanced by the focus which radio and television give to the White House.

Congress has lagged behind.

In two landmark decisions—public desegregation and the one man, one vote ruling providing for reapportionment of state legislatures—the Supreme Court has done more to change the face of the nation than anything Congress has done in two decades.

It was always open to Congress to act in these two areas. It failed to do so.

What can be done? What should be done?

One thing is sure: what Congress is presently trying to do won't work. It is trying to increase its powers by attempting to decrease the president's.

This was the stated objective of the original draft of the Fulbright resolution which prescribed that the president as commander in chief must not use the armed forces outside the United States without prior approval by the Senate. That would have meant that President Kennedy couldn't have acted, as he did successfully, to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba. That would have meant that President Eisenhower could not have acted promptly in sending United States troops to Lebanon. That would mean that no president could act quickly, as needs require in this uncertain and turbulent world.

But the resolution has been so watered down that it is nearly meaningless, except that it cannot fail to plant doubts in the minds of America's allies and adversaries that the president is losing his freedom of initiative. He isn't, in reality, because no resolution by Congress can amend the president's constitutional powers.

They are broad and, in my judgment,

have been used prudently. I know of no foreign policy or foreign military commitment which has not had Senate approval. SEATO (the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) was overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate. Every military action which President Johnson took in Vietnam had explicit authorization in the Tonkin resolution, also overwhelmingly approved.

There are valid reasons why Congress should recover the powers and initiative which it has lost through neglect. It can do this by effectively using the great powers it possesses—the power of the purse, the power of scrutiny and review, the power of congressional advocacy.

But it can do this only when it is willing to organize and equip itself with the means to do the job.

For years the initiative has always been with the president in part because he has in his hands the means to achieve a coordinated global view of foreign policy, military policy, and domestic policy. The instrument is the National Security Council.

Congress urgently needs the same kind of instrument so it can look at the whole of United States policy, not merely at its separate parts. What is needed is a joint congressional committee on national security to match the work of the National Security Council.

At the present time, at least six different committees in each House—12 in all—examine the bits and pieces of foreign, political, and military commitments and defense spending, and no single committee of Congress ever looks at the whole.

No wonder Congress falters in its job.

No wonder Congress accomplishes so little in supervising and controlling defense spending despite the fact that its powers are great. It deals separately with symptoms, not with causes.

When Congress matches the National Security Council with a joint congressional security committee, it will galvanically recover powers it has long allowed to erode.

Now is the time. It's needed.

KREMLIN-WATCHERS DOUBT ARMS TALKS' VALUE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star carried an excellent article by Mr. Henry S. Bradsher which should be read carefully by those who want to set aside development of America's defense capability until after Mr. Nixon meets with the Soviet leaders to discuss arms control.

Mr. Bradsher has performed a commendable public service with his penetrating analysis on the futility of trying to deal with the Communists.

His excellent article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 25, 1969]

KREMLIN-WATCHERS DOUBT ARMS TALKS' VALUE

(By Henry S. Bradsher)

A sampling of Sovietologists shows skepticism about the usefulness of arms limitations talks which the Nixon administration hopes to open with the Soviet Union this summer.

Traditionally favoring strong defenses, the Kremlin now has to worry about a potential

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Chinese danger in considering any weapons agreements, the American experts on the Soviet Union say.

They estimate that the Soviets are spending about \$60 billion a year on all aspects of defense, a figure equal to or greater than this country's non-Vietnamese military spending. Yet the Soviet economy is only half as large as the American one.

Kremlin decision-makers—who, the experts emphasize, are Communist party careerists rather than military men—appear willing to continue bearing a big defense burden. The Soviet public is simply forced to accept it.

TIGHTEN DISCIPLINE

Beyond the arms talks, the experts saw the Soviet Union currently engaged in an effort to tighten internal discipline, but they said it is wrong to characterize this as a turn back to Stalinism. Focusing narrowly on a small group of dissident Soviet intellectuals and generalizing from their harsh treatment might give too dark an impression of the overall Soviet situation.

These observations were given by eight specialists on the Soviet political system, economy and military machine. They testified Monday and yesterday before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee's subcommittee on economy in government.

The topic was "the economic basis of the Russian military challenge to the United States," but questioning ranged far afield.

In fact, the chairman and only committee member to sit through all nine hours of the hearing, Sen. William Proxmire, tried to lead several witnesses into expressing opinions on the controversial question of Soviet first-strike capabilities. He got only cautiously hedged answers.

DIMMEST VIEW

The dimmest view of basic Soviet receptivity to fruitful arms control talks came from an expert within the administration, which has set a July 31 target for beginning the strategic arms limitations talks (known as SALT talks).

He was David E. Mark, deputy director for research of the State Department's bureau of intelligence and research. Mark warned that "it will take many years" before Soviet thinking shifts from basic hostility toward the West to one of common interests.

The Kremlin cannot understand substituting law for force, Mark said, and so it believes in keeping a powerful military machine.

Although SALT prospects are better than before, the Soviets still hesitate to launch into an unknown field, Mark said. Previous East-West agreements like nuclear non-proliferation and a limited test ban did not touch so directly on Soviet strength as will the SALT talks.

PRESSURES ABSENT

Prof. William R. Kintner of the University of Pennsylvania, an expert on Soviet strategic thinking, saw no pressure on the Kremlin to make SALT talks productive, while on the contrary a Soviet fear of rising Chinese strength might argue against it.

"The SALT talks will be far more complicated than either the nuclear tests or non-proliferation talks," Kintner warned. "And those took two or three years apiece."

A specialist on the Soviet armed forces, Thomas W. Wolfe of the RAND Corp., thought that bureaucratic pressure would tend to keep Soviet military spending about the same despite the talks. Both countries can see the need for arms limitations, he indicated, but he was pessimistic of the Soviets agreeing, Wolfe said.

Merle Fainsod and Alex Inkeles, both Harvard professors, said the Soviets want to talk but neither held out any assurances that talking would be fruitful.

The estimate that Soviet military expenditures in 1968 were about \$60 billion was

vaguely ascribed to "the U.S. intelligence community," including the Central Intelligence Agency and other analysts of secretive Soviet budgetary practices.

"Some observers have concluded that the defense share of the Soviet gross national product must come to 15 percent, rather than the American 10 percent," Mark said.

The \$60 billion estimate, higher than a generally used one of \$50 billion by the British Institute for Strategic Studies, includes all Soviet space activities, militarized border guards and other elements besides defense research, production and pay.

IMPACT ON FARMS

Prof. Holland Hunter of Haverford College, an academic rather than intelligence community expert on the Soviet economy, quoted the announced Soviet defense budget for 1968 as \$25.3 billion. Hidden items run it higher.

Investment in inefficient and backward Soviet agriculture is suffering from military demands, and both general investment and consumer needs are expendable when the Kremlin thinks weapons are needed, the experts said. This enables the Soviet Union to keep its more primitive economy going while matching U.S. weapons.

Wolfe cautioned Proxmire that it would be a mistake "to look for a rational tie" between Soviet military spending and Soviet world policy. The Soviet military-industrial complex had a momentum of its own.

And it has failures of its own, too, it was noted. He cited an early Soviet missile that had to be scraped.

Mark quoted former Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's complaints about failures in the Soviet armaments industry and cited the abandonment of what possibly was an early 1960's anti-ballistic missile system.

"I don't foresee any domestic unrest" in the Soviet Union, Mark said, "that would cause any difficulties for the defense industry."

UNREST ISOLATED

"Unrest is isolated, small-scale, intimidated, worrisome in terms of breaking conformity since the leadership likes conformity, but not of serious concern to them."

Mark and Fainsod emphasized that there has not been a return to Stalinism in the full sense of the terror and bloodshed which the Soviet Union once suffered.

"What I see, rather," Mark said, "is an effort by the leadership to tighten up discipline, to keep the young in line with the objectives of the regime, to restrict contacts with the West, to restore the morale of the repressive agencies like the KGB—the secret police—to give some continuity to Soviet history so that Stalin plays an important part."

"All these things are happening," Mark added. "But they don't necessarily have any connection with Soviet foreign policy."

DISSENT CITED

Fainsod said there is, "to a degree unparalleled in the Stalin period, a degree of dissent manifest in the intellectual and scientific community. It's underground."

There is today, Fainsod said, "a very, very different society of the one of Stalin prison camps and absolute limitations on the freedom of movement."

"We are beginning to see a new generation in the Soviet Union, a generation that has lost its fear, that didn't know Stalinism."

A person with contacts among the dissidents who sees the police moving in on them "might be tempted to say that Stalinism is back in full flower," Fainsod added "but no one who knew Stalinism is likely to make that statement."

Inkeles, a sociologist who has long studied Soviet society, said the current evidence could not be carried so far as to "deny that we

have been a shift to a new, more complex system of reaching decisions" in Soviet society compared with simple Stalinist degrees.

Wolfe added to the discussion that "in the long term, it won't de-evolve into Stalinism. And it's not going to evolve into a democratic society, either, but a pluralism that, hopefully we will be able to deal with better than a dictatorship.

COMMUNISTS POUR ABUSE ON NIXON DURING FRUITLESS SESSION IN PARIS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished writer for the Washington Post, Mr. Murrey Marder, reports from Paris this morning of the insults and abuses being heaped upon President Nixon by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese negotiators.

Mr. Marder quotes U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge as stating glumly: "They don't negotiate."

I am placing Mr. Marder's remarks in the RECORD today and renew my demand for an explanation on how much longer does the United States intend to let this charade in Paris continue while American boys are being needlessly killed in Vietnam.

President Nixon has made the Communists a most generous offer on several occasions to bring the hostilities in Vietnam to an end.

Mr. Nixon has made a whole series of concessions in his honest and determined effort to bring this war to an end.

Everyone of his proposals has been swept aside by arrogance and insults from the Communist spokesmen.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has previously stated that the United States will have to reappraise its position if this needless suffering continues.

We are now on the verge of seeing the death rate among American soldiers killed in Vietnam since the bombing pause exceed the number of Americans killed in Vietnam from 1961 until March 24, 1968, when the bombing pause began.

The intensity of the suffering has increased. We need only look at the huge punishment being hammered at our American soldiers and at South Vietnamese troops in the battle at Ben Het.

I have suggested here on this floor that we serve notice upon the Communists that if an effective cease-fire is not effectuated by noon, August 1, 1969, the United States will have to take two steps to bring this war to an end.

First, in order to placate American concern about our high rate of casualties, we should withdraw all of our combat troops from South Vietnam as quickly as possible.

Second, to impress upon the Communists that our withdrawal does not mean any victory for them, we should consider resuming bombing of the North and assist the South Vietnamese in whatever

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

other military steps they wish to take to bring this war to a successful conclusion.

Current reports from Paris clearly indicate the Communists have no intentions of ending this conflict in that they are counting on the fact that the United States will be forced to abandon its program of assistance to the South Vietnamese.

I believe that after due warning, resumption of bombing will convince the Communists that while we have placated American concern about the high rate of casualties among our ground troops by withdrawing these ground troops, the resumption of bombing means a long haul of suffering for the Communists in the North.

It is my firm belief that only when the Communists realize their suffering and damage from bombing will continue indefinitely in the North, will then agree to start making some meaningful progress toward ultimate peace.

It is perfectly clear that right now the North Vietnamese have no reason to agree to any kind of peace terms because under the present bombing pause, the tide is on their side.

Mr. Marder's excellent article follows:

COMMUNISTS POUR ABUSE ON NIXON DURING FRUITLESS SESSION IN PARIS

(By Murrey Marder)

PARIS, June 26.—North Vietnamese and Vietcong negotiators heaped unusual personal abuse on President Nixon today, charging him with "brazen falsehood and deception" in blaming the Communist side for intensifying and prolonging the war.

A secondary target of theirs was the South Vietnamese government of President Thieu. But even when they assailed Saigon the burden of their attacks was directed at Mr. Nixon personally, for his refusal to disavow the entire "Thieu-Ky-Huong administration."

At the end of one of the most fruitless sessions in the five months of expanded peace talks, U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge said, glumly, "they don't negotiate."

Saigon's chief delegate, Pham Dang Lam, said that in light of the Communist demands for "the monopoly of political power in South Vietnam," and the total unconditional withdrawal of American troops, "What is there to negotiate?"

No new ingredients were added to the diplomatic mix today by either side. Lodge, who returned to Paris last night after a three-week absence, concentrated on trying to accentuate the positive.

He repeatedly said he saw "common ground" in the positions of the two sides. But he told newsmen afterwards, "There's got to be some mutuality in it (the negotiating process), and I regret to say there was no sign of it today."

The Hanoi-Vietcong position in today's meeting of nearly five hours confirmed what was foreshadowed by North Vietnamese Politburo member Le Duc Tho in an interview here Sunday with The Washington Post.

That is that, for the present, the Communist side is standing firm and discrediting all talk of compromise in order to put maximum pressure on President Nixon to change the military-diplomatic policy of his Administration.

There is no evidence here that any such shift is coming especially in U.S. support of the Saigon government. Lodge told his adversaries, "As President Nixon made clear in his press conference on June 19, we cate-

gorically reject your demand that we 'replace' the legitimate government of the Republic of Vietnam."

Both Ha Van Lau, acting chief of the North Vietnamese delegation, and Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, newly designated Foreign minister of the recently formed Provisional Revolutionary Government that represents the Vietcong, zeroed in today on President Nixon's latest, controversial comments on troop withdrawals.

ATTACKS NIXON

Mrs. Binh attacked Mr. Nixon for what she called his "ambiguous statement" in his June 19 press conference to the effect that he "hoped" to withdraw considerably more American soldiers from South Vietnam, beyond the 25,000 whose withdrawal was announced at the Midway conference June 9.

Lau said the "hope that Mr. Nixon expressed" exemplifies his "ambiguous and perfidious statements" that "are merely a scene of the play staged by Mr. Nixon to appease and deceive public opinion in the United States and the world . . ."

Lodge reiterated President Nixon's view that the withdrawal of 25,000 troops represents "a significant step," and that "further reductions" will take place.

But Lodge avoided any direct reference whatever to the President's declared hope that the United States "will be able to beat" the timetable proposed by former Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford, which touched off the controversy. Clifford called for a pull-out of "about 100,000" troops this year, and the withdrawal of all American ground combat forces by the end of 1970.

The U.S. delegation here has avoided any such projection like the plague, on grounds it would undermine their entire negotiating position.

SPOKESMAN PRESSED

When pressed as to why Lodge avoided any reference to President Nixon's hope of toppling the Clifford proposal, American spokesman Harold Kaplan said:

"There was no particular reason for that. The disposition of forces on our side remains, so long as there is no real negotiation here in Paris, a problem between us and our allies."

Kaplan was asked to explain how the disposition of allied forces in the South can be a "military housekeeping" problem for the allies, and simultaneously a door-opening move toward peace.

If the recall of 25,000 American forces is only a "replacement" of them by South Vietnamese forces (terminology that Saigon has insisted upon in place of "withdrawal") Kaplan was asked, will the total remain unchanged?

"It is perfectly true that as our forces are replaced by the South Vietnamese and other allied forces there, the total strength on the allied side does not change," Kaplan replied. "But the fact remains," he said, "that the withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces should, if the other side is disposed to go down the road, constitute an opening, a possible invitation . . ."

Saigon delegation spokesman Nguyen Thieu Dan, when asked what he believes the Communist side thinks of gradual U.S. troop withdrawals, said:

"They don't like it—and I may say they also fear it, because it represents a strengthening of our capacity for defense." But if the allied reduction is succeeded by a reduction in North Vietnamese troops, said Dan, "that would be the beginning of de-escalation, mutual de-escalation. . . . There won't be any unilateral de-escalation."

The Communist side also came in for its share of hard questioning from newsmen in the post-conference briefings. The Hanoi-Vietcong program calls initially for replacing the entire Saigon government with a provi-

sional coalition government, but even before that, the Communist side says, a "peace cabinet" should replace the existing regime.

The Hanoi-Vietcong negotiators, however, have avoided formally demanding, as part of their official program, the total removal of the Saigon government as a precondition. One reason, presumably, is to avoid the charge of making such a sweeping demand; instead they call for initial ouster of "Thieu-Ky-Huong" or the "Thieu-Ky-Huong administration."

When pressed by newsmen today, Vietcong spokesman Duong Dinh Thao spent more than 15 minutes stressing this distinction.

The net result was that he said the Provisional Revolutionary Government supports the demand of the "urban population" for replacing the present Saigon government with a "peace cabinet," and will not be drawn into "maneuvers" for holding elections of the so-called constitution of Thieu-Ky-Huong administration" or "under the threat of the (American) bayonets . . ."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Krannerts. The opening of the new center today indeed will be a great stride toward enhancing the quality of life.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 19, 1969]
A MAGNIFICENT HOME FOR PERFORMING ARTS

After years of preparation, the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts is being dedicated today in Urbana. In the Great hall, the University of Illinois Symphony orchestra opens a month-long festival in celebration of the university's adding to its physical plant a new 21-million-dollar fine arts complex. At a bound, Urbana acquires facilities for mounting concerts and theatricals such as have few if any equals elsewhere.

Thanks to the princely generosity of the principal donors, Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert, the stunning new center for the performing arts belongs to present and future generations of the state university community—and to the citizens of Champaign-Urbana, the region and state of which that city is a part, and beyond. Innumerable Chicagoans will find or make occasion to appear on the stages and in more than 4,400 theater seats of the Krannert center.

The intent of the design is that "the arts of music, drama, and dance can operate both in training and in performance as interrelated and complementary to each other" at a single site. The center is both a performing and a teaching instrument. Its theaters accommodate audiences as large as 2,100 and as small as 150. Here both individual beginners and professional operatic and orchestra companies will find the means to function with a minimum of handicaps and a maximum of access to tangible and intangible supports of every sort.

Private generosity has made the Krannert center possible. To appropriate tax money to build an installation so expensive, and one without which the university has been able to reach its present distinction, could hardly be justified. Yet the fine arts have much to offer university students and everyone else. The Krannerts have acted in the best tradition of patronage of the arts, in which people of wealth provide the means for people of artistic talent and genius to do their work and find their audiences.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 9, 1969]

A PRAIRIE ACROPOLIS—ABRAMOVITZ'S NEW ARTS CENTER IN ILLINOIS
(By Robert C. Marsh)

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA, ILL.—For David D. Henry, the university of today requires not merely classrooms, libraries, and laboratories but a home for the artist at work. It was this idea, seconded by the generosity of Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert, that led to the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts on the Champaign-Urbana campus of the University of Illinois.

President Henry, the Krannerts, and architect Max Abramovitz gave seven years to the planning and construction of the project, which brings a major cultural center to the center of the state and offers the music, drama, and dance departments of the university a facility for instruction and performance that rivals (or surpasses) professional working conditions anywhere in the world.

Krannert Center places first emphasis on education. It is a place for students and teachers, not transient performers, although it is hoped that visitors will work with students whenever possible to maintain a constant link between active professionals and the classroom.

This was shown in the first concert when violinist Tossy Spivakovsky played the Bartók Concerto No. 2 with the University of

June 27, 1969

Illinois Symphony Orchestra, Bernard Goodman conductor, and later held a master class for student string-players.

That event, April 19, was the beginning of a month of festival performances to dedicate the new buildings, events which were planned to present a cross-section of student and faculty achievement as well as the work of leading professionals such as the Philadelphia Orchestra and the American Ballet Theater.

UNIFIED FOR USE

Krannert Center is a tightly unified architectural composition in which four public halls are linked by a large and handsome lobby and share a complex of rehearsal rooms, scenery shops, and other facilities essential for their activities.

The buildings are a pleasure to see. Abramovitz has called them "a prairie Acropolis," and it is an apt phrase. Rising from the street in terraces, the central building conceals its vast interior space and draws the eye to a skyline in which strong, redbrick forms stand out from green plantings against a blue Midwestern sky.

Approaching Krannert from the campus the eye first sees the facade of Great Hall, a concert room of 2,100 seats where the dedicatory concert was held. It is a handsome auditorium finished in traditional materials, hard plaster for the ceiling, warm golden wood for the walls and floor, and is very resonant—so much so that some dampening may be needed. Slightly above street level in the center of the composition is a Grecian amphitheater with places for 560, an inviting outdoor facility with uses for music, drama, and dance.

The high point of the center is the 97 foot stage tower of the Festival Theater, an intimate hall for drama with music or dance events. The philosophy of the design is shown in the seating capacity, 985 rather than a couple of thousand. The reason, of course, is that the student voice is not fully developed, and student productions, to be seen and heard at their best, should be placed in an appropriate frame. The large halls required by the high payrolls of professional shows are not a relevant criterion.

SMALL HALLS

Continuing the same approach, the Playhouse, a theater for the spoken word with elaborate electronic equipment for special effects, is limited to 678 seats. One need not be a 19 century tragedian to project a line to the back of the house.

Much of the important work of the center will probably be done in the smallest hall of all, the Studio Theater, a large, flexible room with overhead lights which normally will hold about 150 persons. Here the emphasis is flexibility. The location and size of the stage can be adjusted to any requirement; the seating can flow into all the available space.

Many cultural centers have faced the problem of creating facilities without the additional planning required to fill them with audiences and performers. The Krannert Center avoids this, since the university community is the prime source of both performers and audiences and, even more important, the new buildings are simply a further step in the development of programs of instruction in the performing arts. These are already well established on the campus, despite past difficulties with inadequate classrooms and theaters.

Important as well is the impetus Krannert Center may give to a fresh look at Midwestern culture in general. For there is nothing at all strange about a major artistic center such as this flourishing in central Illinois. Quite the contrary, it is characteristic of a region in transition from a provincial, rural past to a cosmopolitan future.

A PRAIRIE ACROPOLIS IN ILLINOIS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts was opened at the University of Illinois in Urbana.

The center consists of theaters and halls that will be used to educate and train young people interested in the performing arts. It will also serve as a cultural center of great distinction for the Midwest.

The donors of this \$21,000,000 center—Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert—wanted to make a permanent and edifying addition to the University of Illinois campus. With the opening of this great center for the arts in mid-America, Mr. and Mrs. Krannert have earned distinguished positions in the cultural heritage of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, information describing the Krannert Center in detail follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 19, 1969]
A PRAIRIE ACROPOLIS IN ILLINOIS—A GIFT OF GREAT MERIT

The opening today of the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts at the University of Illinois Urbana campus is an event of importance both to students and others devoted to music, drama and the dance.

The \$21,000,000 complex of theaters and halls will be employed both as a center of training in the performing arts and as a major cultural center.

It will be, as university President David D. Henry said, important at a time "when we seek answers to how to enhance the quality of life."

The center bears the name of the principal donors—Mr. and Mrs. Herman C. Krannert of Indianapolis. Krannert, a University of Illinois alumnus, is founder and chairman of the board of Inland Container Co. The Krannerts also were major donors for the University of Illinois Krannert Art Museum, dedicated in 1961.

The university and its students—all Illinois in fact—owe a debt of gratitude to the