United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, September 23, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John E. Howell, pastor, First Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, praise be to Thee for the men and women of this House who possess from Thy hand the opportunity and the willingness to grapple here with the agony of our times.

Protect them from the temptations which beset those who hold high office: to give first thought to political expediency; to shrink from the difficult or thankless task; to lose sight of human needs in the complex workings of government.

Help them to know that there are words of truth and compassion that will not be spoken unless they speak them, and deeds of courage and justice that will never be done in this land unless they instigate them.

Lord, strengthen their hands that this day not be wasted. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 19, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 18, 1969:

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Romeo de la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sannano;

H.R. 2336. An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarski;

H.R. 6581. An act for the relief of Bernard A. Hegemann; and

H.J. Res. 864. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

On August 20, 1969:

H.R. 1462. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vita Cusumano;

H.R. 1808. An act for the relief of Capt. John W. Booth III;

H.R. 2037. An act for the relief of Robert W. Barrie and Marguerite J. Barrie;

H.R. 8136. An act for the relief of Anthony Smilko; and

H.R. 9088. An act for the relief of Clifford L. Petty.

On August 25, 1969:

H.R. 671. An act to compensate the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset in a judgment against the United States obtained by said Indians;

H.R. 1707. An act for the relief of Miss Jalileh Farah Salameh El Ahwal;

H.R. 5107. An act for the relief of Miss Maria Mosio;

H.R. 10107. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle and the existing interest equalization tax; and

H.R. 12720. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Inc.

On September 15, 1969:

H.R. 7206. An act to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of the Congress.

On September 16, 1969:

H.R. 12677. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum.

On September 17, 1969:

H.R. 11235. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17, 1969, General von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4152. An act to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce;

H.R. 11271. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12781. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11271) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12781) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1689) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOSS, Mr. HART, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. GOODELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 2601. An act to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84–689, appointed the following Members on the part of the Senate to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference to be held in Brussels, Belgium, October 16 to 21, 1969: Mr. SPARKMAN (Chairman), Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. PELL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SPONG, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. STEVENS.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 22, United States Code, section 276, appointed the following Members on the part of the Senate to attend the Interparliamentary Union Meeting to be held in New Delhi, India, October 30 through November 7, 1969: Mr. SPARKMAN (Chairman), Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

SCOTT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MATHIAS.

THE REVEREND DR. JOHN E. HOWELL

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to rise on this occasion to thank Dr. John E. Howell, pastor of the First Baptist Church at 1326 16th Street NW., here in Washington, for the thoughtful message he has brought us.

Dr. Howell is a native of Lynchburg, Va., and grew up in Florida, where his father is a Baptist minister, now retired. Dr. Howell received his Ph. D. in theology at Duke University in 1963.

On Easter Sunday of this year, Dr. Howell, his wife Bettye Jean, and his five children joined us at the First Baptist Church in Washington. He came here after serving 3 years as pastor of the Northside Drive Baptist Church of Atlanta, Ga. He previously had served as pastor of the First Baptist Church of DeLand, Fla.

On Sunday, July 20—the day man set foot on the moon—Mrs. Patman and I were privileged to hear Dr. Howell deliver a sermon entitled "Thoughts on Outer Space and 'Inner' Space," in which he reminded us:

We must not forget, in the excitement of climactic moments like today's moon landing, that persons are more important than things and that scientific achievements are valueless as ends in themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a copy of Dr. Howell's sermon in the RECORD:

THOUGHTS ON OUTER SPACE AND "INNER" SPACE

(A sermon preached at the First Baptist Church of Washington, D.C., on Sunday, July 20, 1969, by Dr. John E. Howell)

Scripture lesson: Psalm 8; Psalm 139:1–12, 23–24.

The thought of spaceships taking men to the moon would have astounded the ancient writers of Scripture beyond their wildest dreams. Yet such a venture is not at all inconsistent with their theology or with their conception of man's role in God's creation. Listen, for example, to David's prayer in the eighth psalm:

"O Lord, our Lord,
How majestic is thy name in all the earth!
When I look at thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars which thou hast established;
What is the man that thou art mindful of him,
And the son of man that thou dost care for him?"

Here you can feel David's mind grappling with the smallness and insignificance of man on earth, even from what he was able to observe of the heavens and the universe. "Yet," he concludes with awe,

"Yet thou hast made him little less than God,
And dost crown him with glory and honor.
Thou hast given him dominion over the works of thy hands;
Thou hast put all things under his feet. . . .
O Lord, our Lord,
How majestic is thy name in all the earth!"
(Psm. 8:1, 3–6, 8 RSV.)

If things go as planned during the next twenty-four hours, today will go down in history as a milestone without parallel in the story of mankind. What happens this afternoon and in the ensuing hours is absolutely unique in the history of the human race on this planet. There are many other "firsts" in man's progress: first conquests of earth's frontiers, discoveries and inventions that have moved civilization forward. But none of these compare with what is going to happen today on the moon. This conquest may ultimately change life on earth more dramatically than all man's previous achievements combined.

How should Christians react to this colossal feat of putting men on the moon? Our teenagers at church camp last week wrote down questions which trouble them about life today. One of them wrote: "This week man is going to set foot on the moon. Some people wonder, and so do I, does God's love reach to the moon and beyond?" This introduces the whole question of the relation between science and technology and our Christian faith—and specifically, what effect space exploration may have upon our traditional concepts of God and man. A second question the teenagers raised was this: "Why should we spend billions of dollars on space travel while millions of human beings here an earth are starving, unhoused, uneducated, and in desperate need?" Here they have raised the question of moral priorities and the ultimate value of human life as compared with other values and goals in society.

I

In answering the first question, I would like to urge that Christians should not be afraid of space exploration or of its implications for our faith. The Soviet cosmonaut who first orbited this earth in space said, almost with a sneer, that he saw no evidence of God, heaven, or of angels sitting on clouds. This reflects, of course, a narrow, distorted caricature of Christian affirmation. It represents an effort to tie the Gospel to an ancient, pre-scientific cosmology which depicts heaven as "out there somewhere," just beyond the moon and stars, in the same time-space dimension as the material universe. This is a gross distortion of what Christians want to say about God and heaven.

We can rest assured that earth-men exploring space, regardless of their national origin or religious views, will discover nothing that is news to God. However startling and revolutionary their discoveries may be for man, the Creator of the universe has known them from the beginning. There is nothing in outer space that can threaten or disprove or even surprise the living God. Listen to the Psalmist's witness to God's presence pervading the universe:

"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?
If I ascend to heaven, thou art there! If I make my bed in Sheol, thou art there!
If I take the wings of the morning (what a metaphor for today's events!) and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there thy hand shall lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.
If I say, 'Let only darkness cover me, and the light about me be night,' even the darkness is not dark to thee, the night is bright as the day; for darkness is as light with thee."
(Psm. 139:7–12 RSV.)

How relevant can you get? If God's presence fills all "external" space, from the atmosphere we breathe to the vast darkness of outer space, why should Christians feel any fear, misgiving, or apprehension on a day like this? Rather, our worship on this day, of all days, ought to be alive with joy and adventure! This hour in church should be an exuberant celebration of the glory and majesty of God and of the fact that He is allowing us today to discover and experience more of this magnificent universe He has created.

This new knowledge may indeed broaden our conceptions of God and of His ways, but it can only magnify His greatness to human minds and hearts! It may also clarify our conception of ourselves and our relative importance in the scheme of things. As I viewed the earth again yesterday through the eye of the astronauts' television camera, it looked like a tennis ball my little boy could clutch in his hand and bounce on the floor. Can anyone see this and not be impressed by how infinitely small we are in the expanse of God's universe? Or by how united is the destiny of all human beings on this little ball of earth hung in space? If a man like Adolf Hitler could have viewed the earth from that perspective, might it not have affected his ego-mania and restored a degree of sanity to his conception of himself and his goals in history?

II

Before we shift our attention from outer space, I must go a step further. Far beyond a simple response of joy and praise over what God is allowing man to know and do, I am convinced that space exploration, along with the pursuit of all scientific disciplines, is a Christian duty. By this I mean that it is a proper and necessary response to what we profess to believe about God: that He *is* the Creator of all things and the source of all truth. Developing an increasing knowledge of and mastery over His creation is a part of what Jesus meant about loving and serving God with all our mind and all our strength. (Mark 12:29–30)

But what about the fantastic expense involved? Isn't it immoral to put billions of dollars into this space program while millions of people go without the basic necessities of life? Can this possibly be to the glory of God? We must be careful here. This point of view, which places human life and need above other values, draws much support from the very heart of the Gospel. Jesus came specifically to say: "God is preeminently concerned, not with the material universe and its improvement, but with *man* and his salvation. He made things and declared them good, but it is *people* that He loves—so much that He sent His only Son to become one of them and to die for them. There can be no true praise or service to this "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" which does not remember that human beings are of infinite worth.

Still, it would be rashly premature to write off space exploration as a waste of money and human resources! Many of the scientific and technological discoveries that have most blessed human life were first thought to be useless. Who can predict today what benefits to mankind—what secrets for prolonging and improving man's life on earth—may result from space exploration? We must not forget, in the excitement of climactic moments like today's moon landing, that persons are more important than things and that scientific achievements are valueless as ends in themselves. Yet it was interesting to me that the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, who went to the Cape this week to protest the spending of so much money on space rather than on hungry people, stood in awe with others as he watched the blastoff and said, "I'm proud to be an American." Scientific achievement and love for humanity go hand in hand in God's plan. It was to "love thy neighbor" more effectively that God "made man to have dominion" over all the works of His hands.

III

Another question about outer space may trouble some of us today. What if space exploration leads to the discovery, some day, of intelligent life on another planet? What will this do to the claim of Jesus Christ and His revelation of the nature of God? My answer is: Nothing, nothing at all! In Jesus Christ, God came to reveal Himself and His

Love to intelligent creatures made in His own image. If God is like this toward us, He is the same kind of God in relation to any other intelligent creature anywhere in His universe. *If* God has seen fit to create other beings "in His image"—with personhood, self-awareness, and the capacity to love—He will love them just as He loves us and He will find some way to reveal Himself and His salvation to them as well.

In a very intriguing passage in John's Gospel, Jesus said: "I have other sheep that are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will heed my voice. So there shall be one flock, one shepherd." (John 10: 16) Whatever the historical context of that assertion, its symbolic implication should not be lost on us today. In Old Testament days, King David thought Yahweh was a territorial god, unable to protect his children outside their own lands. Let it be affirmed on this day that Jesus Christ represents no "territorial god," confined to the planet earth and to His children here. He is the God of the universe, the Source of *all* life and truth and love. If He is a personal Father, a loving, forgiving, redeeming God to us on earth, He is the same throughout His universe.

IV

Perhaps the only real danger in the scientific exploration of outer space is the danger of *idolatry*—the worship of ourselves, our human brains, and the achievements of our own hands. But this is the problem we humans have had all along, isn't it? Which leads me to the other main thought I wanted to share with you this morning.

Wherever man may go in "external" or "outer" space—whether on this planet or out into the universe—*there is an "inner space" in his heart* which he cannot leave behind. We call it human presonality. It is the image of God implanted in our being. It is an "inner space" not measured in inches, feet, and miles—or even in light-years. H. G. Wells once called it "the God-shaped blank in the human heart." It is a space that desperately needs to be filled with the presence of God, the love of Christ, the reality of forgiveness, and the sense of meaning and purpose that only God can give.

In the 139th psalm, as we have just noted, David spoke of the presence of God which pervades all "outer" space. Listen again as he gives witness to that same Presence in the "inner space" of his own heart:

"O Lord, thou hast searched me and known me!
Thou knowest when I sit down and when I rise up; thou discernest my thoughts from afar.
Thou searchest out my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways.
Even before a word is on my tongue, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether.
Thou dost beset me behind and before, and layest thy hand upon me."

This realization of God's presence in the "inner space" of his personal life and thoughts leads David to the eloquent plea and prayer which ought to be on our lips on this special day in human history:

"Search me, O God, and know my heart!
Try me and know my thoughts!
And see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."
(Psm. 139:1–5, 23–24 RSV).

Here is the word from God we really need to hear on this day when man lands on the moon. It is that unless we learn the truth about this "inner space" and its needs, all our achievements in outer space will be utterly futile and worthless. Let us bring this truth into sharp focus with a practical question. Who will determine whether the knowledge and power kindled in man's hand through space exploration will finally be used for his benefit or his destruction? I know this much. The outcome will depend upon what fills and motivates the "inner space" in the person or persons who control that awesome power. To the extent that the character and thinking of those persons is controlled and directed by the indwelling presence of God, the world can sleep better at night.

But the leaders of any nation, whose fingers hover restlessly over the ominous buttons of destiny or destruction, are not alone in their responsibility. Their views and actions are greatly influenced by what fills the "inner space" in the lives of those they serve. Therefore, I want to conclude this sermon with an appeal for personal responsibility and Christian service.

An American pastor was visiting Hong Kong. His church had sent him on a trip around the world and, like any tourist from the West, he was snapping color pictures right and left. After his return home, he showed slides of what he had seen at a service for foreign missions. He ended his presentation with a close-up picture of a little Chinese boy in the last stages of starvation. His belly was bloated, his arms and legs were like matchsticks, and his eyes stared out vacantly from his hollow, sunken face. The picture burned its poignant message into the hearts of the congregation, and their offering for foreign missions that night reflected a spontaneous outflowing of compassion and concern. When the pastor and his wife went home and were preparing for bed, she said: "Honey, I'm haunted by the face of that little boy. What did you do for him after you took his picture?" The truth struck her husband like a sledge hammer. He bowed his head and softly groaned as he said, "It didn't occur to me to *do* anything. I just took his picture and hurried on looking for more pictures to take."

Do you get the message? Science and technology, on earth and in space, are "giving us the picture" as we have never seen it before! We know far more than any other generation about both the vastness of human need and the vast resources of the world and universe. Oh, we *get the picture*, all right—in living color! The question is, having seen the picture of mankind's need and of the resources, both material and spiritual, which God is making available to us, *what are we going to do* about it?

The answer to *that* question, my friends, depends not upon outer space, but upon the "inner space" in you and me and other people like us. If the presence of the Lord Christ reigns there, to motivate and direct, to challenge and awaken, He will not let us rest easily on our scientific laurels and material comforts. He will prod us to take the potential placed at our disposal by science—and beyond science—and use it in ways that will honor Him and help the world of people He loves.

There is a poem by Franklin Elmer which describes what happens in the "inner space" of two men's lives and the difference Jesus Christ makes. It is called "A Friend of Christ":

"I know a man who longs to be successful, who wants a quiet country home with woodland pools and privacy.
He has the skill, the urge, and the mental power; but there are whispers in his ear.
He has a friend, unseen, who will not let him dream of fences shutting out the world.
He cannot treat other people as machines; his comfort is in having them as equals.
He cannot pass a lonely child until a tear is dried, a smile renewed.
He cannot hoard the time or wealth or worry that a country place demands, while churches faint and grief comes knocking at a neighbor's door.
He cannot even close his heart to those his enemies whose consciences are tortured by his honor, whose wealth seems dust whenever he comes near, who call him 'fool' and wish they could forget him.
He thinks himself a failure sometimes, a misfit, a chicken-hearted oddity!
Oh, that I knew how to tell him of that blustering tycoon, that big-time business man, that roll-of-money man, that Luncheon Club, Town Club, Country Club man, that three car, 'Take-a-letter' man,
Who, thinking of him once, murmured, 'Christ must have been like that.' and then sat staring at nothing with a wistful longing on his face, while his big cigar went out."

We have just lit a candle on the moon, my friends. But what happens next depends upon the light of Christ in the "inner space" in our hearts.

NIXON'S DOMESTIC PACIFICATION PROGRAM

(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, last May I introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should suspend the monthly draft calls for a period of 6 months.

Last Friday, in what administration officials admitted was an effort to lessen antiwar sentiment on college campuses President Nixon announced a cut of 50,000 in planned draft calls for the final 3 months of this year.

The October call of 29,000 is to be spread over October, November, and December—10,000 each for October and November, and 9,000 for December.

No one should be misled into believing that the proposed cut of 50,000 represents any basic change in strategy in Vietnam. Rather it appears to be part of the administration's domestic pacification program: token withdrawals of troops from South Vietnam and token reductions in draft calls.

The draft calls for 1969 will be less than 3 percent below the draft calls for 1968.

Instead of attempting to pacify college campuses by a little relief from the pressure of the draft, the President should respond to public opinion and bring the war in Vietnam to a prompt conclusion. Instead of vague talk about draft reform to eliminate its most glaring inequities, the President should urge that the draft be abolished, thus eliminating the total inequity.

No more young men should be drafted to fight the tragic and still undeclared war in Vietnam.

In the winter of 1968 presidential candidate Richard Nixon said he had a plan for ending the war. Today, President Nixon has yet to end it.

1969 has been Nixon's year, and Johnson's war has become Nixon's war. The killing continues, and the drafting of young men goes on.

If the administration cannot or will not end the war, then Congress must do so.

PROPOSED DRAFT REFORM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the underlying causes of youthful unrest in our Nation is uncertainty about the future. One of the great reasons for that uncertainty is the present draft system that makes a man eligible for the draft for 7 years. We all know that no man can plan his future if he never knows when the long arm of Government is going to reach out and take him.

The resulting uncertainty can only breed resentment among our youth, regardless of their race or socioeconomic background.

Knowing this, we have gone along with such a system far too long a time.

Finally, the time has come for us to change that system, for it will be done either by congressional action or—if we refuse—by Executive decision.

President Nixon asked Congress in May to provide a random selection system that would limit the draft to 19-year-olds. To date we have not acted. As an alternative, the President will take Executive action after the first of the year that will accomplish much the same objective although, in his own words, "not as clearly and as fairly" as legislation would.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has 3 months to act on this very important matter before the first of the year. I hope we will get on with the job.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-161)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Third Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education which functions under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

It is a special concern of this administration that colleges and universities respond effectively to the needs of local communities and to the desire of their own members to become involved in the task of solving local problems. The increasing level of requests for this type of action, from both inside and outside the campus, raises the question whether Title I of the Higher Education Act is having the impact that it should. This we intend to find out. Therefore, I am instructing the Subcommittee on Education of the Council for Urban Affairs to coordinate a search for ways to improve the performance of this program and report to the Council at an early date.

After we have completed our review of the program under Title I of the Higher Education Act, as well as of the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, we will advise the Congress of the administration's recommendations.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 23, 1969.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 180]

Ashley	Griffiths	Poage
Baring	Grover	Powell
Bolling	Hagan	Pucinski
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Purcell
Buchanan	Hosmer	Reifel
Burleson, Tex.	Jonas	Rostenkowski
Cabell	Kirwan	St. Onge
Cahill	Landgrebe	Sandman
Celler	Lipscomb	Scheuer
Chappell	Long, La.	Sisk
Clark	Lowenstein	Smith, Iowa
Clay	McCloskey	Staggers
Corman	McKneally	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Ga.	May	Teague, Calif.
Dulski	Mollohan	Teague, Tex.
Eckhardt	O'Konski	Tunney
Ford,	Ottinger	Ullman
William D.	Patman	Utt
Gilbert	Pepper	Whalley
Green, Pa.	Philbin	Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

REREFERENCE OF BILLS AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following bills which have been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means be rereferred to the Committee on Government Operations:

H.R. 9586, for the establishment of a commission to study and promulgate a national policy respecting dispersal of population and industry;

H.R. 10515, to establish a Commission on Population and the Environment, to study the impact of uncontained population growth on the national environment, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13337, to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; and

H.R. 13523, to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Executive Communication No. 1000, a letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION FOR EXTENSION OF U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1888) to change the composition of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the meaning of this proposal?

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

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

Mr. FALLON. The bill would add two members of the Commission for the Extension and Renovation of the Capitol. The Legislative Appropriation Act of 1959 created the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol and designated that it be composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the minority leader of the Senate, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, and the Architect. Under the composition of the Commission, both parties in the U.S. Senate are represented on the Commission only when the President of the Senate is a member of the majority party. As the Commission stands today, there is no member of the majority party of the Senate on the Commission. By increasing the membership of the Commission from five to seven members, the bill would change that, and it would designate the two additional members as the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives to serve on the Commission of the U.S. Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. Has money been provided for the extension of the Capitol?

Mr. FALLON. This measure merely has to do with the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Just the Commission for the Extension—in other words, the expansion of the west front of the Capitol.

Mr. FALLON. No. The measure would increase the Commission by the addition of two members. It has nothing to do with future legislation so far as the extension of the Capitol is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Why are the additional members necessary in the absence of a final congressional decision as to whether there should be an expansion of the west front of the Capitol?

Mr. FALLON. This is a matter of representation on the Commission. As it stands now, the majority party in the Senate is not represented. By adding two members, we would add the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House. When and if the administration changes so that you would have a member of a different party who would act in that capacity, then the minority leader would become the member.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say that this proposal is designed to get support for the measure that was approved by the House last week to spend at least $50 million—the Lord only knows how much—for the expansion of the west front of the Capitol? Is it intended for the purpose of securing more support for that expenditure?

Mr. FALLON. No, this bill is designed to make the Commission equally representative of both parties.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The present composition of the Commission is the Speaker, as Chairman, the Vice President, the minority leader of the Senate—that was Senator Dirksen—myself, and the Architect of the Capitol. Under the odd situation that developed, as a consequence of the last election, there is unequal balance between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party on the present Commission. By doing what the gentleman from Maryland has requested, we would equalize representation between the two parties on the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for their explanations. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1888

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the paragraph entitled "Extension of the Capitol" under the heading "Capitol Buildings and Grounds" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 515), is amended by inserting after the words "the Speaker of the House of Representatives," and before the words "the minority leader of the Senate," the following: "the majority leader of the Senate, the majority leader of the House of Representatives,".

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 544 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 544

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12549) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 12549, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1075 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof of provisions contained in H.R. 12549 as passed by the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 544 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 12549 to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to establish a Council on Environmental Quality. The resolution also provides that, after the passage of H.R. 12549, it shall be in order to take S. 1075 from the Speaker's table, move to strike all after the enacting clause and amend the Senate bill with the House-passed language.

The purpose of H.R. 12549 is to create a Council on Environmental Quality, consisting of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom the President shall designate as Chairman.

The Council may employ such officers and employees as necessary and may employ and fix compensation of such experts and consultants as necessary.

The duty and function of the Council shall be to assist the President in the preparation of an environmental quality report, which he shall transmit to the Congress annually beginning June 30, 1970; to gather, analyze, and interpret information concerning conditions and trends in environmental qualities; to appraise the various programs and activities of the Government in this area; to develop and recommend policies to promote improvement of environmental quality; to make and furnish studies and make recommendations thereon.

Cost of the legislation is estimated at approximately $1 million per year. In view of the rapidly deteriorating environment of ours, Mr. Speaker, this cost must be considered an investment, rather than an added expense to the taxpayer.

Time is not on our side and unless we take this action today we will have failed in our responsibility as the trustees of the welfare of the people we represent in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 544 in order that H.R. 12549 may be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with all the statements just made by my friend, the gentleman from Hawaii, on this resolution.

I want to point out that the Rules Committee has had this resolution under consideration since July for the reason that there was a jurisdictional question which arose concerning a matter between the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is our understanding now that the difficulties have been resolved and that, by an agreement between the two committees, when this matter goes to conference two members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be on the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to create a Council on Environmental Quality which shall have a broad and independent overview of current and long-term needs and programs to improve the quality of the national environment. The Council is to advise the President and, through him, the Congress on what steps should be taken to improve and upgrade the national environment.

The Council will be responsible directly to the President rather than to any governmental agency or body. It is to be composed of five members selected by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom the President shall designate as Chairman. All members of the Council are to be persons with expertise, training, and attainments which qualify them to analyze and interpret environmental information of all kinds and to formulate and recommend policies to improve the quality of our national environment.

The President is required to transmit to the Congress annually, beginning on June 30, 1970, an environmental quality report. The Council shall assist the President in the preparation of this report. It shall also carry on a continuing program of collecting and analyzing environmental information, conditions, and trends and shall interpret such information in order to advise the President in this field. The Council shall also evaluate existing Government programs

and make recommendations thereon to the President. It shall make an annual report to the President in May of each year.

Testimony received by the committee indicates that in order to staff the Council to the needed degree approximately 55 professional employees and 20 to 30 clerical employees will be needed. Based upon these figures, it is estimated that the cost of this legislation would be $1 million per year. The Chairman of the Council is to be paid $30,000 per year and the four other members of the Council will receive $27,000 per year. No operational funds are authorized in the bill.

There are no minority views. A number of departments and agencies have submitted reports on the legislation as originally introduced (H.R. 6750) which is very similar to the reported bill. Generally, they support the aims of the legislation but point out that the President, on May 29, by Executive Order 11472, established an Environmental Quality Council and a Citizens Advisory Committee to the Council with broad responsibilities for advising and assisting the President with respect to environmental quality matters. Several departments and agencies question whether this Presidential action does not do all that is necessary now.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the granting of this rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

TAX REFORM, NOW—WATER AND AIR POLLUTION LEGISLATION, THIS SESSION

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was startled to read in Saturday's Washington Post, the headline, "Nixon Aides Do Not Expect Tax Bill To Pass This Year." An Associated Press dispatch also quoted a prominent member of the Senate Finance Committee, that he "could not see action this year on the 'proposed revision' of the Nation's tax system."

Almost 7 weeks ago, after 4 months of hearings by the congressional tax writing House Ways and Means Committee, and also a week's debate on the floor of the House, the tax reform bill was passed. It has been juggled, postponed, and filibustered for weeks in the Finance Committee of the other body. Now we read that the White House seems to extend silent aid and comfort to the painstaking stalling and filibustering which the tax reform bill will undergo in the other body.

In this morning's mail I received 30 letters from my district, which has been the average daily mail I have been receiving, protesting the administration's recommendations that the promised appropriation of $1 billion toward cleaning up water pollution should be cut to $214 million. This proposed weakening of the battle to preserve the health of millions of Americans against the drinking of contaminated and occasionally poisonous water in the urban areas of the Nation is beyond belief. The message which I am receiving from citizens, not only from my own district, but other parts of Indiana and the Midwest, is that they feel that this cut will be a major setback to cities and States and all citizens in their fight against water pollution and an effort to preserve the health of millions.

A great number of Members of the House, including myself, are sponsoring a bill and working for legislation to restore the $1 billion in the 1970 budget which was set up to support the Clean Water Restoration Act.

The House and Senate both must take the initiative to provide the necessary matching funds to aid the States and cities to purify the Nation's water supply in our rivers and lakes. Our Government must give full support to compel the mammoth industries to install the proper machinery to terminate air pollution in our congested urban areas.

It is no excuse for the Government or the Congress to protest lack of sufficient funds to combat this water and air pollution scourge on the present and future health of millions of American families. The tax reform legislation if enacted this year will provide an additional $8 billion to amply supply funds for water and air pollution, education, housing, poverty, health, and so forth.

The tax reform bill, it appears now, is receiving the old legislative trick of postponement and stalling with the hope that public interest for tax reform will subside. The bill passed by the House is now apparently dormant for this session in the other body, judging from the Associated Press dispatches in the papers yesterday. The postponing of this tax reform bill until next session of Congress will mean that the Federal Treasury will not only suffer a loss of many billions of Federal tax dollars from large tax loopholers, but it will afford a better opportunity for the continuation of the unnecessary 10-percent surtax for another year, running it into 1971.

A year ago last June I opposed and voted against the 10-percent surtax for the simple reason that had the Ways and Means Committee taken the tax reform bill up at that time and enacted the same a year ago, there would be no excuse whatsoever for the administration to extend the surtax and curtail needed money for air and water pollution, education, housing, poverty programs, health, and so forth. Now is the time for the American people to become aroused and notify their Senators and the executive department that money for these great domestic programs should not be curtailed, and insist that the President exercise his terrific power toward passing the tax reform bill which the House enacted almost 2 months ago. All segments of our economy should equally share the huge expenses to finance necessary Federal programs.

A number of Members of Congress and almost 90 percent of the wage and salary earning public have no comprehension of the stupendous amount of taxes our U.S. Treasury loses by reason of the fabulous, and in most cases fraudulent, tax loopholes which will be partially outlawed in the pending tax reform bill.

In the September edition of the CWA newspaper a breakdown of some of the major tax loopholes was set out estimating the 1968 revenue loss as a result of the major tax loopholes. I include the tabulation with my remarks.

1968 revenue loss as a result of major tax loopholes (estimated by U.S. Treasury)

[In millions]

Nontaxed interest on tax-free bonds	$1,800
Depletion deductions (corporations) included)	1,500
Intangible drilling deductions (oil and gas)	750
Travel and entertainment deductions (estimated excesses)	400
The 50 percent of capital gains not reported on tax returns	5,000
Capital gains that escape tax at death	2,000
Unreported dividends and interest	1,000
Total loophole revenue loss in 1968	12,450

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman from Indiana tell us if the tax bill, as it left the House, calls for increased or decreased revenue for the Federal Government in toto?

Mr. MADDEN. If the loopholes are closed and not changed over in the other body, it will bring in several billion dollars, especially in the field of the oil depletion allowance, reducing it from 27½ percent down to 20 percent, when it should have been wiped out entirely. It is estimated that the oil depletion allowance alone, if that 27½ percent were wiped out, would bring in something like $3 billion into the Treasury, including exemptions on imported oil, gas, and so forth.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Is it not a fact that as the bill left the House there is a loss of revenue?

Mr. MADDEN. No, there is not a loss of revenue. There would be an increase in revenue. Just the 7½-percent reduction from the oil-depletion allowance would bring in over $1 billion or more.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I had no requests for time on this side, and I yielded back my time. I would like to ask unanimous consent that my time be reinstated, as I do have a request.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) with respect to water and air pollution. I have driven the Indiana Turnpike a good many times since I have had the honor to be a Member of this body, and going west on the Indiana Turnpike you are made aware many, many miles east of Gary, Ind., that you are approaching that city. I wonder what the State of Indiana or the city of Gary, Ind., has done

or proposes to do about the terrible pollution that fills the air over Gary, Ind., and east of it when the wind is in the west.

Also, traveling by plane to Chicago, and crossing the lower end of Lake Michigan, there is no trouble at all in locating the pollution of Lake Michigan as supplied in part by the steel mills of Gary, and other industries.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. The Indiana State Legislature and the mayors of Gary and East Chicago and Whiting, Ind., as well as the city of Chicago, have been fighting this water pollution for a number of years. We have been trying to get help.

You must bear in mind that 90 percent of the pollution that comes about in that area comes from the terrific amount of industry—oil refineries and other industries. Automobiles traveling from the east going into Chicago and the automobiles from the west, out of Chicago and passing through our area. That contributes a great deal to the pollution problem. It is a problem that the Federal Government will have to commence to extend aid on in order to protect the health of the millions of people living in the Chicago and northern Indiana area. The chances are that the gentleman from Iowa drives through there and by doing so he perhaps contributes a little to the pollution problem.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you very much for my contribution to the pollution problem. But if those steel mills were not operating, you would not know there was an automobile in the vicinity insofar as air pollution is concerned.

There is usually a huge cloud of fumes and smoke over Gary, Ind., and the gentleman knows—since he lives there—that when you drive west on the Indiana Turnpike into Gary, Ind., within 25 or 30 miles of the city, if the wind is from the west, this pollution situation exists.

I would ask the gentleman from Indiana, When does the State of Indiana and the city of Gary propose to do something about it? I have been driving over that highway for more than 20 years, and I have noticed little improvement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, every city in the Calumet area, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, including the steel mills, are trying to work together in order to clean up this water and air pollution situation, but we will need some Federal assistance.

Mr. GROSS. Now you have gotten down to paydirt. That is what I thought this was all about.

Mr. MADDEN. But we have been working on these programs——

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the gentleman wants the taxpayers of the entire country to do something that Indiana and Gary ought to do.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. I do not want the RECORD as set forth in the colloquy previously had between the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) and my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) to be in error. I think it ought to be clearly established here that the tax reform bill which left this House will in no manner—and I repeat—in no manner leave any excess revenues, because of the provisions of the bill which provided for tax relief in the lower and middle income areas particularly will absorb—if it is passed in the form in which it passed the House by the other body—will absorb every dime that would otherwise have been realized by the reforms that were written into the bill.

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

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

Mr. MADDEN. I think if both the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) will make a resurvey, they will find that if these loopholes, even the paltry little 7½-percent oil depletion reduction and also the provisions dealing with foundations, real estate, stocks, and so forth, if they are increased in the other body, along with some other loopholes, the bill as passed here would bring in a couple of billion dollars into the Federal Treasury. However, it looks as though now that the White House is doing everything it can to stymie the tax reform bill that the House and the Committee on Ways and Means and our membership devoted so many hours and weeks in this session of Congress in order to have it passed at this session but that the White House is now working to continue it over for another year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I take this 1 minute to again try to straighten out the record.

I think it is totally unfair to even suggest that the administration is trying to scuttle the tax reform bill that passed this House. I would suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), so that he might straighten out his own thinking on this issue, that he read the public statements issued by Members of the other body in his own political party. If the tax reform bill is scuttled that is where it will be done. And if it passes, as it did in the House, I certainly do not expect a Presidential veto—and I seriously doubt whether anyone else does, either.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a typographical error be corrected in House Resolution 544, by striking out on page 2, line 9, after the word "thereof," the word "of," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "the".

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

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12549) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12549, with Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. Chairman, for centuries now, man has exploited and freely used the resources provided by his natural environment secure in his belief that nature's bounty would last forever, heedless of any consequences in his headlong rush toward greater power and prosperity.

More recently, Western man's attitude toward his environment has been characterized by an emphasis on economic motives. The industrial revolution which has provided us with the gift of technology has inaugurated specialization and division of labor as prerequisites for production for profit. In fact, our Nation's wealth was founded on technological progress spurred on by the profit motive.

However, mankind is playing an extremely dangerous game with his environment. Unless we change our ways, mankind faces the very real possibility of extinction from misuse of environment. We have been warned by scientists, citizens' organizations, public officials, and Government agencies of the dangers and consequences of such upsetting agents as air pollution, water pollution, explosion, and overenthusiastic use of pesticides. We have not yet learned that we must consider the natural environment as a whole and assess its quality continuously if we really wish to make strides in improving and preserving it.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12549 clearly expresses my conviction that we need the vigorous involvement of the Executive Office of the President of the United States in this problem. This concept of an independent advisory council to the President on environmental matters is

not new. It was the principal recommendation of a task force report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in June of 1967. I—as well as several other Members of the House—introduced legislation to accomplish this purpose in the 90th Congress. However, no action—other than hearings—was taken on any of these bills.

In February of this year I again introduced legislation to carry out this concept.

After holding 7 full days of hearings, and hearing from a wide range of witnesses including scientists, engineers, ecologists, statisticians, economists, anthropologists, conservationists, and various departmental witnesses, my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation unanimously reported to the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a clean bill in the form of H.R. 12549. H.R. 12549 was cosponsored by all of the members of my subcommittee, except one, and it was unanimously reported by our full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, briefly explained, section 1 of the bill would amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act by inserting a new section in the act designated as section 5A.

Subsection (a) of the new section would recognize the impact of man's activities upon his environment and the critical importance of making that impact less adverse to his welfare. Accordingly, it states a basic and continuing policy that the Federal Government, in cooperation with all other interested parties, shall use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, to assure that man's capacity to change his environment is devoted to making that change one for the better, while remaining consistent with his future social, economic, and other needs.

Subsection (b) of the new section would direct the President to transmit to the Congress at the close of each fiscal year an annual report setting forth an inventory of the American environment, broadly and generally identified, together with an estimate of the impact of visible future trends upon our future environment. This report would follow the report submitted by the Council in May of each year.

Subsection (c)(1) of the new section would create a five-man Council on Environmental Quality in the Office of the President. Although the original bills before the committee provided for a three-man Council, the committee felt that there was a clear need for a slightly larger Council with more personal resources available to it, and yet not so large as to be unwieldy; the Chairman of the Council would be designated by the President, since he would be acting as a major adviser to the President in this area. The qualifications of the Council members are stated broadly, since generalists are what the Council will require, and since it is impossible to define generalists adequately except in terms of their overall excellence and competence. Most critical in the selection of the Council members will be their commitment to an understanding and resolution of the environmental problems which we confront as a society.

Subsection (c)(2) would authorize the Council to employ the necessary staff to assist it in carrying out its duties. The importance of attracting and holding an extremely high caliber staff is of great importance. This subsection would give the Council broad authority to obtain the services of experts and consultants, including advisory committees and task forces on specific environmental problems.

Subsection (c)(3) would specify the duties and functions of the Council. These include—

First, assisting the President in the preparation of the annual report;

Second, gathering information on the short- and long-term problems that merit Council attention, together with a constant analysis of these problems as they may affect the policies stated in subsection (a), and a constant inflow of information to the President on the significance of these problems;

Third, maintaining a constant review of Federal programs and activities as they may affect the policies declared in subsection (a), and keeping the President informed on the degree to which those programs and activities may be consistent with those policies;

Fourth, requiring the Council to review and to recommend policies to the President, on the basis of its activities, whereby the quality of our environment may be enhanced, consistent with our social, economic, and other requirements; and

Fifth, authorizing the Council to make studies and recommendations relating to environmental considerations, as the President may direct.

Subsection (c)(4) would direct the Council to make an annual report on its activities to the President.

Subsection (c)(5) would require the Council to maintain open lines of communication with all affected segments of society, and would instruct it to avoid duplication of work that has already been done by others, wherever that can be done. This will be of particular significance as the Council acts to set up the data bank referred to in (3)(B) of this subsection; certainly most of the information flowing into that bank will have to be derived from sources outside the Council, and it will become vital that the Council assure itself that this information continue to be available to it.

Section 2 of the bill would amend title 5 of the United States Code to add the Chairman of the Council to level II of the Executive pay schedule, and the balance of the Council members to level IV. Since this is the same compensation received by the Chairman and members of the Council of Economic Advisers, who devote their full time to carrying out their duties, likewise it would be expected that the Chairman and members of the Council on Environmental Quality will devote their full time in carrying out the work of this high-level Council.

Mr. Chairman, our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was impressed by the wide range of witnesses testifying at the hearings in support of the legislation. In the main, all witnesses were in favor of the legislation. In fact, it is worthy to note that out of approximately 100 witnesses heard at the hearings there developed no substantive opposition on the part of the public to the legislation, and that the slight resistance on the part of witnesses for the departments stemmed from a feeling that the Council might in some way conflict with the interdepartmental Council on Environmental Quality established by Executive order of the President on May 29 of this year. It should also be noted that while the departments did not recommend enactment of the legislation, neither did they recommend against it. Witnesses from several agencies spoke highly of the potential of the Council contemplated by the legislation as complementary to the excellent steps already taken by the President. The only opposition to the legislation came from the Office of Science and Technology, which was based on the premise that the Council established by Executive order would accomplish the same purpose as the Council to be established by the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, our entire membership of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee applauds the President on creating a Cabinet-level Council on Environmental Quality. However, we do not believe the Cabinet-level Council can devote a major proportion of their attention to the problems in the depth required. The problems are of several magnitudes larger than those which can be dealt with by this interdepartmental organization and its six staff members. On the other hand, we do realize that the interdepartmental Council can fill a clear and observed need of coordinating and resolving internal policy disputes between different executive agencies of the Government.

The purpose of this bill is to create by legislative action, standing outside the programs that can be done and undone by unilateral executive action, a council which can provide a consistent and expert source of review of national policies, environmental problems and trends, both long term and short term. Such a council would act entirely independently of the executive, mission-oriented agencies.

The President, the Congress, and the American people stand in need of this type of assistance. No organization, in existence or contemplated, except as provided for in this bill, shows any sign of meeting that need. It is for this reason that I strongly recommend the creation of such a council, through enactment of H.R. 12549.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note in the report that it is estimated that spending for this council will be in the neighborhood of $1 million a year.

Mr. DINGELL. That was the estimate of the committee as to the cost of the program. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So far as the language in the bill that deals with financing——

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will permit me, I should like to point out that an amendment setting out such a limitation is under contemplation. The committee has been informed of it. I am informed that such an amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL.)

Mr. GROSS. What will it provide?

Mr. DINGELL. It will provide a total annual limitation of $300,000 for the first year, $500,000 for the second year and $1 million each year thereafter. I would say to my good friends on the subcommittee that we have discussed this matter and we intend to interpose no objection to the offer of that amendment.

Mr. GROSS. On page 3 of the bill, beginning with line 15 and running through to line 22 there is a provision for the employment and compensation of experts and consultants. I note that line 20 provides that it be "in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code—but without regard to the last sentence thereof." What is the meaning of that exception with respect to pay or employment?

Mr. DINGELL. That, I am informed, is standard language in this type of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Why?

Mr. DINGELL. I point out that language comes exactly, word for word, from the language in the Full Employment Act of 1946, from which the language of H.R. 12549 was taken and which, as the gentleman well knows, is the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council on Environmental Quality, which is set up in the bill before us, contains the precise language that comes directly from that. It is to enable the hiring of certain kinds of experts for guidance and counseling.

Mr. GROSS. It permits unlimited hiring. Is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. It would not, if the House adopts the amendment the gentleman and I were discussing. As I pointed out, there will be a limitation in total hiring by the agency in the amount of $1 million, beginning with the third year of the program.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, they could hire so-called experts, consulting firms and contract employees at will, I suppose?

Mr. DINGELL. This does, let me say to my good friend, enable the Council to hire consultants to achieve that kind of assistance. It was the opinion of the committee that to do so would be much more desirable than to go out and establish a great big in-house operation. We think the functioning of the Council would be much more efficient if it is able to employ outside skills through the advice of consultants instead of taking people regularly on the payroll.

Mr. GROSS. How many of these environmental councils or offices do we have now in circulation in the Government? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, there is one Council which was set up by the President pursuant to Executive order. There are distinctions, I would point out to my friend. I would refer him to the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5 of the report to see the distinction which exists between the Executive order Council and the provisions of the bill now before the House.

Mr. GROSS. I happened to be driving in Virginia only last Sunday and I came across an environmental setup out there occupying perhaps 300 acres of land with new buildings on it.

Mr. DINGELL. We are not setting up under this legislation such an institution. It is my intention as chairman of the subcommittee that brings this legislation to you to see that the agency functions efficiently and uses its services in the best manner possible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell me about this environmental setup out in Virginia?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no knowledge of it. It is a private institution and I am not able to tell my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, what it is and what it does.

Mr. GROSS. They call it the Environmental Sciences—that is at least part of the title that appears on the gate.

Mr. DINGELL. I wish I could tell my friend what it is, but it is a private institution, and I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. GROSS. But the point is, somebody ought to tell us how many environmental setups there are in existence in the Government now and the cost of them.

Mr. DINGELL. In Government there is one agency set up by the Presidential order, but it has functions which are very different from those in the bill.

I wish I could yield further to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, but I have other demands on my time.

Mr. Chairman, the bill requires an annual report by the President to the Congress on a number of issues of environmental significance. Our committee will of course arrange for public hearings on that report and on any recommendations that the President or the Council may care to make, and will take every step possible to insure that the report receives the widest possible comment in the legislative and public communities.

We also recognize that practically every standing committee of this House has some concern with aspects of the environmental problems which we confront. We would expect, therefore, to do everything possible to see that each committee is kept fully informed on our plans for these hearings and that representatives of those committees will be given every opportunity to bring out points of concern in the report that may be relevant to their interests. Our intention will be not to inhibit public discussion on these issues, but rather to enrich it, and this we cannot do adequately without the cooperation and assistance of each committee.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who has worked very hard to bring this important legislation to the floor. H.R. 12549, the clean bill to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and has the bipartisan support of the members of that committee.

I have been asked, "Do we need another Presidential Commission or Council? Have we not enough experts in and out of Government concerned with the quality of our environment?" The answer to the second question explains the need. There are many experts within Government, industry and academic institutions concerned with various aspects of improving our daily life. We have experts in the field of transportation coping with the problem of moving people from one city to another in the least possible time with the greatest degree of safety. We have constructed a vast system of interstate highways to accomplish this. Yet at the same time, we have created serious problems of soil erosion, stream pollution and urban displacement. We have other experts concerned with assuring an adequate food supply for our ever-growing population. In conjunction with private industry, they have developed powerful chemicals to control pests and diseases that would otherwise destroy a substantial portion of the harvest, but these chemicals pollute our streams and lakes, and their residue is building up in our bodies. We have other experts who build dams to control floods and at the same time destroy irreplaceable stretches of wilderness.

Progress in transportation, agriculture, the prevention of natural disasters, and developments in many other areas where we have applied modern technology are essential in a country of over 200 million people. The experts have, by and large, done their job well, but we must remember that their job is building highways, increasing our food production, preventing floods, and so on. Their primary concern is not the quality of our environment considered as a totality. That is not to say, of course, that the Federal Government is not concerned about the impact of such programs upon the quality of life as a whole. There is a growing awareness on the part of the principal executive departments that they must look beyond the narrow confines of their particular responsibility. We must recognize, however, that there is a natural inclination to foster and promote programs. Rarely will we find a department head urging the curtailment of a program because of its long-range adverse impact upon the environment as a whole. Thus, within the Federal Government we have many groups working to improve our lives, frequently at cross purposes.

The President on May 29, 1969, issued an Executive order establishing an Environmental Quality Council composed of the Vice President and six Cabinet Secretaries. The Science Advisor to the President was appointed Executive Secretary of the Council and assists the

President in directing its affairs. The Office of the President's Science Adviser will furnish administrative and staff support for the Council. This is an extremely important development within our Federal Government in that it provides the machinery whereby the heads of principal departments will be able to interchange ideas concerning the impact of their programs and the goals of their agencies.

Again, however, we must bear in mind that the primary function of our Cabinet Secretaries is to administer and promote the efforts of their respective departments. I would not expect a Cabinet officer who is vigorously pursuing the mandate of his department to lay aside a program to which his department is committed simply because another department head raised doubts about its long-range impact upon the environment so long as there are short-run benefits to be gained. I believe, therefore, that while the President's Council on Environmental Quality will be a useful tool for the interchange of information and for some degree of coordination, we cannot expect that the parochial views of the respective departments will be entirely divorced from its deliberations and decisions.

Beyond the Federal Government, there is the vast area of State and local activity, which has an equal if not greater impact upon our environment. The fields of waste disposal, industrial pollution control, intelligent land use, and so forth, are primarily in the hands of our State and local governments. While the Federal Government through a variety of programs gives assistance, the ultimate responsibility rests at the State and local level, and the goal of an improved environment rests ultimately on the success achieved by our States and municipalities.

The third major area concerned with our environment is private industry encompassing large corporations, which are too frequently large polluters of our environment as well, all the way down to the smallest business entity that produces some form of refuse. The problems of industrial pollution are infinitely complex. Virtually every industrial process requires a different form of pollution control depending upon the raw materials employed and the end product of the process. In this regard, our committee received testimony from an official of one of our largest industrial corporations who outlined the tremendous complexity of pollution control and the great financial investment required, both to build pollution control into new plants as well as add it to existing, often old, economically marginal plants.

The problem that we face in the field of environmental quality is greatly complicated by the fact that no one of these groups alone can bring about any change for the better. Whatever is done will require the highest degree of coordination of programs and interchange of knowledge. The continued appropriation of money by Congress for pollution abatement programs administered by a variety of Federal agencies, often employing conflicting standards, will not of itself produce much return.

What is needed today is an organization devoted exclusively to the problem of reconciling the needs of a large industrial society with the desire for quality in our environment. By quality, I mean, among other things, air that is just air, not air diluted with lead and other industrial wastes—water that is just water, not fortified with DDT—wildlife flourishing in its natural habitat rather than recorded in a book of extinct species—and cities where people can satisfy their desire for economic prosperity without paying a heavy price in terms of physical and spiritual deterioration.

The President's Council on Environmental Quality cannot accomplish the task of coordinating the activities and often conflicting interests of our Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private industry. The responsibilities of our Cabinet officers are already too varied—the demands on their time too great.

Assuming, however, that the Cabinet Secretaries do have the time to get together and engage in a meaningful exchange of information and ideas, who will provide the groundwork for their deliberations? According to the President's Executive order, the Science Adviser and his staff will furnish the needed expert assistance on environmental matters. However, in testimony before our committee, Dr. Lee DuBridge, the President's Science Adviser, stated that the President has requested an appropriation for only six additional staff members to support the Environmental Quality Council, and there is no assurance that even these six would devote themselves exclusively to the Council.

The budget item covering these positions was included in the request for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior. However, the Appropriations Committee refused to act upon this request, and the bill as passed by the House did not include these funds. I understand that the other body agreed with our action yesterday. The report of the Appropriations Committee expressed the committee's concern for the environmental problems facing the Nation, but stated that the patchwork approach such as envisioned by the Executive order would be little better than nothing. The report further stated that the committee would be receptive and sympathetic to the funding requirements necessary to achieve the objectives stated in the various bills now pending in the Congress for the creation of a Council on Environmental Quality.

Mr. Chairman, the essential element of this legislation is the creation of an expert body whose members will devote their full time and attention to the difficult task of analyzing and interpreting environmental information, and who will be in a position to formulate and recommend to the President national policies to promote the betterment of our environment. Of equal importance is the requirement that the Council annually report to the President and the President, in turn, report to the Congress regarding the status of our environment. Only in this way can we gather the facts upon which to make intelligent decisions.

The Council will complement rather than conflict with the interagency council established by the President's Executive order. Hopefully, it will have a staff well versed in all aspects of our environmental problems. In my opinion, this staff will augment and be of great benefit to the office of the Science Adviser

I have not attempted to discuss in any detail the great number of environmental problems facing the Nation today. These problems have been discussed at great length by many distinguished Members. Even a casual examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will illustrate the attention which our colleagues have given these problems. I have stressed the organizational aspects of our fight for environmental quality rather than simply catalog the many crises we are facing. The technological know-how exists today to produce clean air and water and to generally upgrade the quality of our environment. A recent report of the American Chemical Society entitled "Cleaning our Environment—the Chemical Basis for Action," stressed the fact that this country can take enormous strides now toward a cleaner environment if it is willing to devote sufficient energy and financial support to the task. We have identified many of the problems, we have the technical know-how to solve them. This legislation will establish a much-needed focal point to set priorities and channel the efforts of Government and industry in a coordinated program. I therefore strongly urge its passage.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am naturally concerned about all phases of the environment which affect fish, wildlife and our natural resources. The ugly and devastating disease of pollution has contaminated every aspect of our environment—air, land, and water.

The massive pollution that now stalks our Nation is a very real and dangerous threat. It constitutes a problem so vast and so inter-related, one segment of the environment cannot be separated from another. Since man's manifold activities are affecting all components of the natural environment, the only logical approach is a broad-ranging, coordinated Federal program.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12549 is designed to initiate such a program. This legislation proposes to create a Council on Environmental Quality. This Council, which would be composed of outstanding and qualified leaders of the scientific, industrial and business community, would oversee and review all national policies relating to our environment; it would report directly to the President and recommend national programs to foster and promote the improvement of the Nation's total environmental quality.

One of the vital functions of this council would be to consult with State and local governments and other interested groups and individuals, and to utilize the services, facilities and information of

these agencies and organizations. I consider this to be an extremely important and significant function, since, for the first time, it would establish an effective liaison between the Federal Government and individual States, thereby creating a long-needed central clearinghouse of information.

Establishing such a council will not immediately solve all our massive pollution problems. It will, however, constitute the most significant step yet taken because it will represent the very first concerted congressional attack upon all forms of abuse upon our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this legislation, and I hope it will be enacted as rapidly as possible.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD).

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take very much time. I simply want to say that as the ranking minority member on the committee I support this bill.

In recent years, scientists—and in turn the public—have become increasingly aware that technological progress is a mixed blessing. This can perhaps be compared to the injection of a newly-developed drug into the human body. All too often while curing the disease, the drug will produce undesirable side effects. In some instances, these effects may prove fatal. Short of that, the drug must be administered with caution and the body's reactions carefully monitored. Fortunately, the average human body can tolerate a high degree of foreign substances intended to ward off or cure certain ills. Within a certain range, the body simply throws off anything in excess of its needs.

Our planet, earth, has demonstrated a similar ability to absorb the side effects of increased population and industrial development.

We did not begin polluting our environment in earnest until the 19th century. Birmingham and other English cities where iron and coal were brought together to form the basis of an industrial society first witnessed the intolerance of our atmosphere. The grime was an unmistakable sign that man was injecting far more than nature could absorb.

But this was a purely local condition—a very small raw spot. Annoying in the immediate area but hardly of much concern to the world as a whole. Generally, our ancestors stood in awe and marveled at the scientific and technical progress of the 1800's. The water became a bit murky and a smell began to pervade the air, but few noticed.

Some years after England first tasted—and smelled—the benefits of industrial progress the United States began the rapid development of a great industrial society. Our realization of its unpleasant side effects has been slow in coming, however.

In 1695, a man named Thomas Beverly wrote a book in London in which he described the end of the world in 1697. He wrote a second book in 1698 claiming that the world had indeed ended but nobody had noticed.

Probably nobody will notice the day the earth begins to produce less oxygen than is consumed. Nor will anyone be aware of the precise moment when the accumulation of pesticides produces irreversible physical changes in all animal life including man.

The side effects of progress are difficult to monitor. We know so little about the fundamental processes of nature and even less about the impact of our interference with these processes.

To most laymen like myself these problems seem remote indeed. While there is some evidence, for example, that we are using up the world's oxygen supply, it is difficult to relate these questions to here and now. Yet someone must. We do not have the right to exploit the world's resources or apply our scientific knowledge without some regard for those who will inherit this world and this Nation.

Fortunately, this globe has a high degree of natural resistance to man's injections of progress. We have not yet exceeded its level of tolerance. We must, however, begin to monitor it and modify our activities when danger signals appear. This cannot be done haphazardly. It will require expert advice in all scientific and technical disciplines and coordinated action at all levels of government and economic activity.

I believe the Council on Environmental Quality as envisioned by this legislation can fulfill this vital role and I support its enactment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG).

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 12549.

Mr. Chairman, I participated in many hearings at which experts in their respective fields of knowledge warned against action in making progress without regard to its ultimate effect on the quality of our environment and which causes irreparable damage to our streams and lakes and atmosphere. The fact is that the various segments of society working each in its own field has resulted in a situation in which the right hand of government does not know what the left hand is doing. It is certainly not in the best interests of the citizens of our country either as citizens desiring improved environment in which to live and as taxpayers to spend millions to build dams to provide flood control or recreational areas when such a project might add to the pollution of the streams and lakes through tampering with the natural flow of the stream that cleanses it. It is imperative that our efforts to make progress and to improve our environment be coordinated. This legislation is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, man has been able to progress to his present state of development by controlling his environment instead of having to adjust to its changing conditions. He has harnessed streams and rivers to provide power and transportation. He has dug deep into the earth to mine the minerals that provide energy, heat, and light. He has built himself protection from the natural elements by using nature's natural products. But in so doing, he has upset the natural balance of the earth that has provided him with his wealth. If man is to survive, he must learn to work with, instead of against, this natural balance. Man is rapidly running headlong into disaster as a society as he desecrates the water, air, and land. Action is needed now.

Mr. Chairman, the general quality of the environment relates to the general welfare of the people of the United States and must, therefore, be a main priority of Congress. As we consider more and more legislation to combat the problems of environmental imbalance, Congress needs to have at hand an understanding of how to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, thereby fulfilling the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations. The Council proposed by the legislation now under consideration is necessary in order to provide this understanding. If such a council existed at the time of the invention of the automobile, perhaps we would have been able to realize the threat that would be presented to our atmosphere by the internal combustion of hydrocarbons before it was too late.

The great advantage in the council approach is that the findings will be shared by all agencies of the Federal Government, enabling them to develop meaningful environmental policies at the lower decisionmaking levels, and by the local and State governments.

Mr. Chairman, as I work with my district to preserve beautiful southern Wisconsin, I find the greatest problem is that there are many studies on particular problems, but there is no information available on the interrelatedness of all the proposed solutions. I support this legislation with the hopes that the Council on Environmental Quality can meet the needs of the American people. By providing a consistent review of national policies and environmental problems so that the present threat to our future can be approached in a comprehensive fashion.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR).

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the adoption by the committee of the bill to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality. We badly need to create a Council with a broad and independent overview of current and long-term trends in the quality of our national environment, to advise the President, and through him the Congress and the American people on steps which may and should be taken to improve the quality of that environment.

I note from the hearings that the slight resistance on the part of witnesses for the executive departments stemmed from a feeling that the Council might in some way conflict with the interdepartmental Council on Environmental Quality established by Executive order of the President on May 29 of this year. But witnesses from several agencies spoke

highly of the potential of the Council contemplated by the legislation as complementary to the excellent steps already taken by the President to achieve consistent and coherent environmental policy within the executive agencies through the interdepartmental Council.

The Departments of Transportation and the Interior were of the opinion that should the Congress feel that establishment of a separate environmental advisory body in the Executive Office of the President along the lines contemplated by this legislation was desirable to assist the efforts of the President's Council, they would not object to such action. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that if the legislation were enacted into law, it stood ready to cooperate to the fullest in carrying out its praiseworthy purposes.

The testimony at the hearing also stressed the importance of the international aspects of the environmental problem. It is an unfortunate fact that many and perhaps most forms of environmental pollution cross international boundaries as easily as they cross State lines. Contamination of the oceans, with insufficient attention paid to its long-term consequences, appears to be a major problem to which far too little attention has been spent in the past. The international aspects are clearly a major part of the questions which the Council would have to confront, and I feel confident that these would receive early attention by the Council.

Several members of the scientific community have stressed the need for the development of an adequate information collection and retrieval system. There is today a 5- to 10-year gap between the development of basic research information and its technological implementation. Much of this basic research has significant implications for both improvement and degradation of man's environment, and activities in this area should more than repay the initial investment, to the extent that the Council could assist in making this information more accessible to the public and to the Federal Government.

State and local governments have a large stake in the common problem; it is also true that by no means all of the environmental problems which we see are caused, even indirectly, by the Federal Government alone. Witnesses at the hearings stressed the need for a continuing interchange between the Council and other agencies, including private citizens' groups, as a significant part of the environmental problems. There should be clear and open lines of communication between the Council and the public. The Council should also consider the impact of its activities upon the educational system, together with ways and means of continuing the growing trend toward public enlightenment on and concern with the important environmental issues that we confront.

(Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. PELLY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 12549, to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality.

This legislation is, if anything, long overdue, but greatly needed nonetheless. The dangers of polluting ourselves off the planet within a decade are not exaggerated, and unless we act without further delay to combat air and water pollution, we will find ourselves smothered and choked by our own lack of action and existing, inadvertent weather modification. I applaud this urgently needed legislation, but the existence of this Council must in no way be an excuse for lack of action by the interdepartmental Council on Environmental Quality established by Executive order of the President on May 29 of this year. I would hope in addition to annual reports that interim reports from both councils would be forthcoming in the near future as we can tolerate no further delay in national action.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 12549, to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to establish with the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality.

I was pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the other members of the Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife Conservation in sponsoring this legislation, and I am confident that the House will recognize the import of this legislation and quickly voice its approval.

Time is of the essence, Mr. Chairman, in our struggle to restore our environment. Man simply does not have an eternity to right the wrongs he has done to the land, sea and air. Indeed, he may only have a generation. We must correct these wrongs and chart new directions which will guarantee that history does not repeat itself in the wanton and reckless use of the environment that God has provided for us.

This legislation would enable such new direction to be charted by providing the President and the Congress with annual environmental quality reports. The bill would also require the five-man Council to maintain a continuing review of Federal policies and activities with environmental implications. This is necessary because the various agencies and departments of the Federal government do not always act harmoniously in their concept and utilization of the land, sea and air upon which we must rely for our very existence.

Above all, this legislation would provide the first independent source of review of the total environmental situation, and this is most necessary in view of the fact that we are spending more and more each fiscal year to combat pollution and to restore our environment, and we will be spending more in the years to come if we are to successfully win the battle.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by saying that I endorse the remarks just made by the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and wholeheartedly support his request for passage of H.R. 12549.

As one of the cosponsors of H.R. 12549, it is needless to say that I support H.R. 12549. However, I would like to emphasize several points which I think justify the establishment of an independent council on environmental quality.

First. The President's Cabinet level Environmental Quality Council can carry out decisions but has a built-in conflict of interest in arriving at proper conclusions due to statutory obligations for various operating programs.

Second. Environmental decisionmaking requires independent, consistent, and expert advice.

Third. No such capability exists today for the President, the Congress or the public.

Fourth. The Office of Science and Technology has a great number of important duties for a limited staff. Funding of additional environmental staff services in this office is therefore complicated and unlikely to produce the required level of effort.

Fifth. While science and technology can bring important facts to environmental decisionmaking, this information is only a part of what is necessary. Therefore, the emphasis on science, which the announced role of Office of Science and Technology suggests, is misleading and could decrease the availability of non-science inputs to the President.

Sixth. The present Citizen's Advisory Committee is a renaming of a former group established for recreation and natural beauty. Its membership is not chosen—and is therefore not adequate—for the task of environmental quality and productivity studies. Support for this group has been meager—via the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior—and is likely to be curtailed further because of the unwillingness of the Congress to sustain such indirect funding.

Seventh. An independent advisory body established by statute as proposed in this bill, would command the funding support of the Congress, thus enabling the establishment of an adequate, highly competent staff.

Eighth. A mandate of independent review would attract persons of the highest character and expertise to serve as Council members. The goal of complete and objective structuring of the available facts and ideas would bring outstanding scholars to the staff. The stature of the Council and its staff would stimulate improved performance of all organizations concerned with the environment.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, passage of this legislation would add a complementary step to that taken by the President. Both the legislative and executive branches are well agreed on a national policy for the environment. The electorate has the will power and the purse power to accept decisions for an improved management of our natural surroundings. Let us now

construct the institutional arrangements which will put policy into practice.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in urging prompt passage of H.R. 12549.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I echo the sentiments of those who have spoken heretofore this afternoon in connection with the dire need for legislation of this type. I am particularly interested in the pollution of the air which is caused by the emissions from automobile engines. I do hope that sufficient time and attention will be given to this question.

This legislation, H.R. 12549, to establish a Council on Environmental Quality is long overdue.

For too long, we have stressed technological progress, assuming that our environment could take care of itself. We have found that unfortunately it could not, and the result of our neglect is that our environment is becoming increasingly unlivable. Schoolchildren in Los Angeles cannot exercise outdoors on certain days because the smog level is too high. Street corners in Tokyo now must come equipped with pure oxygen so that motorists can prevent themselves from becoming asphyxiated.

I support this legislation today for the same reasons I introduced H.R. 12265, legislation to accomplish the same objective, last June. I believe a new set of priorities is needed in national policy emphasizing the creation, restoration, and maintenance of a habitat in which people can live more healthful lives and better enjoy their physical surroundings.

The American Chemical Society has recently put out an excellent report entitled "Cleaning Our Environment: the Chemical Basis for Action." This report examines our technological capabilities for doing something about pollution and comes to the conclusion that willingness to act, and not technological capability, is the major obstacle to action. What it points out is particularly true of automotive pollution. The report suggests that there are a number of practical alternatives which could be utilized now to lower the pollution level from automobiles if only the auto industry would act. The auto industry, like most of the rest of the society, will act, however, only when compelled.

The individual acts against pollution, if he acts at all, in accordance with his own self-interest. This is fully as true of the man in the street as it is of the legal person called the corporation or of any Government agency. Companies may rail at the actions of pollution control officials, but how many companies have acted to abate pollution without some inducement in addition to the simple desire not to pollute, be it improved public relations, the possibility of profit, or threat of legal action? Self-interest is, of course, old to the affairs of men, and society deals with it generally, in the larger good, by striking a balance called the law.

Since I introduced legislation to ban the internal combustion engine in July I have come into contact with numerous technological improvements which could be employed by the auto and oil industries to lower the emission levels of automobiles. Among these are alternatives to the internal combustion engine itself. The auto industry tells us that steam and electric engines are not practical, yet we find backyard inventors and smaller companies with little capital and few facilities able to develop working, and in many cases inexpensive, steam and electric engines. A recent article in the Los Angeles Times documents one such engine, developed for the State of California:

RETURN OF STEAM AGE? NEW CAR ENGINE COULD CUT AIR POLLUTION

(By Irving S. Bengelsdorf, Ph. D.)

You get into the car, insert the key into the ignition, turn the key, wait about 7 seconds, press down on the accelerator and drive off smoothly and noiselessly. You are driving an automobile equipped with a simple, powerful, inexpensive, lightweight, compact, fast-starting and non-air-polluting steam engine.

Is there such a steam engine? Indeed, there is. Using the latest technological developments in combustion, air flow, metallurgy, measuring instruments and control devices, General Steam Corp., Newport Beach—formerly Thermodynamic Systems, Inc.—has solved the difficult engineering problems that have plagued steam engines in the past. GSC has designed and constructed a steam engine that shortly will be installed for testing in a California Highway Patrol car.

The modern steam engine offers many advantages over the internal combustion engine. Consider air pollution. Don. E. Johnson, GSC executive vice president and general manager, points out, "In testing during 1967, a 1963 car with no smog controlling device produced 596 parts per million of unburned hydrocarbons to pollute the air, even after a tune-up. A 1967 automobile, equipped with California smog devices, cut its production of air pollutants to 267 ppm. However, a 1960 steam car, with no smog device and no tune-up, produced only 20 ppm hydrocarbons."

Or, consider simplicity. Lift the hood of a steam engine and there are few parts—no carburetor, distributor, set of spark plugs or smog devices. Unlike an internal combustion engine that operates by a series of timed, discrete, high-pressure explosions that take place within individual cylinders, a steam engine burns fuel smoothly and continuously at low pressures.

So, steam engine combustion is more complete, tosses out less carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides and fewer unburned hydrocarbons, and does not require leaded fuel.

Thus, the use of steam engines to propel automobiles would not only help to purify our air, but it also would permit us to use a cheaper fuel (kerosene is easier and less expensive to produce than gasoline), and it would eliminate the need for toxic lead additives that ultimately pollute the landscape and ourselves.

Nor is this all. The GSC steam engine needs no internal "motor oil." New advances in metallurgy have made it self-lubricating. And, there is no need for a bulky, massive air conditioner. Use of steam pressure with a small, solid-state device about one-half the size of a pack of cigarettes cools the car pleasingly in hot weather. If the temperature outside is below freezing, a small pilot light keeps the steam generator warm, preventing the water from freezing.

The water that is used to be changed into steam to drive the GSC-steam engine is in a sealed, recirculating system. Once the water is added, additional water should not have to be added for the original water should stay in and be used over and over again to make steam. And the car is explosion-safe. At any given moment, only a pint of water, at the most, is being changed into steam. There is no evidence that any steam-powered car in the past had an explosion due to its steam system.

GSC steam engines can be made in the form of reciprocating engines, turbines or rotary engines. The new steam engine technology opens up a great deal of versatility and flexibility to engineers involved in the design and construction of engines for cars, ships, helicopters, pumps and the generation of small amounts of electrical power.

So, unlike some previously publicized steam engines, an excellent alternative to the increasingly complex internal combustion engine is just around the corner. The modern steam engine can play a key role in the cleansing of our air.

But, a mass-transit system operated by steam not only would clear out skies, it also would solve the traffic congestion problem at the same time. For as long as we depend exclusively on personal automobiles—one person to a car—to move from A to B, there will be horrendous traffic jams, regardless of what kind of power plant is under the hood.

I hope the Council on Environmental Quality will thus not just examine the problems of nature as they apply to the wilderness, but will face up to environmental problems like air and water pollution, which affect our cities, and serve as a lobby for action.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12549 to establish a Council on Environmental Quality to advise the President and, through him, the Congress on steps that should be taken to improve the quality of the American environment. The Council would also submit a report on foreseeable trends affecting the status of the environment in an attempt to forestall future devastation of man's most valuable commodity—his natural surroundings.

At a crucial juncture in the future development of our great Nation, we cannot afford to ignore the deplorable condition of many of our natural resources, the building blocks on which our future greatness depends. While steps have been taken to improve and preserve the quality of the environment, both by the public and private sectors, there is a distinct need for the proposed Council to coordinate these sometimes haphazard efforts and to plan for the future. The commitment, in view of the vast amount of work to be done, cannot be part time. The problems demand full-time expertise and attention.

As the representative and citizen of a district which has the dubious distinction of claiming within its boundaries a river that periodically catches fire and which borders on a lake referred to as the "Dead Sea," I am particularly concerned with measures which would improve the condition of these and similarly afflicted areas. Water pollution, however, is far from our sole environmental problem. The state of the air in Cleveland is at times barely breathable at best. This unfortunate situation exists in virtually all

our large industrialized metropolitan complexes.

The residents of Cleveland are calling for the amelioration of conditions, as are concerned citizens throughout our Nation. These interested individuals may make strides privately or may appeal to local and State governments, but access to sophisticated research and development techniques are limited. In addition, their goals, in general, are specifically related to immediate conditions. The formation of the Council on Environmental Quality would function to coordinate these efforts, lending their expertise with a broad and independent overview of current and long-term trends, saving local interest groups duplication of mistakes and apprizing them of success in other regions.

Last week 6,000 public works experts held meetings in Cleveland, pooling ideas on how to cope with America's environmental problems. Much more needs to be done, however. An annual meeting of this nature does not lend itself to the free and efficient flow of information.

I believe if we had had the annual report on the status of the environment which this bill will produce, a much greater understanding of the problems would exist. And public understanding is basic to obtaining the willingness to make the efforts and expenditures to restore and maintain environmental quality. Our legislative efforts in air, water, and solid waste control, in land use planning, recreation, and natural beauty, and other environmental affairs have given us a good start. The bill today will add another powerful tool in the very difficult task of improving our surroundings while continuing to extract a high standard of living.

I feel that the establishment of this Council is essential and urge support of H.R. 12549. The success of this type of organization is everyone's success in a world in which man can be his own worst enemy.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL).

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12549, to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.

We of the 20th century have leaped technological barriers which for thousands of years baffled and blockaded mankind's progress. But in our haste to expand and modernize our cities, exploit our highways, airways, and waterways, and to wrest from the earth its crops and minerals, we have forgotten the immutable law of nature. All things must remain in balance or the harmony which makes life not only tolerable but possible will be destroyed.

Lake Erie is a tragic example of the mindless abuse men have heaped upon nature in the name of progress. Many of you in this House who remember this lake from your youth know that it was a productive, beautiful body of water. Today it is near death, its harvest of fish reduced only to perch, its waters unfit for swimming, and even when chemically treated so that it is potable, so unappetizing in color and aroma as to be scarcely drinkable. It—and thousands of lakes, streams, and rivers across the Nation—are victims of "techno-illogical" advance: The dumping of sewage, industrial waste, dredging and the runoff of nitrogen fertilizers. Miles of Erie are so choked with algae that all other marine life is strangled. Ecologists tell us the lake is doomed if immediate, massive help is not forthcoming.

Water pollution continues to be one of the Nation's most critical problems, yet we are failing to meet the crisis.

And it is only one of the environmental tragedies threatening our country. While algae and waste products choke life from our waters, automobile and industrial fumes are choking life from the air we breathe. Management of our air environment depends on a knowledge of how contaminants flow, disperse and are converted into other physical and chemical forms, and how they can be contained. Our knowledge is woefully scant in this field but we do know that air pollution is literally poisoning the lungs of millions of urban dwellers.

We only are beginning to realize the deadly dangers of pesticides and their residual effects on the food we consume. And we just are beginning to recognize the long-term consequences of the destruction of topsoil in strip mining.

These problems demand the sort of legislation we are acting on today, if we are to reverse the collision course with catastrophe we are following. I am particularly impressed by the scope of the proposed Council—to set forth "the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental classes of the Nation, including, but not limited to, the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, land, range, urban, suburban and rural environment."

I endorse this legislation wholeheartedly and urge the House to give H.R. 12549 its unanimous support.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO).

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question.

The gentleman in his earlier remarks referred to a bill in the Senate which I presume was unanimously passed and which I further presume was the bill submitted by Senator JACKSON.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct and that bill is now on the Speaker's desk.

Mr. DADDARIO. I had the impression that the gentleman referred to that bill as being identical to the bill now under consideration.

Mr. DINGELL. I said "substantially identical," or "substantially the same."

Mr. DADDARIO. In being substantially identicial, would the gentleman indicate whether or not this bill includes in it title I of the bill which was passed by the other body?

Mr. DINGELL. The bill now before this body, I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, does not include the same policy statement, but H.R. 12549 does include a policy statement which the subcommittee and the committee regarded as being extremely valuable in accomplishing the thoughts set out in the policy statement in the Senate bill.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that the policy statement which is included in the Senate bill is an extremely important part of that legislation, and that it ought to be included in the legislation which is passed here in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to offer an amendment for that purpose, and I intend to do so unless I could have assurances here that the committee in conference on this particular matter would take into serious consideration an adjustment to the Senate position in this regard.

Mr. DINGELL. I have to say in response to the inquiry of my good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, that the conferees are not yet constituted. If I happen to be a conferee I certainly will look with sympathy with regard to the statement of policy in the Senate version. But I am sure the gentleman from Connecticut is aware of the fact that the managers on the part of the House cannot go forward without specific instructions from this body.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

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

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that far too infrequently do we have measures which come before us which are both important in concept and also urgent in concept. Sometimes we deal with important matters that do not appear urgent, and sometimes we deal with urgent matters which on a broad measure may not be truly important. But I think in this measure today we have a measure which is both truly important to the future of this Nation, and which is also urgent.

In addition to that, if you will, we have an issue about which many of the people of this Nation are becoming, I think understandably and properly, deeply concerned.

When we deal with this basic concept of the environment we have something that we still can control in America, and do something about, and yet we have delayed in some areas of this Nation far too long in doing what we ought to be doing. We have a hodgepodge of information. We have a hodgepodge of tradition. We have a hodgepodge of laws which sometimes conflict with each other, and do not go about dealing properly and effectively with this problem which is a nationwide problem, and not a problem of isolated areas. We do not deal with it on a constant basis.

The bill that is before us dealing with providing a Council on Environmental Quality is an attempt to make order out of chaos. I believe that we in the House of Representatives would be derelict if we did not view this problem in its importance and in its urgency, and pass this bill today.

As a member of the subcommittee, and as one of the cosponsors of the bill, I urge my colleagues in the House to join today in fast action by approving H.R. 12549.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to appear as a wet blanket to what appears to be more or less of a love feast going on in the debate on a very important matter before the Committee at this time.

I doubt if anybody can really take exception to trying to protect our environment and at the same time trying to get man to realize his responsibility in protecting his environment and, also, at the same time to fit man into the necessary environment of this world.

This is a very complex matter on which we are spending a very limited amount of time today. I think it is only fair that the RECORD show how it developed.

By Executive order of May 4, 1966, the then President established the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty, and at the same time he established the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty of which the distinguished citizen of New York, Laurence Rockefeller, was appointed as Chairman.

Then by Executive order of May 29, 1969, the present President saw fit to abolish the then existing Council and Advisory Committee and established the Environmental Quality Council, and at the same time he established the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality and at such time the President appointed the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, as its Chairman.

Several of our colleagues in the Congress, one of whom is our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, introduced bills in both Houses seeking to have the Congress of the United States assume some responsibility in this matter.

It so happens that the matter of jurisdiction is all wrapped up with the five or six very important standing committees of the House of Representatives. The same situation exists in the other body. We find in this body that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was given the legislation having to do with legislation that was presented in the other body, and the Committee in the other body on Interior and Insular Affairs handled its own legislation and received the approval of the other body.

But before they sent it over to the House they struck the title of the bill and inserted a new title which left it open generally to all the committees in the House having jurisdiction on the subject of environment.

The distinguished Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House had their own bill. They got to work on it very effectively and it is now before this committee for consideration.

Because of various, I think, inadequacies and some controversy concerning the legislation, I shall seek to offer some amendments, only two or three of which are of substantial importance. The rest of them are clarifying amendments.

But I do think it is important to be advised that this legislation is not substantially identical as my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan states, to the Senate bill; that there is quite a bit of variance between them. But the differences between the two are, in my opinion, such that they can be ironed out by a conference committee between the two Houses. I am relying on that conference committee to help to take care of these differences.

I would ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, if he considers after we have passed this legislation—let us say that we do—and the President of the United States approves it, will there be any need at that time for the existence of a President's Environmental Council or a Citizens' Advisory Committee or Council on Environmental Quality?

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. This matter was discussed in considerable detail with Dr. DuBridge, the President's Science Adviser. At that time Dr. DuBridge said there are two different functions, and his full quotation will appear at the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5 of the committee report, wherein he pointed out that the function of a Cabinet-level advisory committee was one which could iron our difficulties and differences within the Cabinet, whereas the agency before us now has a much broader function, that is, one of establishing the whole national policy in this area, reporting to the Congress and providing an interplay by and between the Congress, the people, the President, and, of course, the agency itself. I would have to defer to the President as to the matter of judgment as to whether that particular agency should continue to exist or not. I think this is a matter that will have to be taken care of in conference, it so happens.

To date this body, the House of Representatives of our Federal Congress, has failed this year to provide any funds for the continuance of the activities of the President's own Environmental Quality Council, and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality headed by Mr. Rockefeller. The reason we find ourselves in this particular situation is because there seems to be no authorizing legislation which would directly authorize the appropriation.

I am sure the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations would like to make the appropriation if they had some method of doing so. If there is this need, we should take care of it in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 12549, to establish a Presidential Council on Environmental Quality. It will be a most useful step in focusing the people's attention on the urgent need to stem the steadily deteriorating physical birthright of this generation of Americans and generations to come. The fact that our environment is really an interacting ecological system of dependent parts must be acknowledged and our efforts to restore it must be immediate and thorough.

We can and must restore the integrity of our natural environment. I would therefore hope that the Council on Environmental Quality, when created, will act as an ardent advocate of the need to protect our besieged natural resources, and not merely as a study group.

The establishment of a Council by the President will give Mr. Nixon the opportunity to seize the initiative in restoring the quality of our environment.

He must not fail this important responsibility, so that there will be a commitment to the establishment of a livable, decent environment by other political leaders, by scientists, and private citizens. The progress of technology must take into consideration the needs of the community.

The Ninth Congressional District of Illinois, which I represent, is in many respects a cross-section of urban America. It stretches along Lake Michigan from the Chicago River to the northern city limits containing a rich mixture of ethnic and cultural communities, teeming with life and a desire to make things better. There are industries, factories, universities, elegant stores on Michigan Avenue and small shopping areas. All in all, the Ninth Congressional District is one of America's unique places.

But my constituents, as the price they pay for living in a thriving industrial center like Chicago, are forced to breathe air that is little less than poisonous. In the United States only New York's air, if one can so designate its envelope of pollution, is dirtier. There are Federal, State and local air pollution statutes, but so far, in spite of these, the situation is only beginning to be checked. Unclean air takes its toll in respiratory diseases, in cleaning and laundry bills, in building exteriors which are covered with layer upon layer of industrial grime and soot.

Invasion of our part of the lake from the north and the south has been threatening for some time. This summer that part of the Lake Michigan shoreline which forms the eastern limit of the ninth district was suitable for swimming. But to the north and to the south along that same shoreline a dip in the lake involved the risk of bacterial infection. Unless some action is taken soon to reverse the spread of pollution in the southern end of Lake Michigan, my constituents

will be subjected to that risk which is a shocking and unacceptable development. The invading contamination must be hurled back no matter what the cost for the lake as a national as well as our local treasure. Industrial polluters must be held to their responsibilities for a prompt cleanup.

But air and water pollution are only two environmental problems with which urban Americans are faced. It is up to us to make our cities cleaner, quieter, less crowded, and more human. We have some basic rethinking to do if we are even going to have a chance at making it all work.

For instance, we are going to have to learn how to recycle our industrial waste products instead of pouring them into the air or into our water supplies where they act as pollutants. To cite a single example, we vent into the atmosphere each year approximately 12 million tons of sulfur worth half a billion dollars. During that same year we extract 16 million tons of sulfur from the earth to support our modern civilization. The reasoning behind that paradox is that it is less expensive to mine new sulfur than it is to recover the old sulfur from industrial wastes. But somehow nobody mentions that pollution costs this Nation more than $20 billion annually in strictly economic terms. Its human costs are incalculable.

We have to recognize the uselessness of passing new air pollution legislation on the one hand and building new highways into the city on the other. What is accomplished if a new air pollution law cuts down the hydrocarbon content of automobile exhaust by 10 percent while new highways concentrate 10 percent more vehicles in the cities?

In the past we have always assumed that our water resources should be used to absorb industrial wastes, and in many instances the result has been to make them useless for any other function. The situation has reached the point now in the area of water quality that we must demand that nondegradation standards be adopted nationwide. A nondegradation standard means quite simply that any further degrading of the present state of water quality anywhere in the country is against the law.

Mr. Bertram C. Raynes, vice president of the Rand Development Corp., says of industrial polluters:

> The only sensible policy now is to force them to take care of their wastes properly. Simply to require that the water they dump be pure, regardless of its condition when they receive it. That the gases they vent be free of pollution. That their spoil doesn't in turn despoil other property or remain ugly, regardless of how poor the area might have been when they undertook their operations. Instead of comforting the public with statements to the effect that "there is no evidence that these pollutants have unfavorable effects upon humans," let's see some evidence that they are definitely not harmful.

When Congressmen brought up the inadequacy of technology to combat pollution in some cases, and asked Mr. Raynes whether he thought the laws should be passed anyway, he answered simply:

> Necessity has always been the father of technology.

But no matter how much we do to make our cities more livable, they will remain cities. Hopefully, they will be a little cleaner and a little quieter—but they will still be crowded centers of activity. Cities will still have more culture than rural areas—more diversity, more dissension—more people, and more pressure.

Thus, in addition to improving the quality of urban life we must provide an alternative to it for those times when a man's spirit demands respite from the rigors and frustrations of city living. More areas will have to be set aside within and near urban areas where a man can take his family for an afternoon or a weekend or a camping trip during the summer. As our population grows, more recreation areas and parks will be required so that every American child will have the opportunity to see a duck take flight from a pond and learn the difference between an oak and a maple.

And, finally, we have to develop a new respect for our wilderness areas. As Americans, we should remember that our Nation was conceived in the wilderness and was shaped in character by the interaction of civilization and the natural frontier. Thus far in our history we have too often looked on the wilderness areas of our country—the vast stands of primeval woodlands, the powerful rivers and clear streams, the mountains and the valleys—as places where nature can be converted into profits. We have been trading away chunks of our natural heritage for short-term economic advantage.

We have forgotten that wilderness is to be valued for its own sake, as a place where man can learn about his world and his place in it. Many of our remaining wilderness areas are unique ecological systems whose balance of interaction between various animal and plant species and the physical environment can never be restored once it is impaired by a new road, a new airport, a mine, or a logging operation. There are many wilderness areas in the United States—the Everglades, the Great Swamp in New Jersey, the Cascades, the Indiana Dunes, to mention just a few. We must protect them all.

We must reject the conventional wisdom that there is something inevitable about the whittling away of nature's wonders. Instead, as David Brower has urged:

> We shall seek a renewed stirring of love for the earth; we shall urge that what man is capable of doing to the earth is not always what he ought to do; and we shall plead that all Americans, here, now, determine that a wide spacious, untrammeled freedom shall remain in the midst of the American earth as living testimony that this generation, our own, had love for the next.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, has explained one of the difficulties which has arisen with regard to this bill. I am satisfied that one of the responsibilities of the Congress is to establish whatever national commissions are in order. We have established others, and the mere fact that the President and prior Presidents have established councils or commissions on environmental quality should not deter this body from properly passing legislation granting congressional sanction. I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress to legislate and the Executive to carry out the mandates of the Congress.

The bill before us was so drafted that it amended the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and as such, went to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The bill, S. 1075, which passed the other body and is now on the Speaker's desk, and that bill which has been supported by other Members of this body, merely authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct these investigations relative to the Nation's ecology, its ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, and called for reports by that Council to the Congress.

As a result of meetings between the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, practically all the difficulties between these two bills have been worked out, and as Mr. ASPINALL explained he has a series of perfecting amendments which will, in substance, change the bill so that it will become, rather than an amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, a substantive piece of legislation in and of itself, establishing a Council on Environmental Quality.

This Council on Environmental Quality will, I believe, be of great importance. I shall tell Members just a few of the reasons why. Its work will be absolutely necessary if mankind is to survive, and we are to be informed by some of the outstanding ecologists in this country and in the world on how to establish a balance in our environment between our exploding population and the depletion of our natural resoures in order to permit a continued high standard of living and the ability to share many of life's amenities. Up until this point we have not tried to have any schedule or any program to consider the total environment of this country or even how it relates to other countries of the world.

I think it is necessary because in this country we are also exhausting some of our depletable resources, and I think it is necessary for a Council on Environmental Quality to study these depletions to determine what is the right manner in which various resources should be depleted—some faster than others probably.

These are the kinds of problems that this Council can and must solve, and must report on to the Congress, because the Founding Fathers intended this body and our counterpart on the other side of the Capitol to legislate on matters affecting the people.

For these reasons, and, with the amendments which will be proposed by the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I support this legislation and ask that it have the united support of all Members of this body.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield

such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

Conserving our natural resources is becoming our No. 1 domestic problem. If we destroy our environment, we destroy everything.

While various agencies may be working on this problem, we hope the Council, authorized under this bill, will be able to coordinate all work in this most important field.

I urge the passage of H.R. 12549.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12549, to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality.

It is because of my conviction that a Council of this type is necessary that I authored a proposal identical to the one by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and others that we are debating today. I do not believe that we can any longer afford to give our environment little more than passing attention. There are those who already feel that because of population pressures, new technology and an inadequate public and private desire, we are, in fact, already overwhelmed by the problem.

Last week, Col. Edwin Aldrin stood before us in this very Chamber and stated:

> The Apollo lesson is that national goals can be met where there is a strong enough will to do so.

The passage of this legislation should signal that we do have the will to preserve our environment.

It would establish a Council whose sole purpose is to consider implications for our environment when decisions are made by the private sector of our economy and by other departments and units of Government. For too long we have given economic considerations greater weight than environmental considerations and the result is surely becoming obvious for even the most shortsighted among us—a tasteless environment and an injured one.

Some questions have been raised about this proposal on the grounds that this new Council will conflict with the Interagency Environmental Council recently established by the President. They say that there is no real difference between the tasks or the organizations of the two. I do not believe this is true.

One difference concerns the composition of the President's Council. That Cabinet-level Council is composed of very busy men with vast governmental agencies to run. That committee cannot be expected to do the long-range planning and does not have the training and expertise needed to delve into the complex problems of the environment.

The other difference is one which any legislator who has ever dealt with a bureaucratic department should understand. Any department of Government is concerned first of all with the programs within its jurisdiction and only secondarily with the implications which the carrying out of its programs have on others areas of concern. The great danger presented by an interagency Council of the type proposed by the President is that when you get people from various Government departments sitting down at the same table they will be tempted to say to each other, "you stay out of my bureaucratic backyard, and I will stay out of yours."

As a consequence of that attitude, environmental considerations will be given little weight. The main goal of each of the participants is likely to be the protection of his jurisdiction from outside interference rather than the preservation of our environment.

This problem is not necessarily unique to the question of the environment. In Wisconsin several years ago we faced the same argument in the field of mental health.

When considering whether to have an interagency committee on mental health or a coordinating committee on mental health with outside experts as members, the Wisconsin legislative committee which recommended the creation of the advisory committee said:

> It is apparent that *stimulation* and *coordination* in the field of mental health is imperative; this stimulation and coordination cannot be expected from one of the departments engaged in mental health activities nor from a commission composed exclusively of representatives from the departments involved.
>
> In addition to the need for stimulation and coordination, there is a need for *constant evaluation* and *research* of all mental health activities and programs.

These words are as true for a consideration of the environment as for the consideration of mental health problems.

Stimulation into new avenues of research can only come from the outside because it is impossible for those who are involved with departmental programs to evaluate them without bias. It would be unlikely, to say the least, to expect an individual to engage in a critical review of another department or policy if that person knows he will be subject to the same critical review by his colleagues a few days later. Evaluation of government programs is a sensitive job and one which cannot be carried out effectively solely by those who have a special stake in the outcome. For these reasons, while I commend the President for his initial action, I feel the Congress must take further steps.

This bill would minimize bureaucratic back scratching. For that reason, I strongly support the measure before us today. I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the other authors of the legislation, and I would like to especially commend the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and its able chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

There is more that can be done in environmental quality and I would like to see a stronger bill. But this legislation will be a good first step in our newly found willingness to attack the environmental problems before it is too late.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 12549, is another valuable contribution from the Congress to the array of administrative forces against pollution and other threats to the continued quality and productivity of our environment. These two concepts are the essence of the issue. Quality—because we must restore and maintain the diversity and vitality of all the living landscape. Productivity—because we are a burgeoning technological society with great dependence on natural resources. If we cannot harmonize our civilization with the principle of ecology then nature, and not mankind, will ultimately dictate the course of events.

I have been proud of the leadership shown by the Congress in environmental affairs. The Air Quality Act and the Water Quality Act were developed over a decade of legislation. Scenic rivers and scenic trails laws have originated in this branch of Government. Modern agricultural practice, mining and forestry laws, and natural beauty protection have evolved from the hearings and debates of various committees.

Thus, the Council on Environmental Quality is one more necessary governmental institution, the need for which has been recognized by the Congress. This is not to disparage in any way the efforts of the President and his Cabinet coordinating group. The support of the executive agencies is essential if action programs are to be carried out in consonance with a national policy for environmental enhancement.

But an advisory council such as provided by this bill, with a statutory link to the Congress and an independence from Federal departments, will fill a unique role. It will collect, evaluate, and present authoritative data in an annual report on the status of the environment. It will serve as a channel of information from State and local governments, private industry, and citizens groups. It will take a long-range view with no need to sacrifice our natural heritage to political or economic expediency.

I strongly endorse the Council on Environmental Quality and urge the adoption of this measure.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 12549, a bill providing for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality within the Executive Office of the President.

Not only is pollution worsening, but so far we have not done anything to insure the ecology problems are carefully studied. It is not enough to dip cleansing agents into a stream, or try to swish the air clear with a spray. To achieve the desirable result, the eventual affects of such actions upon living organisms must be studied. I believe H.R. 12549 makes a good start in this direction.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which reported out H.R. 12549, says:

> The problem is deep and it touches on practically every aspect of everyday life, economic, scientific, technological, legal and even interpersonal . . . it is a problem which we can no longer afford to treat as of secondary importance . . . if we are to reverse what seems to be a clear and intensifying trend toward environmental degradation.

These significant facts must be acknowledged.

The administration has recently established an Inter-Cabinet Environmental Quality Control Council. However, it is patently clear that the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Commerce, together with the Vice President and the President, all of whom will serve on the Council, will have little enough time to devote to the subject of a stable and healthful environment.

Science Advisor Dr. Lee A. DuBridge has testified that he hopes to have a staff of six professionals and an equal number of supporting clerical staff assigned to this Council. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has suggested 55 professionals and 20 to 30 clericals as a workable number of members for the Council on Environmental Quality set up under H.R. 12549. Although it is good to know that the administration is interested in this overriding issue, I would be set more to ease were I to know that the Congress had shown its intent by setting up a Council with its complement of staff. The staff under this Act would entirely devote itself to the problems at hand.

At recent hearings on H.R. 12549, Dr. David M. Gates, director of the Missouri Botanical Gardens and chairman of the board of advisers to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment, said:

> It is not unlikely that our generation or the next one or perhaps the one after will have reached the pinnacle of quality and after that it will be a downhill slide. There is a finite amount of energy to be consumed. There are a finite number of resources.

Something must be done. That is why I support H.R. 12549 unreservedly. Too much is at stake.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the sponsors of this bill and I enthusiastically support the purposes and the goal which it seeks to achieve.

Very simply, the bill creates a Council of five members appointed by the President, who will analyze environmental information and recommend national policy to promote the improvement of our environmental quality. The Council will report directly to the President and he, in turn, will report the findings and recommendations to the Congress.

I have no doubt that such a Council is necessary. The President has many advisors available to him with knowledgeable experience in all fields. He does not, however, have a panel of advisers whose main concern in the environmental problems of our Nation and the world. For the sake of our Nation's health, it is imperative that he have this advice.

As has been stated previously, mankind is playing an extremely dangerous game with his environment. Unless he stops, unless he changes his ways, he faces a strong possibility of extinction. Our industrial revolution has given us a magnificent technological progress that staggers the imagination. But along with benefits it has brought deteriments and we must realize this.

Jamestown Island, the site of the first landing of the colonists in America, lies within my district. Several years ago, a well-known artist was commissioned to paint the scene of the three small ships at anchor in the James River as it appeared over 350 years ago. He did so, executing a beautiful painting showing the tiny ships on a blue James River. I am told the local committee questioned accepting it because, as every one knows, the James River is grayish in color—not blue. When the artist was questioned, he sincerely answered, "It was blue then." We shall not see a blue James River again but hopefully it will not get any grayer.

Man must learn to live in harmony with his changing environment. This bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 12549, a bill to create a Council on Environmental Quality, and I congratulate the chairman and committee for reporting it to the House. This legislation will provide for a permanent agency in the Executive Office of the President to work toward a national policy to relate man and his work to the total environment.

This is an important first step in defining protected areas where Americans can live and enjoy happy and productive lives. The five-member Council will be charged with insuring our citizens of open and naturally attractive areas they and their children and future generations can enjoy.

The population explosion, the movement from the towns to the cities, natural changes and industrialization have transformed our Nation into an environmental hobgoblin.

We are now living a nonquality life because our builders and leaders have moved too fast with brick and mortar with little regard to what changes have been made in our living space.

> It is primarily a matter of how fast or how long one wishes to live at certain quality.

Dr. David M. Gates, director of the Missouri Botanical Gardens, said in the hearings on the bill—

> One can live high and short or slow and long. Civilization cannot do both.

It is obvious we are living high and short. We are doing this with little planning and thinking about the quality of our lives. I like what Don Marquis wrote:

> If the world were not so full of people, and most of them did not have to work so hard, there would be more time for them to get out and lie on the grass, and there would be more grass for them to lie on.

What we are considering today is where the grass will be in another generation. I believe this bill, which is similar to one I introduced in the 89th, 90th and 91st Congresses—to provide for a study of our ecology—will develop the type of program and national policy to make sure we will live in "America the Beautiful."

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration reflects the broad concern of the public and of the Congress over the quality and productivity of our natural environment. It seems quite probable to me that we will pass some version of this legislation. I intend to vote for it.

However, there is a serious deficiency in the bill as reported out of the committee in that it lacks a statement of national environmental policy as presently interpreted by the Congress. Not to include such a statement would be to miss a great opportunity to lead this Nation out of the complex of program objectives which bring about present environmental degradation. The resolution of conflicting agency activities cannot be accomplished easily unless there is a commonly accepted policy guideline.

If the House does not endorse a policy position today, I am sure we will be faced with such a requirement when this bill goes to conference with the Senate. It is unnecessary and improper that we be put in that position since the diverse hearings of the past few years before several House committees have established the basic principles of environmental policy.

When we held hearings on Environmental Council bills before our Science Research and Development Subcommittee in 1968, we deferred action at that time because it was not clear as to what organizational changes would be made in the executive branch. Last summer, in the Joint House-Senate Colloquium on a National Policy for the Environment, it became apparent that, regardless of organization, a strong policy statement was desirable and that it was the responsibility of the Congress to take the lead in formulating this policy.

The report from the colloquium suggested elements of national policy and these were forwarded by me for comment to the administration. On April 24, 1969, I received a detailed reply from the Executive Office of the President endorsing the congressional policy suggestions and adding several important elements. I inserted this correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 20, 1969, page 13148.

The general agreement on these elements of policy was further evidenced by the language in title I of S. 1075, passed by the Senate and sent to the House in July 1969. Believing that particular words are unimportant as long as the principles are the same, I adopted title I of S. 1075 as title I of my bill, H.R. 13272, the Environmental Quality and Productivity Act of 1969, introduced for myself and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) on August 1, 1969. On that date I documented in detail the 3-year history of our committee work in environmental affairs—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 1, 1969, page 12828.

The Members of this House must recognize the great interdependence of man and his environment and the ultimate requirement for harmony between his actions and ecological principles. We should recognize a human right to a healthful environment and a personal responsibility for preservation and enhancement of these values.

We must call on all agencies to conform their activities to these policy statements. This directive should provide an administrative route for redress of grievances by citizens groups who now

must go to court in order to bring the rights for environmental quality into balance with Federal or private operations.

The original of national policy for the environment can be traced back over the past several years. There was apparent a growing concern of citizens everywhere that the earlier guidelines of economic exploitation were yielding byproducts of determination, pollution, and esthetic offense. Many organizations in government and the private sector began studies and programs to describe the cause and effect relationships between society's actions and environmental quality. At the same time, increased productivity from the landscape was demanded by a growing world population and desire for higher living standards. These studies found that environmental quality and productivity go hand in hand. In fact, in the long run the most productive environment is one which is kept at a high state of quality.

Therefore I call on the sponsors of the subject bill to include a strong policy statement when this bill comes back to the House from the conference committee. In doing so, the House will stand with the Senate in a position of leadership, serving notice on the executive agencies which come before our various committees that the entire Congress has agreed to restore, maintain, and enhance the quality of air, water, and land resources for continued productivity and enjoyment of our society far into the future.

Mr. Chairman, the bill being considered under the rule would authorize the President to appoint a five-man Council on Environmental Quality. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) would omit the necessity of the President seeking the advice and consent of the Senate for these appointments.

In my opinion, the amended bill would also leave the President free to appoint at least five members of his present Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality to the newly established Council on Environmental Quality. Such flexibility would satisfy, to a degree, the provisions in my bill, H.R. 13272, which would have provided a statutory base for the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. My purpose was to preserve the momentum of executive branch activities recently initiated by the existing cabinet council and the citizens advisory group. I have been concerned that the congressional action under discussion might be viewed as confusing, duplicative, and unnecessary. However, if my interpretation is acceptable, the valuable talents in the group headed by Mr. Laurance Rockefeller could continue to serve as a channel for public and congressional inputs. The bill would provide staff services, just as was intended in my proposal.

Adequate help in gathering and interpreting the factual data base for environmental management decisions is essential. I would agree that the Office of Science and Technology, with its present limited budget must be augmented. This is not to say that Dr. Lee DuBridge, Dr. John Buckley, and other staff members involved are not extremely valuable in this role. They are doing excellent work and we must give them more assistance.

There is a question in my mind as to whether full-time service on the Council established by this bill is necessary. The role of the Council is in long-range planning and to act as a watchdog for the public and the Congress on the activities of the Federal departments. The best persons for these tasks may not be available to serve full time but would be willing and able to contribute on a part-time basis as does the present advisory committee. As I read the bill there is no requirement that the Council members serve full time, having no other employment.

Another minor problem in this bill is that the President has named his Cabinet group the Environmental Quality Council. This bill creates an independent Council on Environmental Quality. The obvious confusion in names for these groups with distinctly different duties is unfortunate. I would hope that the sponsors of the bill would in conference rename the congressionally established group as something other than a council.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, because it is unquestionably in the immediate and long range urgent national interest I am supporting this bill before us, H.R. 12459, to create a Council on Environmental Quality and I hope the House will overwhelmingly approve it without extended delay. This measure recognizes and responds to the imperative necessity to legislatively initiate a strong, independent review of our total environment, the causes by which that environment has become increasingly dangerous to human life from pollution and poison and the means through which we may begin to meet these dangers in order to prevent our own unwitting self-extinction.

Let us emphasize that, at present, there is no unit or commission or other body in existence that can provide this Nation and our Government with an abstract, critical appraisal of various Federal programs and activities related to the environment and from which we could receive broad policies and recommendations for expedient improvement of our environment.

Mr. Chairman, it is universally recognized and admitted that our complex environmental issues and answers require legal, economic, social, management and systems analysis as well as scientific study in order to be of realistic value and effect.

Every school child and adult in this country is well aware that the advance of modern technology, however great its material benefits, has been unrestrained in its accompanying afflictions upon us through byproducts that increasingly poison our air and pollute our waters. The Federal Government has spent vast sums of money on different aspects of and approaches to this critical national problem. Yet there is no independent source of review of the total environmental situation nor any agency to provide the President and the Congress with an estimation of the priorities that should be assigned and the activities that should be coordinated to meet and overcome this problem.

In considering this measure before us, the House is demonstrating its interest and concern that every American has a fundamental and inalienable right to a healthful environment. In approving this bill the House will be fulfilling its legislative duty of insuring that this right will become a reality in the most prudent manner at the earliest date. I most earnestly urge my colleagues therefore to speedily adopt this measure which I believe is imperative to the public interest and our national survival.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 12549, the bill to establish an Environmental Quality Council.

I think we are all pretty much in agreement in this House on the need for such a Council. All we need to do is pick up the newspapers or take a good look around us and we read or we see deterioration of our environment. For the most part, it is a deterioration caused by man.

We are only now beginning to feel the impact of overpopulation. We know that the effects of this problem places great stress on our existing institutions and facilities. Our real problem is trying to produce goods and services sufficient and suitable to man's needs.

We read of smog-filled cities and of polluted waters, a serious danger not only to mankind, but also to all wildlife and plantlife. We continue, almost unchecked to mar and deface our landscape and to ruin and destroy the few remnants of natural beauty remaining. We know the dangers of radioactivity and nuclear testing; dredging and filling of productive estuaries; drainage of wetlands; deforestation and soil erosion; defacing of land through stripmining; and ground water depletion.

Such development must no longer be allowed to go unchecked. We are fast becoming a victim of our own technology and progress. Man and his environment are vital to each other; the development and protection of one is dependent on the development and protection of the other.

The proposed five-man Council would provide a broad and independent overview of existing and potential problems that affect the quality of our environment. The bill would also require the Council to report annually to the President on the status of various aspects of the American environment. The President is required by this act to submit an annual report to Congress on the condition of the environment, current and long-range trends, utilizing the environment, and an evaluation of the impact on these trends on national requirements. The Council itself would maintain a continuous review of Federal policies and activities that influence environmental quality and will have the authority to conduct studies that are deemed necessary to carry out its mandate. I feel that the establishment of an independent Council will also assist in the coordination of various Federal programs and provide a means in assisting in resolving internal policy disputes. The Council, in short, will provide additional

assistance for both the President and Congress in meeting the environmental problems that have been created by advancing technology.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this bill to establish an Environmental Quality Council is a most valuable addition to attempt to solve the most serious problems of environmental pollution. I urge the adoption of this measure by this Chamber.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, even as we gather here today, the quality of man's environment on earth is slowly decreasing. While such ecological disasters as the ruptured oil well off the Santa Barbara coast make the headlines and bring about a national concern, we must also be concerned about the environment on a long-range basis. The deterioration of the various facets of man's environment is becoming more and more noticeable. The coastal zone which surrounds so much of Florida is a prime example of this deterioration. Pollution of outlying regions and its effect on inland waterways, the washing away of literally hundreds of feet of beautiful beaches by waves, hurricane damage and the incorrect utilization of the delicately balanced ecology which forms the habitat of important fish and wildlife are only a few examples.

Marine environmental problems and their solutions will become even greater as private industry more and more realizes the wealth which lies beneath the ocean floor. And this is only one of our environments. One of the more important general questions relative to man's environment is whether or not the world's population will have enough to eat in the 21st century and beyond.

Our Federal, State, and local governments have spent great amounts of money in efforts to define the various problems in the environment and then arrive at workable solutions. This bill, H.R. 12549, will provide us for the first time with a council which will make an independent review of the total environmental situation and provide both the President and Congress with an estimation of the priorities which should be assigned to the various aspects of the problem. I urge your support of the legislation.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the bill (H.R. 12549) to provide for the establishment of a permanent Presidential Council on Environmental Quality. This bill is an important first step in formulating a national policy for environmental quality.

The Council on Environmental Quality would oversee Federal, State, and local programs aimed at improving the environment and would assist the President in the preparation of an annual message to the Congress on the state of the environment, just as the Council of Economic Advisers assists the President with his annual message on the state of the economy.

I welcome these legislative steps toward the creation of a national policy for environmental quality and a governmental capability to implement that policy. I am especially gratified that this bill under consideration includes essential provisions of my own bill, H.R. 13826, for environmental quality improvement. A permanent Presidential Council on Environmental Quality, as recommended both in my bill and in the one now under consideration, must be established to oversee and coordinate the multiple and often conflicting programs pursued by the different levels of government to improve different aspects of the environment.

We need to develop on the part of Government an anticipatory capability; we need to go beyond reacting to specific crisis situations in the environmental field. It is far cheaper in human, social, and economic terms to anticipate these problems at an early stage and to find alternatives before they require the massive expenditures which we are now obligated to make to control water, air and land pollution.

My own bill was tailored to begin developing this anticipatory capability and I would hope that future legislation in this field would follow this route. To achieve this anticipatory capability I recommended that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to conduct studies of natural environmental systems in the United States, to document and define changes in these systems, and to develop and maintain an inventory of natural resource development projects which may make significant modifications in the natural environment.

Further, I recommended that the Secretary of the Interior be directed to establish a clearinghouse for information on ecological problems and to disseminate information about programs related to those problems.

Also, I recommended that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to establish a comprehensive solid waste management program which would coordinate all such research now being done under a number of different Federal programs. Another recommendation of mine directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to compile a national inventory of solid waste management needs and problems and of solid waste management technology.

In addition, I recommended that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare establish a clearinghouse for information on all aspects of air, water and soil pollution and solid waste disposal. This information would be made available to business, industry and municipalities, and the general public. These are the kind of provisions which would help to develop an anticipatory capability and I would hope that future legislation in the environmental field would include them.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the ever-increasing expanse of mankind and man's undirected use of technology pose a direct and definite threat to man's very existence.

The tragedy of Lake Erie and the Potomac River are but limited examples of man's shortsighted use of technology. Technology that was implemented for the betterment of man's condition and quality of life has created problems of air, land, and water use that threaten to cause irreparable harm to his environment.

The Federal Government has spent vast sums of money in recent years in an effort to meet a limited number of these problems and will likely increase its efforts in the future. However, at present, there is not an independent agency or review board that can review the total environmental situation or provide the President or Congress with an estimation of the priorities which must be assigned to different aspects of the problem.

There are numerous instances, such as the Peripheral Canal project in California, where a Federal project designed to deal with the need for an expanded water supply in the southern California region may not have fully taken into consideration the affect of the water removal on the Sacramento River Basin.

This bill would require the President to transmit to the Congress an annual environmental quality report concerning the status of various aspects of the American environment and their impact on other national requirements.

The bill would also require the Council to maintain a continuing review of Federal policies and activities with environmental implications.

When a Federal project, such as the Peripheral Canal project, irreversibly changes the ecology of a vast region there needs to be in depth study of the total environmental effects of such a program.

On May 29 of this year the President, by Executive order, created an interdepartmental Council on Environmental Quality. While there is a definite need for an interdepartmental Council to resolve internal policy conflicts between mission oriented executive agencies, that is not the purpose of this legislation.

There is a definite need for a consistent and expert source of review of national policies, environmental problems and trends, both long and short term. The problems that need to be solved are several times larger than those which can be adequately dealt with by this interdepartmental Council. In addition, they are problems which will require full-time expertise and attention—expertise and attention which ought not to be devoted to other problems.

An overwhelming need exists for action to be taken in this area. No other organization, in existence or contemplated shows any sign of meeting that need. It is for that reason that I urge immediate passage of this legislation, H.R. 12549.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is before this House today, calling for the creation of a Council on Environmental Quality, is one which deserves the support and approval of every Member of Congress. Its purpose is one which has for too long been delayed. The issues it proposes to tackle are far too critical for the quality of life to allow us to further postpone this necessary first step toward effective control and improvement of our environment. We must act.

H.R. 12549 is not a complicated bill. Its primary purpose is the creation of a five-man council whose mission will be a continuing study and assessment of factors and trends affecting the quality of our environment. It will prepare and

submit to the President an annual report on its activities, and assist him in the preparation of an annual President's report to the Congress on environmental quality, which is called for in the bill. The council will also maintain a continuing review of Federal activities and programs affecting the environment, and keep the President informed on its findings. Finally, it will recommend to the President policies to enhance the quality of our environment.

In a sense, the Council will be the President's main adviser on environmental matters, in much the same manner as the Council of Economic Advisers now assists him in matters relating to the economy. That Council has been in existence since 1946, and has proved of inestimable value to the President, the Congress, and the country.

Mr. Chairman, ours is a society that has succumbed to the bewitchment of technology, a process which has transformed the world around us. Technology is widely credited with many of the good things of modern life; rising agricultural productivity, new sources of power, automation, accelerated travel, increased volume, and speed of communication, spectacular improvements in medicine and surgery—and more. Technology has greatly increased the wealth produced by human labor; it has lengthened our lives and immeasurably improved the conditions under which most men live. Little wonder that there has been engendered in our society a firm faith in technology as an almost undiluted good.

There are now, however, a number of reasons to question this implicit faith, for there is a growing body of evidence that society is paying a high price in environmental pollution for the advantages that flow from the rapid spread of technology. We now know that the beneficiaries of the good that technology can do are also victims of the environmental disease that technology breeds.

Few Americans are untouched or unaware of the extent of water pollution. Many of our urban dwellers are conscious of the discomfort—even the danger—of air pollution. Few who traveled the highways of America or visited our public parks this past summer will be surprised, on reading an advertisement in Time magazine for September 19, to learn that each of us is producing some 5 pounds of trash every day. These are the more obvious signs of our deteriorating environment. There are other, more subtle—even exotic—examples of technology's encounters with our environment—the mysterious fishkills; the quieter, if not "silent" springs in some areas; the death of a herd of sheep in Utah; the depredations of the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes.

Our record to date is not bright. Hindsight tells us that what we are experiencing is a logical outcome of almost-unrestrained application of technology on the once magnificent resources of a rapidly-growing country. It may be that we will never be able to restore some of the despoiled resources and the natural beauties of our country. Certainly, recovery will be a long and costly process. But if we remember that the future begins tomorrow, then the bill we are considering today offers a great opportunity to prepare for that future.

A common reference point for looking ahead these days is the year 2000. If we consider just one aspect of the predicted future—population growth which will boost our numbers to some 300 million—we know that these numbers will place almost unbearable demands on the resources and the institutions, some of which are barely able to serve today's society. If we add another dimension of the future—the impact of the predicted growth of science and technology—then the interaction of these two dimensions will surely shape a future beyond our comprehension.

We have become more aware in recent years of past and present insults to our environment. Our response has been piecemeal and often too late. Lake Erie's reputed death may be the most glaring example of our inability or unwillingness to act in a responsible manner. We have an opportunity today to prepare ourselves to deal with this kind of thing in the future.

We have more than an opportunity; we have a responsibility.

As representatives of a democratic society, we are committed to the development of policies which insure maximum individual freedom and human development. Neither of these goals can be achieved in a decaying and overburdened environment. We must devise policies that take full account of the impact of technological development on the environment, and we can achieve this only if we have a clearer knowledge of what that impact might be.

The Council which this bill would create is the vehicle which can provide the President and the Congress with the kind of information which can guide us in shaping programs consistent with society's needs. The Council will also provide a vitally needed source for reviewing the total environmental situation—an "early warning" system that warns us of the effect on the environment of a particular program. Finally, it will fill the need for an agency capable of providing the President and the Congress with estimates of the priorities which must be assigned to all of the different aspects of the interaction of man and his environment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member of this House will support H.R. 12549.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in urging passage of the Environmental Quality Council bill, H.R. 12549.

The purpose of this legislation is to create in the Executive Office of the President an independent advisory group to advise the President and through him the Congress and the American people on steps which should be taken to improve the quality of our environment. Although the President is in the process of organizing his Cabinet-level Council, created by Executive Order No. 11472, May 29, 1969, the legislative branch still sees the need for a permanent type council and feels that creation of this independent council would serve to complement and supplement the President's efforts.

Mr. Chairman, the Cabinet-level Council is an excellent means of communicating Executive decisions to the departments and agencies which would carry them out, but it has no potential as a means of promoting new policies, or even of investigating them, which may conflict in any way with the status quo. If the President had the time to concern himself personally with the many and complex issues with environmental implications, it is possible that the independent council that we propose might not be as important as it is. But he does not have that time, nor does his Science Advisor, and he needs a competent full-time group of advisers to assist him—men and women with commitments to no programs or missions, other than that of environmental protection.

Mr. Chairman, the problems of our environment are several magnitudes larger than those which can be adequately dealt with by the part-time council. They touch on practically every aspect of everyday life and require the full-time expertise and attention of a Council such as that envisioned by this bill. The Council closely parallels the Council of Economic Advisers, which was created by the Full Employment Act of 1946 and which has successfully proven its worth, and it is for this reason that I highly endorse H.R. 12549 and urge its prompt passage.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill today, I want to acknowledge a debt owed by our committee to an impartial and expert group of men and women who have provided us with excellent and timely assistance in our deliberations. Almost one-fourth of the membership of this House has joined the informal and unofficial Ad Hoc Committee on the Environment—a committee of concerned legislators who have expressed an interest in information relevant to the growing problem of environmental degradation. That committee now numbers 119: Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives in the House as well as on the other side of the Capitol. I would particularly like to thank Mr. Frank Potter, the executive director of the ad hoc committee, who has worked closely with our committee and through his tireless efforts has made the passage of this legislation possible.

Our committee is in regular contact with 126 distinguished scientists, educators, businessmen, and conservationists, who serve as a board of advisers to our ad hoc committee. This board, which usually communicates with members of the ad hoc committee through the Environmental Clearinghouse, Inc. (a local nonprofit corporation which provides staff assistance to the ad hoc committee) provided 21 witnesses for our hearings. If time had permitted, many more advisers who had offered to appear before us would have been heard. The testimony of these advisers was almost unanimously in favor of the bill, and that testimony was a very important factor in our being able to report the bill to the floor of the House as early and as strongly as we were able to.

I cannot say whether or not we could have moved as surely or as rapidly as we have, without the assistance of these public-spirited men and women in the board of advisers. I can say, however, that they were of immeasurable assistance to us in putting the issue into proper perspective, and that much of the urgency with which we view the environmental crisis, and which we are attempting to communicate to our colleagues today stems directly from the urgency and concern expressed by this impressive body of experts.

As I say, this is a debt that I am happy to acknowledge, and I know that I speak for all my colleagues on the subcommittee as well. The only proper way that we could pay this debt would be to see that this bill, H.R. 12549, is passed as quickly as possible, and that the Council on Environmental Quality begins to move.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I also would like to bring to the attention of the Members the recently established Environmental Policy Division in the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress. Mr. Richard A. Carpenter, senior specialist in science and technology, has been appointed chief of the new division. Mr. Carpenter has been most helpful to the committee and I would like to take this opportunity to officially express my appreciation for his kind assistance and to congratulate him on his promotion. The Environmental Policy Division was established in response to increasing congressional concern for the quality and productivity of the physical environment.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act is amended by redesignating section 5A as section 5B and by inserting immediately after section 5 the following new section:

Mr. DINGELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman from Michigan would withhold that request. I have no intention of asking the Committee of the Whole to read the entire bill, but I wish the gentleman would withhold that request for a minute or 2, or 3 or 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw by unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"SEC. 5A. (a) The Congress, recognizing the profound impact of man's activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, both living and nonliving, and the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality to the overall welfare and development of man, declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, urban and rural planners, industry, labor, agriculture, science, and conservation organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

"(b) The President shall transmit to the Congress annually beginning June 30, 1970, an Environmental Quality Report (hereinafter referred to as the 'report') which shall set forth (1) the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental classes of the Nation, including, but not limited to, the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, including, but not limited to, the forest, dryland, wetland, range, urban, suburban, and rural environment; and (2) current and foreseeable trends in management and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation.

"(c)(1) There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality (hereafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom the President shall designate as chairman, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental information of all kinds, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and to formulate and recommend national policy to promote the improvement of our environmental quality.

"(2) The Council may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. In addition, the Council may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this section, in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but without regard to the last sentence thereof).

"(3) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

"(A) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report;

"(B) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in environmental qualities both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information for the purpose of determining whether such conditions and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

"(C) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

"(D) to develop and recommend to the President national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality to meet social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation; and

"(E) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request.

"(4) The Council shall make an annual report to the President in May of each year.

"(5) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this section—

"(A) the Council shall consult with such representatives of science, industry, agriculture, labor, conservation, organizations, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable; and

"(B) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistcal information) of public and private agencies and organizations, and individuals, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided."

Mr. SAYLOR (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the section be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Where does section 1 end?

The CHAIRMAN. On page 5, line 11.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have amendments at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that my amendments be read down to No. 17, and that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Aspinall: On page 1, lines 3 to 6, strike out "Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act is amended by redesignating section 5A as section 5B and by inserting immediately after section 5 the following new section:

"SEC. 5A. (a) The".

On page 2, line 13, strike out "'(b)" and insert "SEC. 2."

On page 3, line 1, strike out "'(c)(1)" and insert "SEC. 3."

On page 3, line 5, strike out "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,".

On page 3, line 15, strike out "'(2)" and insert "SEC. 4."

On page 3, line 23, strike out "'(3)" and insert "SEC. 5."

On page 3, line 24, strike out "'(A)" and insert "(a)".

On page 4, line 1, strike out "'(B)" and insert "(b)".

On page 4, line 10, strike out "'(C)" and insert "(c)".

On page 4, line 17, strike out "'(D)" and insert "(d)".

On page 4, line 21, strike out "'(E)" and insert "(e)".

On page 4, line 24, strike out "'(4)" and insert "SEC. 6."

On page 5, line 1, strike out "'(5)" and insert "SEC. 7."

On page 5, line 3, strike out "'(A)" and insert "(a)".

On page 5, line 7, strike out "'(B)" and insert "(b)".

On page 5, line 11, strike out "avoided.'" and insert "avoided."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that these amendments are satisfactory to the committee having jurisdiction over this legislation. Most of them are technical. However, there are three or four amendments which are substantial in their effect.

The first amendment has reference to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. This language is deleted in order that this new legislation can stand on its own and will not be tied to an existing program. The subject matter of the bill relates to all environmental classes, and therefore its enactment as an amendment to this act is not appropriate and should be changed.

The second important amendment has to do with the question of Senate confirmation. Requirements for Senate confirmation of members of the Council is deleted by my amendment. I see no reason for Senate confirmation of a Presidential council of this nature. In fact, I think it dilutes the importance of the council. I think it means, if you take it as I read it, that this House is giving way to the Senate in the membership of the proposed council a great deal of its own prerogative in the establishment of the Council itself.

Another important change that I make is the language added to make it clear that nothing in this act changes the authority given to an existing agency created by provisions of existing law. We leave existing law as it is. In my opinion, if additional authority and direction to existing agencies is needed, it should be provided by additional legislation. Here is where we will find ourselves in conflict with the other body when our conferees go into conference with the other body, because they do not pay sufficient attention in my opinion to existing authority of agencies already created.

If I remember correctly, that is as far as these amendments to this section go.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, these amendments have been discussed by and between me and my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado.

I would like to ask my good friend from Colorado if these are the amendments that we discussed at a time earlier.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct, excepting that there are other amendments I have before the committee at this time and they will be added when we get to the reading of the next section.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed these amendments with my good friend from Colorado, and on behalf of the committee I interpose no objection. We have agreed to accept these amendments on the floor.

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

Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers said that the people are deeply concerned about environmental quality. Let me add that the people of this country are more deeply concerned about the tax burdens that are being loaded onto them, the inflation, and the debt that is being piled up. I suggest that at this time a council on tax environment would be far more appropriate than still another Council on Environmental Quality.

I tried a few minutes ago to get some kind of a handle, some kind of information, on the number of councils already loose in this country dealing with various forms of environmental quality. I got exactly nowhere. There is one, as I tried to point out earlier, in Virginia occupying, I do not know how many acres of land. This is out by Dulles Airport in the Herndon, Va., area. It is called Environmental Sciences and apparently operated by the Department of Commerce. Is that not large enough to embrace all environments? What is the meaning of "sciences"? What is the meaning of "environment"?

There was established last spring by the President of the United States, an Environmental Quality Council. It is apparently functioning right now.

What is proposed to be done with this Council already in existence? How much money is it proposed to spend on organizations of this kind?

There is no question in my mind but what this pending bill is going to provide more duplication. When do we propose to start saving $1 million around here? There is no limitation contained in this legislation except the estimated cost of $1 million a year. It could be more.

When is it proposed to save $1 million around this place? When is it proposed to give the taxpayers a break? When are we going to make some move toward stopping inflation that is chewing the economy of this country to pieces?

I do not know how many consultants, how many supergrades it is proposed to hire in this deal. I do not know how many there are over at the White House backing up the Council that has already been established with the same title. How many supergrades are already employed for this purpose? There is no limitation on this bill except the report says, "We estimate $1 million a year."

Is it not about time to apply the brakes around here? When? When? When do we stop the duplication and the extravagance?

Mr. Chairman, this bill ought to be put on the shelf at least until we are provided valid reasons for spending money for purposes of this kind.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I supported this legislation in the committee. However, I did support it with reservations, some reservations which I would like to point out to the Committee today.

No one can doubt that cleaning up our air and earth and water demands the best efforts of many people. Any attempt to control the environmental system, therefore, must involve not only the best efforts of science and technology, but the law, sociology, politics, and economics.

But when we join such diverse talents can we strike that precious balance to avoid self-interest—the greatest of all pollutants to man's progress. For in matters of the environment, the range of self-interests to be served is national in scope.

The environmental system, furthermore, is by nature thoroughly geopolitical. Air and water contaminants do not respect State and local political boundaries. And so it falls on the Federal Government—the Congress—to create the basic legislation that applies equitably and effectively to all jurisdictions.

The purpose of the legislation before the Congress today—to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality—is supposed to promote general welfare and to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony. It may not.

The problem of swill, garbage, rubbish, and trash is very close, if not near and dear, to the citizens of New York and in fact every major urban area and many less concentrated areas of population. These necessary but unwanted byproducts of our everyday life are politely termed solid waste. It is the disposal and even worse the failure to dispose of solid waste that is the constantly growing cause of major hazard to health and esthetics. When we seek to establish a Council on Environmental Quality with the goal of controlling our environmental system—our air and earth and water—we should strive to think in grand terms of accomplishment. In the case of solid waste, many communities have only one practical means of disposal and that is by burning. So we must consider solid waste then as a fuel and as a fuel we should use its energies for electric power, the control of water pollution, and the treatment of sewage. We should burn it cleanly so as not to pollute the air around us and we must develop new combustion technology for this purpose.

With considerable foresight I believe, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been committed to research for this very objective for several years. This is a program that ought to vitally concern at least three Cabinet departments and five agencies within those departments: Health, Education, and Welfare, with its divisions of solid waste and air pollution; Interior, with its Office of Salient Water and Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; and Housing and Urban Development, with its planning of model cities and its multitude of other responsibilities.

Now, not tomorrow, is the time for a crash program by all of these agencies to complete the research and put our solid waste disposal into a safe position and perhaps even one that actually contributes to, rather than detracts from the general well-being of all of our people.

This I would deem one of the major challenges that would concern the Council on Environmental Quality proposed in this legislation. However, the ubiquitous hand of a number of Federal agen-

cies and vested interest groups, both implicitly and explicitly, has written this legislation for their own self-interest and not the general welfare.

I would like to emphasize here that the power of the Department of the Interior, in matters of conservation, seem to override almost all considerations for the public good. In fact, they affect public works on a national basis.

The Department has consistently hid behind the veil of conservation to overrule vitally needed public works projects.

On the one hand they screamed pollution to prevent a channel-dredging operation in New York Harbor. Yet they allowed the dirtiest type of coal-fired powerplant to be built in my district.

So what we are talking about now is control of the environment by Government agencies. We cannot build a road in my district. We cannot build a road because of environmental factors and conservation factors that completely override need, technology, and the public good.

The constant threat of power blackouts in New York City alone would be abated today if single-minded preservationists had not effectively thwarted efforts to build a hydroelectric powerplant outside of the city.

I am concerned about creating a commission that will be conservation oriented. If that were to happen, progress would be limited to what has taken place in past decades. I cannot support any measure that literally insures dominance by conservative elements that so override the desires and needs of the public that we lose sight of those everyday needs.

I want the record here today in the Congress to insure that this Commission does not act against the environment in our urban areas. That it consider balance in the creation of necessary public works to clean, as well as to preserve our land.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 2, line 22, strike out "and" immediately preceding "(2)".

On page 2, line 25, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "(3) the adequacy of available natural resources for fulfilling human and economic requirements of the Nation in the light of expected population pressures; (4) a review of the programs and activities (including regulatory activities) of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, and nongovernmental entities or individuals, with particular reference to their effects on the environment and on the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources; and (5) a program for remedying the deficiencies of existing programs and activities, together with recommendations for legislation."

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the members of the committee for having brought forth this trailblazing piece of legislation to the floor this afternoon. It, in its day, when enacted, will be as much of a landmark in matters of the environment as the Employment Act of 1946 has been in matters of economics.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment I propose is a simple amendment. It relates to the annual report on environmental quality required of the President by the bill. As the bill now stands, it contains excellent language that the President shall report on the status and condition of the environment. My amendment goes on to say that he should also give a report on how we are doing to fulfill the environmental goals under existing measures and programs and, if we are not doing as well as we might, to recommend ways of remedying those deficiencies, including recommendations for legislation.

This language is modeled after the language which has proved workable for more than 20 years with respect to the Employment Act of 1946.

It was approved in testimony before the House Committee on Government Operations by the presidential science adviser, Mr. DuBridge, and I have submitted it to the managers on both sides. I believe it is satisfactory to them.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. I have discussed with the members of the committee with the able and distinguished chairman of the committee, the Honorable EDWARD GARMATZ, and with my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

We find no objection to this language and I believe it would help the bill. On behalf of the committee, I am happy to accept the language offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I do commend him for his labors in this regard and I thank him.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: On page 1, strike lines 3 through 6 and insert the following:

"That (a) This Act may be cited as The Environmental Quality and Productivity Act of 1969.

"SEC. (b)(1). The Congress, recognizing that man depends on his biological and physical surroundings for food, shelter, and other needs, and for cultural enrichment as well; and recognizing further the profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource exploitation, and new and expanding technological advances on our physcal and biological surroundings and on the quality of life available to the American people; hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibity of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may—

"(A) fulfill the responsbilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

"(B) assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;

"(C) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;

"(D) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;

"(E) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

"(F) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

"(2) The Congress recognizes that each person has a fundamental and inalienable right to a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the environment.

"SEC. (c) The Congress authorizes and directs that the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States, to the fullest extent possible, be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act, and that all agencies of the Federal Government—

"(1) utilize to the fullest extent possible a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision-making which may have an impact on man's environment;

"(2) identify and develop methods and procedures which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic and technical considerations;

"(3) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a finding by the responsible official that—

"(A) the environmental impact of the proposed action has been studied and considered;

"(B) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided by following reasonable alternatives are justified by other stated considerations of national policy;

"(C) local short-term uses of man's environment are consistent with maintaining and enhancing long-term productivity; and that

"(D) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources are warranted.

(4) study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommend courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of land, water, or air;

"(5) recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems and lend appropriate support to initiatives, resolutions, and programs designed to maximize international cooperation in anticipating and preventing a decline in the quality of mankind's world environment; and

"(6) review present statutory authority, administrative regulations, and current policies and procedures for conformity to the purposes and provisions of this Act and propose to the President and to the Congress such measures as may be necessary to make their authority consistent with this Act.

"SEC. (d)(1) The Congress, recognizing the profound".

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

On page 2, line 13, strike out "'(b)" and insert "2".

On page 3, line 1, strike out "'(c)(1)" and insert "3A".

On page 3, line 5, strike out "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,".

On page 3, line 15, strike out "'(2)" and insert "B".

On page 3, line 23, strike out "'(3)" and insert "C".

On page 3, line 24, strike out "'(A)" and insert "(i)".

On page 4, line 1, strike out "'(B)" and insert "(ii)".

On page 4, line 10, strike out "'(C)" and insert "(iii)".

On page 4, line 17, strike out "'(D)" and insert "(iv)".

On page 4, line 21, strike out "'(E)" and insert "(v)".

On page 4, line 24, strike out "'(4)" and insert "(D)".

On page 5, line 1, strike out "'(5)" and insert "(E)".

On page 5, line 3, strike out "'(A)" and insert "(i)".

On page 5, line 7, strike out "'(B)" and insert "(ii)".

On page 5, line 11, strike out "avoided.'" and insert "avoided."

On page 5, line 12, strike out "SEC. 2(a)." and insert "SEC. (e)(1)."

On page 5, line 16, strike out "(b)" and insert "(2)".

On page 5, after line 19, insert new sections f, g, and h, as follows:

"SEC. f. The annual reports submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 2 of this Act shall be referred by the Speaker to each standing committee of the House of Representatives that has jurisdiction over any part of the subject matter of the reports.

"SEC. g. Nothing in this Act shall increase, decrease, or change any responsibility or authority of any Federal official or agency created by other provision of law.

"SEC. h. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $300,000 for fiscal year 1970, $500,000 for fiscal year 1971, and $1,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASPINALL. The amendment, as it has been offered, would destroy the entire structure of section 1 as perfected by the so-called Aspinall amendment. I wish to know if the Chair would rule that that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut was offered in the nature of a substitute for section 1 of the bill, but the Chair will examine the amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. I did not understand the gentleman from Connecticut to offer his amendment as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut proposed to strike out lines 3 through 6 and insert substitute wording.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it comes too late. It comes after perfection of the original language and would destroy the so-called Aspinall amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is exactly correct. That is what I am doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order again?

Mr. ASPINALL. After the bill has been perfected by the so-called Aspinall amendment, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is offered as an amendment to that amendment as such, after it has been adopted by the House.

If the amendment were offered as a substitute, then I could not object to it, so far as that is concerned. But I object to it as purely an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer as a substitute to the first section would simply add language which would in no way interfere with the activity already taking place but which is in fact supplementary to it. The language is clear. It would have no effect on the action already taken, excepting to add language.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCARTHY). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Committee has agreed to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Colorado. His first amendment altered the language on page 1, lines 3 to 6.

The Chair upholds the point of order of the gentleman from Colorado that the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut attempts to amend an amendment already agreed to and is not in order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(20) Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality."

(b) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding, at the end thereof, the following:

"(92) Members, Council on Environmental Quality."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 5, line 14, delete "of" and insert in lieu thereof "on".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 5, line 12, strike out "SEC. 2." and insert "SEC. 8."

On page 5, after line 19, insert new sections 9 and 10, as follows:

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall increase, decrease, or change any responsibility or authority of any Federal official or agency created by other provision of law.

"SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $300,000 for fiscal year 1970, $500,000 for fiscal year 1971, and $1,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, are these the amendments the gentleman discussed with me earlier?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, these are the amendments I discussed with my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. They are dealing with what?

Mr. ASPINALL. They deal with the proposed sections 9 and 10 and also a correcting amendment on page 5, line 12, because that section is to be renumbered, as it should be.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have discussed these amendments with the able and distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. GARMATZ, and with my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY). I am prepared to accept these amendments.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make two short statements. One, I thank my friend the gentleman from Michigan, for his statement that his committee accepts the amendments, but I do want the RECORD to show that what we propose in the language is to make clear that nothing in this act changes the authority and responsibility of existing agencies created by other provisions of law. In my opinion, if additional authority is needed and direction to existing agencies is needed, they should be provided by separate legislation.

Finally, I wish to state that the House bill is open ended for the expenditure of money. The Senate bill is open ended in one place and closed in two other places, with larger amounts of money than is proposed here.

The language I have proposed, and on which I have received unanimous consent to have the amendments considered en bloc, places a ceiling on the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to this legislation we are giving to Congress the oversight authority which it needs and which it should have on any environmental program that is proposed by the executive department or by Congress.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado for offering these amendments, particularly the amendment which is new section 10, because this places a limitation upon the expenditures that can be made by this Commission that will be appointed. This is in keeping with the policy which we have used in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in all legislation we report to the Congress. I think other committees might do well to follow like procedure in such matters.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, now in the well, suggests that this is the way to see that our oversight authority is taken care of properly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the amendments offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCCARTHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12549) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 544, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 372, nays 15, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—372

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bennett
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Coughlin
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gubser
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—15

Ashbrook
Burlison, Mo.
Camp
Devine
Gross
Hall
Henderson
King
McMillan
Mills
Montgomery
Rarick
Scherle
Stuckey
Whitten

NOT VOTING—43

Baring
Berry
Bolling
Brown, Ohio
Burleson, Tex.
Cabell
Cahill
Celler
Chappell
Colmer
Corman
Dawson
Fascell
Gilbert
Griffiths
Grover
Hanna
Hosmer
Jonas
Kirwan
Landgrebe
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McCloskey
McKneally
Mollohan
O'Hara
O'Konski
Pepper
Poage
Powell
Pucinski
Reifel
Rostenkowski
Sisk
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Teague, Calif.
Tunney
Utt
Whalley
Wilson, Charles H.
Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. McKneally.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mollohan.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 544, I call up for immediate consideration the bill (S. 1075) to establish a national policy for the environment; to authorize studies, surveys, and research relating to ecological systems, natural resources, and the quality of the human environment; and to establish a Board of Environmental Quality Advisers.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. DINGELL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1075 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12549, as passed, as follows:

"That the Congress, recognizing the profound impact of man's activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, both living and nonliving, and the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality to the overall welfare and development of man, declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, urban and rural planners, industry, labor, agriculture, science, and conservation organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

"SEC. 2. The President shall transmit to the Congress annually beginning June 30, 1970, an Environmental Quality Report (hereinafter referred to as the 'report') which shall set forth (1) the status and condition of the major natural, manmade, or altered environmental classes of the Nation, including, but not limited to, the air, the aquatic, including marine, estuarine, and fresh water, and the terrestrial environment, including, but not limited to, the forest, dryland, wetland, range, urban, suburban, and rural environment; (2) current and foreseeable trends in management and utilization of such environments and the effects of those trends on the social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation; (3) the adequacy of available natural resources for fulfilling human and economic requirements of the Nation in the light of expected population pressures; (4) a review of the programs and activities (including regulatory activities) of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, and nongovernmental entities or individuals, with particular reference to their effect on the environment and on the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources; and (5) a program for remedying the deficiencies of existing programs and activities, together with recommendations for legislation.

"SEC. 3. There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council on Environmental Quality (hereafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, one of whom the President shall designate as chairman, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental information of all kinds, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and to formulate and recommendation national policy to promote the improvement of our environmental quality.

"SEC. 4. The Council may employ such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. In addition, the Council may employ and fix the compensation of such experts and consultants as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this section, in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code (but without regard to the last sentence thereof).

"SEC. 5. It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

"(a) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Environmental Quality Report;

"(b) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning the conditions and trends in environmental quality both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information for the purpose of determining whether such conditions and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such conditions and trends;

"(c) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

"(d) to develop and recommend to the President national policies to foster and promote the improvement of environmental quality to meet social, economic, and other requirements of the Nation; and

"(e) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of policy and legislation as the President may request.

"SEC. 6. The Council shall make an annual report to the President in May of each year.

"SEC. 7. In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this section—

"(a) the Council shall consult with such representatives of science, industry, agriculture, labor, conservation, organizations, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable; and

"(b) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of public and private agencies and organizations, and individuals, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(20) Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality."

"(b) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding, at the end thereof, the following:

"(92) Members, Council on Environmental Quality."

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall increase, decrease, or change any responsibility or authority of any Federal official or agency created by other provision of law.

"SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $300,000 for fiscal year 1970, $500,000 for fiscal year 1971, and $1,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes.' "

The motion was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12549) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1075

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate bill (S. 1075) and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARMATZ, DINGELL, ASPINALL, PELLY, and SAYLOR.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 534 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 534

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 534 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 474 to establish a Commission on Government Procurement.

The purpose of H.R. 474 is to establish a temporary commission of experts on Government procurement.

The Commission would be composed of 15 members; six appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate, four by the Speaker of the House, with the Comptroller General serving ex officio. Each appointing authority would draw equally upon Government and non-Government sources. The congressional appointees would be bipartisan. The Commission would have a broad mandate to study procurement Government-wide and to make findings and recommendations to the Congress. Its tenure would be limited to 2 years.

The bill outlines 12 general ways of achieving this policy. These are intended as general guidelines for the Commission and not as changes or modifications in existing procurement laws.

The Commission is directed to "study and investigate the present statutes affecting Government procurement; the procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices followed by the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and the organizations by which procurement is accomplished to determine to what extent these facilitate the policy" declared in the bill.

Such sums as necessary to carry out the provisions of the act are authorized. Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or Federal employees shall receive no compensation for

services, but shall be allowed travel expenses. Members of the Commission from outside the Federal Government shall be paid at the rate of $100 a day for actual service, and other expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 534 in order that H.R. 474 may be considered.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to establish a commission of experts on government procurement.

The report points out that, while the Government's procurement bill is about $55,000,000,000 annually, there is no comprehensive, systematic review of our methods. While a number of congressional committees have jurisdiction within the area, none can comprehensively study the entire problem on a systematic basis. A body charged with that responsibility alone must be created.

The Commission will be composed of 15 members. Six will be appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate, four by the Speaker, with the Comptroller General serving ex officio. The mandate of the Commission is broad and general, giving it as much flexibility as possible. Its existence is limited to 2 years, by which time it must report its findings and recommendations to Congress.

There are 12 general areas set forth in the bill for the Commission to consider in its work. Non-Federal members will receive $100 per day. The Commission is empowered to hold hearings, hire experts and consultants, and contract for the services of private organizations to carry out studies.

Such sums as are necessary are authorized to be appropriated. In 1967 it was estimated that such a study would cost about $2,000,000; this may be outdated now but it gives a rough approximation.

Agency letters contained in the report support the legislation. There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 474, with Mr. McCARTHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, H.R. 474, to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, is a simple, straightforward bill. It would establish a temporary Commission of experts on Government procurement. This would be a mixed Commission of 15 members; six appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate,, four by the Speaker of the House, with the Comptroller General serving ex officio. Each appointing authority would draw equally upon Government and non-Government sources. The congressional appointees would be bipartisan. The Commission would have a broad mandate to study procurement governmentwide and to make findings and recommendations to the Congress. Its tenure would be limited to 2 years.

The watchword of the bill is economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in Government procurement. This is declared to be the policy of the Congress, and the bill outlines 12 general ways of achieving this policy. These are intended as general guidelines for the work of the Commission and not as changes or modifications of existing procurement laws.

These guidelines aim toward improvements in procurement personnel and organizations. We want to avoid or eliminate wherever possible, overlapping and duplication in Government procurement organizations and activities as well as redundant requirements on contractors. In the procurement laws and the great mass of regulations and directives there are gaps, omissions or inconsistencies which we want to identify and bring to the attention of Congress. Greater uniformity and simplicity in procurement procedures is another aim.

There are, of course, many departments and agencies of the Government engaged in procurement, and attention must be given, not only to their procedures and practices, but to conforming Government procurement policies and programs to other policies and programs. We want the Government to buy what it needs, within the time needed, at the lowest reasonable cost, and using competitive bidding to the maximum extent, but we also have to be concerned about small business, the antipoverty program, fair employment, and other considerations. This question comes up frequently, and it should be answered: How does procurement relate to the many other goals of Government?

Then, of course, procurement has a great impact on the whole economy and particular industries, areas, and occupations. Minimizing possible disruptive effects of Government procurement upon jobs, careers, community and regional welfare is another aim of the bill.

The Government has an obligation, not only to protect the public interest, but to be fair in its dealing with business. And so fair dealing and equitable relationships between the contracting parties will be a concern of the Commission.

The Commission under section 4(a) of this bill would have a broad mandate to study and investigate—

First, the present statutes affecting Government procurement;

Second, the procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices followed by the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Third, the organizations by which procurement is accomplished, to determine to what extent these factors facilitate the policy set forth in section 1 of the bill.

Section 4(b) requires the Commission to report to Congress within 2 years from the date of enactment, its findings and recommendations for changes in statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures which would carry out the policy stated in section 1. The Commission may make such interim reports as it deems advisable, and it may submit its final report to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate if the Congress is not in session when the report is completed.

This bill is strongly endorsed by the Comptroller General of the United States, who has highlighted the need for a study as proposed in H.R. 474 in these terms:

> The piecemeal evolution of Federal procurement law is generally designed to solve or alleviate specific and sometimes narrow problems as they arise. Federal procurement statutes are chiefly concerned with procurement authority and procedures and do not contain a clear expression of Government procurement policies. Implementing procurement regulations are voluminous, exceedingly complex and at times, difficult to apply. These procurement regulations have great impact on the rights and obligations of contractors, and the high level of spending for Government procurement. For fiscal year 1968 the Department of Defense alone awarded contracts totaling about $43 billion for supplies and services, representing about 80 percent of total Government procurement expenditures.

The Bureau of the Budget also has pointed out that there has been no full-scale review of Government procurement policies and practices since the report of the first Hoover Commission which led to the enactment of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act in 1949, and I may add that I handled that measure in committee and in the House. That was some 20 years ago. In the following 20 years, there have been many changes in the procurement area. These include, in the words of the Budget Bureau:

First. New techniques in contracting;

Second. New contract administration processes;

Third. Significant increases in research and development;

Fourth. Purchase, lease, and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment;

Fifth. Revisions concerning procedures for procurement in labor surplus areas and from small business;

Sixth. The promulgation of Federal procurement regulations;

Seventh. Significant revisions in the armed services procurement regulations as well as revisions of the Federal procurement regulations;

Eighth. Procurement and distribution of supplies under the national supply system;

Ninth. Procurement by contractors from Federal supply sources; and

Tenth. Shifts in the percentage of formally advertised and negotiated procurement.

Mr. Chairman, we have never had a Commission on Government Procurement dedicated exclusively to that subject matter. True, the Hoover Commission and several other commissions have looked at one phase or another of Government procurement in past years, but the contemporary problems are so many and so complex that we need a group of experts that will give their concentrated attention to this job. The Government, as a whole, spends probably $55 billion a year for the procurement of goods, services, and facilities. Just consider, if we can find better ways of doing Government business that would make even a 1-percent improvement, then the savings would be more than a half-billion dollars a year. Think of that. Over one-half billion dollars a year if we can just save 1 percent.

Of the approximately $55 billion in annual purchases, the Department of Defense accounts for more than $40 billion. It is the biggest buyer, and when it makes mistakes in procurement, they are the biggest also. There is no need to recite the horror stories which have filled the pages of the press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The point is that a serious and systematic and comprehensive study is needed to deal with these problems—a study in depth and substance. I don't mean legislating from the floor, with all sorts of quick-fix amendments which may make news material but are not carefully thought-out solutions. We need a better base of facts and recommendations. We need the help of a Commission that is expert but also practical minded, seasoned and sophisticated, because the technologies and the requirements are sophisticated.

A mixed Commission, with the President and the presiding officers of each House making the appointments, should achieve a blend of experience and expertise which will assure problem area coverage that is broad and deep.

The hearings on H.R. 474 were extensive. Our subcommittee sat in more than 30 separate sessions; 17 Government departments and agencies were represented as well as many outside groups. Altogether we heard approximately 100 persons who were expert or experienced in one aspect or another of Government procurement.

When I say "expert," I mean we asked for people who had had years of experience in procurement to give their testimony rather than to have someone with a big title or a big name. We wanted people who had had actual experience and we drew them from wherever we could find them.

The hearings are printed in nine separate volumes, and I may say there has been a big demand for copies.

It was not our purpose in these hearings to try to do the work of a commission, but we did want to identify problem areas with enough depth and particularity to make sure we were on sound ground and not just talking in generalities.

Our report highlights some 27 problem areas of Government which might well be studied by the Commission. This is not an exhaustive list, neither is it prescriptive of what the Commission should or will do. That is up to the Commission itself to decide with the resources that are made available. And I hope that the Commission will be given sufficient resources to do the job, including a top quality staff. If ever there was an opportunity to trade off some modest expenses now for huge savings later, this bill provides it.

And let me say, Mr. Chairman, that there are commissions and commissions. Some are useful only for window dressing, or to give some prestige and publicity to predetermined policies or programs. Other commissions are used as buck-passing devices, to postpone rather than grapple with tough problems. The Commission contemplated by this bill is not meant to be a facade nor a buck-passing device. There are no predetermined positions to defend nor any problem solving to postpone. This Commission would be, as I see it, a hard-working commission, one that is objective, impartial, and concerned only with factfinding and recommendations for improvement.

The Commission will not interfere with any work of the committees of Congress now going on or committed for the future. They have their jurisdictional responsibilities and their legislative chores which go on, day by day and year by year. What the Commission will do is help the committees of Congress by assembling a body of factual information and recommendations which they can, within their respective jurisdictional responsibilities, consider after the Commission submits its report.

Mr. Chairman, I might depart from my script at this point to say that I served for 2 years on the second Hoover Commission. We had 12 members on that Commission, and I regret to say that many times we did not have over five to seven members of the Commission at a meeting. We met every Saturday for 2 years, practically, when we sat as a commission to scrutinize the work of some 27 task forces which had been appointed to study the different areas of Government.

Now, we are not going into the whole gamut. We are going into one specific problem, the problem of procurement. But within this problem of procurement there are a number of different areas and someone, I am sure, will read the number of areas that we propose that this Commission should cover.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: No one that I know of is opposed to this bill. All of the witnesses that appeared before our committee were in favor of doing something. They realized the tremendous problem that we have in spending $55 billion, and spending it wisely, and for the purposes which Congress intends.

This bill had the support of the Johnson administration, the Comptroller General, the Budget Bureau, the Department of Defense, and many other agencies of the Government. I can say with equal authority and veracity that H.R. 474 has had the strong support of the Secretary of Defense, our former colleague, Melvin Laird. He has made it clear in a number of public statements that the Commission on Government Procurement, as proposed in H.R. 474, will help his Department and help him in the enormous responsibilities thrust upon his shoulders. The Commission will complement, not compete with, the procurement study efforts now being made by the Defense Department.

I might say that the Budget Bureau appeared before our committee, and they also expressed a need for it. Also the Comptroller General appeared before the committee, as did the Director of the General Services Administration.

We had people from NASA and other agencies and departments of the Government who appeared before our committee. All of them expressed their approval of the bill and their thoughts about the importance of having this study made.

The important point here, Mr. Chairman, and I believe the Secretary fully recognizes it, is that a statutory Commission, with the membership severally appointed, including Government representatives, but working independent of the Department of Defense or any other agency, with a staff under the Commission's own direction, is in a better position to engender public confidence in its findings and recommendations. It will not be dominated by any one agency or organization inside or outside the Government. Today, more than ever, the Congress and the people need to understand our institutions of government and particularly our military institutions because they are the biggest spenders.

The purpose of the bill is not to defend what should be criticized, nor to tear down what should be conserved. One of the most important functions of the Commission, as I see it, is to let the people know that our institutions of Government are adaptive, subject to change with the times, responsive to the new problems that emerge.

The bill is strongly endorsed by the Comptroller General and the Director of the Budget, who for the Congress and the Executive, respectively, keep watch of Government expenditures. Many departments and agencies of Government are on record in support of H.R. 474. Outside of Government, legal, technical, and other professional organizations, and business groups, have recorded their support.

I speak of one group, the American Bar Association, public contract law section, that appeared before us and said that the study should be made.

Not all of them may agree on how the problems should be solved, but all of them agree that the problems are there and that the time has come to make a con-

certed search for solutions. There is an underlying assumption that men of good will, men of experience, men of expertise, can go far toward solving the problems in this field. For those problems that cannot be solved by the Commission's findings and recommendations, at least we will have a clearer idea of their dimensions, and what we must do in learning to live with them.

This bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations without any exception or qualifications whatsoever. It was promptly granted a rule by the Committee on Rules. It is before you now and I hope it will have the support and the vote of every individual in this House who is concerned with the burgeoning expenses of Government and who wants to have our procurement procedures and processes just as efficient as it is possible to make them.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from California, for his very excellent statement.

I notice on page 2 of the report your committee outlines 12 general courses of action prescribed in the bill.

The distinguished former Senator from Illinois, Paul Douglas, made a very detailed analysis at the time he was serving in the other body concerning procurement in the Department of Defense. He proved without question that many items were being sold as surplus for infinitesimal amounts of money compared to the original cost at the very time the Department of Defense was purchasing that item at a much higher cost.

In your bill you say that greater uniformity and simplicity in procurement procedures should be achieved whenever appropriate and in item (7) you say:

> The procurement policies and programs of the several departments and agencies should be coordinated wherever possible.

I am particularly interested in these two items. I want to commend the committee because I know in my congressional district where we have a lot of small industrial firms that want to do business with the Government, it is like looking for that needle in the haystack in trying to find out where to apply or how to get on the bidders' list.

This seems to be really the great void in the purchasing practice of the Department of Defense—trying to find out where to go. So I certainly feel sure the Government can save money if they have one central agency where people can apply for procurement work or at least get on the bidders' list.

So I hope great emphasis can be placed on items six and seven in trying to coordinate the buying practices of the departments.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman and his colleagues for bringing out this much needed bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the gentleman and the members of the committee for reporting out this bill.

As the gentleman will recall, I served on the subcommittee back in 1967 when hearings were held on this bill. I supported it wholeheartedly at that time and I again support the gentleman's bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Alabama rendered great service in 1967.

I did not refer to those hearings, but we held, as the gentleman knows, substantial hearings in 1967 and again in 1968. And, as I have said, we have held over 30 days of hearings this year. We have gone at this matter very thoroughly.

The gentleman knows that I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Operations for some 17 years. During those 17 years we have looked at literally hundreds, possibly thousands, of contracts which have been referred to us from Members on both sides of the aisles for scrutiny, for fraud, inefficient procedures, or unfair procedures. In going through those years of work and those contracts, and doing all that I could do to bring economy and efficiency into the practices, I became convinced that this is such a tremendous job that no committee of Congress, unless it gave its full time for a couple of years to the subject, could do the job.

We have so many duties in our different committees, and on the floor of the House with legislation from other committees, that we do not have the time nor the staff expertise or enough staff to really look at this tremendous problem resulting from the proliferation of the departments of Government and the diversity of processes.

I have had many small businessmen—the gentleman from Illinois mentioned the troubles of small businessmen—come to me and say: "When we learn how to do business with the Defense Department and then we go to NASA or we go to the Atomic Energy Commission or to HEW or DOT, then we find that they use different procedures. They have different forms for us to fill out. Why can we not have uniform, standard forms as far as possible?"

I think there is a job there that can be done to bring about uniform procedures, practices, application for bids, and that sort of thing in all departments of the Government.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield further, the remarkable thing to me is, with all the contracts of the Government, the size of the bureaucracy, that the procurement system works at all. I think we have been very fortunate to have had a good procurement system. But I think we all agree that there is much in it that needs to be changed, looked at, and improved upon. Certainly I hope the work of the Commission will finally result in that type of improvement.

It is also noteworthy to me that the various Cabinet departments support this bill. The Secretary of Defense has given his wholehearted support to it. I am really looking forward to some good work on the part of the Commission. I am happy to have been a part of the bill, a cosponsor, and again, I commend the gentleman and his committee for the work they have done.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. On page 1 line 6, the following language appears: "in the procurement of goods, services, and facilities by and for the executive branch of the Federal Government." And you outline 12 items. As you and I know, the General Services Administration is authorized in certain instances to transfer and trade real estate by the Federal Government with individuals. Would the proposed Commission have a right to look into that particular situation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I said before, the General Services Administration is the result of a bill that I produced, and we passed it in 1949. It is called the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. It would have a great deal to do along that line. It handles property. It handles leasing. It is the housekeeper for the other agencies of Government. It sells surplus property. I might say that I served on the Rizley Committee immediately after World War II, during the 80th to 83d Congresses, when the Republicans were in power. Mr. Rizley of Oklahoma, who is now deceased, was my chairman and we studied this problem of the disposal of surplus property. As the gentleman from Illinois said, there was a tremendous loss to the Government in disposal of property, both real property and personal property. They do have the authority to look into that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. They have the authority now and use it in certain instances, taking trades.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Property of the U.S. Government with individuals.

My question is, Will this Commission have a right to call in the GSA and say, "What is your procedure here? What is the safeguard the Government has in these transactions?" Would the gentleman be able to look into those situations?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This Commission would have authority to look into that. If the gentleman will turn to page 6, he will see there listed the powers of the Commission. It can bring before it witnesses and administer oaths, and it can acquire directly from the head of any Federal department or agency information deemed useful in the discharge of the Commission's duties. The paragraph goes on to say:

> All departments and agencies of the Government are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I assume if the gentleman would happen to be on the Commission, he would follow through on that?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly would.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentlemen is expert in that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the

gentleman will allow me, I will reserve the balance of my time. I regret I have taken so much time because there are others who may wish to speak.

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

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

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 474, the bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement. It is timely and important. It is a means to achieve great money savings, and it seeks greater efficiency in the vast procurement business of Government which exceeds $50 billion a year.

Efficiency in Government procurement, Mr. Chairman, is not a one-sided process because there are two parties to a contract of a company as well as a Government agency. Efficiency in Government procurement can be brought about if contractors are not overburdened with unnecessary paperwork, if procurement regulations are stated clearly enough and simply enough so that businessmen can understand them and prepare their bids or offers in the proper way. And so the bill contemplates that the Commission on Procurement will look at issues from both sides in the interest of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, which also includes fair dealing between the Government and its contractors.

I do not pretend to be an expert in this complex field but I do know, as a Member of Congress, that there are many problems that need attention. I am sure that most Members are made aware of these problems not only by the daily newspapers and speeches in the Congress but by businessmen who write letters and visit congressional offices complaining about some real or fancied error or injustice on the part of Government in its numerous business transactions. As the gentleman from California once remarked, businessmen are often inclined to look upon the Congress as a source selection board.

We in Congress do not exercise a procurement function, which really is a function of the executive branch. We authorize the programs, we provide the funds, we try to supervise administration of the programs, and expenditure of the funds. But since we do not do the buying, we should at least try to make it possible for others to do a better job of buying. H.R. 474 offers a way to help the Government do a better job.

One of the great problems in Government procurement is people. Industry has high-paid lawyers and procurement experts on their side of the table. Oftentimes the Government counterpart is a man of GS–7 or GS–9 salary, of varying experience, who works in quarters that are ill-equipped and poorly staffed. We need to upgrade procurement on the personnel side through more training, better pay, suitable work surroundings.

This bill is pointed toward improvement of procurement organizations and personnel, among many other objectives. With the multibillion-dollar transactions involved in major procurement today, it just does not make sense for the Government to stint on a few dollars to assemble the talents and raise the performance levels of Government procurement and contracting officers.

This is not intended as a criticism of the many conscientious and dedicated military and civilian procurement officers who work long hours and get little or no recognition for their efforts in the Government's behalf. Let not the horror stories of procurement mistakes lead you to believe that they are the rule rather than the exception. The fact is that there is a great amount of talent and expertise in Government procurement today. What we need is to make sure that these resources are brought to bear effectively. We need to organize them better and give procurement more prestige and status, because such large sums of money are involved.

In military procurement, for example, it has been pointed out that the paths to career advancement are not in procurement but in more military-type activities. This is understandable and perhaps to a degree necessary, but the time has come, Mr. Chairman, to recognize that a large portion of military dollars is expended on the business side, and we have to bring a more businesslike approach to military spending.

The studies of the two Hoover Commissions, quite some years ago, showed insight and understanding of the need to put the business side of the military house in order. Many changes have come about since those studies were made, as the gentleman from California pointed out, and many new problems have developed, but I believe the essential lesson is still to be learned that the best fighters are not necessarily the best buyers. I see in this Commission on Government Procurement a great opportunity to open up creative investigations and studies, which will give due attention to the people side of the procurement process.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the full support of the Committee on Government Operations. It is bipartisan in that it provides for House and Senate Members to be drawn equally from both parties. It has the strong support of the Comptroller General, the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and many other agencies of the Government as well as business, professional, and technical organizations, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) has pointed out. I commend this bill to you as the right way to go about solving some very difficult problems.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her comments and for her assistance and help in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse everything that my chairman and good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) has said about H.R. 474, the bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement. I was a cosponsor of this bill from the very beginning, and I sat through those long hearings with the Chairman, which he mentioned in his remarks.

The hearings on H.R. 474, as the gentleman from California explained, were designed to identify problem areas. They had a plan and a purpose. This is what we sought to do:

First. To hear from the Government departments and agencies which account for the great bulk of procurement spending. These include the Department of Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Atomic Energy Commission, and General Services Administration. Since the Department of Defense is preeminent in the spending of procurement dollars, the subcommittee examined procurement at the Defense level in terms of policy, funding controls, contract administration, and contract auditing. Procurement functions and activities of the Defense Supply Agency and the several military departments also were reviewed. There was considerable discussion of problems associated with selected weapon programs, such as the Air Force's C–5A cargo aircraft, the Army's Cheyenne helicopter, and the Navy's shipbuilding.

Second. To get a cross section view of civil agency procurement, with particular attention to those departments and agencies which have a potential for substantially increased procurement as efforts are made to solve pressing urban problems. The subcommittee took testimony from the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Transportation; and Post Office; and from the Veterans' Administration. Significantly, some of the strongest endorsements of the bill in the executive branch came from heads of the newer departments—HEW, HUD, DOT.

Third. To examine the procurement process from the standpoint of those agencies whose regulatory, investigative, administrative, or adjudicative functions are important in guiding or controlling this process. In this category prepared and oral presentations were made by the Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, Small Business Administration, and the Departments of Justice and Labor. The Renegotiation Board submitted a written statement.

Fourth. To examine in more depth and detail selected functional or problem areas which cut across agency lines or are common to several or all of them. Here the subcommittee examined such problem areas as support service contracting, procedures for resolving contract disputes, and financial risks to the public and contractors arising from catastrophic accidents.

I might point out to the members of the Committee that 20-some different problem areas we discussed in the report, and some of the areas which we held hearings on are:

Modernizing the procurement statutes;
Simplifying the regulations;
Training of procurement personnel;
Procurement organizations;
Promoting more competition;
Incentive contracting;
Total package procurement;
Source selection and performance evaluation;
Government work in-house or by contract;
Government-furnished property;
Truth in negotiations;

Cost estimation;
Profits and risks;
Reduction of paperwork;
Small business;
Procurement against poverty;
Fair employment and public contracting;
Labor standards on public contracts;
Patents and proprietary data;
Conflicts of interest;
Bid protests;
Contract appeal board structure;
Resolution of contract disputes;
Role of the contract auditor;
Architect-engineer services;
Rights of the subcontractor;
Financial risks of catastrophic accidents; and
Contracts versus grants.

These are just some of the areas set forth. As the chairman pointed out, we had 33 days of hearings with over 100 witnesses. I believe it is very important for us to consider this when we think in terms of the work of the Commission.

The fifth purpose of the hearings was to afford an opportunity to any individual, group, or organization to come before the subcommittee and discuss procurement problems in connection with H.R. 474 from the standpoint of special knowledge and experience or economic interest. Among the organizations which endorsed H.R. 474 are the American Bar Association—Public Contracts Law Section; National Institute of Governmental Purchasing, Inc.; Federal Executives Institute; American Institute of Architects; National Association of Wholesalers; National Tool, Die, and Precision Machinery Association; Aerospace Industries Association; National Security Industrial Association, and Electronic Industries Association. The subcommittee also heard individuals in Government, industry, academic, and legal circles who have had many years of experience in dealing with Government procurement matters.

I must confess that until I sat through this extensive round of hearings, I never appreciated fully the magnitude and complexity of the problems in Government procurement. Of course, as a member of the Small Business Committee, and as a Congressman listening to many complaints and grievances of businessmen in my district, I had a pretty good working knowledge of the subject. But I am convinced today, more than ever, that this Commission is urgently needed and that it has a vitally important job to do.

This bill will help small business. I note that our colleague, Mr. CORMAN, of California, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement of the House Small Business Committee, also is a sponsor of this bill. I believe that small business desperately needs some help in the procurement field and will get some real benefits from this legislation. If we can do nothing more than make the procurement process and the regulations more understandable to the small businessman, the Commission will have fully justified itself.

Note that the procurement study proposed in the bill is governmentwide. It is not limited to the military. The military spend the bulk of the moneys, but increasingly the civilian departments and agencies are being thrust into the procurement process as they cope with difficult problems of our urban and rural areas. They are expanding their procurements of complex technical goods and services, and they have a lot to learn by way of procurement training, organization, and procedures. Not surprisingly, this bill is warmly endorsed by the Secretaries of the newer departments like DOT, HEW, and HUD.

And, as far as the military side is concerned, I want to emphasize again what the gentleman from California has said about Secretary Laird's support. I have talked personally to Mel Laird about this bill and I can assure you that he goes all the way with us.

It is true that the Secretary has set up a "blue ribbon" panel to look at various defense matters, not only procurement, but organization, research and development, command and control, and other matters as assigned. The Secretary proposed such a group even before he came into office. Its tenure is rather brief, only one year, and its members include persons who are not experts in the procurement field. As Secretary Laird pointed out, the Commission on Government Procurement would complement rather than compete with his group.

Secretary Laird has not only given me his assurance personally of his support for H.R. 474, but he has gone on the record with a public statement. He says simply and clearly:

> Recognizing that improvements in our Federal procurement practices and procedures can result in strengthened defense and significant benefits to the taxpayer, I wish to state my unqualified support for the establishment of a Commission on Government Procurement.

This statement was made publicly on July 31, 1969, when the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, Barry J. Shillito, was about to testify before the committee of the other body on the companion bill to H.R. 474.

I believe we have to consider the bill before us today in the light of the situation that confronts the Congress. On all sides we hear about procurement overruns, performance underruns, mistakes of judgment. Many of these were made in past administrations, but there is no magic formula that will solve the problems of the present administration. Unless we set up a group to examine procurement policies, procedures, and practices, without fear or favor, without any ax to grind, without any deadlines to beat or headlines to make, what will we get? As the gentleman from California said, we will get legislation from the floor.

The choice now is between a Commission for constructive and comprehensive change, and legislation by floor amendment to patch only the most glaring weaknesses in our procurement structure.

Let me more fully explain why I believe that floor amendments, aimed at alleviating specific and isolated procurement problems, or at changing particular procurement judgments or priorities, cannot even begin to solve the morass of difficulties and inconsistencies in this area.

First, I believe it would be instructive to review briefly, the Federal statutes which deal with Government procurement. The two key laws which govern procurement policies are the Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. In addition, title 41, United States Code, contains major "guideline" legislation in the procurement field.

In addition to these three basic sources of procurement law there are no less than 22 ancillary statutes affecting Federal procurement. To afford some taste of how intricate and extensive this field is, I will take the liberty of listing these ancillary laws. They include the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended; the Small Business Act of 1963, as amended; the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; the Freedom of Information Act, as amended; the Assignment of Claims Act; the Tucker Act, as amended; Public Law 85–804; the Wunderlich Act; the Miller Act; the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended; the Public Contracts Act; the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Work Hours Act of 1962; the Service Contract Act of 1965; the Copeland Act; the Buy America Act, as amended; in addition to numerous conflict of interest statutes and laws concerning prison-made and blind-made supplies, and legislation requiring appropriations prior to contracting. Brief descriptions of each of these sundry statutes and their relation to the procurement process can be found beginning on page 690 of volume 3 of the Military Operations Subcommittee's recent hearings.

Of course, each of these statutory provisions has given rise to a proliferation of agency regulations and requirements. In many cases, agencies have used legislative language to stretch their power and influence over larger and larger segments of the procurement pie. One example that was brought out in our hearings will serve to illustrate the depth of the problem. The Service Contract Act of 1965 is principally designed to provide for payment of minimum wages and for the observance of safety and health rules on all contracts of the Government the principal purpose of which is the performance of maintenance services—such as guards, janitors, mechanics, laborers, and so forth. One of our witnesses testified that the agency administering this law had stretched its interpretation to bring aircraft flight instructors under its wing. The agency's reasoning went something like this and I quote:

> Flight instructors, in addition to providing ground instruction as to the theory of flying, also take students on actual flights. As the work of a pilot concerns itself with the need for manual dexterity, a degree of physical strength and other physical processes necessary to control an airplane in flight, it seems reasonable to classify such employees as "laborers or mechanics."

A category of worker covered under the act.

As the witness observed, through this

reasoning process any occupation including that of a surgeon could be "umbrella-ed" under the jurisdiction of this law. The additional paperwork, redtape, and inefficiency that would be involved in each procurement transaction if only a few of these 25 statutes were so stretched beyond their original intent is easily foreseen—if indeed it is not already happening.

Including flight instructors under a law meant to protect the wages levels and working conditions of unskilled laborers is but one isolated problem affecting procurement which has arisen over a single provision of a single law. There are literally hundreds of other such problems woven into our present procurement structure. For Congress to ferret out and correct each of these on a piecemeal basis would take years, and maybe decades.

The problems of inefficiency, waste, and policy priorities are far too urgent today for us to sit back and try to untangle this morass through patchwork or piecemeal legislation. It is obvious that our procurement system must be shaped up and modernized, so that our constituents get more for each tax dollar spent on goods and services.

I think there is no doubt that a comprehensive study of the overall procurement structure, by a working commission of experts, committed to trimming the fat and to finding workable, possible solutions, and alternatives, is essential if this job is to be done properly and if it is to be done anytime soon.

I think this bill makes more sense now than it ever did, and I hope that it will be enacted into law so that the Commission can get organized and get down to work and come up with more efficiency and economy in Government procurement and a break for the taxpayers.

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

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

Mr. KYL. This bill in no way gives any sanction to the Federal Government agencies' interpretation regarding Federal purchasing for States?

Mr. HORTON. No, it does not.

Mr. KYL. I just want to add one other thing. A short period of time ago I received from a small industry in my district information regarding an order in which the Department of Defense was trying to procure $8.75 worth of repair parts for lawnmowers and the seller had to fill out 16 different pages to complete this transaction for less than $10 worth of parts.

Mr. HORTON. I want to sympathize with the gentleman and make the point that he made and on which I agree with him 100 percent. That is one of the reasons why this Commission is so important. We found in the work we did and in the hearings we held it was one of the problems that the small businessman had; namely, the tremendous amount of paperwork involved. It is my hope that this Commission will tackle this problem and come up with very concrete proposals which will help the small businessman when he is dealing with the Federal Government.

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

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I was here, as was the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), when the Defense Department was established. At that time we were led to believe that this would provide for the ne plus ultra in purchasing, including commonality of articles. There was to be a common purchasing catalog and all that sort of thing. The Defense Department was sold on that basis. Apparently it has not worked out that way. Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. HORTON. Let me say it this way: Much of that has been done. This Commission is not necessarily to criticize but to point out a lot more that has to be done. The gentleman's comment is a good one, because there are places where there can be duplication and where duplication has arisen. The Defense Department, for example—and we also heard from NASA in this regard—has tried to meet and get together to accomplish the purpose that the gentleman is talking about. Unfortunately it breaks down in many instances. That is one of the objections that the Commission can help to eliminate.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the contracting out and the use of consulting firms and contracting firms, is it planned to go into that form of contracting and purchasing of services outside of the various agencies and departments of the Government?

Mr. HORTON. Yes. I can say to the gentleman that is one of the areas the Commission will certainly look into.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly hope so.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. HORTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 474.

Mr. Chairman, I came onto this subcommittee rather late, just during the last 3 months, but in the very limited time during which I served on the subcommittee it is my considered judgment based upon the testimony presented to the committee that we certainly need this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Commission would be a working commission. All of us have seen many commissions which have been functional in name only. However, here is one which would provide the tools with which we can streamline procurement in the various departments and agencies of the Government in order to save the taxpayers' money. And if we are to save the taxpayers' money we must first do it right here in this body through legislation and by being wise in our appropriations. After we have funded the various procurements through appropriations, we must see that the executive branch does a good job of procurement and in carrying out the intent of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this Commission is certainly needed here, as the gentleman from New York has said, to provide for the taxpayers of this country a fair return for their tax dollar invested, which I believe this Commission can do if we enact this legislation.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his comments and to tell the gentleman we were very pleased to have him as a member of the subcommittee. It is my recollection that the gentleman attended all of the hearings of the subcommittee after his assignment to the subcommittee and I certainly want to thank him with reference to his comments about the make-up of the Commission, because I know he shares with the chairman the view that this should be a hard-working Commission. It is a very important Commission. It has a tremendous task to perform, a task which in my opinion is impossible of accomplishment within the confines of the Congress, but one which I think can be accomplished by hard-working industrious people who will study this problem of procurement and come up with some meaningful recommendations and suggestions.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

SMALL BUSINESS ASPECTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 474, a bill to create a Commission on Government Procurement. As the ranking minority member of the House Small Business Committee, I would like to point out that this Commission can be helpful to small business, and small business needs help.

As disclosed in the subcommittee hearings on H.R. 474, conducted by the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), the small business share of defense prime contracts has declined, as shown in recent statistics. The small business share of defense procurement dollars declined from 21.8 percent for fiscal year 1966 to 18.8 percent in fiscal year 1968. The decline has been attributed to the changed composition of procurement, particularly an increase in missile and space system hardware and other systems supposedly beyond the capabilities of small business.

The basic procurement statutes advocate a fair share of Government procurement to small business. And the Small Business Act provides techniques and resources for assisting small business and promoting procurement opportunities in that sector.

Small business participates in Government procurement through direct contract awards in ordinary competition, through subcontracts from prime contractors, and through small business set-asides, which may be total or partial. I might note here that certain large Government contractors, such as General Electric which has a major plant in my hometown of Pittsfield, have developed excellent small business programs of their own, providing coordination, cooperation, and assistance for small business concerns and subcontractors. The Small Business Administrator shares responsi-

bilities with Government contracting officers in having statutory authority to certify the competency of small business firms for Government awards in terms of capacity and credit.

The report accompanying H.R. 474 raises questions as to whether small business participation can be enhanced by more set-asides, more subcontracting by primes, breakout of selected items from big systems for small business award, better deployment of small business specialists in procuring organizations, simplification of regulations and paperwork, expanding the authority of the Small Business Administrator to certify the competency of small firms, and other measures.

More facts are needed. In order to help small business more effectively, we need the results of the studies of the Commission on Government Procurement, and we should enact H.R. 474 as soon as possible.

Small business concerns always face particular problems in dealing with Government procurement which are much more difficult for them to handle due to their size. Besides the paperwork of regulation and administration, there are always barriers of information that must be surmounted by small business producers in order to find out what contracts can be competed for, what agencies have needs, what the specifications are, and whether they need to be the way they are.

In order to have a healthy climate for the small businessman, he needs as much of a one-stop service as he can get, so that he can put his major effort into making a good product for the Government. But no such service is available. Businessmen must go from agency to agency to search out the list of things that are needed that he can supply, with no assurance that he can find anything at all.

The Commission on Government Procurement, when it is formed, should make it a part of its job to examine all of the agency small business programs, to assess their effectiveness, and suggest as many ways as possible for the agencies to coordinate their efforts, cooperate, and bring their procurement information together for the benefit of the small business enterprises who cannot afford the expertise that larger firms can in dealing with these matters. It should also undertake to assess the cumulative effect of the agency procurement policies on the small firms with whom they do business.

If it can do these things, the Commission on Government Procurement will not only be a great boon to small business, it will inevitably help to improve the competitive climate, broaden the procurement base, and help the Government buy what it needs, when it needs, at sound and reasonable prices.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN).

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to point out that at the present time the fact that our Federal Government is spending almost $55 billion a year of the American taxpayers' hard-earned money to buy supplies and equipment from private industry. As Members of Congress, it is our duty to see to it that these dollars are spent as wisely and as efficiently as possible and that the taxpayer gets the best possible return for his money.

I am sure that we all agree that overseeing these enormous expenditures is a tremendously difficult task. We all know of the examples of waste and inefficiency in Government procurement which have been called to the attention of Congress and of the public in the past few years. In the case of many other contracts, confusion and doubt have arisen because our procurement and contracting practices, the contracts themselves, and the applicable laws and regulations have become so proliferated and so complicated that even lawyers, accountants and other experts cannot understand and apply them all.

Contracts made by competitive bidding are so changed by negotiated change orders that the original specifications and prices become meaningless. Negotiated fixed price contracts turn out to have no fixed price at all. Cost contracts with fixed fees, incentive and award fees often multiply costs beyond anyone's expectation. Estimates, also, have often become meaningless, and accusations and counter accusations have become the order of the day. Critics claim or imply great waste exists, while many contractors point to losses or low profits on Government work. Even the Comptroller General can do little to stem the tide.

This measure, H.R. 474, offers a ray of hope in this dark and desperate situation. The Commission it will set up to study the procurement laws, regulations and practices will be able to make use of the best minds and the most experienced expertise to bring order into our present chaos. I am sure that the members of the Commission themselves will be selected on the basis of their knowledge, experience and firm determination to reestablish our procurement laws on a solid and workable foundation.

As each day passes, the procurement system becomes more entangled in its own complexities. As a first and essential step on the road back.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) in urging the passage of this legislation.

I would be remiss, Mr. Chairman, if I did not compliment both the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON). I did not attend all of the hearings because of duties on other committees that I had to attend that were of equal importance in my mind. However, these two gentlemen have given untold hours to this legislation, not only in this Congress but in the previous Congress. I believe the work that they have done is reflected in the report and in the hearings.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I believe a great deal of credit should go to the committee staff for the yeoman work that they have done on this legislation. Without their working nights and weekends on the background it would have been indeed difficult for us to comprehend or even begin to try to comprehend the chaos that exists. I am sure that with the passage of this legislation the fruits of their labors will be realized.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, when a labor bill comes to Congress which has the sanction of both management and the unions, we are prone to hasten the passage of the necessary law. This is natural. It is well to formalize the arrangement whenever antagonists find a common ground.

The Committee on Government Operations has reported out H.R. 474, for the creation of a Commission on Government Procurement. As one of the cosponsors, I was interested to find that buyers in the several Government departments testified in favor of this bill, and we found similar good reception from the sellers—from the men in industry who do business with their Government.

The most often heard argument against this bill is that the Commission would do what the various committees are supposed to be doing all the time. I think this may have a certain theoretical validity, but I think it lacks practical merit.

First, if the committees were to survey this procurement field, every one of them would need more staff people. And second, virtually every committee has so many other concerns—so many other things to do—that it is difficult for them to give this procurement study the kind of attention that is needed.

Finally, this bill calls for a Commission of limited tenure. This is intentional. We believe the Commission can concentrate its efforts over a 2-year period and can come in with recommendations which will lead us toward more economical buying practices in the Federal Government.

The procurement regulations of the various departments have grown piecemeal. Each department has, from time to time, asked for changes to solve one problem or another. In some cases, the problem has long since disappeared, but the regulation has remained nevertheless.

As a result, a small businessman who has learned to bid on—let us say—supplies for the Department of Labor may find that he has a completely different set of rules to follow in presenting his case to the Agriculture Department or the Department of Interior.

This diversity is only a small problem to the huge corporation which sells several million dollars' worth of goods and services to the Federal Government annually. It is a major stumbling block, however, to the small businessman who measures his Government contracts in the hundreds or the thousands of dollars. And this costs the Government money. It reduces the number of bidders and, inevitably, reduces the number of low bidders.

I hope, therefore, that a Commission on Government Procurement would find ways to simplify the regulations of the various executive departments and, as nearly as practicable, to make them uniform.

The last full-scale review of Govern-

ment procurement was made by the first Hoover Commission in 1949—20 years ago. Since then, the value of supplies and equipment bought by the Government has risen from $9 to $55 billion. To me, this argues strongly that it is time to take another look at this activity.

In the intervening 20 years, there have been many new developments which affect procurement. There have been new techniques in contracting, new methods of contract administration, and a huge rise in the contracting of research and development. Automatic data processing, unknown two decades ago, has been adapted both to inventories and to procurement.

We now have rules about procurement in labor surplus areas and about buying from small businesses. We have developed a national system for the procurement and distribution of supplies; and we have learned to save money by having private contractors on Federal projects buy their supplies from Federal sources.

None of these were covered in the Hoover Commission recommendations because they were not known then.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is the biggest—but far from the most efficient—business in our big country. It is so big that even a tiny refinement in buying practices can save tens of thousands of dollars; so big that a small improvement may easily save a million dollars; and so dynamic that regulations which were adequate in 1949 are in many cases inadequate to the needs of 1969.

The Government Operations Committee was unanimous in its approval of this bill. Its report contains several pages of excerpts from the testimony of various department heads, all urging that it be passed. These statements are followed by more declarations by officers of various trade associations. They also voice support of a Commission on Government Procurement.

These are the buyers and the sellers; and both sides agree on this point. I believe it is time that Congress hasten to ratify their agreement.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman for his comments and to tell him it was a privilege and an honor to work with him when he was a member of this subcommittee. I feel that the House should know that the gentleman from Illinois spent a great amount of time working on this bill, attending the hearings, and he was very conscientious in his work with the subcommittee. I regret that he is no longer a member of the subcommittee, but we do value his comments and the remarks that he has made here today very highly, because in the last two Congresses he has been very concerned about this very important problem and in judgment presents an expertise which is invaluable.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 474. I believe it is proper and necessary for the Congress to create a commission to carry out the congressional duties of overseeing procurement of military and other equipment. However, even as we create this Commission we should remember that it is a congressional duty which we are delegating to the Commission.

Of late, much has been said and written about clause 1 of section 2 of article II of the Constitution which provides that:

> The President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

Under the Constitution the President commands whatsoever Armed Forces are provided to him but the decision as to the number of soldiers and sailors and whether they shall be equipped with ABM's and MIRV's is, under our Constitution, not his decision to make. Under our Constitution the power to make these decisions is given to the Congress of the United States.

The so-called "war power" clauses of the Constitution are clauses 11, 12, 13, and 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution. These clauses provide that Congress has power: "to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the Government and regulations of the land and naval forces." Under the constitutional authority "to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy" we the Congress could properly enact statutory procurement rules and regulations, or as is contemplated by the bill, H.R. 474, we can create a commission to do the job for us. There is no question that the job must be done. The Armed Services Committee and our Military Operations Subcommittee have unearthed enough real procurement horror stories in the Defense Department to assure that the Commission will have plenty of work to do.

On May 15, 1969, the case of the Army's Cheyenne helicopter came before the subcommittee. One of the main troubles with this helicopter, we were told, was that the newly developed rigid rotor blade "oscillated." This seemed mild enough until it was brought out that it "oscillated" so much that one time it amputated the canopy in which the pilot would sit. The officer testifying protested and said:

> But sir, that wasn't planned.

Last Wednesday while undergoing 100 knot wind tunnel tests, a Cheyenne helicopter was "totally destroyed."

On May 14, 1969, the case of the Sheridan armored vehicle, or more accurately its infamous turret and caseless cartridge, came before the subcommittee. It was revealed that the Army rushed into production of the chassis for this $1.3 billion vehicle to avoid "adverse and political and budgetary impacts," even though it was clear the ammunition for the vehicle's gun just would not work.

The insidious relationship between some in the military and some in the defense contract industry is also illustrated in the C–5 aircraft. Here is illustrated a classic case of a sweetheart contract. It was a beautiful buy-in bailout deal. The contractor bid in well below the Air Force's estimate of the cost for first run, or run A of the C–5 airplane.

The contractor could afford to bid in under the repricing formula in the sweetheart contract because it would be bailed out if the Air Force ordered the second phase for run B. There was little doubt that the Air Force would exercise the option to order run B. The fact of the $2 billion overrun was shocking enough, but even more shocking is the fact that the existence of these overruns was deleted from official Air Force reports "under direction of higher authorities." When asked why this was done, the Systems Program Director, in a very dramatic moment in a hearing before our subcommittee, revealed that this concealment was not for the benefit of the Government or the taxpayer, but to protect "Lockheed's position in the common stock market." Mr. Chairman, concern with the stock market position of a defense contractor is not, I submit, a proper function of an Air Force official.

In addition to specific rules and regulations, the Commission will have to deal with the attitude of prevailing in procurement. This attitude was eloquently described in testimony by Gordon W. Rule in the case of the F–111B, and particularly Gordon Rule's assessment of the attitude of one Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Gordon Rule testified as follows:

> I know of one such secretary who will tell you that he believes no defense contractor should be allowed to lose money on a Government contract and whose test of a contractor who has failed to live up to the terms of a contract is "could any other contractor in that industry have done better?"
>
> I strongly suggest that no man with such a philosophy should ever be appointed an Assistant Secretary for I&L, because such a person provides the negotiators on the firing line the antithesis of sound procurement leadership.

There is much that a Procurement Commission can do and the most important of all is to change the attitude on the part of those engaged in procurement.

Even as we recognize that there are things which a Procurement Commission can do, we in the Congress must also recognize that there are things that the Commission cannot do, and that only we in the Congress can do. The Constitution gives to Congress the responsibility for considering all the needs of the Nation, not merely the military. The first clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution expresses this idea very succinctly. It says:

> The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises, to Pay the Debts and *provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.*

Congress should take a hard look at our general purpose conventional forces because these items involve over 60 percent of the Defense Department's budget.

In the Joint Economic Committee hearings, Dr. Karl Kaysen projected a

greatly reduced military budget by changing the two-war-plus policy and that we should "maintain no continuing ground force commitment in Asia."

The Constitution directs the Congress to provide not only for "the common defense" but also for the "general welfare" of the United States. If we are to provide the funds for housing, education, and so forth which the "general welfare" requires, the best source of additional funds seems to be those conventional forces which are not needed or which are only "marginally" needed for the "common defense."

The enactment of H.R. 474 and the establishment of a Procurement Commission will be good for the country, but we in the Congress must realize that it is not a complete discharge of our constitutional duties. It still continues to be our duty to the Constitution to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today, H.R. 474, to establish a temporary commission of experts on Government procurement, is a much needed piece of legislation, and I am pleased to support it. I hope it is adopted.

This bill would set up a new Commission to carry on a full-scale review of Government procurement policies and practices. This has not been done since the Hoover Commission's report led to the enactment of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act in 1949. During the period from 1949 to 1969, the dollar value of Government procurement awards for supplies and equipment has increased from about $9 billion to about $55 billion, according to the Bureau of the Budget.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am fully aware of the need for a stronger check on Government spending. The taxpayers properly demand this and the Congress has an obligation to provide it.

I have sponsored legislation in this Congress which would strengthen the economy of the Federal Government. One of the bills, H.R. 340, is a wider version of the bill we are considering today. It would establish a program to study existing Federal activities to determine if full advantage is being taken to benefit the American people at the lowest possible cost. Another bill, H.R. 13260, would prohibit former Federal employees who participated in a contract formulation from being employed by anyone who has a direct interest in the contract for a period of 2 years. This legislation is similar to a bill I first introduced in 1951. In light of recent findings concerning the so-called military-industrial complex and the questions of overruns on contracts, and the apparent lack of adequate fiscal controls in some areas of defense spending the legislation is clearly needed. A third bill, H.R. 951, would establish a Budgetary Information Service to help Congress modernize its authorization and appropriations systems. A fourth bill, H.R. 12256, would impose an excess profits tax on corporate profits. A similar tax during the Korean conflict added $8 billion to Treasury. I think all these bills are needed.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to voice my strong endorsement of the bill which is being considered on the floor of the House today—namely, H.R. 474—legislation authorizing the establishment of a Commission on Government Procurement.

I am confident that most of my colleagues in the Congress agree that the immediate establishment of such a commission is not only timely, but long overdue. We in the Congress must face up to the fact that we at the moment do not possess the insights or resources to enable us to police effectively the multibillion-dollar procurement activities of the Federal Government, and particularly in the area of defense procurement. All evidence points to the fact that the executive branch, too, especially since the escalation of hostilities in Vietnam, has found it increasingly difficult, if not impossible to maintain tight control over the procurement process.

Today we live in a period of unprecedented change, which has brought about a radical shift in the order of our Nation's priorities. We have suddenly awakened to the fact that our Nation's cities are in serious trouble. Our State and local governments are finding themselves in a critical fiscal bind due to the insistent and well warranted demands for more public services by the American people. Thus the Federal Government has and will continue to be called upon to play a more direct and active role in combating the many pressing social and economic ills facing our Nation today.

Given this setting, it is abundantly clear that the Federal Government must give top priority to the objective of getting the most out of every dollar spent by the National Treasury. I can think of no better place to start than in the area of procurement. Today the Government spends approximately $50 billion for the procurement of goods, services, and facilities—the bulk of which is accounted for by Defense procurement. We in the future must insure against the likelihood of excessive and unnecessary cost overruns in Defense and other types of Federal procurement—which have recently received such widespread public attention. We must give top priority to improvement of the overall efficiency of the procurement process. These improvements must come from both the Government and its contractors.

In sum, it is clear that our control over the procurement process has broken down. What is clearly needed now is strong bipartisan effort in the Congress to reestablish an effective system of control. The establishment of an independent Commission on Government Procurement—which at this moment clearly possesses strong bipartisan support in the Congress—would indeed move us a giant step forward on this matter of grave national importance. Hence, I urge again quick and favorable support of the legislation which we are being asked to consider today.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to use the 1 minute I have remaining to echo the praise that the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) gave to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) for his hard work on the committee and to all members of the subcommittee who attended the meetings and worked on this matter.

I also want to say I do not think we could have had a more devoted staff, both on the majority side and the minority side, because they certainly responded to every request of the members.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time. I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 474

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the procurement of goods, services, and facilities by and for the executive branch of the Federal Government by—

(1) establishing policies, procedures, and practices which will require the Government to acquire goods, services, and facilities of the requisite quality and within the time needed at the lowest reasonable cost; utilizing competitive bidding to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) improving the quality, efficiency, economy, and performance of Government procurement organizations and personnel;

(3) avoiding or eliminating unnecessary overlapping or duplication of procurement and related activities;

(4) avoiding or eliminating unnecessary or redundant requirements placed on contractor and Federal procurement officials;

(5) identifying gaps, omissions, or inconsistencies in procurement laws, laws, regulations, and directives;

(6) achieving greater uniformity and simplicity whenever appropriate, in procurement procedures;

(7) coordinating procurement policies and programs of the several departments and agencies;

(8) conforming procurement policies and programs, whenever appropriate, to other established Government policies and programs;

(9) minimizing possible disruptive effects of Government procurement on particular industries, areas, or occupations;

(10) improving understanding of Government procurement laws and policies within the Government and by organizations and individuals doing business with the Government;

(11) promoting fair dealing and equitable relationships among the parties in Government contracting; and

(12) otherwise promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in Government procurement organizations and operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. To accomplish the policy set forth in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Government Procurement (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of fourteen members, including (1) four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate (who shall not be members of the same political party), and two from outside the Federal Government, (2) four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives (who shall not be members of the same political party), and two from outside the Federal Government, and (3) six appointed by the President of the United States, three from the executive

branch of the Government, and three from outside the Federal Government.

(b) The Comptroller General of the United States or his designated representative shall be an ex officio member of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Any vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate the present statutes affecting Government procurement; the procurement policies, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices followed by the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and the organizations by which procurement is accomplished to determine to what extent these facilitate the policy set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) Within two years from the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall make a final report to the Congress of its findings and of its recommendations for changes in statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures designed to carry out the policy stated in section 1 of this Act. In the event the Congress is not in session at the end of such two-year period, the final report shall be submitted to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. The Commission may also make such interim reports as it deems advisable.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or who are officers or employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses (or in the alternative, mileage for use of privately owned vehicles and a per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed the rates prescribed in 5 U.S.C. 5702, 5704), and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I, chapter 57 of title 5 of the United States Code, the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, or section 5731 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The members of the Commission appointed from outside the Federal Government shall each receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission in addition to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing subsection.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission, or at its direction any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such subcommittee or member.

(b) The Commission is authorized to acquire directly from the head of any Federal department or agency information deemed useful in the discharge of its duties. All departments and agencies of the Government are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish all information requested by the Commission to the extent permitted by law. All such requests shall be made by or in the name of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and such personnel may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and general schedule pay rates, but no individual shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum rate authorized by the General Schedule. In addition, the Commission may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem.

(d) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private organizations and educational institutions to carry out such studies and prepare such reports as the Commission determines are necessary in order to carry out its duties.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES AUTHORIZED TO AID COMMISSION

SEC. 7. Any department or agency of the Government is authorized to provide for the Commission such services as the Commission requests on such basis, reimbursable or otherwise, as may be agreed between the department or agency and the Chairman or Vice Chairman. All such requests shall be made by or in the name of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. One hundred and twenty days after the submission of the final report provided for in section 4 of this Act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 3, line 19, after "the Federal Government", insert "(who shall not be members of the same political party)".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like, if I may, to just explain the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was merely going to ask the gentleman, since his amendments are of the same nature, if he would consider having them read and considered en bloc.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thought it might be simpler to proceed the other way, but if the gentleman would prefer, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the three amendments which are of the same nature considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 3, line 23, after "the Federal Government", insert "(who shall not be members of the same political party)".

On page 4, line 2, after "the Federal Government", insert "(not more than three of the six to be members of the same political party)".

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these amendments is quite apparent, I believe. It is to assure that the proposed Commission be bipartisan in nature. The provisions of the bill require, quite properly, that the two Members appointed from the House be of different parties and the two Members appointed from the Senate be of different parties. But the same proviso does not apply to the public members or to the members to be appointed by the President.

As the bill is now drawn it would be possible for the President to appoint—and I do not say he would do it, but he would be empowered to—six Republicans, so that there might be 10 Republican members out of the 14. It seems to me that it is unwise to leave this possibility open. A commission of this sort should be bipartisan in nature. There are plenty of able people to serve on such a basis.

I would hope these amendments would be acceptable to the Chairman and members of the Committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to these amendments. This matter was considered in our committee. We took note that there had been commissions appointed on this basis and also that there had been others that had not been. The second Hoover Commission, on which I served, did not provide for any political division, even among the congressional Members, although the Speaker of the House in consultation with the minority Member did appoint the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and me on that Commission. In the Senate, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, headed the Government Operations Committee there, and at one time Mr. Brewster of Maine did, and he was succeeded by Mr. Bridges of New Hampshire. So it was bipartisan among the Members of the Congress.

We think the proper place for bipartisanship is in the House and Senate Members. We feel the recommendations that are going to be made by this Commission are going to be sufficiently reviewed by the Members of the House and the Senate. We are going to look at this thing in a nonpartisan way, not a political way.

I can say to the Members if there is the injection of partisanship into this, certainly from the standpoint of representation which takes advantage of either side of the political spectrum, then I would be the first to rise on the floor of the House and oppose such recommendations.

I believe the responsibility is going to be upon the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate and the President of the United States to give us a good working commission. If we do not have a working commission, frankly we will not accomplish anything. I will be the first to say this. We have to have people of expertise. When I say that, I hope and I am going to urge that the President of the Senate and the President of the United States look upon this as a search for talent, a search for people who know something about this.

If we do not have people of talent and people who do not just have certain titles or prominence in society, we are not going to get the job done. This problem cannot be solved that way.

This problem is really nonpartisan, and it should be nonpartisan to bring about the best recommendations we can in this field of improving the procurement procedures and practices of Government. I, therefore, think the amendments would be a mistake.

I am a Democrat and Mr. HORTON is a Republican. The members of this committee—and that is the full committee and not only the subcommittee—have served on this without any hint of partisanship.

I can say this much. If I am appointed on this Commission and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) is appointed on his side, we will see to it that the job of study and recommendation is done. If we are given the experts—and I say the responsibility is on the President of the United States and the President of the Senate and the Speaker to appoint people of competence and people who have the time, and this is very important, because on the second Hoover Commission, there were members who had famous titles and who had national titles, but who did not have the time to do the job of hard grueling work that is necessary to be done if we are to do a good job—I, for one, do not want to bring partisanship into it at this time.

I would ask that the amendments be defeated. I know the gentleman offers the amendments in good faith, but I also have faith that the responsible people named in this bill will do a job based on the merits of this proposition and not upon partisanship.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendments be voted down.

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

I want to agree with the gentleman from California. I will say to the gentleman from New York, who has offered these amendments, in a way I am glad he has offered the amendments because it does give us an opportunity to make some legislative record here with regard to the choice of the members of the Commission.

We did discuss, as the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) stated, in the subcommittee and in the committee the problem of making this a bipartisan type Commission. It was our strong feeling that by doing so, by affirmatively saying it should have a bipartisan flavor, we would of necessity tend to make it somewhat partisan. We felt that by not having the bipartisan flavor, by not requiring this type of appointment, we could get from the appointive authorities people who, as the chairman said, are experts in this area and people who would be nonpartisan.

I tried to deal in my statement with the problem areas. This is set forth in our report. The General Accounting Office, in a letter from the Comptroller General, outlined some 10 to 15 problem areas. I outlined some 27 problem areas.

I indicated there are something like 22 or 23 statutes involved, when studying this problem of procurement.

This will not be the type of commission where people can be just appointed and expect the work to be done. It is an important Commission, where people will have to work.

I am hopeful that the three appointive authorities will, without regard to politics, not thinking in terms of politics at all, select the most competent people to accomplish this purpose.

I do hope that the amendment will not be adopted, for that reason.

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

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to say, in response to the distinguished chairman and my friend from New York (Mr. HORTON), I do not understand their reasoning. It seems to me to be upside down.

They say their purpose is to avoid partisanship on the Commission, but oppose the idea of incorporating into the bill the very customary form of language to assure that it be bipartisan.

As a practical matter, I am sure that if the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee had the power to make the appointments he would make appointments free from any partisan consideration. But as he knows, having been in politics for a long time, the President of the United States and the Vice President are under great pressure, particularly at the beginning of an administration, for members of their own party to be appointed to commissions.

Many of these commissions carry a certain amount of prestige. Even though the compensation is not important, there are strong pressures from members of their own party to get some kind of reward.

I submit it would put a terrible burden on the President, when he has six appointees here, three from his own executive departments and three from outside, to leave him total discretion. It would make it easier for him to assume the bipartisan nature of the Commission, to resist those who seek honorary titles, to provide for bipartisanship in the right kind of bill. My amendment does not say the appointees shall be members of a particular party, but merely says in each case, not more than one member from each party, or not more than three from any party.

I respectfully submit, if we are for bipartisanship—and that is what I assume everybody wants on the Commission—the way to provide for it is to provide for it.

I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, much as I may laud the purposes of the proposed Commission on Government Procurement which H.R. 474 would establish, it seems to me that we are once again proposing to put on a bandaid where we should be amputating.

Hearings have already been held, studies completed, reports received, and suggestions given for streamlining Government procurement procedures, particularly in the sacrosanct area of defense spending. We do not need to go through it all again and thereby put off doing anything about the problem for another 2 years. We know that our present procurement methods are inadequate to protect against excess profits to certain companies, massive overruns which are not caught until they are "fait accompli" and unwarranted wasting of the taxpayers' dollars.

With all the suggestions we already have at hand, I think it is about time we in Congress got down to work, established the necessary guidelines and gave additional or strengthened powers to those overseeing groups which already exist: the GAO and the Renegotiation Board.

Our first act should be to strengthen the Renegotiation Board, which I have supported several times in the past. There is no reason in the world why the U.S. Government should be required to pay for the inefficiency of any private corporation, whether it involves boondoggles of the magnitude of the C–5A $2 billion overrun, or some less publicized mistake. Furthermore, after paying through the nose for the C–5A farce, it is inconceivable to me that we should go right ahead paying for Lockheed's mistakes by procuring more of their aircraft. I think this is an excellent example of the need for establishing a strong Renegotiation Board.

In regard to the Government Accounting Office, in hearings last year Admiral Rickover made several very sound suggestions for strengthening the watchdog powers of the GAO. Among other things, he recommended the establishment of a uniform system of accounting. This would mean that there would exist a sound basis for contracting that would enable the Congress to readily identify actual cost and profit in any given contract. This would make GAO's job easier and would enable Congress to keep its fingers on the progress of any project.

Another move which Congress should make is to give subpena powers to GAO so that the "hard looks" the Government Accounting Office is supposed to give to all Government spending cannot be effectively deflected, particularly in the defense area.

In addition, Congress should take a sharp look at all areas of defense spending in its procurement hearings scheduled for next month. In addition to the more publicized projects which we could do without, such as the ABM system and the C–5A project, we should look into such situations as the continued request by DOD for aircraft carriers when those which we already have are being retired

to the mothball fleet or ordered home for training purposes.

Still another sphere which needs congressional action is that of retired Defense Department personnel who barely have time to take a deep breath before they seat themselves behind a desk as employees of the same defense contractors with which they dealt while in Government service. According to a report prepared by the DOD just this last March, there are over 2,000 retired military officers of the rank of colonel—or captain in the Navy—or above who have "retired" into the service of 100 or so contractors whose major business is done with the Defense Department.

I do not mean to impugn the character or sincerity of these former Government servants, but the fact cannot be ignored that the major reason for their obtaining their civilian positions—many of them at close to the corporations' mandatory retirement age—is their knowledge of the intricacies of the defense procurement system. And for many, I cannot believe that the knowledge that such positions are available after retirement does not affect their judgment in assigning contracts.

Legislation along the lines of H.R. 13138, which I introduced last July to prevent former Federal contracting and procurement officials from going to work for companies with which they dealt for a period of 2 years after retirement, is vitally needed to correct this abuse.

Rather than establishing a commission to study the problem for 2 years, and pointing to the Commission as the excuse for not acting, I urge the House to dispense with the Commission and to take the responsibility upon itself to act against the abuses right now.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendments. As stated by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member, this question was considered by the subcommittee and the full committee.

It was considered, as I say, after having heard an army of witnesses; not a battalion but an army of witnesses. I think it would be unwise to restrict appointments to those made on a nonpartisan basis. What we are looking for is talent and people who can and are willing to do the job. I feel confident that is what the President will be looking for when he is making his decisions as to appointments, and likewise the Vice President. Frankly, I do not know that the President or anyone on his behalf has sent word down that he would be troubled by this onerous task of bestowing these honorific titles.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is not serious in suggesting that the President would openly make any complaint about the pressure he might be receiving from members of his own party for appointments, is he?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and evident ability to read the President's mind.

However, as I say, I oppose this amendment because it was thoroughly considered in the subcommittee and by the full committee. The bill was voted out as a unanimous effort after considering these proposed amendments, and I certainly hope the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

The amendments were rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, a number of people have expressed concern about this legislation in that it might have an effect that would, I am sure, not be in the minds of the Chairman or the Committee; namely, it might make it possible for the departments whose practices have been criticized in the procurement area to delay or defer any changes in those practices until the Commission submitted its report. As I say, I am sure that is not in the minds of the committee, but I think it would be helpful if it were so stated on the floor. For example, there are some very excellent recommendations that have been made by the Joint Economic Committee for changes in the procurement practices in the Defense Department. I would assume that the Defense Department would consider those recommendations and, if they are appropriate, would act on them and certainly not simply take the view that they are not going to do anything in this area until the Commission submitted its report. I would welcome a statement on that.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I only will say this: The passage of this bill and the setting up of this Procurement Commission, in my opinion, should not be used—and I do not believe it will be used—to stop any committee of the Congress from going ahead just as they have in the past in requiring changes wherever they are needed. The committee of legislative jurisdiction, of course, here is the Armed Services Committee in the House. They have brought about a number of amendments. The truth in negotiation amendment was one which was offered by a member of that committee. I would hope that the members of the blue ribbon committee of Secretary Laird will go right ahead and make any recommendations they see fit. I understand a study is being made for the purpose of making some changes. The study cannot be the study in depth which we envisage here, but I would assure the gentleman that I would like to see every improvement in procurement that can be made by the present administration.

And, I have been assured that they will make improvements, that studies are going on and that they intend to make improvements in the Defense Department. Of course, I know there is a constant scrutiny by the Comptroller General and, by the way, he is the arm of the Congress; he is a man that looks at more contracts and has more auditors and people to look at them than any other agency of the Government. He is continuously making recommendations, many of which are being adopted by the Defense Department, not only the Department of Defense but other departments of Government.

I assure the gentleman that I share his feeling that no hesitancy should be used in legislating these procedures. There is too much money at stake.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for his assurances.

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

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, may I reassure the gentleman from New York and confirm and agree with the statement which has been made by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and to say most certainly it is our intention and it is our desire that the Commission would have no exclusive jurisdiction during its duration insofar as the legislative provisions are concerned or insofar as the executive departments are concerned. They should proceed to make whatever changes are necessary to improve the procurement procedures until the Commission reports back to the Congress.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would agree with what the two gentlemen have said but I would like to point out the fact that throughout the hearings—as a matter of fact in many instances when agencies appeared before us and branches of the Department of Defense they were asked about suggestions made to them previously for improvements that could have been made in the interim which had been made, but they were late. I know myself in some instances about some of these changes. It was made very clear to them that we do not expect them to sit back and wait for something to happen, but to keep looking ahead toward the solution of this problem.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS) of Colorado) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCARTHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, pursuant to House Resolution 534, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT THIEU AND VICE PRESIDENT KY ATTEMPT TO BLOCK REASONABLE SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Thieu-Ky regime in Saigon has been consistently trying to block any reasonable settlement in Vietnam, because any such settlement would necessarily involve either a loss of power for them, or the risk of the loss of such power through fair and open elections. This has long been my view. It is fully confirmed by today's New York Times report from Saigon about Thieu's recent hard line statements.

It is officially stated in South Vietnam that the U.S. objective is to assure the right of the South Vietnamese people to self-determination. This can be done only through free elections in which all parties have the right to participate, and which are carried out in an atmosphere free of compulsion. The only kind of elections that President Thieu seems prepared to accept are elections conducted by his regime and in which the opposition, that is, the NLF, would be prohibited from participating as such. Obviously no settlement can be arrived at on such a basis.

Gov. Averell Harriman has been urging that the United States insist on a substantial broadening of the Thieu-Ky government to include the various non-Communist elements in South Vietnam, so as to carry on effective negotiations with the NLF. President Thieu has been going in the opposite direction, increasing the role of the military in his regime. As Governor Harriman has also pointed out, it was Thieu's stalling on the Paris talks last fall during a critical period that made it impossible to get effective private talks underway.

Cyrus Vance has spelled out a constructive and detailed proposal for a standstill cease-fire, to be followed by negotiations and elections. Thieu has rejected that also.

President Nixon's announced withdrawals of some 10 percent of American forces are clearly not enough to make President Thieu aware that he cannot continue to exercise a veto over the possibility of a peaceful settlement in South Vietnam.

I urge President Nixon to make clear to President Thieu that our patience has been exhausted and that American boys will not go on dying to keep Mr. Thieu and Mr. Ky in power. If these gentlemen do not quickly and specifically indicate a drastic change in their adamant opposition to any realistic negotiable position, the United States should embark on a program for a withdrawal of all our forces, to be carried out as quickly as possible, consistent with protecting the safety of our own troops.

Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith today's article by Terence Smith in the New York Times, together with an article on the Cyrus Vance proposal by Robert Kleinman which appeared in the Times magazine for September 21, 1969:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1969]

THIEU TAKING A TOUGHER LINE ON PEACE NEGOTIATIONS AND THE WAR

(By Terence Smith)

SAIGON, South Vietnam, September 22.—In private conversations and public statements during the last two weeks, President Nguyen Van Thieu, has hardened his Government's position on both the conduct of the war and the peace negotiations in Paris.

Such a stand has also been evident in statements by Premier Tran Thien Khiem and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky. Taken together, their remarks seem to signal a general shift to the right by the Government—a shift that is currently being scrutinized by Western diplomats and observers here.

President Thieu has been uncompromising in his views on the war both in public and in private sessions he has held recently with a variety of visiting groups. The members of a British parliamentary delegation that spent an hour with him in the Presidential Palace last week came away startled by his position on the Vietcong.

Mr. Thieu is reported to have told the delegation that he was implacably opposed to any direct Communist participation in South Vietnam's political future. He is said to have added that in his view it will be 20 to 30 years before the Vietnamese Communists modify their brand of politics into a form acceptable to the South Vietnamese Government.

Mr. Thieu took a similar line in public Friday when he appeared as the guest on a newly inaugurated Vietnamese television version of "Meet the Press" entitled "People Want to Know."

During the course of 40 minutes of carefully prepared questions and answers, Mr. Thieu dismissed the concept of a standstill cease-fire as "unrealistic," pledged never to cede "so much as a hamlet" to the Vietcong and promised that he would make no further concessions in the Paris talks.

"Not only do I not have any further peace initiative in mind," he said in answer to a question, "I cannot foresee how the Paris talks could last much longer. We cannot sit at the conference table for one or two years saying nothing."

This, he said, is not an ultimatum to the enemy but a personal prediction that the Paris talks will eventually dissolve unless the other side modifies its stance.

Finally, Mr. Thieu assured his audience that his Government would never accept the existence "in any way" of a Communist party in South Vietnam.

All in all, it was the President's toughest public performance to date, and one that presented a sharp contrast to his rhetoric of last summer. Only last July the emphasis was on compromise, and Mr. Thieu was assuring the other side that everything would be negotiable once private bargaining began.

Opinion among observers is divided on the reasons for Mr. Thieu's apparently deliberate shift to the right. Some feel he is taking advantage of the stalemate in Paris to bolster his domestic political stature and improve his relations with the generally hawkish South Vietnamese National Assembly.

Others believe that Mr. Thieu's message is directed more toward the United States. They see it as a warning to the Nixon Administration not to expect any further concessions before the end of the year.

The observers and diplomats who tend to this view believe that Mr. Thieu is proceeding according to a private timetable designed to insure that the next South Vietnamese presidential elections are held as scheduled in 1974 and that he is the Government candidate.

They point to a speech Mr. Thieu made in July at the coastal resort of Vungtau in which he predicted that it would be at least two years before the next nationwide elections were held.

Mr. Thieu said then that it would take a year to bring about the mutual withdrawal of most of the allied and North Vietnamese troops from the country, six months more to arrange an election and select the international organization to supervise it, and another six months for the election campaign.

"That's Thieu's schedule, and he plans to stick to it," a senior diplomat said here recently, recalling the Vungtau speech. "He'll consider it a victory so long as the elections are held near or on schedule and he is a candidate for re-election."

[From the New York Times Magazine, Sept. 21, 1969]

THE VANCE PLAN FOR A VIETNAM CEASE-FIRE

(By Robert Kleiman)

(NOTE.—Robert Kleiman, of The Times Editorial Board, was a diplomatic correspondent for more than two decades, and covered the Geneva conferences of 1954 and 1962.)

A 30-day race against time brought the first Vietnam war to an end at the 1954 Geneva Conference.

A simple two-word agreement on "temporary partition"—a phrase that never appeared in the official record—made peace possible. The outline of that agreement was found by Pierre Mendès-France in Foreign Ministry notes taken during private conversations held in Geneva, as he prepared to ask the French National Assembly for investiture as Premier. That is what led him to make his famous wager—that he would negotiate a settlement in a month or quit—a wager that won him the Premiership and ended the war. Once the principle of partition had been accepted by both sides, Mendès-France realized, all that remained was to settle the details.

Is there a simple key to ending the second Vietnam war in 1969? Ambassador Cyrus R. Vance believes there may be. The former Vietnam peace negotiator thinks that that key is a "standstill cease-fire."

The attractiveness of the Vance Plan is that it is a proposal to negotiate a division of power—and territory—based on current realities. It would, simply, freeze the status quo and establish a modus vivendi between the contestants in Vietnam's two-decade civil war. Can it be done?

The leopard-spot distribution of Vietcong areas in South Vietnam has led some analysts to dismiss partition as an impossible solution. Most students of the problem in 1954 took the same view—for precisely the same reason. The Communist Vietminh then held areas in South Vietnam almost identical with those held by their Vietcong successors today, and held a similar though stronger position in the North.

But two young Frenchmen—one a diplomat, the other a colonel—believed otherwise, and devised a scheme. Foreign Minister Georges Bidault, a hawk who wanted to continue the war, brought it in his pocket to the Geneva conference for use if American intervention could not be obtained. The formula, without details, was suggested privately to a Vietminh delegate, Col. Ha Van Lau, who is now a delegate to the Paris peace talks.

Many weeks later, his agreement in principle was given on condition that the territory allocated to the Vietminh have the "character of a state," which he defined as an area with a capital and a port. It was a clear bid for the region of Tonkin, with its capital at Hanoi and its port at Haiphong.

Ha Van Lau's hand was on a map of Vietnam, covering that northern region, as he spoke. When his French interlocutor asked how far south he proposed to place the partition line, he moved his fingers into Annam Province and out again quickly, replying, "Not very far."

The cease-fire settlement of 1954 evacuated hundreds of thousands of French and Vietnamese troops from North Vietnam to the South, followed by a million civilians, mostly Roman Catholics. In the South, Vietminh forces regrouped into five zones and, later, 80,000 Vietminh troops and many of their families were evacuated to the North.

Beginning on this page are questions I posed to Mr. Vance, and his replies:

Q.—Mr. Vance, why are the peace talks stalemated in Paris?

A.—In my judgment, because there has not yet been proposed a realistic political-military package which could provide the basis for a settlement.

Q.—Our side is proposing mutual withdrawals of external forces and free elections run by a joint electoral commission, including the Communists. The Communists are proposing an interim coalition government to conduct the elections. Is there nothing negotiable here?

A.—As presently formulated, neither proposal is acceptable to the other side. For example, Hanoi and the National Liberation Front (N.L.F.) have made it clear that they are not going to discuss mutual withdrawal until the shape of the political settlement has been generally outlined. On the other hand, Saigon (the G.V.N.) has made it clear that it is not going to agree to the N.L.F. demand that it step aside in favor of a coalition provisional government. A middle ground has to be found which bridges the differences between the two sides.

Q.—What do you propose?

A.—That we change our strategy so as to cut down the fighting, and also put on the table in Paris a political-military package which proposes negotiation of a standstill cease-fire as the first order of business. This latter element is tremendously important because merely to propose it is to recognize the military, territorial and political status quo. It is necessary, in my judgment, to recognize the status quo to get serious negotiations.

I am convinced that President Nixon is determined to achieve peace in Vietnam. In order to do this, I believe a new initiative is required.

Q.—What do you mean precisely by a standstill cease-fire?

A.—A simple cease-fire is one in which the writ of the Saigon Government would run throughout the country. Obviously, that would not be accepted by the other side, as they would view it as a surrender.

In contrast, a standstill, or cease-fire in place, recognizes the status quo. Each of the sides remains in place, takes defensive positions and stops all offensive actions. Free movement of trade, civilians and unarmed military personnel would be permitted throughout all areas of South Vietnam. Procedures would be developed to permit the movement of the required logistics for the military forces of both sides. During the winding down process, it would have to be agreed that local incidents of non-compliance would not justify departure from the general cease-fire. Further, the principle that no military or political advantage should be gained by either side throughout the period of the cease-fire would be recognized by the parties.

Q.—How could you assure that?

A.—There would have to be, first, an assurance that no Government troops would enter the areas under N.L.F. control except with the approval of the local government. This is a commitment somewhat like those made in the past to the Hoa Hao and Cao Dia sects and to some of the Montagnard provinces. In return, Vietcong terrorism in areas controlled by Saigon would have to cease.

Second, an understanding would be needed that in the areas which are currently under N.L.F. control, the authority of existing local officials of the "liberation committee" would be recognized, pending elections, and that appointments of Saigon Government officials within those territories would not be made over the objections of the local authorities. There is precedent for this. Similar arrangements have been made in the important areas controlled by the Hoa Hao and the Cao Dai. The kind of Saigon Government officials that I have in mind are those from the civilian ministries, such as Agriculture and Health.

Third, there would be recognition, pending elections, of N.L.F. control over taxes in its areas and N.L.F. use of such taxes for local purposes. Again, this is a procedure similar to that currently being used in Saigon-controlled rural areas. Moreover, the N.L.F. already collects taxes in these areas.

Further, you would need a recognition by the Saigon Government of the legality of decrees by N.L.F. liberation committees on land tenure, unless Saigon first moves to institute its own program for land reform.

Q.—Now, isn't this, in effect, a kind of partition of South Vietnam?

A.—In a sense it's a partition. But only by recognizing the realities that exist are you going to find a basis on which the two sides can negotiate a settlement.

Q.—The places now partitioned—Germany, India-Pakistan, Korea, North and South Vietnam, Berlin, Ireland—are divided by a fixed line, two in the case of India-Pakistan. But in South Vietnam there is a leopard-spot division of territories, cutting across roads, railroads, canals, separating cities from their countryside. How can partition work in that kind of a jigsaw puzzle?

A.—What I believe you would end up with is essentially a form of federation with the various local entities and their people represented in the national legislature, thus giving them a voice in the national government. At the local level you would have control resting in the hands of those who control the territory now.

Q.—How would you prevent violations of the agreements?

A.—The most practical mechanism to guard against violations of the cease-fire would be a modified international Control Commission (I.C.C.). The I.C.C. created by the 1954 settlement in Geneva consists of three parties—India, which serves as chairman, Canada and Poland. This peace-keeping force—either alone or in coordination with a joint military commission similar to that set up by the French and the Communist Vietminh in 1954—would establish and staff posts in the 43 province capitals and in the district towns. They would receive reports and make recommendations for the solution of difficulties and disputes. Local commanders would be instructed to comply with the recommendations of the local peace-keeping unit.

Q.—How many posts would you need?

A.—Perhaps 300 or so.

Q.—How many people would this involve?

A.—About 3,000. The posts could be small. The peace-keeping units would have to operate under majority rule; under the current procedures, the vote of one member can block action by the I.C.C. This would have to be changed. They would be guaranteed safe conduct and free movement to investigate reported violations rapidly.

Q.—Do you have any reason to believe that the Vietcong would accept majority decisions by the I.C.C.?

A.—They have never said either that they would or would not. But the Vietcong would have an interest in seeing that the peace-keeping force was effective. If the Vietcong is going to stop fighting, it will wish to be sure that its people will be protected, and therefore that it has effective machinery in place to which it can effectively appeal.

Now, I'm not suggesting that the Vietcong is going to turn in its arms, because that would be impractical during the period of working out the details of the political settlement.

Q.—You mean that they would continue to retain their own armed force?

A.—That's right.

Q.—On a permanent basis?

A.—No, on a permanent basis the nature and size of military forces that would be permitted is a matter that would have to be negotiated. Assuming a confederal type of settlement, one possibility is that the N.L.F. forces could become the local element of the national government forces in the particular area in which they lived.

Q.—How can you define the status quo territorially when so much of the country is contested territory, under the control of Saigon in the daytime and under the control of the Vietcong at night?

A.—This would have to be negotiated between Saigon and the N.L.F. in Paris.

Q.—In the end, they would wind up trading some areas for others—some areas would be given to the Vietcong and others would be given to Saigon?

A.—That's the case in any negotiation. In some disputed areas, the negotiators might agree to determine the majority allegiance by local balloting.

The idea of a leopard-spot federal or confederal solution is not a new theory, as you undoubtedly know. It has been discussed in Vietnamese circles and elsewhere. What has not always been seen clearly is that a proposal for a standstill cease-fire would almost automatically shape the solution in that way.

Q.—What about the people who live in these areas? Would they have to remain there?

A.—There would have to be complete freedom of movement for all civilians.

Q.—Anybody who didn't want to stay in a zone allocated to the Vietcong could move into another area?

A.—That's correct, and I would foresee elections in all areas eventually so that the people of South Vietnam would have a voice in determining their future.

Q.—Do you think this movement in population would take place before the elections?

A.—In a number of areas, yes. In others, there would be little movement. I would expect that local elections would precede national voting. You would first have elections of local representatives at the hamlet and village level, and perhaps at the provincial level as well. The elections, in areas where the N.L.F. is clearly in control, would obviously reflect the realities that exist on the ground. The same would be true in those areas where the Saigon Government is clearly in control.

Then you would have elections for the National Assembly—both the lower and upper houses—with all South Vietnamese entitled to vote. In this connection, I think you could expect to see the resulting legislature composed of various political, religious and ethnic groups.

Finally, there would be the election of a President and a Vice President.

Q.—You see this as a series of elections rather than one election?

A.—Probably. But the timing of the various elections would be for the parties to decide. What you would end up with, then, would be strong local governments in various areas which would be controlled and dominated by the N.L.F., as they actually are on

the ground today. The Central Government's role in these areas would be a weak one. In other areas you would see the local governments dominated by Saigon. And in a third group of areas you would have sort of a mixed bag, with a center group emerging that is not aligned with either Saigon or the N.L.F. I think there is a large segment of Buddhists and others who fall into this category. It's a sort of third force that exists in all parts of South Vietnam.

Q.—Do you think they might be drawn into some local as well as national role as a buffer between the two major political forces that are armed?

A.—I think that's possible. You would also probably have Hoa Hao, Cao Dai and Montagnard autonomous areas in the federation.

Q.—Who would conduct the elections?

A.—The elections would be conducted under a broadly representative electoral commission with the N.L.F. and the Saigon Government participating, and both sides pledged in advance to accept the outcome.

I want to make it clear that what I am suggesting is not a winner-take-all electoral solution. I don't think that either side is going to be willing to accept a winner-take-all election. The risks to each are too great, because in one fell swoop either might lose what it had been fighting and dying for over many years.

Q.—Is it your assumption that N.L.F. would give up the idea of sharing power nationally through a coalition government? Are you saying that it would settle for minority representation in the national parliament if it were assured virtual local autonomy in the regions that it now controls?

A.—I think so. In the settlement I've outlined, the two sides would divide power and territorial control rather than seek to govern jointly through a coalition government at the start. The N.L.F. would be accepting a trade-off, obtaining local control by giving up its demands for a strong position in the Central Government. It would see the prospect that it might increase its political power later by peaceful competition. Meanwhile, it would be guaranteed what it has achieved on the ground over the years.

Q.—Is this the essence of the political-military package you are proposing for the Paris talks?

A.—Yes. But there are other important elements as well. Let me say first that this plan did not spring to life overnight, nor is the process by which my conclusions evolved in this direction a unique one. The thinking of many students of the problem has helped to shape my thinking. Clark Kerr's Committee for a National Political Settlement in Vietnam, with which I have associated myself recently, saw the need very early for a package proposal of this kind. Similar proposals have been examined within our Government. There are six essential elements in the political-military package:

(1) A standstill cease-fire. (2) Self-determination for the South Vietnamese through free elections. (3) A broadly representative electoral commission with N.L.F. participation that could determine what changes are needed in the Constitution and election laws, and could then conduct the elections. (4) An international peace-keeping force. (5) A sweeping land-reform program. (6) Medical aid and relief to North as well as South Vietnam to bind up the wounds of war, along with economic assistance.

Q.—One objection to the cease-fire approach is that the other side is a clandestine movement engaged in subversion and the use of terrorism. It moves by night under cover. Its activities would be difficult to regulate while the movement of the South Vietnamese Army and police in uniform would be controlled by the cease-fire. How would you get around that objection?

A.—From what we have been able to observe over the years, it appears that the North Vietnamese and the N.L.F. have the ability to exercise firm control over the action of their troops in the field. I think there's good reason to believe that an agreement would be carried out if the instructions to do so were given by the commanders of the North Vietnamese and N.L.F. forces. Moreover, you would have the peace-keeping force policing the cease-fire. I want to underscore the fact that the recent three-day truce is not a valid indicator of what might happen in the future because the G.V.N., according to reports from South Vietnam, did not observe the truce.

Q.—How could you control political infiltration and terrorism, and the use of threats, to extend N.L.F. political control during a a period of cease-fire.

A.—As I have indicated, you would have either the I.C.C. or the I.C.C. together with a joint military commission, which would police the cease-fire and to whom complaints could be made about violations. In my judgment, this would act as a deterrent.

I'm not suggesting that there might not be a rather messy situation when the cease-fire was put into effect. There undoubtedly would be violations, and people would be injured and killed in the process. It would be misleading if I didn't make it very clear that this is to be expected.

On the other hand, as the situation exists today, taking the total casualties on both sides, many hundreds are being wounded or killed each week. If there were a standstill cease-fire, the casualties would be very substantially reduced—if not eliminated—even with the violations you would have to expect.

Q.—I suppose you would have as a deterrent the fact that Saigon's forces could always resume the fighting if they felt the Communists were taking advantage of the cease-fire?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Saigon secret police would also, presumably, be functioning. Might there be a kind of tong warfare and clandestine undercover fighting going on in some of these areas?

A.—I'm sure you would have all kinds of violations of the cease-fire from time to time in various places throughout the country.

Q.—Now, another objection that is raised is this: If you had a standstill cease-fire, the N.L.F., which has set up a phantom provisional government, would be able to announce a capital and proclaim themselves there as the Government of South Vietnam. This is something they have not been able to do at present. Although they control large regions clandestinely, there is no part of the country which the South Vietnamese Army and the American forces cannot seize if they wish. But if there were a cease-fire, the army of Saigon would not be permitted to enter the N.L.F. areas. The argument made by the Saigon Government is that the political position of the N.L.F. would be upgraded very substantially, if it could set up a secure capital. What do you think of this argument?

A.—It is possible that the N.L.F. might take that action. But assuming that were done, I believe it is questionable that it would materially change the situation.

Q.—The final argument that's made against the cease-fire approach is that all these arrangements would weaken the Saigon government, and its position might disintegrate. Is the Saigon government that weak?

A.—If the G.V.N. broadens its political base and takes the initiative for peace, it should be able to win the support of a broad spectrum of the South Vietnamese people. But it must broaden its political base.

Q.—Do you see any broadening in the new Cabinet and in the replacement of a civilian Prime Minister with General Khiem?

A.—No, I think it was a step backward. In my judgment, it is essential that President Thieu promptly name a strong advisory council with a very broad political and religious base.

Q.—If the United States is withdrawing from Vietnam, does it have the right any longer to tell the Saigon leaders how to constitute their Government? We can't have it both ways, can we?

A.—The United States has made a great expenditure of lives and blood in Vietnam, and I think we have the right to urge what we believe is required to end the fighting and give some hope of stability for the future.

Q.—In other words, unilateral withdrawal or even a mutual withdrawal of the American and North Vietnamese forces might lead, not to peace, but to a continuation of the war?

A.—If you could get mutual withdrawal of North Vietnamese and United States forces, it might put pressure on both the N.L.F. and the G.V.N. to reach a political accommodation. But most important, we must try to stop the fighting now and capture the initiative for peace. If the United States were to come forward with a proposal calling for a standstill cease-fire, it could have a profound impact throughout the world. In my judgment, it would gain the support of world opinion. And even if the cease-fire proposal were turned down initially, it could be left on the table and world opinion would in time have its effect on the parties. As you know, both the North and South Vietnamese are very sensitive to world opinion.

Vietnam has been driven by war for many, many years. I think there's a great desire for peace among the Vietnamese people, North and South, running from the grass roots right up through all segments of the society. If a broadened Saigon Government were to offer the country peace and land reform, the other side would have to respond.

Q.—How does land reform fit into the peace negotiation package you are proposing?

A.—I hope that it will pass the Saigon legislature quickly, transferring all tenant-farmed land to the peasants who are tilling it. In my judgment, the land-reform program would have a major political effect throughout South Vietnam. I would think it would be of gerat concern to the N.L.F., and it could become a useful subject of negotiation with them. You might offer to withhold putting the program into effect in N.L.F. areas, pending a working out of the political settlement with the other side.

Q.—How could the N.L.F. come out against distributing the land to the peasants?

A.—They would claim they already had done that and that it was unnecessary for the Saigon Government to take any action in their areas.

Q.—What makes you think Hanoi wants to negotiate a settlement? Might they not think now that they only have to sit tight and the United States will pull out?

A.—They might, but one indicator is that they have shown great interest on a number of occasions in economic and technical assistance from the United States in the post-war period. Another indicator is the quality of the negotiators Hanoi has sent to Paris, which leads me to believe they have come to make a settlement, not to stall indefinitely. We were impressed by their serious attitude, their skill and precision and their courtesy. I also want to make it clear that the G.V.N. has also sent very able people to Paris.

Q.—Do you think American aid to North and South Vietnam would help to guarantee that the peace agreements would be carried out?

A.—It could have an important effect. I believe that the North Vietnamese want to remain independent of both China and the Soviet Union. To the extent that they could receive assistance elsewhere, it would fortify and strengthen this position. You will recall that both Hanoi and the N.L.F. have said that they look forward to good relations with the United States after the war.

Q.—Do you think the N.L.F. is serious about its stated desire to assume a neutral posture along with the rest of Southeast Asia?

A.—I hope so, but only time can tell.

Q.—The settlement you propose, then, would not terminate the political or economic role that the United States plays in Southeast Asia in support of national independence by countries in the area?

A.—No. Our Government has said on many occasions that it is prepared to take a very active role in supporting economic development for all of the peoples in Southeast Asia, including the North Vietnamese.

Q.—Would the federation within South Vietnam that you foresee ultimately join in a confederation with North Vietnam, or unite with it in some other way?

A.—That would be up to the North and the South to negotiate. My own feeling is that both North and South want some form of eventual unification. Indeed, I have heard individuals on both sides say that they wish to see North and South Vietnam eventually joined together in some way. Members of the N.L.F. have spoken to the press about a period of five or ten years before unification with the North.

Q.—Is there a political inhibition against early reunification?

A.—I think there's little question but that Southerners are Southerners in Vietnam. They want to pull themselves together politically so that they can deal with North Vietnam on an equal basis, rather than be taken over. The Saigon Government and the N.L.F., too, I believe, have suggested that the first steps be trade, exchange of letters, the movement of families back and forth from North Vietnam to South Vietnam and vice versa. The fact that South Vietnam had abundant rice was a very important factor in the past in trade with the North.

Q.—If Hanoi doesn't respond to all our offers, do you think we ought to continue unilateral withdrawal?

A.—Yes. I think that we can and should remove substantially larger forces than we have so far. We must try to bring about an end to the fighting now, but, if we can't, we ought to turn it over to the G.V.N. as rapidly as possible.

Q.—Would your objective in pulling out be to force Saigon to negotiate seriously?

A.—In part.

Q.—Do you think we are now in a period of de-escalation, and that if we reciprocate . . . ?

A.—The only way we'll ever know is to test it. That's why we ought to come forward at this point and put on the table a proposal for a standstill cease-fire and for a realistic political settlement. We have nothing to lose by doing it, and everything to gain.

Q.—What would you do to deescalate in response to a lull?

A.—I would cut back on the search and destroy operations, and cut back further on the B-52 operations.

Q.—Why would you cut back on the B-52 operations?

A.—B-52 operations was one of the subjects that the other side raised many times in Paris. Because of the importance the other side attaches to these operations, cutting them back further might provide the initiative for the cutting down of hostilities by mutual example. It is important to remember that it would be unrealistic to expect an immediate response from the other side. These things take time.

Q.—What effect will Ho Chi Minh's death have on the Vietnam war and the Paris peace negotiations?

A.—I don't know. The death of a charismatic leader who over the years was strong enough to reach compromises, as he did, with the French in the nineteen-forties and nineteen-fifties may lessen the chance for peace. On the other hand, there will undoubtedly be a period of uncertainty in the aftermath of his death during which there will be a struggle for succession. It may well be, therefore, that the collective leadership, while sorting out their own relationships and those of their country with other countries, may want to take a fresh look at the situation.

In any event, we should seize this opportunity to open up a new path toward peace. To this end, we should propose a practical political-military package which could provide a basis for a settlement.

WALTER LIPPMANN, PHILOSOPHER OF THE REPUBLIC

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the most influential columnist of our time is 80 years old today.

Walter Lippmann is the undisputed philosopher of the Republic.

For many years his words of reason have influenced and continue to influence the course and destiny of this Nation.

His personal experience in Government goes back to the days of Elihu Root and Henry L. Stimson and Woodrow Wilson in World War I.

But his effect on Government and those in it results from more than mere longevity.

His impact flows from his thoughtfulness and his sensitivity.

What Matthew Arnold said of Edmund Burke is true of Walter Lippmann:

> He brings thought to bear on politics, he saturates politics with thought.

James Reston of the New York Times once wrote of Walter Lippmann that—

> He is almost the only thoughtful man I know in Washington who never complains that he cannot find time to think.

It is small wonder that it was he who first saw the unwisdom of our massive intervention in Vietnam.

No wonder it is that he who now proposes a new international philosophy for the United States, which, while rejecting isolationism, recognizes that we cannot and should not attempt to interject our will over the globe.

But Walter Lippmann's stature results not only from his wisdom but also from his sensitivity to the situation in which a public official finds himself. Many years ago he wrote:

> It is not enough to criticize the official's policy. We must put ourselves inside his skin, for unless we have tried to face up to the facts before him, what we produce is nothing but holier-than-thou moralizing.

For years this thoughtful and sensitive man has helped public officials find their way.

Now at 80 he is continuing to do so. I commend to my colleagues his recent interview with Henry Brandon which appeared in the New York Times magazine of September 14, 1969, and I include this interview to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Sept. 14, 1969]

A TALK WITH WALTER LIPPMANN, AT 80, ABOUT THIS "MINOR DARK AGE"

(By Henry Brandon)

SEAL HARBOR, MAINE.—For many—at least for anyone who wanted to know what Walter Lippmann was thinking—breakfast is not what is used to be. Lippmann could raise the hackles of Presidents, give policy makers second thoughts and spark discussions in Cabinet meetings, chancelleries and editorial offices around the world. The most influential columnist of our time, he will be 80 on Sept. 23 and has retired from writing his column, but not from the world. He lives in New York in the winter, but still travels abroad, mostly to Europe, and spends the summer in a charming, comfortable old villa in Seal Harbor, Me., with a short-range vista of the little island outside the harbor where Governor Rockefeller has a summer house and a long-range perspective of infinite ocean. He writes about two hours a day and swims in the pool of the Harbor Club, where nothing seems to have changed since the turn of the century. He says that he really does not miss Washington or writing for newspapers. In his active retirement he is concentrating on writing his last book. He does not seem to have aged in the last 10 years, but is taking life more easily.

His wife, Helen, is a lively, wonderful companion who spreads her affectionate wings or utters little warnings to protect Walter. Years ago, on a walk in the mountains above Bar Harbor, I remember her saying as we climbed over some steep rocks: "Walter, don't think! Look!" The other day they were playing croquet against a strong team. Suddenly Mrs. Lippmann's warning voice sounded across the court: "Walter, don't think! Be clever!" I didn't ask which comes easier.

When we settled down in Lippmann's study to discuss the world, I suggested that he also reminisce a little, for after all he had a lot to look back to; no living newspaperman has seen as many of the great as he has. "I am bored with the past, I am only interested in the future," he replied a little grumpily, but he mellowed as we talked.

BRANDON. *The U.S. finds itself engulfed in a deep social crisis. Do you see it as a consequence of a failure of your generation and of its ruling élite because they did not pay enough attention to such problems as poverty and hunger?*

LIPPMANN. It's quite clear from the results that we see about us that there has been a failure. It hasn't been due to paying too little attention to poverty and hunger. I ascribe the essence of the failure to miscalculation, to misunderstanding our post-World War II position in the world. That has turned our energies away from our real problems. The error is not merely the trouble in Vietnam, but the error lies in the illusion that the position occupied in the world by the United States at the end of the war was a permanent arrangement of power in the world. It wasn't. The United States was victorious; but by then all the imperial structures which set the bounds of American power had been destroyed: the German Reich, the Japanese empire. The result is that we flowed forward beyond our natural limits and the cold war is the result of our meeting the Russians with no buffers between us. That miscalulation, which was made by my generation, has falsified all our other calculations—what our power was, what we could afford to do, what influence we had to exert in the world.

BRANDON. *But don't you think that if the United States had not preserved after World War II its then boundaries, Western Europe would have been in serious danger of going Communist?*

LIPPMANN. I always have believed in holding Western Europe and we certainly had to defend it, but I don't think Western Europe would have gone Communist. I think there were natural limits to the extension of the Soviet—or, in a more realistic sense, of Russian—power. They had reached the limits of their power or well beyond them when the armistice came in World War II.

BRANDON. *Well, how do you explain, for instance, the Communist thrust into South Korea?*

LIPPMANN. I think it was a miscalculation on their part. We miscalculated and so did they. They tried to do more than they could do. They thought the opportunities were greater than they were and they ran into not merely American opposition but the opposition of 16 nations united against them.

BRANDON. *It has often been said that the U.S. could afford guns and butter. It now seems that the U.S. can't afford both.*

LIPPMANN. The United States could and can afford guns and butter, but it can't afford a military position with infantry across both oceans. There are limits to the reach of American military power, and those were transgressed during the cold-war period.

BRANDON. *So you see the failure of your generation not as due to a lack of attention and funds to alleviate social ills, but to the wrong world philosophy, am I correct?*

LIPPMANN. Yes, that's correct.

BRANDON. *Do you then feel that the present generation is justified in its protests?*

LIPPMANN. I think it's justified in its protests and I include in the present generation not only the young people but a very large part of the population. The overexpansion which President Nixon has used as a keynote of his foreign policy is now increasingly evident to all the young, middle-aged and old people. That overexpansion in the nineteen-fifties—beginning before the Korean War, beginning really with the Truman Doctrine—has been the cause of the distortion of our whole way of political life.

BRANDON. *How do you then see the role of American leadership in the world?*

LIPPMANN. The United States should basically accept the fact that its sphere of effective military influence is what is often called the blue-water strategy. What happens on the land—on the surface—in the Eurasian Continent is something we can negotiate about but not something which we can direct and govern.

BRANDON. *What is your bargaining position then based on?*

LIPPMANN. On our economic influence and our wealth and the fact that we are more or less invulnerable to attack from the Eurasian mainland. We have, of course, air and sea supremacy in both oceans.

BRANDON. *Well, where would you draw the borders?*

LIPPMANN. Roughly at the blue water.

BRANDON. *Would you explain what you mean by the blue water?*

LIPPMANN. Blue water excludes inshore positions and shore positions, on the eastern rim of Asia particularly. That leaves a very large area of the Pacific and Pacific islands and even continents like Australia within the sphere which we have a vital interest in defending. We can't govern beyond that. We have to strike a balance of forces with the masters of the Eurasian Continent, whoever they are. But we cannot govern or police the Eurasian Continent.

BRANDON. *On the European side where would be the boundary?*

LIPPMANN. The boundary as left by World War II was the line down the middle of Germany. That will have to disappear in a reasonably short time, because after a generation we cannot any longer say that this is the line that divides Europe. Europe will have to find its own balance and equilibrium and unity without the presence of American infantry.

BRANDON. *And what will maintain the balance between the Soviet Union and Western Europe?*

LIPPMANN. Whatever maintains the balance between two great powers: possession of power.

BRANDON. *But Western Europe has nothing compared to the power of the Soviet Union.*

LIPPMANN. Well, they'll have to develop it.

BRANDON. *Do you think the Europeans are capable of doing this today?*

LIPPMANN. I think so. I'll put it another way. I think the Russians are equally incapable of holding as much as they acquired as a result of World War II. They'll have to pull back just as we are pulling back. One thing we've learned in the last generation is that big powers, big in numbers and territorial size, are no longer great powers. They can be defied. The smaller powers with the use of technology can stand us off. Even in Vietnam, we haven't been defeated, but we have failed because of the resistance of the North Vietnamese.

BRANDON. *Yes, but isn't the advent of the nuclear strategic talks—which will be conducted without the smaller powers present, and I am not critical of that—symbolic of the continued dominance of the superpowers?*

LIPPMANN. I think what we know now about nuclear power is that it's good only to balance nuclear power. It cannot be used against anybody else because our nuclear power is good only as a balance and deterrent to the nuclear power of the Soviet Union. Theirs vice versa. We can't use nuclear power in Vietnam; they can't use it in Czechoslovakia, they can't use it in Rumania, they can't use it anywhere where they're in trouble.

BRANDON. *Not even against China?*

LIPPMANN. It is quite conceivable that the Soviet Union might make a pre-emptive strike at China's nuclear power. But it won't be total war. Neither China nor the Soviet Union can invade the other seriously. It will remain a border war, and I don't think theirs will be a pacified border as far ahead as we can see.

BRANDON. *How do you foresee, then, the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union on one side and China on the other?*

LIPPMANN. Believing as I do that we're in the age—I'm not talking about the next six months—of the decline of very great, very large powers in influence, I expect to see the breakup of the Soviet empire in Asia and possibly the breakup of the Chinese empire. They're too big to govern. I think those will go along with the deflation of the American ambition—not ambition because I don't think the people had the ambition—but the American theory that we are the guardians of the world.

BRANDON. *When you talk of breakup of the Soviet Union or China, do you mean that some of the republics now part of the Soviet Union would become independent?*

LIPPMANN. They will break down along the edges, with that long, 5,000-mile frontier which is neither Russian nor Chinese.

BRANDON. *And on the Chinese side. . . .*

LIPPMANN. I don't know enough about Asia, but I think China is obviously too big to be governed as one central state.

BRANDON. *What kind of policy should the United States pursue with the Soviet Union? There is a controversy as to whether the U.S., for instance, should side with the Soviet Union to help contain China, or should she play an even hand between the two?*

LIPPMANN. First of all we must make perfectly sure that the nuclear power is really balanced, that there is no question about the impossibility of waging nuclear war, using nuclear weapons as an instrument of diplomacy. After that, I think our best policy is one of absolute neutrality or hands off, and let nature take its course. I wouldn't align myself with anybody.

BRANDON. *Do you think that this balance of the nuclear field is best maintained by the status quo or through disarmament talks?*

LIPPMANN. I don't have very great hopes for the disarmament talks. I think the reality is the fact that nuclear war is made impossible for both the nuclear powers by the facts of life, and as long as that's maintained that is the essence of it.

BRANDON. *With the great success that the United States has scored in landing men on the moon, do you think the time has come to further advance in that field and spend more money on it, or would you now cut down in space expenditures?*

LIPPMANN. I would follow the advice of the best scientists, not only the best engineers we have. If they say, as I think they seem to be saying, that the next stage of exploration should be done by unmanned spaceships, that would certainly be less expensive than having a manned landing. I would follow that line.

BRANDON. *So you would prefer to reduce the cost of space exploration?*

LIPPMANN. Yes. There's no necessity of expanding it. I mean, it might be desirable to land a man on the moon, but there is no compulsion to do it.

BRANDON. *You have no blue-water theory about space?*

LIPPMANN. No, I haven't. I don't take the view of those who say that the $25-billion, or whatever we spent on getting to the moon, should have been spent at home in clearing up the slums and so on, because I don't believe it would have been spent on that. I think under no conceivable circumstances would the Congress of the United States or the American taxpayer have voted all that money for any form of social improvement because they couldn't have agreed on what improvement to spend it on. They'd have spent it instead on liquor, cosmetics, television sets and whatnot.

BRANDON. *Do you think they'll spend for social improvements what until be saved as the costs of the Vietnamese war decline?*

LIPPMANN. I don't think they'll spend $25-billion on any social project because there is no social project that can get the kind of agreement that could be gotten, perhaps once in an era, on a project like the moon. To go to the moon they didn't have to consult any Congressmen, lobbyists, vested interests or people on the moon. The moon was empty and that made it much easier to agree upon. What's more, the whole project was conceived originally (as we know from President Kennedy's memorandum) as a project for defeating the Russians. It's easy to get people to agree on something like that. But to get them to agree on where to build tenements or where to clean up rivers is a wholly different matter.

BRANDON. *Do you think that Nixon's new approach to welfare may catch the imagination and support of people?*

LIPPMANN. I think it will. I think it will take more time than I wish it would take, but it is inherently sound and I think almost unanswerable in theory. I agree with people who think it will take two years to enact, put it into law, and that debate will be useful. But the kind of political structure of welfare it proposes is a good one; it is almost unanswerable in principle.

BRANDON. *Are you surprised that there are virtually no representatives of the so-called Establishment in the Nixon Administration?*

LIPPMANN. I look on Nixon himself and his Administration as engaged in deflating, not merely the financial inflation, but deflating the political inflation which was built up in the course of generations, built up really from the time that Wilson promised to make "the world safe for democracy"; then by Franklin Roosevelt promising "to save the world from fear" and by Kennedy trying to save it from revolutionary wars, and finally Johnson trying to make a Great Society everywhere, not merely in the United States. Those were inflated promises, and we're now in the process of unrolling or deflating that inflation. In the course of time an Establishment grew up which had vested interests in these inflated promises and programs. It's perfectly natural that they shouldn't be active or shouldn't be enthusiastic about the deflationary process which we're now living in. Deflation is always uninspiring. You always feel, "My God, I wish something exciting would happen!"

The country is fed up with what I'm calling now inflationary promises. I think they're tired of high prices, they're tired of having wars, of having responsibilities all over the place.

BRANDON. *Do you think that this attitude will lead to a new isolationism?*

LIPPMANN. If you measure the opposite of isolationism by the extreme expansionism which we suffered (as I've said before) as a result of the military consequences of the Second World War—yes, of course, it is. Any drawing back is more isolationist than going forward, but in the sense that the United States will be isolationist as it was when World War I came along, I certainly don't.

BRANDON. *Well that's a very poor yardstick . . .*

LIPPMANN. That's the opposite extreme.

BRANDON. *But where do you think is really the borderline today between the U.S. maintaining a role of leadership in the world and new isolationism?*

LIPPMANN. The borderline, as I said, strategically and for the use of infantry, is in the two oceans in the blue-water areas.

BRANDON. *But doesn't it go further in Europe?*

LIPPMANN. Western Europe, of course, has a very fuzzy frontier, but Western Europe and North America and Central America are the common homeland of Western civilization and they must be defended. Beyond that our military power does not really effectively reach.

BRANDON. *Let's take another comparative yardstick. The "America First" idea before World War II. How would that compare to the situation today?*

LIPPMANN. The "America First" idea before World War II was an attempt to go back to the isolation of pre-World War I. First, they said our influence should be the three-mile limit outside the continental United States. Then they gradually agreed that we'd probably defend Hawaii and Alaska and a little belt of water around South America.

I think the difficulty for you, Henry, if I may say so, being English, is that you are haunted by the notion that the United States is going to fill the role in the 20th century that Britain thinks it filled in the 19th century. I mean after the Napoleonic War the theory was that there was a *Pax Britannica* in the world. After World War II, Britain having exhausted itself and America becoming very strong, the theory was propagated—foremost of all by Churchill himself after World War II—that from now we would have a *Pax Americana* in the world. Now, that proved to be an illusion. We're living in the aftermath of that. There is no such thing as a *Pax Americana*. There won't be a *Pax Sovietica* or anything like it, because the world is too big to be governed by anybody. There will be no central place—not London, not Washington, not the United Nations—to which you can go and resolve every conflict.

BRANDON. *So the world will rest on an unwritten constitution.*

LIPPMANN. And on the balance of forces. The world, I think, has lost its appetite for big wars. Small wars, such as we see now in Ulster and along the borders of Israel—that people will continue to fight about.

BRANDON. *But couldn't the big powers be dragged into a fight like Israel?*

LIPPMANN. They could be, nobody can say they can't be or won't be, but they will increasingly try to avoid it as long as the balance of nuclear power is maintained because it's too absolutely, devastatingly suicidal for everybody concerned and there could be no winner in a nuclear war.

BRANDON. *Let me turn to a more immediate problem. What sort of outcome do you foresee in Vietnam?*

LIPPMANN. I think that the United States will withdraw, is withdrawing. I don't think we are doing it as neatly as the formula expounded by the Administration. I think if this withdrawal and gradual pulling at it continues, the Government in Saigon will collapse. When it collapses, a new Government will take its place which will be acceptable as a negotiator, both with the Vietcong and with Hanoi. I don't think that's very glorious. I think it could be done very much more neatly and with less loss of the moral and spiritual realities of that conflict by announcing (I think we should have announced when President Nixon took office) that the objective of the negotiations in Paris was to negotiate the withdrawal of the American forces from the continent of Asia over a period of two or three years, subject to terms of amnesty and whatnot, which would make the thing humane if not glorious. In other words, we should have admitted, not that we were defeated—because we haven't been defeated—but that we have failed in the attempt to extend our influence through the kind of government we think we believe in, for whenever we go, that influence will evaporate anyway.

BRANDON. *What do you think will be the consequences of such an outcome?*

LIPPMANN. I think that Hanoi will become the dominant part of Vietnam, North Vietnam will dominate South Vietnam. It's the stronger part of it, and it will be Communist, probably more or less like Yugoslavia is Communist, relatively speaking, and it won't make very much of a difference.

BRANDON. *If I may become more personal: you have known more important people in the world than probably anybody in your profession alive today. Who are the men who stand out in your memory?*

LIPPMANN. Churchill, de Gaulle, Khrushchev, then Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, but I wouldn't rank them with the men I mentioned first as prime figures.

BRANDON. *Why not Wilson?*

LIPPMANN. Because I think Wilson made a botch of the conclusion of the First World War, which led, really, to the Second World War. I think he misunderstood what he could do in Europe, but the details of that are very complicated. But having more or less seen it and participated a little bit in it, I think I know what I mean by that.

BRANDON. *You participated yourself in the drafting of the Fourteen Points, I believe. Do you feel that you played a part in the miscarriage?*

LIPPMANN. No, I don't think so. I think the Fourteen Points were an attempt—or 8 of the 14 points, to be more exact—to offset and uncommit the Allied forces from the secret treaties which had been found and published by the Bolsheviks when they seized power in the revolution of 1917. The Fourteen Points say "no" to the secret treaties that were formed before that, but I thought that the general peace that was made at Versailles was a violation, not a minor violation but a major violation, of the commitments we had made in the Fourteen Points, and was bound to lead to war, as we said in The News Republic at that time.

BRANDON. *You mentioned Churchill first. Why?*

LIPPMANN. I think first of all of what Churchill did in 1940 in rallying Britain, and with it a great mass of people scattered all over the world, against Hitler. It was an enormous accomplishment of the human spirit. I think his general strategy of the war, in spite of the fact that disagreements arose, was a brilliant strategy.

BRANDON. *What do you remember about your own meetings with him?*

LIPPMANN. I met him several times under not very interesting circumstances in the thirties, but I remember very well an evening that my wife and I spent with him and with the Kenneth Clarks and Harold Nicolson, and I think maybe one other man, when the war had begun—1939, as I remember. It's all described, this dinner, in Harold Nicolson's book. The war had begun and it was a so-called phony-war period. Churchill was there and we sat on a sofa and discoursed about what was going to happen. It was one of the most moving and entertaining and brilliant performances I've ever listened to. My wife and I, when we got home, just as Nicolson did, made a complete record of everything we could remember, and I still have it.

BRANDON. *Then you mentioned de Gaulle.*

LIPPMANN. I first met de Gaulle in 1942. I went to London to see him. I had been a partisan of his ever since the fall of France, and I was writing a lot about him. He was the man who didn't give in. What I remember about de Gaulle—and I have seen him on and off ever since—is that he was the man who, in the long view, was more right than anybody I ever talked to. He wasn't very good at the short view. The immediate subject didn't interest him; he didn't study the details. But as to the long view, he was a genius. I always used to see him whether he was in or out of power once in Colombey-les-Deux-Eglises; I still admire him enormously. The only trouble with de Gaulle is that he should have stopped after his first term. He shouldn't have run the second time.

BRANDON. *Did he change a great deal over the period you knew him?*

LIPPMANN. The last time I saw him was just before he was leaving for Rumania a year ago; it was before the student troubles broke out in Paris. He was very interesting, but I thought it was obvious he was no longer firmly at grip with the realities of Europe and France. If he had stopped a little bit over a year before that, his record would have been wonderful.

BRANDON. *What you call de Gaulle's short-term aims, aren't they really long-term aims: the relationship between France and Germany, the future of Europe de patries. They really did not come to pass. The Franco-German alliance deteriorated. The Europeans still want Britain in the Common Market and a politically more united Europe. Nor did his relations with the Soviet Union in many ways materialize the way he hoped. Would you agree with this?*

LIPPMANN. I think you are confusing the long-term vision and the short-term errors. Take Franco-Germany: He was the first Frenchman who really saw that France and Germany had forever to end the Franco-German feud which resulted in three or four wars, though some of the speeches he made when he went to Germany were appallingly bad, I thought. The Europe *de patries* is really correct; Europe is not ready to relinquish sovereignty to a federal system. Jean Monnet misunderstood the American system of government. I used to argue this at length with him. He couldn't understand why there was any difference between the United States of America and the United States of Europe. But the difference was that the United States of America had always been united under the King of England, and the United States, as we know it, was formed to make a more perfect union; but they never had a union in Europe unless you go back to the Roman Empire or the Holy Roman Empire. So basically, even today, England wouldn't join Monnet's Europe. You may deny that as an Englishman. It will be a Europe *de patries;* that's what it's going to be. It's not going to abolish national sovereignty.

BRANDON. *Then you mentioned Khrushchev.*

LIPPMANN. I saw Khruschev twice in Russia, and both times I had long talks. Nothing with Khrushchev was ever short. That was Kennedy's mistake in Vienna, in my opinion. He was in too much of a hurry. Anything with Khrushchev lasts a day at least, and maybe three days, and Kennedy was in a hurry to get away. That's impossible with Khrushchev. I think on the whole that if there was any possibility in our time of a gradual liberal growing together between the West and East, it was under Khrushchev. It might have worked, it just might have. His fall has certainly made it impossible at any foreseeable time to have anything more than a balance of forces.

BRANDON. *Why do you attribute so much to an individual in a country like the Soviet Union, which is basically controlled by a party and not by an individual?*

LIPPMANN. Because I think it wasn't an individual; Khrushchev represented a real movement; that's why there was some sense in it. I think that movement still exists in Russia. I don't think the Soviet Union is a peaceful, easily controlled country now because the Government in power is opposing the forces that he embodied and that were behind him.

BRANDON. *We were talking earlier about your role in drafting the Fourteen Points. In looking back, do you feel that you have influenced events?*

LIPPMANN. I don't know. I think I have sometimes been right and sometimes have been wrong. Sometimes, when events went the way I thought they ought to go, I had the feeling of going with them. But that I made events, I have no illusions.

BRANDON. *Which of the positions that you took in the past are you particularly proud of?*

LIPPMANN. One of them is that I was editor of The New York World when we were in great danger. We were about to invade Mexico, and The New York World raised such a hullabaloo about it that President Coolidge picked Dwight Morrow to go down there and compose it, rather than invade and occupy. Then he, Dwight Morrow, in order to cement good feeling, brought Lindbergh to Mexico City for a visit to show off, like we show off the astronauts. And Lindbergh married his daughter. I am most pleased with that because I think we averted a disaster, something like Vietnam. I think the most foolish thing that I can remember in my many human errors is that during the Second World War I was one of the people who joined the hue and cry for war against the Soviet Union to save Finland. That was the most nonsensical thing that anybody ever proposed, but I can remember doing it.

BRANDON. *Are there any other mistakes?*

LIPPMANN. Those are the highlights. There are many other mistakes, but I don't want to bring them out at this moment.

BRANDON. *Any other point that you are proud of?*

LIPPMANN. I'm glad that I was opposed to the land war in Vietnam from the first time it was mentioned. I was coached by very good coaches—I won't mention their names, but among them were the highest generals in the American Army. They were the same people who advised President Eisenhower, who never would involve himself in the kind of war that we finally did involve ourself in.

BRANDON. *If you look back, what are the events that influenced your own life?*

LIPPMANN. The first, I suppose, was the First World War, for which I was entirely unprepared in my mind. You see, I was born literally in the horse-and-buggy age. So much so that as a child I used to drive around Central Park with my grandfather and his horse and buggy. The automobiles were just coming in, and I remember the first telephone put in our house. You could telephone only to a few people who belonged on the same line. That was the age of innocence, and I certainly partook of that innocence. I was in Europe when the First World War began and was on my way to a holiday in Switzerland when the railroad station told me the line was closed. The Germans were invading just a few miles away. That was the beginning of my first awareness of what the world was all about.

BRANDON. *Do you regret having lived in this century, are you more a 19th century man?*

LIPPMANN. I don't think I would have liked the 19th century. I think I would have liked the 18th century if I had been one of the people privileged to enjoy it. That's only because I like to read about it.

BRANDON. *Do you think that this is a better world today than it was when you were young?*

LIPPMANN. No. I think it's a much less pleasant world to live in, especially for people who had privileges, but I think certain evils begin to recede and there is progress in that sense. But there are some big setbacks. I mean the barbarity of modern war is incredibly greater than it was in the 18th century and even in the 19th century. But the feeling of human equality, the right to equality, is greater today than it was when I was a child. Then we didn't talk about it; it didn't exist. Anything that makes the world more humane and more rational is progress; that's the only measuring stick we can apply to it. But I don't wish to imply that I think this is a great progressive age in the world; I don't. I think it's going to be a minor dark age.

BRANDON. *Is it a safer world today than the world of your youth?*

LIPPMANN. It's not safe for the human being in a personal way. It's much more dangerous and difficult. But what I didn't know in my youth was that two world wars were impending. I don't think world wars are impending now.

BRANDON. *Do you think that today's young offer a greater promise than the generation of your youth?*

LIPPMANN. One of the disadvantages of being my age is that you don't meet many young people, not nearly enough. You meet an awful lot of their disillusioned parents, and you read and you see them performing. My impression is that they are far better informed than my generation was. They are far more concerned with the state of the world. Those that I have met don't have any of the characteristics that they're supposed to have, but they are still free and liberated in themselves and not at all dirty in their physical appearance. I'm inclined to think that due to rapid technological progress there is a large mass of redundant human material, people who cannot be employed in our highly complex technological systems. These derelicts from progress—the anarchists, the hippies, the nihilists and all those—are not an unusual development in the history of very great revolutions in the world. It probably was like that in the first and second centuries of the Roman Empire. I don't think anybody, and least of all me, is capable of making a judgment as to how competent they are or whether they are going to solve the problems that we don't know how to solve.

BRANDON. *Are you implying that you foresee some sort of a revolution?*

LIPPMANN. We live in a revolution! I don't foresee it; it's here. This is the most revolutionary period that has occurred for centuries. What I mean by that is that we know as a matter of ordinary history that when you have a revolution by the invention of steam engines or the invention of printing, social developments follow from their application. The absolutely revolutionary invention of our time is the invention of invention itself. We have learned how to invent inventions. That's why this is truly the most revolutionary age that man has ever lived in. It's also the reason for the moral and psychological differences of our time. You see, when Charles Snow wrote that very suggestive lecture about the two cultures, he didn't say then, as we would say in America (it may not be true in England), that we have a large generation now that has neither culture. It doesn't understand science and it doesn't understand the old humanist tradition. Those people probably hold the balance of preponderant votes in our political system. They understand only their own personal appetites and likes and dislikes and prejudices and ambitions and hates. But they really are alienated from either the technological or the humane source and they don't believe in much religion. They don't believe in the scientific view of the world because they don't understand science. Anyway, there isn't any scientific world that you can believe in in that sense.

BRANDON. *Who influenced you most in your life?*

LIPPMANN. My first and best teacher as a child was a man named Frederick Thompson who taught me history and geography in school. He taught me a great deal of geography, and I've always thought if you didn't understand the geography of an international situation you probably wouldn't understand it. Then in college I was very much influenced by William James, who was retired but living in Cambridge, and by Santayana, whose courses I took. And by Graham Wallas, who was a visiting professor at Harvard in my junior and my graduate year. Then I was very much influenced later by John Maynard Keynes, whom I first met at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and whose book on the Paris Peace Conference I arranged with my publishers to publish. Keynes had a very great influence on all my economics. In fact, I hope I'm a Keynesian.

BRANDON. *How did James and Santayana influence you philosophically?*

LIPPMANN. I want to add to Keynes and Santayana another name, Irving Babbitt, who was teaching at Harvard then. James, I think, made me see how a human reaction to problems ought to be. But what he taught I found less convincing than what Santayana taught. But Santayana was inhuman in his personal relations.

BRANDON. *But wasn't he also rather inhuman in his outlook on humanity?*

LIPPMANN. Yes, but it was beautiful and it was correct. Babbitt, whom I resented greatly as a young man, today would be resented as a conservative but has proved to be right about the dangers of the romantic movement and about the Jacobin movement, much of which I've adopted. He's not a very ingratiating figure, but he was a very influential teacher.

BRANDON. *You probably would have been a very great teacher yourself if you had gone into that profession. Do you wish that you had gone into a different profession than you did?*

LIPPMANN. I tried teaching for a year. I was an assistant to Santayana, actually, in his elementary philosophy course. I didn't like teaching. I was bored with the subject, having to repeat it over and over again. No, I would not have preferred a different profession, but I would have preferred to have different gifts. I'd like to have been born a great mathematician or something like that where I would have dealt with problems that didn't require dealing with the everlasting persnicketiness of human nature.

BRANDON. *You are really one of the few columnists, perhaps the last one, who has a philosophy, who tries to see the world in a specific perspective and who tries to analyze events as they fit your own philosophy.*

LIPPMANN. If I am perhaps the last it is because there is no available philosophy around that fits the revolutionary period in which we live.

BRANDON. *Do you think that television is partly to blame?*

LIPPMANN. Television is guilty of an awful lot of things in our lives, and it's adding to the irrationality of the world, I think. There's no doubt of that because it makes everything simpler or more dramatic or more immedate than it is. You really, if you listen to television, can't find out what's going on in the world.

BRANDON. *So that would merely imply that columnists and analysts are more important today than they ever were.*

LIPPMANN. Yes, they are. They've got to stand against a tremendous tide, and I think they probably will.

BRANDON. *Do you think newspapers are here to stay?*

LIPPMANN. Oh, yes. People can't live on television. I listen to the news on the television and it's very good. People like Walter Cronkite and David Brinkley are excellent,

really, but you can't live on what they give you.

BRANDON. *That's very reassuring, for a newspaperman. Tell me, what are your plans for the next 10 years?*

LIPPMANN. I'm not planning that far ahead. But I'm working on a book and if I can get it blocked out this summer, which I may be able to do, then I'll spend the next few years rewriting it; what will come of that, I have no way of telling. Then occasionally I'm going to write newspaper articles and vent my opinions.

BRANDON. *Is your book going to be a sort of philosophic legacy?*

LIPPMANN. Yes, I can't really describe the book to you because it really isn't written yet, but it's dealing with the problem of the ungovernability of mankind in our era and why and how and whether and what.

BRANDON. *What have you got in mind?*

LIPPMANN. This is not the first time that human affairs have been chaotic and seemed ungovernable. But never before, I think, have the stakes been so high. I am not talking about, nor do I expect, a catastrophe like nuclear war. What is really pressing upon us is that the number of people who need to be governed and are involved in governing threatens to exceed man's capacity to govern. This furious multiplication of the masses of mankind coincides with the ever-more-imminent threat that, because we are so ungoverned, we are polluting and destroying the environment in which the human race must live.

BRANDON. *Where does this lead us?*

LIPPMANN. The supreme question before mankind—to which I shall not live to know the answer—is how men will be able to make themselves willing and able to save themselves.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS IS NOT AN INCREASE

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the President's recently announced proposal for a 10-percent increase in social security benefits effective in April of 1970 does not represent a real increase at all. In terms of actual buying power, it represents a reduction in social security benefits.

Since the last increase in social security in February 1968, the cost of living has gone up by 8.2 percent—and it is continuing to rise. By April of 1970, a 10-percent increase in benefits will be totally meaningless. It will not even serve to counteract the loss our senior citizens have suffered from the rapid spiral of inflation.

I introduce today a bill designed to provide meaningful relief for social security beneficiaries. My bill includes an across-the-board increase of 15 percent effective January 1, 1970. This increase does more than just make up for the cost of living increase in the last 2 years; it represents a meaningful increase in actual buying power.

It further increases the minimum primary benefit from the current level of $55 per month to a much more realistic $100 per month.

This legislation also provides for an increase in the amount of money which a social security recipient may earn before losing any of his or her benefits. There are many senior citizens who are willing and able to work, but who are held back by the outside income limitation in the present law. Believe it or not, they have to worry about making too much money. My bill will permit a social security recipient to earn up to $250 per month—$3,000 per year—without loss of benefits.

Each of these provisions represents a meaningful change in social security, but the most important provision of my bill is the one which provides for an automatic cost-of-living increase. Unfortunately, the cost of living does not wait for the slow and deliberate workings of the legislative process. I suggest a mechanism whereby benefits may be increased without necessitating congressional action. As soon as possible after the end of each calendar quarter, the increase in the Consumer Price Index would be computed, and when it is determined that there has been a 3-percent increase over the base period—the last time benefits were increased—then benefits would automatically be increased by that percentage.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the senior citizens in my district—and I am sure that I speak for many others throughout the country—I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for announcing that hearings on amendments to the Social Security Act will begin within a month. I hope that these hearings will lead to prompt action. Our senior citizens have been promised so much this year, and they are becoming discouraged—I might say, disgruntled—by our lack of action to date. Their polite requests for increases in social security are now being followed up by more and more insistent demands. The time to act is now.

BILL TO REFORM SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the administration's announcement last week that draft calls for November and December will be canceled is little more than a clever manipulation of numbers designed to leave the impression that something substantial has been done about the draft.

According to the President, the October draft call will be "phased out over the final quarter of the year." The 29,000 previously scheduled for October will be drafted as follows: October, 10,000; November, 10,000; and December, 9,000. The previous November and December quotas, 32,000 and 18,000, respectively, were not draft calls but rather estimated projections prepared by the Defense Department but never formally forwarded to the Selective Service System. They were, therefore, easily "canceled."

What we really have is a reduction in the quotas for these 3 months—not a suspension or cancellation of the draft. In fact, a review of figures for the same quarter last year will show that lower calls at this time are not unusual. In 1968, we drafted 13,800 in October, 10,000 in November, and 17,500 in December, while the monthly average for the preceding 9 months was 28,000. In the first 9 months of 1969 the average has been 26,000 per month.

Mr. Speaker, this numbers game should not deceive us and divert us from the urgent task of providing fundamental and effective reform of the Selective Service System.

The administration's "cancellation" was designed to mislead the public into believing that substantial action had been taken when actually only a routine reduction of monthly quotas was authorized. Nothing has been done to rectify the inequity and uncertainty of the present draft.

I am today introducing a bill to reform the Selective Service System. This legislation incorporates some of the features of previously introduced bills but adds significantly to them.

Briefly, the bill provides for: a genuinely random selection system to pick those to be drafted; a primary selection pool of 19-year-olds; a 1-year period of eligibility for the draft—either a man's 19th year or the 1 year following his graduation from college; elimination of "critical skills" deferments to prevent Presidential prerogatives from structuring the manpower of each generation; cancellation of college deferments when casualty rates in a declared or undeclared war reach a certain level; nationally uniform standards and criteria for classification and induction of draftees; and a reduced active duty obligation for men who serve in a national service program to combat poverty, ignorance, or disease.

This feature also provides for complete relief from Reserve obligations following active duty for such individuals.

Fundamental reform of the draft cannot wait. The President's actions last week do not constitute reform but rather serve to confuse and mislead the public.

There are some 40 reform bills presently pending before the Armed Services Committee. The bill I am introducing today combines the best features of those bills and adds to them. Mr. Speaker, let us act immediately to bring about the necessary and overdue reform that the present state of the draft requires.

Thank you.

THE SST DECISION MADE BY PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the President today has given the green light to the U.S. supersonic transport program. The Congress now must provide the necessary appropriations to assure this Nation's leadership in air transportation.

I wholeheartedly endorse the President's decision. It was a careful and deliberate decision. The President sought the counsel of an interdepartmental committee and the advice of experts in and out of Government.

On April 18, 1969, I sent a telegram to President Nixon and the Secretary of Transportation urging that the United States proceed, without delay, on prototype production of the SST.

As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I am well aware of

the serious fiscal situation confronting our Nation, and the need for establishing priorities.

The SST, in my opinion, should be given a high priority to proceed for the following reasons:

First. The United States already has over a half billion dollars invested in this program, and we are within 3 years of having our own prototypes ready for testing. Although the Government's share will be an estimated $994 million, this amount will be recovered through royalty payments.

Second. Any interruption or slowdown of this program would seriously undermine America's world leadership in aviation during the crucial 1970's and 1980's. The British, French, and Russians already are flight testing their own versions of the SST.

Third. Aircraft exports have been and continue to be an important, favorable influence in the U.S. balance of trade. If the SST program is not pursued, we will lose significant exports, further deteriorating the balance-of-payments situation.

Fourth. One of the most important domestic contributions of the SST program is in the area of employment. It has been estimated that development and long-term production of an SST within this country will sustain an average employment level of 50,000 among the prime airframe and engine manufacturers and first level subcontractors.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has invested billions of dollars in the program to land men on the moon. The genius of American industrial, scientific, and technological know-how was intrumental in achieving the national objective of a moon landing in the 1960's.

Now we have the objective of commercial supersonic flight. It will not be as costly as the lunar program; and more than likely the American taxpayer will recover his investment by the sale of the 300th SST.

We must see to it that when the day of extensive supersonic travel arrives, U.S. aircraft lead the way. President Nixon's decision today to proceed will assure U.S. leadership in air transportation.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S NEW DOMESTIC POLICY PROPOSALS

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson expressed the essence of the American constitutionalism and our governmental system:

> It is not by consolidation, or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected.

But for the past third of a century the drift of the American Government has been the opposite. Forgetting the warning of our Founding Fathers, political leadership in these past four decades too often thought that bigger government meant more effective government.

Ever since the depression era spawned its spate of alphabet agencies, there has been increased concentration and consolidation of power. Decisionmaking and responsibility have flown away from the people and the States to Washington.

But now for the first time that tide has been stemmed and there is beginning a new era in government. Future historians will mark President Nixon's proposals on welfare reforms, manpower training, and revenue sharing as the turning point in a new government direction. In what may be the most dramatic domestic decision made by any President this century, Richard Nixon promises a "new federalism"—a new federalism which brings opportunity and a chance to work back to those people on assistance; a new federalism which brings the administration of manpower training programs back to the State governments; a new federalism that makes the Office of Economic Opportunity, which was a massive cluster of federally administered projects, into a laboratory for pilot projects and experimentation.

With the thrust of these programs we can begin returning responsibility and initiative to the States, and the people.

By a family assistance program that offers incentives to go out and find a job or the training that leads to a job, we can bring the chance for self-reliance and self-initiative to the people.

By a new manpower training program which offers flexible funding and decentralization, we can carefully shift the administration of training programs to the State and local governments.

By a revenue sharing program we can begin in 1971 to return a half billion dollars back to the States. This first step will be a dramatic gesture of faith in the American ideal of encouraging government close to the people.

MARIHUANA

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply disturbing to me to read in the newspapers of recent weeks the statements attributed to administration officials promoting the downgrading of penalties for the use and possession of marihuana. Not that the penalty structure for such offenses is beyond legislative review, but the off-the-cuff personal comments by respected public officials may well have the unfortunate effect of giving license by implication to the curiosity-seekers to at least give marihuana a try.

To be specific, Dr. Roger O. Ekeberg, HEW's Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, is reported to have said at a recent meeting of the International Union Against Tuberculosis that the penalties for possession of marihuana are too strict and that marihuana should not be classed with dangerous drugs such as heroin.

Dr. Ekeberg allegedly said:

> The present laws are completely out of proportion to the dangers presented by marihuana. I don't personally think marihuana leads to heroin.

Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, Director of the National Institutes of Health, testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, is credited with urging milder penalties for the use and possession of marihuana and said:

> The smoking of marihuana has become an accepted fashion among millions of our citizens.

While emphasizing that the use of marihuana is unhealthy, Dr. Yolles reportedly said:

> That in the interests of public health, it is necessary—*at least for the present*—(emphasis added) to maintain restrictions on the availability and use of marihuana.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Yolles was the Chairman of the Health Subcommittee to report on the dangers of marihuana for the Special Presidential Task Force Relating to Narcotics, Marihuana, and Dangerous Drugs, and in connection with statements of public officials in the mass media, the report says:

> Allegations have been made and attributed to government officials that marihuana is no more dangerous than alcohol. When these stories appear in the mass media, they often do considerable harm, even when subsequently retracted.

The same may be said of those statements which minimize the dangers of marihuana and urge lesser penalties for its use and possession. Youth echo the so-called logic of supposedly responsible adults, and the higher placed the individual, the more credence is given to his reported remarks, whether or not well-founded. The logic and merit of these statements are immaterial, for the impression left in the minds of youth is that here we have a couple of highly-placed Government officials who are saying that marihuana is not really as dangerous as it has been made out to be, and if its use is as widespread and popular as claimed, not only is it likely that penalties will be reduced, as urged, but it may even be legalized if there is no effective deterrent to its use. This reasoning is unsound, for compared with traffic laws for speeding, for example, the mere allegation, or even the fact, that most drivers exceed the speed limit would in no way be a legitimate reason for reducing the penalties for speeding.

With respect to the dangers of marihuana, whether they be social, psychological, or physical, it may be well to note certain aspects of the special Presidential task force report.

On its effects on youth:

> Normal adolescence is a time of considerable psychological turmoil . . . Persistent use of an agent which serves to ward off reality during this critical period of development is likely to effect adversely the future ability of the individual to cope with the demands of a complex society.

On progression to other drugs:

> It must be concluded that regular and continuous use of *cannabis* (Marihuana) can and does produce psychological dependency and marked susceptibility to progression to stronger reality concealing drugs.

On marihuana versus alcohol:

> While alcoholism constitutes a major social problem, surely it is not valid to justify the adoption of a new abuse on the basis that it is no worse than a presently existing one . . . (Legalizing the use of marihuana) would not solve our alcohol problem and would only lead to additional numbers of marihuana intoxicated individuals.

On marihuana use and crime:

While perhaps it cannot be statistically proven that marihuana or other dangerous drugs may be the cause of originating crime, nevertheless the use of marihuana or dangerous drugs is related to increased criminal activity.

Mr. Speaker, because the debate continues over the pros and cons of downgrading the dangers and the penalties for use and possession of marihuana, I believe it will be of interest to all the Members of this body to review that chapter from the task force's report on "The Dangers of Marihuana" and include the text at this point in my remarks:

CHAPTER I. THE DANGERS OF MARIHUANA

WHAT IS MARIHUANA?

Marihuana (pot, grass, weed, etc.) is a product of the Indian hemp plant known to botanists as *cannabis sativa* (L.). It is derived from the leaves and flowering tops of the female plant which are the source of the phychoactive material. Under federal law, marihuana is defined to mean all parts of the *cannabis* plant except for the stalks and sterilized seeds.

Marihuana contains a number of potent compounds called tetrahydrocannabinols (THC) which affect the mind and body in various ways. Potency of the drug varies greatly depending on growing conditions such as temperature, humidity, soil conditions, and methods of cultivation. Generally, plants grown in sunny, dry climates are most likely to contain the highest proportion of THC. The pharmacologic potency of any preparation of marihuana depends upon the amount of THC which it contains.

The drug is most commonly smoked in hand-made cigarettes (reefers, sticks or joints.) The butt is called a "roach." Marihuana is also smoked in ordinary pipes or water pipes. The effects of the drug are decreased three or four times if it is swallowed rather than smoked.

Various forms of marihuana are prepared from extracts of the plant. Hashish (hash, charas) is the purest and most concentrated of the natural *cannabis* products. It consists of the concentrated resin of the plant and is usually eight times as concentrated as the typical marihuana available in North America. Once rare in the United States, hashish is reported to be increasingly obtainable in response to a rising demand. Relating foreign studies of *cannabis* use to the American scene is difficult because of the generally higher potency of the *cannabis* products used abroad. Marihuana grown in this country is typically of lower potency and is often weakened further by additives such as oregano. However, Mexican grown marihuana has a high potency and is regularly sold in the United States. It should be noted that all marihuana products lose strength over time.

While marihuana contains many ingredients, THC is believed to be the principle psychoactive substance. With the synthesis of THC in 1966,[1] and the demonstration of its psychopharmacological effects in 1967,[2] a basis was finally established for more precise, systematic pharmacological investigation of the drug. At present, THC is being synthesized in research quantities. Along with other natural marihuana constituents, THC is being made available under appropriate precautions to qualified researchers through the National Institute of Mental Health's Center for Studies of Narcotics and Drug Abuse.

Since marihuana products produce effects similar to other hallucinogens like LSD, and their reactions are often indistinguishable from those produced by other psychedelics, they are pharmacologically classified in that category.

PRESENT EVIDENCE OF EXTENT OF USE

Marihuana use has been rapidly increasing in the past five years. Although originally restricted to certain jazz musicians, artists and ghetto dwellers, it has now appeared among the middle and upper class. A conservative estimate of persons, both juvenile and adult, who have used marihuana at least once is about five million.

One of the most alarming aspects of the current drug crisis is the involvement of young people. In California alone juvenile arrests for drug offenses increased from 1,271 in 1961 to 14,112 in 1967. Of the 14,112 juvenile arrests in California during 1967, 10,987 were arrested for marihuana violations. To understand the full significance of this figure it must be compared with the year 1961 in which there were 401 arrests. In 1967 alone there were over 2,000 more arrests for marihuana violations then in the previous six years combined.

Two years ago, surveys in parts of the country where marihuana use is known to be high suggested that twenty percent of the college students in those areas had experience with marihuana. Present evidence, although spotty, suggests that as many as sixty percent of the students on some campuses have used it. Some students feel that official estimates are low, and that the true extent of drug abuse among college students is even higher. There are also many reports of increasing use of marihuana in high schools although there is not sufficient data to establish a countrywide pattern. Significantly, most recent college data indicated that many college users were first exposed to marihuana in high school. However, the bulk of users are more aptly characterized as "triers" rather than habitual "potheads." Two out of three who have tried the drug have used it not more than one to ten times. In the most recent (Fall, 1968) survey based on a geographic area of high use, about one person in ten reported using marihuana regularly for as much as a year's duration. Finally, there is growing evidence that the number of pre-teenagers who are using marihuana is increasing.[3]

EFFECTS

The use of marihuana produces a variety of mental and physical effects. If active marihuana is smoked effectively (inhaled and kept in the lungs as long as possible) symptoms may appear after one or two puffs and the effect may last from several minutes to several hours.

Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, Director, National Institute of Mental Health, has stated:

"Little can be added to previous reports on the toxicity of marihuana. It is considered to be a mild hallucinogen, taken by the usual route of smoking, occasionally by ingestion. It may induce a mild euphoria and lead to heightened suggestibility and faulty perception, really an exaggerated notion of thinking more clearly, profoundly and creatively. In addition, it is known to cause reddening of the membranes of the eyes, rapid heartbeat, muscular incoordination, unsteadiness, drowsiness, and distortion of time and space perception.

"In acute intoxication, especially when ingested, it may also produce visual hallucinations, pronounced anxiety, paranoid reactions, and transient psychoses lasting four to six hours. It generally tends to lessen inhibitions and creates for the user a false reality based on his wants, his motivations, or the situation. In this respect it is similar to LSD, but its effects are not as potent.

"The muscular incoordination and the distortion of space and time perception commonly associated with marihuana use are potentially hazardous, since the drug adversely affects one's ability to drive an automobile or perform other skilled tasks.

"We still do not know enough about the long-term effects of marihuana use. As in the case of tobacco, it is possible that there are serious consequences of chronic use which will only become apparent through careful, longtime studies." [4]

A 1965 report on drug dependence for the World Health Organization describes the nature of marihuana intoxication in the following terms:

"Among the more prominent subjective effects . . . are: hilarity . . . carelessness; loquacious euphoria . . . distortion of sensation and perception . . . impairment of judgment and memory; distortion of emotional responsiveness; irritability; and confusion. Other effects, which appear after repeated administration . . . include: lowering of the sensory threshold, especially for optical and acoustical stimuli . . . and aggressiveness as a possible result of various intellectual and sensory derangements; and sleep disturbances." [5]

In small, low potency quantities marihuana may act as a mild euphoriant and sedative somewhat similar to alcohol. In relatively high doses psychotic-like phenomena, quite similar to those associated with LSD use, have been reported. Recurrences of the marihuana state (flashbacks) without actually taking the drug again have been reported. These recurrences can be anxiety provoking. Unlike the stronger hallucinogens, such as LSD, which produce wakefulness, marihuana tends to be more sedative in its properties. THC in sufficiently high doses can induce psychotic reactions in almost any individual.

Despite marihuana's long history—spanning thousands of years and many cultures—there has been comparatively little sound research on this drug. Only four laboratory studies investigating marihuana's immediate effects on humans have been reported in the American scientific literature. The first of these was done with a group of 34 soldiers in the Canal Zone. A second study, reported in the 1944 LaGuardia Report, is based on 72 prisoners' responses to marihuana extract. In 1946, a small number of chronic using prisoners were studied. A more carefully controlled study recently produced a report on some laboratory work with marihuana in humans done partially with NIMH support.[6]

All of these studies generally found loss of inhibitions, and feelings of relaxation and self-confidence together with some mild impairment of thinking and coordinated performance. It has also been demonstrated that THC, when administered in sufficiently high dosage, will cause a psychotic-like state, similar to that induced by LSD.

While no long-term physical effects of marihuana use have been adequately demonstrated in this country, the American experience has been extremely brief and additional studies are needed to resolve this and other issues. Although there is no firm evidence that marihuana use in humans has either teratogenic or genetic implications, this possibility should be explored—particularly in view of some evidence on this point with respect to LSD. It is possible that there are serious consequences of chronic use which will only become apparent after careful, long-term studies. In foreign countries where heavy use of the stronger cannabis preparations is common, a variety of physical ailments supposedly related to marihuana use have been reported—notable conjunctivitis, chronic bronchitis and certain digestive ailments.

There have also been reports of adverse psychological effects of marihuana both in this country and abroad. Recently a group of some 1500 psychiatrists, psychiatric residents, internists, general practitioners and psychologists in the Los Angeles area reported that they had seen almost nineteen hundred "adverse reactions" to marihuana.[7] It is difficult to interpret this finding since "adverse reaction" was poorly defined, and there has been no follow-up to define just what the reactions to the drug were. How-

Footnotes at end of article.

ever, there have been reports of increased number of hospitalizations following the usage of marihuana.

Considerable concern has been expressed in the United States over the possibility of personality changes and a loss of motivation among youthful marihuana users. The potential effects of a reality distorting agent on the future psychological development and maturation of the adolescent user are of special concern. Normal adolescence is a time of considerable psychological turmoil. Patterns of coping with reality developed in the teen years help determine later adult behavior. Persistent use of an agent which serves to ward off reality during this critical period of development is likely to effect adversely the future ability of the individual to cope with the demands of a complex society. While systematic studies of large numbers of American chronic users are not yet available, a number of clinicians have observed that at least some users show evidence of a loss of convential motivation. They seem to prefer instead a non-goal oriented life style, which emphasizes immediate satisfactions to the exclusion of ambition and future planning. The "pothead", then, may well retard his own chances for emotional growth by not learning how to deal with life stress. Characteristic personality changes among impressionable young persons from the regular use of marihuana include apathy, loss of effectiveness, and diminished capacity or willingness to carry out complex long-term plans, endure frustration, concentrate for long periods, follow routines, or successfully master new material. It has also been observed that verbal facility is often impaired, both in speaking and writing.

The British *cannabis* report by the Advisory Committee on Drug Dependence (1968) concluded:

"There have been reports, particularly from experienced observers in the Middle and Far East, which suggest that *very heavy long-term* (italics, theirs) consumption may produce a syndrome of increasing mental and physical deterioration to the point where the subject is tremulous, ailing and socially incompetent. This syndrome may be punctuated on occasions with outbursts of violent behavior. It is fair to say, however, that no reliable observations of such a syndrome have been made in the Western World, and that from the Eastern reports available to us, it is not possible to form a judgment on whether such behavior is directly attributable to *cannabis*-taking." [8]

PROGRESSION TO OTHER DRUGS

A basic question that frequently arises is the extent to which marihuana use in some sense predisposes users to escalate to stronger and more dangerous drugs. There is little question that most heroin and LSD users have had experience with marihuana. Indeed, 85 to 90 percent of heroin addicts reported that they started their use of drugs with marihuana. There is also a question whether any but a small percentage of marihuana users progress to other drugs, the evidence tending to show that only five percent of the habitual marihuana users progress to heroin addiction.

In discussing the question of progression, it is vital to distinguish between the casual experimenter with marihuana, and the regular and continuous user, and between physical addiction and psychological dependency.

A casual experimenter by definition is not dependent upon the drug. A regular and continuous user, on the other hand, may very well be dependent upon it.

Once he has become psychologically dependent upon one drug as a "crutch" to cope with life stress, the user is substantially more susceptible to the acquisition of a larger crutch through the medium of a stronger drug.

An example of the importance of this distinction is the heroin addict. The most desperately "hooked" of junkies with a "habit" costing hundreds of dollars per day can be "detoxified" in under 8 days, and brought to a point where absence of the drug will produce no physical reaction or withdrawal symptoms. Yet, let that individual be imprisoned for 5 years without access to the drug, and without effective psychiatric treatment, upon release he will seek a pusher. He will do so because he is still psychologically dependent upon heroin. Recognition of the fact is basic to the New York State rehabilitation program which spends years, rather than weeks, treating addicts. Their physical craving is terminated in days—their psychological dependency is the subject of years of treatment.

In view of the foregoing, it must be concluded that regular and continuous use of *cannabis* can and does produce psychological dependency and marked susceptibility to progression to stronger reality concealing drugs.

The progression is, however, probably not a consequence of the pharmacological properties of marihuana, but rather is due to sociological and psychological factors present in a vulnerable minority of users. For example, in ghetto situations where both drugs are freely available, sometimes from the same supplier, a progression based on availability may be likely. Similarly, heavy drug using subcultures may encourage widespread experimentation with a wide variety of drugs. Is it generally true that a heavy marihuana user is more likely to be a multiple drug user. In one study, half of the heavy users of marihuana had tried LSD. One in seven had used LSD more than 25 times or had tried heroin. Two out of five heavy users in this same study had abused amphetamines. This trend to multiple drug experimentation may increase in the future. In this connection it is important to point out that use of a combination of dangerous drugs may have a synergistic effect and may result in the death of the user.

There is reason to believe that heavy marihuana users are likely to have considerable interest in the use of the stronger forms of *cannabis* such as hashish. If hashish is available, many would probably use it in preference to low-potency marihuana. The history of mind-alerting drugs invariably reveals that excessive indulgence increases sharply as more potent preparations of a given drug become available.[9]

MARIHUANA VERSUS ALCOHOL

Some marihuana users have tried to justify their behavior by claiming that it is no worse than consuming alcohol. It is estimated that the consumption of alcohol is a major problem for some five to six million Americans who are unable to control their drinking. In most cases, excessive drinking of alcoholic beverages causes serious physical, psychological, social and vocational problems for these people and their families. It is well known that one-half of the fatal traffic accidents in the United States are related to excessive drinking. [10]

While alcoholism constitutes a major social problem, surely it is not valid to justify the adoption of a new abuse on the basis that it is no worse than a presently existing one. The result could only be added social damage from a new source. It would not solve our alcohol problem and would only lead to additional numbers of marihuana intoxicated individuals. Moreover, marihuana, unlike alcohol, is nearly always consumed by its users for the express purpose of obtaining a "high", a disorientating intoxication.

Allegations have been made and attributed to government officials that marihuana is no more dangerous than alcohol. When these stories appear in the mass media they often do considerable harm even when subsequently retracted. Dr. James Goddard, former Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, was extensively quoted as saying that marihuana is no more dangerous then alcohol. Dr. Goddard was, in fact, misquoted and never made such a statement. Although the wire service issued a written apology, the retraction has never caught up with the misquote.

THE POSITION OF THE AMA AND WHO

The American Medical Association has stated that marihuana is a dangerous drug and, as such, is a public health problem.[11] They reiterate that while no physical dependence develops this does not mean that it is an innocuous drug. Further research is considered essential, and educational programs should be directed to all segments of the population.

The World Health Organization recently reaffirmed its previous opinions that *cannabis* is a drug of dependence, produces public health and social problems, and that its control must be continued.[12] More basic data are needed on acute and chronic effects on the individual and society to permit accurate assessment of the degree of hazard to public health.

MARIHUANA USE AND CRIME

Aside from the fact that marihuana use and possession is in itself a crime, it has not been proven that its use is a direct cause of other types of criminal behavior.

Generally, assertions that marihuana plays a causal role in the commission of crime are based on reports from other than scientific agencies. The validity of these impressions is, however, questionable because of the unscientific basis on which such data has been collected. The New York Mayor's Committee (1944) reported that many criminals might use marihuana, but the Committee did not feel marihuana played a causal role in crime. In the United Kingdom, the use of *cannabis* has not been generally regarded as a direct cause of crime.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has observed:

"One likely hypothesis is that, given the accepted tendency of marihuana to release inhibitions, the effect of the drug will depend on the individual and the circumstances. It might, but certainly will not necessarily or inevitably lead to aggressive behavior or crime. The response will depend more on the individual than the drugs." [13]

While perhaps it cannot be statistically proven that marihuana or other dangerous drugs may be the cause of originating crime, nevertheless the use of marihuana or dangerous drugs is related to increased criminal activity.

According to the President's Crime Commission Task Force Report on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, page 11, the FBI submitted criminal histories on 7,920 narcotics offenders. These criminal histories, when examined as to marihuana users and heroin users, indicated that the criminal careers of narcotics users, both marihuana and heroin, were longer, and resulted in more frequent arrest activities than the average non-narcotic criminal offender. For the marihuana offender this comparison demonstrated that during the course of his criminal career he was proportionately more frequently involved in violent crimes than the normal non-narcotic criminal offender.

CONCLUSION

There is no question that the widespread use of marihuana represents a significant mental health problem.

There is no known beneficial result from the use of marihuana; there are, on the other hand, definite detrimental effects.

More research is needed to further our understanding of the effects of marihuana use. However, it is clear that, depending on the dose, the active ingredient found in marihuana may have substantial detrimental effects on both the mental and physical

---

Footnotes at end of article.

well-being of the user. In this connection it is important to point out that use of a combination of dangerous drugs may have a synergistic effect and may result in the death of the user.

Medical evidence neither proves nor disproves that marihuana is a cause of crime. Criminal records do establish clearly an accelerating rate of association between crime and the use of marihuana.

The Task Force recommends:

Continued and expanded research to further our understanding of the causes and effects of marihuana use.

Prevention by wide distribution, among other means, of scientifically accurate information and materials about the dangers of drug abuse.

Provisions of resources to treat and rehabilitate marihuana users in need of mental health care.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Mechoulam, R. et al. *A total synthesis of a 1–△1 tetrahydrocannabinol, the active constituent of hasish.* Journal of the American Chemical Society 1965, pp. 3273–3275.

[2] Isbell, H. et al., *Effects of △9 Tetrahydrocannabinol in Man,* Psychopharmacologia, 1967, pp. 184–188.

[3] Blum, R. H. et al., *Students and Drugs,* Vol. II, 1969, pp. 31–47.

[4] Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Mar. 4–6, p. 4658, 1968.

[5] Eddy, N. B. et al. *Drug Dependence: Its Significance and Characteristics.* Bull. World Health Organization. 32:721, 1965.

[6] Weil, A. T. et al., *A Controlled Study of Cannabis in Humans,* Science, pp. 1234–1242, 1968.

[7] Ungerleider, J. T., et al., *A Statistical Survey of Adverse Reactions to LSD in Los Angeles County,* American Journal of Psychiatry, Sept. 1968, p. 355.

[8] *Cannabis,* Report by the Advisory Committee on Drug Dependence, 1968, pp. 14–34.

[9] McGlothlen, W., et al. *American Journal of Psychiatry,* Sept. 1968, p. 373.

[10] 1968 Alcohol and Highway Safety Report, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968, pp. 11–21.

[11] Marihuana and Society, Journal of the American Medical Association, June 24, 1968, pp. 1181–1182.

[12] World Health Expert Committee on Drug Dependence, WHO Technical Report Series 407, 1969, p. 19.

[13] Task Force Report: Narcotics and Drug Abuse. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967, p. 13.

WHEN IS SECRETARY FINCH GOING TO JOIN THE ADMINISTRATION TEAM?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk during the last week about busing children and how this fits into desegregation plans. To recap, the statements go something like the following:

On Tuesday, Vice President AGNEW told the Southern Governors Conference that:

> This administration favors integration but not mandatory, artificially contrived social acceptance. He also said that I'm against busing those children to other neighborhoods simply to achieve an integrated status of a larger geographic entity.

On Wednesday, the President, through his press secretary said:

> The President is not for imposing busing as a way to achieve racial balance. He also supported Mr. Agnew saying he was voicing the Nixon Administration's policy on busing.

On Thursday, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's press section added its 2 cents to the discussion saying that they "let local school officials to the greatest extent possible under the law work out their individual busing schedules and routes."

On Sunday, however, Secretary Finch sought to bring his Department's statement out from under all the bureaucratic language and say exactly what he meant. His statement on ABC's Issues and Answers was:

> You can't rule out busing. Every district practically in the country uses buses to move people from one place to the other.

He also noted that his Department does not object to the use of buses to bring racial balance to the schools.

Mr. Speaker, I think now we are beginning to see what is actually happening here. President Nixon and Vice President AGNEW are on the right track. They have clearly stated the administration policy against busing. This is consistent with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The question I would now like to ask is this: When is Secretary Finch going to join the administration team?

I think it is time that the President brought his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in line. The law and the administration policy as stated by President Nixon is certainly not what is being practiced by Secretary Finch and his social reformers in Alabama.

It is time for the President to make this one thing clear. Just who is deciding administration policy? The President or Mr. Finch?

WASHINGTON—A MODEL CITY

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the executive branch have recognized the need to make Washington a model city and the National Capital region representative of our best efforts for urban development. In 1968, expenditures totaling over $6 million were made by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Washington suburb of Prince Georges County. An additional $32 million was granted for the construction of low-rent public housing for the same suburb. Programs for elderly housing in the region were granted an additional $8 million, of which 60 percent went to the Virginia suburbs. Also, in this area of regional improvement, the Small Business Administration granted close to $6 million worth of loans for Washington and its surrounding suburbs. The complete job cannot be done by Federal action alone—private enterprise must carry a substantial part of the load.

For this reason, I am pleased to join in introducing an amendment to the Registered Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 which I believe will provide for expanded coverage of the credit needs of the District of Columbia. The question arises then, What can private enterprise do? Are the banking institutions in the District able to shoulder the burden of providing credit for the ever-expanding needs of the District, let alone meet the new demands for large-scale urban financing? A glance at a few statistics will quickly produce the answer. In keeping with the congressional intent to further regional development, the District banks in the past have been an important factor in financing the growth of the suburbs, certainly to a greater extent than the major financial institutions of Baltimore or Richmond.

In the District itself, the banks have been the leader in financing private homes and businesses for all sectors of the community. In 1968, District of Columbia banks loaned more than $200 million for residential real estate and more than $400 million for commercial and industrial uses. In the past, it seems that the District banks have been able to meet the credit needs of the area, but the future is not promising.

With the vast outflow of people and goods from the District and the modern trend today to bank at home, the source of credit, bank deposits in the District banks, are not keeping pace with the ever-expanding needs of the Washington metropolitan area in general or the District of Columbia borrowing community. In 1947, savings and time deposits in the District banks were over 75 percent of the total deposits of this type in the Washington area. In June of 1968, this percentage had slipped to less than 50 percent. If this trend continues, and it will without congressional action, the District banks will unquestionably play a greatly diminished role in the banking competition in this area and any plans for loans for large scale urban development and improvement will be forgotten. If the District economy is to be revitalized and it must, large commercial credit will be needed. But, with the immigration rate from the District remaining as high as it is and the tendency to bank at home, the deposits in the District banks will steadily decrease, restricting the credit outflow. It is my conclusion therefore that the current banking laws which restrict the District of Columbia banks to an area of 61 square miles do now interfere with and retard the orderly development of the area. As we look to the future, the impact of this restriction will bear heavily on the District. If my assumption is correct, the result might well be that the Nation's taxpayers would be burdened with ever-increasing charges to support the activities of the Nation's Capital. It could also mean slower growth and reduced revenues for the entire metropolitan area.

The legislation which has been proposed is designed to increase the competition in banking in the Washington area and to improve the flow of commercial banking funds throughout the region. The legislation itself is quite simple; it states that for the purposes of the Registered Bank Holding Company Act, the National Capital Region will be considered as a single political jurisdiction. This concept is nothing new for it has

been done on frequent occasions in other vital areas such as transportation, water pollution, park planning, and so forth. In presenting the need for coordination in the development of the National Capital Region, Congress has declared that:

All the areas therein, shall be so developed and the public affairs shall be so managed as to contribute effectively toward the solution of the community development of the Washington Metropolitan Region on a unified metropolitan basis. (74 Stat. 223)

This means that a registered bank holding company organized in the District of Columbia can buy a bank in the National Capital region and that Maryland and Virginia registered bank holding companies will have the same rights in the District.

This bill will not reduce in any way the existing authority of Maryland and Virginia over the establishment of State chartered banks and branches within their jurisdictions. This is not a branching proposal. It would not permit a District bank to come into Maryland or Virginia and establish branches. Just as at present, new banks or branches could be established only with the approval of the State banking authorities, in the case of State-chartered banks, or by the Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a national bank.

This bill would not reduce in any way the authority of Maryland and Virginia banking agencies to examine and supervise State-chartered banks within their jurisdiction. This is not a merger proposal under which Maryland or Virginia banks would merge into District banks and thereby move from supervision by State authorities to supervision by the Comptroller of the Currency. This legislation would not alter the bank supervisory situation in any way.

A major provision of the bill is to permit a registered bank holding company to acquire stock in banks throughout the National Capital region. This could only be done with the express approval of the Federal Reserve Board, the Board could not act without allowing time for the banking agencies of the State involved to express its disapproval of its proposed acquisition. If the State authorities disapproved, the Board would be required to conduct a full hearing on the matter and review would be available in the courts.

The major thing which the bill would do would be to open up the National Capital region to competitive banking. It would create substantial deposits upon which credit institutions could lend money. It would be another step in the congressional plan to solve the common problems of the National Capital region. As you can see, the benefits which would accrue from such a plan run not only to the Nation's Capital and the economies of both Maryland and Virginia, but also to the National Capital region and the Federal Establishment which is located therein.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from California, DEL CLAWSON, in introducing legislation today which will establish the National Capital region as a commercial banking area.

District of Columbia banking institutions are rapidly approaching a point in time when the ever-expanding credit needs of the community will completely overwhelm the institutions' ability to provide the necessary services not only for the residents of the region, but also of the District.

Why has this happened? What can we do to remedy this situation?

The National Capital region, in comparison with the 20 largest metropolitan areas, is the fastest growing region in the United States. The Washington Metropolitan statistical area has almost doubled between 1950 and 1965—1950, 1,464,089; 1965 estimate, 2,408,000. Population in the region between 1960 and 1967 increased at an average annual rate of 4 percent. Only the metropolitan areas of Dallas and Houston show an average annual increase, 3.3 percent, which would come close to matching the rapid expansion of the National Capital region.

Coupled with this increase in population has been the continuation of the current exodus from center city. In 1940 the population of the District of Columbia represented over 65 percent of the total regional population. By 1966 this percentage had slipped to only about 30.8 percent. To state it another way, while the population of the District since 1940 increased only 20 percent, the surrounding suburbs have increased over 400 percent.

Recognizing the trend of decreasing revenue in the central city caused by the mass urban exodus, retailers have followed their customers and established suburban branches. It is reported that revenues from these branches enable the merchants to provide the central city with necessary shopping services. Banks located in the District of Columbia, however, have not been able to follow the retailers in their move to the suburbs; Washington banks are limited to the 61.4 square mile boundaries of the District. Not only are District banks denied the opportunity to provide services in the suburban areas, they are not able to obtain a proportionate share of the bank deposits of the region. Depositors bank at home rather than at or near their place of employment. This tendency, plus the fact that 55 percent of the people who work in the District live in the suburbs, has created a drain on Washington area bank deposits. Since 1947, deposits in the District banks have shrunk from over 83.3 percent to little more than 55 percent of the total area deposits. Suburban banks have shown a tremendous increase in their total deposits, 334 percent. This can be seen in dollar figures by looking at the 15 Maryland and Virginia banks which have offices located on the borders of the District of Columbia. Currently these banks have deposits of over $7 billion while the District's 14 banks show only a total deposit of $2,600 million.

All this adds up to a shortage of funds on deposit at District banks. The situation would not be as grave if the demands of District and area residents were not spiralling. This era has been aptly termed the age of urban crises. Great concern has been focused on the problems of the city and its residents. The Federal Government and private foundations have poured large quantities of funds into urban redevelopment.

Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital, has been chosen by Executive order to be a model for other urban areas. The city cannot fulfill this goal if District banks are prevented from meeting the credit needs of the area because of dwindling reserves.

How then can these banks who are the financial mainstays of the District replenish their resources?

I believe this situation can be alleviated by the bill before you. The bill would enable a registered bank holding company organized in the District of Columbia to buy one or more already-established banks located in the National Capital region. Maryland and Virginia bank holding companies would also be able to purchase banks located within the District. Therefore, a twofold benefit is provided; besides allowing District banks to replenish their resources, Maryland and Virginia banks will be able to provide some of the District residents with needed credit.

Either of these two transactions would only be allowed after approval of the Federal Reserve Board has been obtained and appropriate State authorities have been consulted. The Board would, by its statutory grant, be able to regulate these purchases and to prevent misconduct or misdealings by the banks.

Therefore, I believe that this legislation will be of invaluable assistance not only to District but also area residents for it provides the needed resources for credit to the area, but coupled with it is a necessary check against abuses.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT PROGRAM

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's decision to go ahead with the development of the supersonic transport program is a sound decision for many reasons.

Let me list just a few:

Given the balance-of-payments situation, the President had no other choice. Failure of the Americans to build an SST would have been American dollars going abroad to purchase foreign aircraft and would have ended American dominance of the world air transport industry.

With the Russian Tupelov transport now flying at supersonic speeds and announcement by Aeroflot officials that they intend to fly this aircraft in Moscow in 1973, failure to build an American SST would inevitably result in the destruction of a vital American industry.

This is the only advanced aeronautical program now on-going in the United States. The technology developed from this program will result in improvements of electronic navigation, communications, materials machining and sophisticated production techniques.

The SST program will provide direct employment for a minimum of 50,000 skilled and unskilled workers. This necessarily translates into multiplier-in-

duced employment impacts measured in the several hundreds of thousands, many of whom will work from generally disadvantaged groups.

The economics of a nearly mach III aircraft in terms of personal time saved alone is virtually immeasurable when contrasted with mach II and subsonic aircraft.

This program, practically unique among major federally-sponsored developments, provides for virtually full recovery of its investment by the Government.

Failure to proceed at this point would cause the leadership to pass from American hands to those of our foreign competitors. We would lose momentum which would never be recovered.

Mr. Speaker, I support wholeheartedly the President's decision. I would hope that the vast majority of the Members of Congress—in both parties—will do likewise.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the President's announcement that the SST program will be continued is good news for Cincinnati. It means the continuation of the program at the General Electric Evendale plant where a good many Cincinnatians have been employed in this work.

I think it is also good news for the Nation because it means that we will remain in competition with the Russians and with the British-French Concorde aircraft, both of which are already flying.

They have problems, however, and I am certain that the American supersonic aircraft will be superior when it comes into the market.

If we abandon the SST at this time, we would be writing off a large part of the international aircraft market that has been a very important one to the United States in the past.

I am convinced that now that the go-ahead has been given, the United States can and will build a better airplane and solve the problems that are involved.

Hopefully, Congress will follow the President, and authorize the funds that he has requested for the SST.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those voices supporting President Nixon's decision today to go ahead with development of the supersonic transport. Like the President, I am convinced that this Nation is great enough to meet the challenges both of the world and on the homefront.

And that if we are unable to meet both, we likely lack the spirit and the drive to meet either.

Mr. Speaker, there are those in our Nation who have lost confidence in America. They see only disaster both at home and abroad. They fear the future and look only at the dark side.

But, Mr. Speaker, the United States is still a young, vibrant Nation, capable of meeting any challenge if we will put our minds to it. We have gone to the moon. We are reaching out for the planets.

We are working to solve the problems of our society.

And we can solve them and at the same time build a supersonic transport that will again tell the world America is first and will continue to be first in every field of human endeavor.

I am proud that we have a President who refuses to concede that America should be or has to be second in anything.

I am proud that he has decided that not Russia and not Britain and France, but America and American ingenuity and American labor will build the commercial airplane of tomorrow. And I am sure that the vast majority of the American people feel the same way.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's decision to go ahead with development of the SST is indeed a wise one and deserves the support of all who wish to see the United States continue its leadership in the field of aviation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has led the world in aviation since its inception. Most of the airplanes flown, not only nationally but internationally, are American-built transports.

American aeronautical technology and superiority has been a major factor in maintaining this Nation's military and economic strength in the last 50 years of this century.

To abandon that superiority now, it seems to me, would be the height of foolishness. Once lost, such superiority might never be regained.

Mr. Speaker, for those who look at the cost of the next year's funding of the SST, let me remind them that the program calls for the Federal Government to get virtually all its investment back from industry after the SST goes into operation.

This is a sound investment—in many ways—not a boondoggle.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to support this major American program as a program that will benefit not only America but, in the long run, all the nations of the world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in behalf of President Nixon's decision to go ahead with the development of the supersonic transport program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ROGERS INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO AID VETERANS

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to assist the veterans of this Nation who suffer from loss of hearing.

This bill would expand the wartime disability benefits to include deafness developing to a degree of 10 percent or more as a condition that shall be presumed to be a service-connected disability if it occurs within 7 years after separation from active service during a period of war.

Under present law, five categories of diseases or conditions are presumed to be service connected for any veteran who served for 90 days or more during a period of war. These are: First, a chronic disease becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within 1 year from the date of separation from such service; second, a tropical disease, and the resultant disorders or disease originating because of therapy, administered in connection with such diseases, or as a preventative thereof, becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within 1 year from the date of separation from such service, or at a time when standard or accepted treatises indicate that the incubation period thereof commenced during such service; third, active tuberculous disease developing a 10 percent degree of disability or more within 3 years from the date of separation from such service; fourth, multiple sclerosis developing a 10-percent degree of disability or more within 7 years from the date of separation from such service; and fifth, Hansen's disease developing a 10-percent degree of disability or more within 3 years from the date of separation from such service.

For each of these five categories, there need be no record of evidence of such disease during the period of service.

My bill would add a sixth category to include deafness.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this legislation following information that was presented to me last month showing the extent of hearing loss or damage among soldiers in the U.S. Army.

In 1963, the Surgeon General of the Army recommended that each Army recruit receive a pair of ear plugs "individually fitted to each ear." This recommendation has not been implemented.

Moreover, recruits at the Army's tank training school in Fort Knox, Ky., do not use protective earmuffs similar to those worn by civilian airport workers, even though such muffs only cost $6 per pair.

I have contacted Secretary of the Army Resor about implementing better protection procedures, but as yet, I have not received a reply which would indicate what the Army is going to do to abate the problem.

The Veterans' Administration spends more than $32 million to treat hearing defects each year, yet many veterans who should be entitled to treatment cannot get it because there is no presumptive period for the problem.

This legislation would correct that inadequacy of the law.

A HIGHER QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT FOR A HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the conservation of our natural resources for ourselves, our future, and the future of our children is one of the most important challenges facing us today.

We have achieved the world's highest standard of living in an amazingly short period by using the vast natural resources of the American environment. But this has been accompanied by side

effects that we did not foresee. Our capacity to alter nature is awesome, but we have caused alterations with little regard for the consequences.

In advancing and perfecting our technology we have polluted our waters, eroded our soil, silted our reservoirs, destroyed our recreation areas, and—in other ways to a frightening degree—diminished our environment.

Meanwhile, our Nation grows at a tremendous pace. Within the next 31 years our population is expected to increase by one-half while our land area remains the same. We will continue to receive the same amount of fresh water from the skies, but we will need twice as much. We will be fed from the same thin layer of topsoil that feeds us today, but we will need one-half more food from the soil.

Pressures on land use will intensify greatly. Housing for another 100 million Americans will be built, roads for three times the number of cars as today will be constructed, land required for outdoor recreation needs will more than double, and means to dispose of another million tons of solid waste each year will have to be found.

If we are to survive, we must look to the land, its soil, water, plants, and animal life—with renewed interest and develop a will to support a comprehensive program of environmental management.

Our resources of soil, water, timber, and wildlife are limited. The demands on them are not. More people, more affluence, and more leisure time are bringing new pressures on our natural resource base out of proportion to anything we have known in the past.

Once conservation meant merely the setting aside in restricted and protected areas and parks, our trees, our most spectacular scenery and a sprinkling of our wildlife. Gradually, as we became more aware of the fact that we actually could and were using up and destroying our precious bounty of resources we began to think about other resources—our minerals, our soil, our air, and water. Our Nation was growing but we continued to deal with each problem separately.

Our conversation efforts were not thorough enough. We had dealt with some of the problems around the periphera as best we knew how, but the core of the problem was left untouched, in fact, unnoticed.

In the past few years, we have begun to see the ravages of a modern society. Much of America's beauty was being hidden behind billboards and smog, muddied by wastes and debris of modern industry, leveled by growing cities, silenced by pesticides and uncontrolled hunting and out of reach to members of our urban society. Now we know, we have taken the trip from a simplistic elemental approach to a view of the entire picture of the environment of man. We have grown up to know that man and nature are best served by a consideration of a total quality environment.

Let us not have come all this way to a sophisticated understanding of conservation only to fall back onto a narrow construction of the term environment. For certainly, when thinking of a quality environment we must think of bringing about man's best management of and benefit from his surroundings and vice versa. We must think not only of a healthy recreational environment, but also of a healthy living and working environment.

Today, nearly two-thirds of our population are crowded onto about 2 percent of our land area trying to live, work and relax. They are living in our modern cities. What can I say about our cities that you do not already know? They are troubled by overcrowding, by shattering noise pollution, poisonous air, dangerous waters, and by growing tensions of our urban-industrial life style. Our progress seems to have been too great, too fast, and too harsh on man and his surroundings. We read in the papers every day that the conditions in our large cities are unhealthy. People simply cannot live together in such proximity without flare-ups.

At the same time, we have a problem in our rural areas that may strike very close to home to some of you. If the effects of the rural population drain have not touched you directly, you probably know someone who has felt the sting. The last census of agriculture showed that in Alabama we lost about 16 percent of our total cropland acreage; we harvested almost 20 percent fewer acres; small farms of less than 50 acres declined in number by almost 25 percent and farms selling under $10,000 worth of farm products fell off almost a fourth. In my congressional district, every county of the 12 lost in its total number of farms. Here, as in the rest of the country, the small farm is falling by the wayside. It is unsettling, for sure, to watch the number of farms dwindle, to see the small farm—the institution which has lent stability and charm to our American heritage—disappear. More troubling still is that the man who has given up his small farm is most likely now out of work. The small farmer who is forced to abandon his way of life is more often than not faced with the grim realization that he knows no other satisfactory or satisfying way of life. He is untrained for any other vocation. He has nothing to do where he is, so he moves—to the cities. And our farm youngsters—what becomes of them? Even though today's colleges and universities are offering better and more varied training in agriculture and management, yet you are witnessing today's youth eager to leave the rural areas and head for the cities, the oftentimes hollow promises of success ringing in their ears. We are watching a general loss of interest in the American farm way of life.

Still and all, things are not disastrous for us. If we have lost in the number of farms we have, we have seen that those who stayed in farming have increased the size of their farms and are doing pretty well. In all but two counties of my district, the average size of the farms has increased and in every county the value of farm land and buildings has gone up. Farmers have enjoyed the fruits of modern technology and advancement of production methods. From all indications, we can look forward to the continuation of our present agriculture program fairly administered by the new Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford Hardin. President Nixon has indicated that suggestions for any changes his administration might make in the general agriculture program will not be forthcoming for some time yet.

The creation of the Appalachian Regional Commission in 1965 was the offshoot of the realization that not only did we have severe economic problems in our Appalachian region but we also had an unopened treasure chest of opportunity for growth. With the help and guidance of the planning commission and funds made available under the law, we are seeing wonderful results here before us. We have growing needs for more and better highways, more local access roads, better health facilities, and vocational training for those people who have felt left behind by modern industry and who have been, in fact, small contributors to the economic and social growth of our Nation. The Appalachian development highway system is receiving extensive attention in hopes that it will open up large areas of potential development where growth has been inhibited in the past by a lack of adequate access. Appalachian funds are being used to build access roads to open up specific areas for industrial, commercial, residential, and recreational purposes and in general to make our area more available to economic and social growth. The money here has gone to build health centers and sewage facilities; it has been used for libraries, vocational-technical schools, and parks.

As we in this country continue to become more urbanized, the need for havens of peace, quiet, and unspoiled beauty for recreation, and restoration of the urban man continues to grow. In the future there will be more opportunity to travel and more leisure time for relaxation. Every park, every stream, and every landmark will become more precious as the years pass and cities spread out to accommodate our ever-increasing population. Our national parks cannot be available to everyone, but the quiet beauty of rural countrysides can be.

The development of new industrial centers may well relieve some of the pressure from the existing industrial complexes. The development of better educational, health and service facilities will make our countryside more desirable for residential purposes and will enable men to move away from the air pollution and the dirty conditions of the cities. The development of more opportunities in the rural areas will prevent the high rate of migration from the country to the cities. And the development of our rural areas as places of peace and quiet, of restful retreat is essential to the well-being of man as well.

We have in our hands the power to reshape our environment and make it more useful and safe for all Americans.

The question is, will we? I know we will.

We will continue our efforts to build upon our historic working relationships and encourage and support State and

local governments, conservation and other districts, educational institutions, private organizations, business and industry, and farmers, ranchers, and rural landowners in the multiple use of natural and human resources.

We will move forward boldly to revitalize rural communities through resource conservation and development projects all the time striving to reach a balanced use of human talents and natural and economic resources to create more jobs and higher income for more people.

And we will look ahead to the preservation of man and his environment together for a higher quality of life for all.

MEANINGFUL TAX REFORMS SEEM DOUBTFUL THIS YEAR

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply worried about the progress of tax reform and tax relief in this legislative Hall, and in this legislative body, and in the Senate. I seem to recall that when this chance for reform and for relief started this year, that there was some foot-dragging on the part of the administration that most of us were led to believe was just the newness in office.

The administration has now been in office 9 months and 2 days, and the more they talk about tax reform and tax relief the less I like it.

I seem to recall that we were asked to pass a surtax here because of the need for revenue, and we passed that surtax with the understanding that the administration would get behind our tax reform bill and help us get it passed this year. That has not happened.

We put some $12 billion more in the hands of the administration to spend this year, and we have had very little action on tax relief. Now comes the administration asking for a separation of the investment credit repeal from the other tax reform package. I believe that this sounds the death knell of any kind of meaningful tax reform at all this year.

If it dies, if the people are not granted substantial tax reforms this year, I believe the people ought to know where the blood is. It is not on the hands of the Democrats who have been pushing for tax reform, but on the administration who have been dragging their feet.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. How did the gentleman vote on the extension of the surtax?

Mr. GIBBONS. I voted against it, because frankly I did not believe at that time that we were going to get any tax reforms.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, you were not helping to put any pressure on?

Mr. GIBBONS. I certainly was not.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the gentleman who controls the U.S. Senate—what party is in control?

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman knows as well as I do who controls the Senate, but the gentleman also knows as well as I do that there is not going to be tax reform unless your leaders get behind the tax reform and push it. The gentleman announced the priorities and the gentleman did not mention tax reform.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The administration has requested that the tax reform bill be passed this year. The party the gentleman is a member of has a majority of 57 to 43 over in the Senate. They control the Senate, and they are in control of the scheduling of legislative activity, both in all committees and on the floor. It is your party's responsibility, the Democratic Party, to get tax reform out of this Congress. We in the Republican Party favor tax reform. We voted for it and it is the responsibility of the Democrats who control the Congress to see to it such legislation is pushed by its leadership in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

GIANT LOOPHOLES IN MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY BILL

(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 material.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous pressure on many Members to get them to cosponsor a mine health and safety bill reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor. Although certain provisions of this bill are clearly improvements over the present toothless law, there are obviously some giant loopholes in the proposed bill which must be tightened up if genuine protection is to be accorded to the coal miners of this Nation.

Specifically, the House bill includes a very loosely worded compromise which extends almost indefinitely the time period that many mines can keep dangerous spark-producing equipment.

The New York Times, and various other newspapers, on Sunday describe this provision as the result of a one-man lobbying campaign which may be worth $800 million to the coal operators but which will ultimately endanger the lives of many coal miners.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The article the gentleman referred to also indicated that this amendment was for the benefit of the "coal barons." Would not the gentleman agree that the amendment he refers to was meant to alleviate the problems of the small independent operators of the coal mines and blue-collar owners?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I will say the gentleman knows it is being treated as an economic problem. But I do not think this problem ought to be treated economically. It ought to be treated in the human terms of loss of lives in the coal mines. We ought to begin with that basic principle and then go on to the economics as a secondary consideration.

Also, I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois that I agree with Mr. W. A. Boyle, the president of the United Mine Workers of America, a man with whom I do not often agree, in condemning this compromise and the watering down of the coal mine safety bill. I say when Mr. Boyle says a bill is bad or that something in it is bad, then it really must be awfully bad. Mr. Boyle is quoted by the Associated Press in articles published September 19 as "charging that the committee bowed to coal industry pressure" by "giving some small-mine owners 4 to 6 years to install new, safer equipment." Mr. Boyle is further quoted as stating:

> It is only for the most callous motive that certain coal operators pressured the full committee into permitting four to six years for enforcement of this provision. . . . Hundreds of coal miners could die in explosions while the coal operators continue to use dangerous, spark-emitting equipment.

I should point out that a careful examination of the "compromise" indicates that a waiver may be given even beyond 6 years by the Secretary of the Interior, and it is entirely possible that the waiver could go on almost indefinitely if the operator claimed he could not obtain the equipment. But what about the safety of the coal miner during this waiver period? Should we not think of him first? Furthermore, I have not observed many members of the House Education and Labor Committee who have reported any contact from Mr. Boyle urging that they remove or modify this loophole. It will be interesting to see now just how aggressive Mr. Boyle will be in pressing to practice what he is publicly preaching. If he is successful, I will be the first to applaud his actions.

There is a second dangerous loophole in the bill reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor on which Mr. Boyle has been completely silent—the iniquitous Federal Coal Mine Health Safety Board of Review. The Secretary of the Interior has the primary responsibility for enforcement of the mine health and safety law, with certain health features being the responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Written into the bill are very thorough procedures for a review of the findings and orders of inspectors and the Bureau of Mines by the Secretary of the Interior, as well as further judicial review by the U.S. court of appeals for the circuit in which the affected mine is located. Despite all the protections and reviews contained, it was felt necessary to establish another layer of review by a private-interest-dominated Board of Review completely outside the Department of the Interior, and to give this Board vastly increased powers to rule on health and safety standards, penalties, and even to direct how money is to be spent on health and safety research.

Who is on this Board? It includes five presidentially appointed members, the Chairman being designated as "public," and the other four being drawn from representatives of large and small mine operators and large and small mine workers. Judging from the past composition

and record of the Board of Review, its personnel have not taken aggressive efforts to protect the health and safety of the coal miners. The four organization men—even those ostensibly representing the mine workers and the public, have failed to indicate any interest in taking the measures necessary for protecting health and safety among coal miners. I intend to analyze this provision further when the full text of the clean bill is available to all Members, because I feel very strongly that this so-called Board of Review can become the Achilles heel of this legislation and make the rest of the provisions of the bill a joke. Under the present weak law, the Board of Review may not have caused much harm, but there are two reasons why it can become in the future potentially more harmful: First, its powers have been substantially expanded in the House committee bill; and, second, when other provisions of the bill are tougher, those trying to weaken the enforcement of the new legislation will tend to use the Board of Review to water down effective protection of health and safety.

There follow various articles to which I have referred in my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 21, 1969]

A LOBBYIST GAINS A POINT FOR MINERS—SAFETY BILL CHANGED AFTER CLOAKROOM CONFERENCE

(By Ben A. Frankin)

WASHINGTON, September 20.—One of the most effective one-man lobbying campaigns so far in the 91st Congress quietly produced this week a provision * * * may be worth $800-million to operators of small coal mines.

The provision was inserted into the House version of a proposed new Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, approved last Thursday by the Committee on Education and Labor, 29 to 3.

Intensive last-minute lobbying to limit the bill's impact on small mines delayed the 35-member committee's meeting from its scheduled 9:30 A.M. until 11:10 A.M., when the chairman, Representative Carl D. Perkins, Democrat of Kentucky, was able to muster a quorum of 18.

Many members were in the committee's connecting Republican reception room hammering out the arrangement with John L. Kilcullen, the small mine operators' registered lobbyist.

3,000 MINES EXEMPTED

The chairman ordered repeated roll calls, all disclosing the lack of a quorum. Finally, he was told that many absent Republican members and some Democrats were "in the next room working on an amendment."

"Well," Mr. Perkins said, with some exasperation, "get them in here."

The amendment had the effect of exempting 3,000 small mines from stringent requirements covering the use of electrical machinery.

Lobbying on Capitol Hill is rarely observed, in part because it is often informal and personal, done in private social contacts between special interest representatives and members of Congress. Moreover, most Congressional committees hold closed sessions for their final meetings on bills, and it is there that the most effective lobbying is often accomplished.

Mr. Perkins' committee is a rare exception. The Education and Labor Committee regularly opens its final amending sessions to the public. The crucial, last-minute byplay on controversial measures is thus more visible, although rarely as evident as in this case.

LARGE MINES UNSUCCESSFUL

Mr. Kilcullen, a Washington lawyer who says he regularly does "legislative work" for clients as a lobbyist, registered as such with Congress, acknowledged in an interview, "There was some discussion in the cloakroom adjoining the committee room last Thursday."

He said that the meeting finally won for his client, the 3,000-member National Independent Coal Operators Association, a key concession in the generally stringent measure after nearly six months of open hearings.

On the other hand, representatives of the large coal mines were generally unable to delete provisions they disliked.

Representative John N. Erlenborn, Republican of Illinois, an ally of the small mine operators, proposed to the full committee the amended language supported in the cloakroom by Mr. Kilcullen. It was accepted on an unrecorded voice vote. On all other important amendments there was a recorded vote.

NEEDED REPUBLICAN VOTES

Committee sources said later that the leaders of the Democratic majority, Representatives Perkins and John H. Dent of Pennsylvania, had agreed to accept the Erlenborn amendment "because the Republicans' votes are needed to help the bill when it gets to the floor, and Kilcullen has them on his side."

The amendment had the effect of exempting more than 3,000 small, gas-free mines from the requirement that, within 90 days of enactment, all mines be equipped with fully "permissible" explosion-proof electrical machinery approved by the Bureau of Mines.

Instead, the small mines' deadline for obtaining such equipment will be four years from the effective date of the law, with an additional two-year extension available on request.

Moreover, the amendment says that the Secretary of the Interior may waive the six-year deadline further "if he determines that the permissible equipment for which the waiver is sought is not available."

Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat of West Virginia, a strong supporter of the strictest possible mine safety bill, told newsmen, "This is an open-end waiver, a sellout, a giveaway."

Mr. Erlenborn, in particular, was denounced by Ralph Nader, the consumer and safety advocate, for helping "the coal barons" give "the breath of death" to workers in the small mines.

Mr. Erlenborn could not be reached for comment today, but he has said in the past that an overly strong mine safety bill that disregarded the economic impact on mine owners would "contribute nothing to safety."

"We just didn't have the votes on the committee," Mr. Kilcullen said in commenting on the cloakroom meeting. "This was going to cost the small mine operators anywhere from $400-million to $800-million for new equipment, and they don't have it. What we wanted was an exclusion. All we've got is a little time."

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Sept. 19, 1969]

BOYLE HITS DILUTION OF MINE SAFETY BILL

WASHINGTON.—United Mine Workers President W. A. "Tony" Boyle accused the House Education and Labor Committee Friday of watering down a coal mine safety bill in a move that could cost hundreds of miners' lives.

Boyle, charging that the committee bowed to coal industry pressure, said that giving some small mine owners four to six years to install new, safer equipment to guard against explosions was too long.

"It is only for the most callous motive that certain coal operators pressured the full committee into permitting four to six years for enforcement of this provision. . . . Hundreds of coal miners could die in explosions while the coal operators continue to use dangerous, spark-emitting equipment," Boyle said in a statement.

"As usual, certain coal operators have taken the position in favor of profits over human life," he said.

Boyle also objected to language in the bill on a provision controlling the permissible level of coal dust in mines "over several shifts."

"We hold that dust levels must be enforced on each shift for the protection of the lungs of the men working on that shift," Boyle said.

The bill would limit the maximum dust level to 4.5 milligrams per cubic meter of air immediately if the bill is enacted into law, to 3 milligrams six months later and to lower levels as soon as possible.

"Compromises have been made on key issues which America's coal miners are not willing to accept," said Boyle, whose union represents about 20,000 working miners.

Boyle said the union will do everything in its power, "including contractual action," to enforce safe conditions in the mines.

His reference was apparently to a provision in coal mine contracts permitting the union to pull workers out of the mines for "memorial" periods of up to 10 days in memory of dead miners.

Boyle said in some respects the bill, reported out by the House committee Thursday, represented "strong legislation."

It includes a provision to pay up to $272 a month to miners suffering from severe stages of incurable pneumoconiosis, or black lung, believed caused by breathing coal dust.

Boyle, says his opponent for the top union post spent more money for expenses in 1968 than other union officials.

"The record on file with the U.S. Department of Labor shows that Mr. (Joseph) Yablonski's expenses for 1968 were the highest of any officer of the UMW" Boyle said Friday.

"Yablonski has never showed the slightest concern for the way he used the dues-money of the rank-and-file," the union leader said in a statement.

Yablonski frequently has accused Boyle of mishandling union funds.

The UMW election is scheduled for Dec. 15.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

U.S. CAPITOL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The U.S. Capitol Historical Society's program to encourage a better understanding of American history has made possible the viewing of a collection of Capitol pictures in the lounge next to the Public Works Committee room—room 2167, Rayburn Building. It is my hope that all Members of Congress, their staffs, and friends will avail themselves of the opportunity to drop by and see them.

Mr. Speaker, a Miss Josephine Cobb has prepared a brief statement and description of the display that I invite my colleagues and friends to read.

The article on the pictures follows:

The pictures in the Exhibit now awaiting your pleasure on the First Floor of the

Rayburn Building consist of some thirty views of the U.S. Capitol. Among them are many examples of a vanished art. These are the original lithographs and engravings made by hand by artisans, skilled in the production of copies of pictures in great numbers on copper or steel plates or on stone or wood blocks. Until the discovery of photography in 1839 which led to the development of photo-mechanical processes in the 1850s, there was no other way to produce copies of pictures in great numbers except by hand work. After the Civil War, hand engraving became almost a lost art. These early views of the Capitol are, therefore, of value because of the medium in which they were made as well as for their special subject significance to members of the Capitol Historical Society.

Collections of city views in the form of lithographs and engravings are perhaps the most numerous and varied. Special collections exist showing the likenesses of individual statesmen of national prominence. But there are almost no collections of views of public buildings, either in this country or abroad. We have no accumulation of pictures of Independence Hall nor of Faneuil Hall nor of Mount Vernon or Monticello that can compare with the abundance of views of the U.S. Capitol Building. Produced as single items for framing or as illustrations in books and periodicals, engravers and lithographers in the early days of the nation created more than a hundred views showing the Capitol of the United States. Few of the pictures were made locally because the best engravers in the country were located in Philadelphia and Boston and New York City. A number of them were made by Europeans for publication abroad, illustrative of the considerable interest shown in the new country on the part of foreigners.

Among the pictures of special interest, selected from the Kiplinger Collection and the Columbia Historical Society, there are many that serve to document the physical growth of the Capitol over a period of about a hundred and fifty years. Others are quite fanciful, depicting the Capitol as the artists thought it might appear. There are also a few interiors, showing the Halls of House and Senate. Of unusual subject interest is an 1817 picture of the Capitol in which a group of negro slaves, handcuffed and chained to their master, appears in the foreground.

In a different medium, there are a few watercolor drawings. One of these, on exhibit for the first time, is a colorful drawing of the Blodgett Hotel which served as the meeting place of the 13th Congress, following the burning of the Capitol in 1814. Finally and of more recent date, there is a watercolor done in 1961, depicting the reconstruction of the East Front. Here then, in some 30 pictures displayed for your pleasure by the Capitol Historical Society, is a sampling of the existent views of the past history of your U.S. Capitol Building.

BIG TRUCK BILL

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee has recently completed 11 days of hearings on H.R. 11890, and H.R. 11619, bills to increase the size and weight of trucks and buses that use the Interstate System.

Let me first express my appreciation to our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), for his efforts to insure that as many witnesses and viewpoints as possible were brought before the committee to testify and otherwise add to a better understnding of this far-reaching legislation. I especially want to commend him for his patience with questioning of the various witnesses. Within the framework of the existing committee system, the hearings have been as complete as could be expected. The absence of some vital information, which is not yet before the committee with respect to this legislation, is the fault of our committee system and not that of our chairman.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that Frank Turner, the Federal Highway Administrator, could come before the subcommittee and testify that he "does not have sufficiently reliable evidence to make a clear case for or against the proposal on safety grounds." Mr. Speaker, if the "experts" at the Department of Transportation, with the extensive research facilities available to them, cannot come to a clear conclusion with respect to the safety aspects of this legislation, our committee should summarily reject the legislation. To do otherwise, would be to presume expertise on the part of the committee which is apparently not even available in the Department of Transportation and the National Highway Safety Bureau, with all of their "experts."

Mr. Speaker, I am very critical, especially of the Department of Transportation.

In one breath the Department says:

> An analysis of the safety effects of increases in commercial vehicle sizes and weights is an exacting task requiring significant lead time and extensive data that simply are not available at this time.

And in the next breath makes the incredible statement that—

> Some sets of data . . . when taken in a broad perspective, will permit the drawing of some reasonable inferences, (with respect to safety.)

It is simply inconceivable to me, that a Department whose first concern they say is safety, could take such a callous and inadequate approach to the safety of our traveling public or as the President has said, "the interest of the traveling public."

President Nixon really put the proper emphasis on the problem in his statement last fall when he said:

> This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public. Questions remain about the extent to which the greater truck size and weight would impose additional wear and tear on a road network.
>
> I believe these matters are so important to so many of our people that I favor postponement of action on the bill now before the House.
>
> As President, I would want this entire matter most carefully reconsidered. I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interest of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the nation's commerce.

In view of this directive of the President, it is inconceivable to me that the Department could be testifying in favor of the bill, while admitting in effect, that they have not carried out the President's directive.

Mention should be made at this point of the so-called quickie study undertaken by the Department. At the highway safety hearings held during May and June of this year, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, testified that he "knew of no work being done with respect to the effect on safety of the proposed legislation." Later, in response to my written question as to whether the study directed by the President had been undertaken, Dr. Brenner stated:

> As far as I know, President Nixon has not directed any new study to Secretary Volpe relating to the proposed increase in truck width and weight.

Mr. Turner, on the contrary, testified that a review pursuant to the President's directive was commenced in March of this year and involved the National Highway Safety Bureau. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of these two high officials at the Department of Transportation is in direct conflict, and I believe casts serious doubt on the credibility of the Department of Transportation with respect to all other testimony they have given before the committee. It would seem highly unusual to me, that Dr. Brenner, as Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, would not be aware of any study such as the one described by Mr. Turner. In my opinion, the Department asked for a delay in their appearance before the committee, and belatedly began a "quickie" study only after they realized they would be seriously embarrassed at the hearings for having failed to carry out the President's directive. This so-called quickie study, especially as it relates to safety, was nothing short of a sham, and an insult to the President. It certainly is ignoring the President's request to "protect the interest of the traveling public."

The problem of highway safety is an extremely important problem, and one involving the lives and well-being of the citizens of this country. If we do not now possess sufficient answers with respect to the effect of this legislation on safety, we had better get them before we take action on this legislation.

Still further doubt is cast on the accuracy of Mr. Turner's testimony by a recent statement from Douglas B. Fugate, a Virginia State highway commissioner. Mr. Fugate stated:

> The State Highway Department has estimated it would cost $151 million just to make the bridges on the Virginia primary road system adequate for the heavier loads [proposed by legislation now before the Roads Subcommittee].
>
> That wouldn't even count the extra money for strengthening roads which he said would wear out 25 to 40% quicker under the pounding of the bigger trucks, or for upgrading bridges on the secondary highway system.

In contrast, Mr. Turner apparently felt this item was so insignificant that it was not even mentioned in his prepared statement. However, in response to a question from a member of the committee, Mr. Turner stated that the increase in maintenance cost to the States would be $300 million per year. If the estimate given by Commissioner Fugate could be multiplied by the 50 States, Mr. Turner's figure would appear to be ridiculously low.

Inasmuch as the hearings have now been concluded, and the subcommittee

will soon commence executive sessions, I feel it is an appropriate time to again bring to the attention of the Members of Congress, the feeling about the big truck bill across the country. I have copies of editorials opposing the big truck bill from nearly all of the 50 States. It is clear that feelings against the big truck bill run high in every section of the country. People are concerned because more attention has not been paid to the highway safety aspects of the big truck bill. They are convinced that the case for the bill is woefully weak and inadequate. Undoubtedly, many amendments will be offered in the executive session. However, as long as the authorization for wider and heavier trucks remains in the bill, I will continue to fight the bill. During the next few days I will be inserting in the RECORD each day some editorials from the various States in order to more fully acquaint the Members with the gravity of case against this legislation which exists in our country. Based upon correspondence I am receiving, I am convinced that these editorials accurately reflect the thinking of at least 90 percent of the traveling public.

I would also like to take this opportunity to invite the attention of all Members to my statement before the committee on this subject.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FRED SCHWENGEL BEFORE THE ROADS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, JULY 10, 1969

Mr. Chairman, we have before us again this year a misguided piece of legislation that was productive of much controversy in the last session, primarily due to a woeful lack of research and study. Once more, I feel it is necessary to present my views and convictions. It may be well to put the bill in proper perspective.

But before turning to the substance of this matter, I would like to express my appreciation to the Chairman for ensuring that more adequate time is being made available for both sides to be heard on this critical subject. One thing which was made clear last year. This matter is far too important to pass over lightly with only cursory consideration.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956

In 1956, the Congress first considered the subject of vehicle weights and dimensions. The subject was broached in the consideration of the Federal Aid Highway Act which established a vast new highway system spanning the country known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The Federal-State ratio of contribution was to be 90–10.

The magnitude of the Federal contribution gives support to the imposition of standards for vehicle users designed to protect the useful life of this enormous investment and to enhance the safety of the motorists who travel on our highways. Before this time, the matter of regulation had been primarily regarded as a State concern. Naturally, the standards varied quite widely from State to State, ranging, for example, from 18,000 to 24,000 pounds for single axles—from 28,650 to 44,000 pounds for tandem axle maximums.

Ten years earlier, the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO), concerned with the same problem of promoting the maximum useful life of the nation's highways, established certain standards to that end. This group of professional highway officials from the various States set forth the following standards:

1. maximum weight: (a) single axle, 18,000 lbs; (b) tandem axle, 32,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck, 73,280 lbs. (as determined by AASHO formula based on maximum allowed length within the states).
2. maximum height: 12½ feet.
3. maximum width: 96 inches.
4. maximum length: (a) single unit trucks, 35 ft.; (b) buses with 2 axles, 35 ft.; (c) buses with 3 axles, 35 ft.; (d) truck-trailer semi-trailers, 50 ft.; (e) other combinations, 60 ft.

Although in 1956 some thought that these standards were out of date and somewhat restrictive, still it was felt that they were reliable enough to be incorporated into the Federal Aid Highway Act. As passed, the Bill adopted the following legal limits and made them binding upon all Interstate mileage, with certain exceptions for States with liberal legal standards:

1. maximum weight: (a) single axle, 18,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 32,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck, 73,280 lbs.
2. maximum height: 12½ feet.
3. maximum length: No limit.
4. maximum width: 96 inches.

The exceptions protected by the "grandfather clause" contained in Section 108(J) of the 1956 Act are in the appendix to my statement.

At the time of the bill's passage, a commitment was also made to undertake extensive research to determine the standards necessary to ensure maximum useful life of the new Interstate System. The commitment was embodied in Section 108(K) of the Act which reads:

"TEST TO DETERMINE MAXIMUM DESIRABLE DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHTS

"The Secretary of Commerce is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned, or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several states, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal Aid Highway Systems, including the Interstate System, and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1959, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights."

In 1956, AASHO already had in the planning stage, a series of tests which were designed to elicit much the same information as that mandated by the Act. With some modifications to meet the requirements of Section 108(G), 836 sections or test pavements were built late in 1956 near Ottawa, Illinois. Beginning in 1958 and spanning a two-year period, a nearly continuous series of tests of fully-loaded trucks was conducted over these sections of pavement. The purpose was to gather information bearing on the relationship between pavement types and bridge construction *and* vehicle weight limits and axle loadings. The resulting data was to be a critical factor in setting the maximum desirable weights and dimensions of motor vehicles allowed on the Interstate System.

After several delays, the data from the tests was made available by the Secretary of Commerce and printed as House Document No. 354, 88th Congress, 2nd Session.

The maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles justified on the basis of the Ottawa tests are the following:

1. Maximum weight: (a) Single axle, 20,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 34,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck—to be determined by the formula:

$$W=500\left(\frac{L\times N}{N-1}+12N+36\right)$$

Where W is the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L is the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N is the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. maximum height: 13½ feet.
3. maximum width: 102 inches.
4. maximum length: (a) Single unit truck, 40 ft.; (b) single unit bus, 40 ft.; (c) semi-trailer, 40 ft.; (d) truck-trailer semi-trailer, 55 ft.; (e) all other combinations, 65 feet.

It must be noted that the AASHO tests were designed to compare the durability of various pavements and bridge structures under the stress of different vehicles, load suspension systems, etc. Before we change these standards, we must be provided with ample and proven justification. The toll in needless safety hazards and mounting costs which is likely to follow any increase in the present limits should place a heavy burden on those who would propose a change. Unless the economic benefit to the nation derived from increasing vehicle weights and dimensions is sufficient to offset the higher safety and construction costs necessarily incurred due to the greater burden created by these larger vehicles on present roads and bridges, this bill should be summarily rejected. It should be noted that AASHO's official position is in opposition to any increase in size or weight of motor vehicles on the Interstate System.

We must also put this bill in other than economic terms. We must place it in the realm of human consideration—the well-being of all the motorists who use our nation's highways. We should not promote the economic well-being of particular interest groups at the expense of the safety of the great majority of the motoring public.

II. ACTION IN THE 90TH CONGRESS

A. Senate action

In November of 1967, Senator Magnuson, and others, introduced a bill, S. 2658, to increase the maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles operating on the Interstate System. This bill provided for the following limitations:

1. Maximum weight: (a) Single axle, 20,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 36,000 lbs.; (c) gross weight, computed by formula:

$$W=500\left(\frac{L\times N}{N-1}+12N+40\right)$$

Where W equals the maximum weight in pounds carried on any group of two or more axles, L equals the distance in feet between the extension of any group of two or more axles, and N equals the number of axles in the group under consideration.

2. Maximum length: No limitation.
3. Maximum width, 102 inches, exclusive of tire bulge and safety devices such as mirrors.

Four days of hearings were held before the Senate Public Works Committee in February and March of 1968. The bill was reported out of committee after it was amended to include the following limitations:

1. Weight, single axle, 20,000 lbs.; tandem axle, 34,000 lbs.; gross weight (computed by formula):

$$W=500\left(\frac{L\times N}{N-1}+12N+36\right)$$

The bill was then considered by the Senate under suspension of the rules, and passed by a voice vote with only 7 Senators on the Floor.

B. House action

Similar legislation, H.R. 14474, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Kluczynski of Illinois and 8 others. During the general hearings on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968, this bill was considered together with S. 2658. The hearings were held in February, May and June of 1968. On July 3, 1968, the House Public Works Committee favorably reported the bill, as amended, to the House.

Subsequently, a rule was obtained from the Rules Committee and the bill was placed on the Union Calendar, Number 669. The bill, however, was never called up for action and died at the end of the session.

C. Campaign

During the Presidential Campaign of 1968, the question of increasing the vehicle weight and dimension limitations became a national issue. Eventually, both major candidates issued statements on the subject. President Richard M. Nixon observed during the 1968 campaign, that:

"This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public. Questions remain about the extent to which greater truck size and weight would impose additional wear and tear on a road network.

"I believe these matters are so important to so many of our people that I favor postponement of action on the bill now before the House.

"As President, I would want this entire matter most carefully reconsidered. I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interests of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the Nation's commerce."

Former Vice President Humphrey also indicated his opposition to the legislation during the campaign.

III. ACTION IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

A. House of Representatives

In June of this year, Representatives Kluczynski and Denny introduced legislation essentially the same as that which was reported out of the House Public Works Committee in amended form in 1968. This bill is H.R. 11870. The only change is the addition of a length limitation not contained in S. 2658. The following limits are provided in the bill presently under consideration by this committee:

1. Maximum weight: (a) Single axle, 20,000 lbs.; (b) tandem axle, 34,000 lbs.; (c) gross truck, as computed by the formula:

$$W=500\left(\frac{L\times N}{N-1}+12N+36\right)$$

2. Maximum height: No change from present limits.
3. Maximum width: 102 inches.
4. Maximum length: 70 feet.

We must bear in mind that this bill, while specifically referring to the Interstate System, must in fact apply to all Federal Aid Systems—Primary, Secondary and Urban extensions—as well as Interstate, as there is no Federal law governing maximum size and weight standards for any system except that System.

This bill would increase the present allowable width of a vehicle from 96" to 102", "plus additional width necessary for safety devices and tire bulge due to loads." Competent authorities have estimated that safety devices can add as much as 24" to the width, thus making legal a total width of about 126", or 10⅔ feet. This creates a definite safety hazard on roads with 10 and 11 foot traffic lanes. Under the present limit, two trucks passing on an average two-lane road, with 12 foot lanes (of the size found in the Interstate System), would have 4 feet of clearance if they are in the middle of their lanes. Under the new limits, this safety gap would be reduced to less than 2 feet.. Now, consider for a moment two supertrucks passing at 60 or 70 miles an hour with less than 2 feet of clearance between the trucks. Most truck drivers would attempt to put far more distance between vehicles, thus putting the trucks virtually on the shoulder of the road, a very dangerous practice in itself. Further, more than 60 per cent of all State primary road mileage in 1966 had lane widths under 12 feet another 16 per cent of the roads were under 10 feet.

For the first time, the Federal law would impose a length limit. In H.R. 11870 the limiting length is placed at 70 feet. At the beginning of 1969, only two states permitted lengths of 70 feet or greater for regular operation, while 18 permitted 65 foot units, and 32 states restricted overall length to 60 feet or less.

The single axle weight would be increased, in the proposal, from 18,000 lbs. to 20,000 pounds, and that on a tandem axle from 32,000 pounds to 34,000 pounds.

The gross weight of a vehicle is presently restricted to 73,280 pounds. Under the bill this weight would be determined by formula. The practical new gross weight of the proposed 70 foot vehicle with 5 axles would be 88,625 pounds or an increase of 15,345 pounds above the present legal limit. A six axle, 70 foot vehicle would have a practical gross weight of 92,000 pounds.

A new section provides that two consecutive sets of tandem axles separated by 36 feet or more may carry 68,000 pounds, regardless of the law's formula. The practical effect of this section is to permit the common 55 foot truck-tractor semi-trailer unit to haul about 78,000 lbs. rather than the 73,500 lbs. which would result from using the formula.

It is noteworthy that the policy of AASHO recommends performance standards for vehicles of the anticipated sizes. The Department of Transportation concurred with the AASHO recommendation in 1968, and submitted a bill covering this aspect which is so fundamental to safety. The proposals before us do not include any such item on safety.

B. Hearings on highway safety

Early in June, hearings were held on the subject of the Highway Safety Act of 1966. In the course of these hearings, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, testified that little, if any research was being conducted with respect to the effect of increasing vehicle weights and dimensions on highway or vehicle safety. Mr. Ben Kelly, Vice-President of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, testified that he knew of no credible research done on this problem. Dr. Brenner further testified that he believed the work done by Professor Wolff at Cornell University, with respect to the high rate of accident involvement of trucks, was reasonably accurate.

It seems clear, then that there are several important aspects of this legislation which must be considered and dealt with, and important questions which must be answered, before this committee or the Congress can act on the question of increasing vehicle weights and sizes. Generally, these considerations fall into four broad categories: safety highway costs, economic benefits, and Federal initiative versus State's rights. I shall discuss each briefly:

Safety

When I speak of the problems of safety with respect to increasing the weights and sizes of vehicles, there are a number of areas to be explored: One of the most important, in my judgment, is the effect of increased vehicle dimensions on automobiles. This legislation must, of necessity, reduce clearance between passing vehicles, decrease visibility, increase difficulty in passing, increase the hazards of negotiating narrow corners, generate additional suction or blast caused by ever larger trucks and buses, etc. These are not trifling problems to be lightly passed over. They are concerns which may be reflected in lost lives and disabling injuries. These are problems upon which we now lack sufficient information to make reasoned judgments. In the highway safety hearings last month, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the Highway Safety Bureau, testified before this very committee that his agency has almost no research underway with respect to these problems. Witnesses who have testified to date in favor of the bill have failed to come forward with any credible research to support their position that the weights and sizes of vehicles can be increased without significantly affecting safety. I believe, in fact, that when these hearings are completed, there will be a considerable amount of raw data and personal observations indicating that serious highway safety problems would result if we allow bigger and heavier trucks on our highway system. I might note here also, Mr. Chairman, that it is my position that the proponents of this legislation have the burden of coming forward with sound evidence that the increases in legal limits which they seek can be made without endangering the safety of the motoring public at large. Economic benefit is of little value if it must be measured in terms of needless accidents and human suffering.

A distinct aspect of the safety problem is that where two trucks or buses are involved. The real problems in passing, turning, suction, and decreased clearance between vehicles are present here as well.

Consider also the safety of the single large vehicle. Adequate braking capacity, weight to horsepower ratios, coupling devices, tires, and stability must be assured. Of prime importance is adequate braking capacity for each weight of vehicle considered, and adequate horsepower to diminish the problem of speed differentials which are the cause of so many fatal accidents.

Still another concern is related to highway surfaces and structures. Nearly every source admits that increases in vehicle weights and sizes will bring about an accelerated deterioration of highway surfaces. The earlier and more pronounced any deterioration is, the greater the safety hazards in the form of cracking and rutting and—in the case of our narrower highways—serious rutting in the shoulder area alongside the pavements. Aside from these dangers, any increase in required maintenance means more detour lanes as well as machines in the roadway, which pose additional safety hazards in and of themselves. Similarly, the effect of the proposed increases in sizes and weights on structures such as bridges will create additional hazards. While the legislation before us purports to deal only with vehicles on the Interstate System, it is clear that these same vehicles cannot load and unload on the Interstate System itself. They must of necessity travel on primary and secondary road systems for at least a sizeable portion of most journeys. These highways, which are the backbone of our road network, account for 244,753 miles of our most vital roadways on which we would rely in a period of national emergency. This important system includes 95,750 bridges. 68,700 of them, or over 71%, are designed for less than the present Interstate Standard (HS-20) and 30,073, or more than 31% are designed for a 15-ton truck with a 24,000 lb. load on its rear tandem axle and 6,000 lbs. on its steering axle with a 14 foot wheelbase. These are much smaller and lighter vehicles than those being considered in this bill. Thus the dangers of allowing still larger and heavier trucks on our highways is apparent.

Effect on Highway Costs

Now we shall consider the effects on our nation's highway system with respect to costs of building and maintenance. In a Government document entitled "Total Disbursements for Highways, All Units of Government," I find that from 1921 to 1965 we have invested over $232,190,000,000 in this system of highways. A great portion of these billions of dollars represents the so-called Federal "contribution." This alone justifies more extensive Federal involvement in the active

protection of our nation's highway network. It is an indisputed fact that an increase in weights and sizes will cause more rapid deterioration of highways. AASHO testimony last year stated that a 20,000 lb. axle weight would reduce the remaining service life of pavements by 35 to 40 percent.

We would have, then, a direct increase in total costs over those which would accrue under present standards. The basic design criteria for the Interstate System is based on the standard of an 18,000 lb. single axle weight. Doesn't this mean that the bill, if enacted, would require reconstruction of the 70% of the system presently built, at a period 35 to 40% sooner than we have anticipated? Such reconstruction is already taking place due to overweight trucks. The potential costs of this early reconstruction are staggering. Conceivably we would actually be rebuilding some of the older Interstate sections before the System is ever completed. I think it is important that this committee and the Congress have a reasonably accurate estimate of this enormous additional cost.

A corollary question is that of *who should pay for the additional costs incurred by any increase in the weights and sizes of vehicles?* It would appear that we presently have sufficient data at hand to make an informed judgment on this question. Both the Highway Cost Allocation Study, 88th Congress, First Session, House Document No. 354, and the Supplementary Report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study, 89th Congress, First Session, House Document No. 124, are available. Relying on these documents we should have sufficient information to determine which highway users should bear the increase in cost of highway construction and maintenance accrued by reason of any increase made in vehicle weights or dimensions. At present, studies of wear characteristics of pavement indicate that the passage of a heavy truck over a high grade pavement produced deterioration equivalent to the passage of 6,000 automobiles. In order to pay their fair share of road costs, heavy trucks would have to pay 6,000 times the tax levied on the passenger car per mile traveled. These figures do not, obviously, reflect the susbtantially greater costs which would result from increasing vehicle weights. And, just as obviously, large trucks are not paying their fair share of road maintenance costs even now. Therefore, in considering any increase in truck sizes and weights we must also include reasonable increases in user taxes. No such proposal is included in this bill.

One remaining problem in this area is the method by which the increased costs of highway building and maintenance would be recouped by the government. This could take the form of an increase in the fuel tax, in the various user taxes presently being used by the states, or some new form of taxation. With respect to this area of taxation, I am not troubled about the ability of this committee at this time. Suffice it to say that I am not troubled about the ability of this committee to arrive at a fair and rational decision with respect to each of the items I have here mentioned.

C. Economic benefits

While I feel other factors, such as motorist safety, are our primary concerns, the economic impact of increasing vehicle weights and sizes cannot rightly be ignored.

The first important element of this discussion is the adequacy of available transportation for goods and materials in various geographic sections of the nation. It is clear that certain areas of our country rely almost entirely on motor vehicles for transportation of vital goods, and, obviously, the economic impact of this legislation will be very grave in these regions. I am more concerned with this phase of the economic problem than any other. At the same time we must realize that the adverse effects of increasing motor carrier sizes can more than cancel out the economic benefits of such an action. The undesirable side-effects of adding larger vehicles to our roadways must be measured realistically against the benefits to the public which might result from increasing hauler capacity.

Further, the extent to which this legislation will reduce transportation costs, namely freight rates, is questionable. Again, we must know exactly by how much costs will be reduced and, more importantly, who will be the ultimate benefactor of the purported savings. I seriously doubt if the consumer, or even the various manufacturers and intermediary shippers will experience substantial or any benefits. The trucking industry has recently signed a new labor contract providing for rather significant increases in labor costs. The temptation to offset these increased costs with any savings resulting from an increase in vehicle weights and sizes will undoubtedly prove too difficult to resist.

D. Coercion of the States

A fourth and final consideration with which this committee must deal is that of the relative roles of the Federal and State governments in regulation of vehicle weights and dimensions. This Congressman realizes that the action we take with respect to this legislation will have effects more far-reaching than those which simply concern the Interstate System of this nation. In this respect we should look once again to the mandate of the 1956 legislation. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 directed a study of the appropriate vehicle weight and size limitations with respect to all Federal aid highways. The AASHO studies and the recommendations resulting therefrom, have been directed solely to the Interstate Highway System. Obviously, the Interstate System has been built to the highest standards of any highway system in our Nation. The greater problem arises from the fact that our Interstate System does not lead from one vacuum to another, but, in fact, leads from one city to another via the ABC, or primary and secondary road systems. The Federal Government has an investment of 50% in the cost of constructing these systems. Granted, this amount may be considerably less than the 90% of construction costs which we have invested in the Interstate System, but there is no logical argument why the Federal Government should not protect its investment merely because it is *"only 50%"* of the total cost.

The larger and heavier vehicles which would be permitted on the Interstate System under the legislation now before us are not going to load and unload in the middle of that system. They must, of necessity, use the primary and secondary systems in their movement from one point to another. Section 109 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which includes standards for all Federal Aid Systems, says that the Secretary of Transportation may not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects unless they provide a facility "(1) that will meet the existing and probable future traffic needs and conditions in a manner conducive to safety, durability, and economy of maintenance." AASHO stated in testimony last year that they believe the standards adopted as maximums should apply to all systems. It is clear that passage of this legislation by the Congress would serve as leverage to force the various states to increase their size and weight limitations on the primary and secondary systems so as to equal that of the Interstate System. This is despite the clear fact that our primary and secondary systems are not up to the same standards as our Interstate System, particularly with respect to the bridge structures on these systems, many of which were built prior to 1935, and are over-stressed even under present weight limitations. It is one thing to say that this legislation is merely "permissive" and doesn't force the states to do anything. To adopt this philosophy is to be something more than naive.

EXHIBIT I

STATE LEGAL MAXIMUM DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHTS PROTECTED BY "GRANDFATHER CLAUSE"

State	Width (inches)	Axle load (pounds)				Specified maximum gross weight (pounds)		
		Single		Tandem		Truck-tractor semitrailer		
		Statutory limit	Including statutory enforce-tolerance	Statutory limit	Including statutory enforce-tolerance	4-axle	5-axle	Other combination
Alabama			19,800	36,000	39,600			
Alaska		20,000		34,000		74,000	88,000	100,000
Colorado				36,000				
Connecticut	102	22,400	22,848	36,000	36,720			
Delaware		20,000		36,000				
Florida		20,000	22,000	40,000	44,000			
Georgia			20,340	36,000	40,680			
Hawaii	108	24,000						
Indiana			19,000		33,000			
Iowa			18,540		32,960			
Kentucky			18,900		33,600			
Maine	102	22,000		36,000				
Maryland	96	22,400		30,000				
Massachusetts		22,400		36,000				
Nebraska			18,900		33,600			
Nevada			18,900		33,600			
New Hampshire		22,400		36,000				
New Jersey		22,400	23,520		33,600			
New Mexico		21,600		34,200				
New York		22,400		36,000				
North Carolina			19,000	36,000	38,000			
Ohio		19,000	19,570		32,960			
Oregon		20,000		34,000			76,000	76,000
Pennsylvania		22,400	23,072	36,000	37,080			
Rhode Island	102	22,400						88,000
South Carolina		20,000						
Utah				33,000			79,900	79,900
Vermont		22,400	23,520	36,000				
West Virginia			18,900		33,600			
Wisconsin			19,500		32,000			
Wyoming					36,000			
District of Columbia		22,000						

EXHIBIT II

1. The additional cubage granted to longer vehicles would be about as follows:

States with 55-foot law: additional 15 feet or 27% more cubage.

States with 60-foot law: additional 10 feet or 17+% more cubage.

States with 65-foot law: additional 5 feet or 8−% more cubage.

The history of additional length is that for each foot of additional length, the permissible weight has gone up about 2700 pounds.

2. (a) The findings of the AASHO road test (from testimony of AASHO on S. 2658, page 203) that a single axle had a tandem axle equivalent in accordance with the following:

Single axle:	*Tandem axle*
18,000 lbs	29,000 lbs.
20,000 lbs	33,000 lbs.

(b) The increase from 18,000 lbs. to 20,000 lbs. single axle, would reduce the remaining life of pavements from 35 to 40 percent. (AASHO testimony S. 2658, page 203)

(c) Cost of resurfacings due to heavier loads would be about $3 billion over a ten year period (Congressional Document 354 expanded to 50 states)

3. A 65 to 70 foot double bottom unit with 4–18,000 pounds axle would have about 125% of the damaging effect of a truck-tractor semi-trailer with two 32,000 pound tandem axles. (AASHO road test date—Summary Report #7, Chap. 7)

4. In September of 1968, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads reported that there was a total of 473,869 miles of surfaced roads on the State Primary Systems. 429,913 miles of these roads were undivided. 198,735 miles had lane widths of less than 12 feet. When two vehicles 10.5 feet wide (including the width of their safety equipment) meet on a highway with 10 or 11 foot traffic lanes, the result is obvious. This condition pertains to 198,735 miles of State Primary highways or nearly 42% of the total.

5. About 70% of the original 41,000 mile Interstate system is now built and it was designed basically for 18,000 pound single axles and 32,000 pound tandems.

6. The defense requirement routes of the country total 244,753 miles or one-seventh of the total highway network. This System includes 95,750 birdges, 68,700 of which are designed for less than HS–20 (the present Interstate Standard), and 30,073 for H–15 or less (the standard which applied prior to World War II.)

EXHIBIT III

(From the June 4, 1969, hearings on "Federal Aid Highway and Highway Safety," before the Subcommittee on Roads, of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And I would like to ask, have you done any research or are you planning any research on the effects of increasing the width of the trucks on the highway?

Dr. BRENNER. We have work in progress at the present time in the general problem area of stability of trucks, truck-trailer combinations, double bottoms, semis, the whole problem of truck-trailer stability. And insofar as the width of the vehicle, wheel base in relation to the height as well as the mass distribution, are certainly central to stability studies and we will be working in the general area.

As to the specific of what the extra width does or does not do in the safety picture, I am not aware of any work specifically in that regard.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Do you not think since this was a question before the committee, question before the Congress, question both of the candidates for President commented on in the last election—one candidate said we ought to do a lot more studies here in this area—where we should be immediately pursuing this?

Dr. BRENNER. Of course, the Department is studying its position on this question of truck size and weight right now.

I think that we have to learn a great deal more about the problem of truck stability. I think this would be helpful. I do not know whether or not at this time this would preclude action, one way or another, upon the legislation that is pending. I think we have to continue to work in the area.

I would not comment as to whether or not we now know enough one way or another with regard to safety.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You are not sure we ought to study this, research this before we act on increasing the width? One candidate for President said we should.

Dr. BRENNER. I certainly would like to see as much information as possible, or at least all of the information that is available, considering any legislation on any matter. And I am not familiar with the totality of the research that has been done with regard to the truck-trailer stability. I do know that there is an awful lot we do not know about why some of these vehicles flip over and why some of them don't.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Are you aware of the Professor Wolfe report?

Dr. BRENNER. Generally dealing with it, yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If you are, then you know that they say that there will be two and one-half million accidents per year in which trucks are involved, with 4,000 to 5,000 deaths. And this study also shows that for every truck driver killed in a truck-auto crash, 35 are killed in automobiles.

Now, this is one of the reasons the public is concerned, the very reason we had better know what we are doing, the safety measure before we consider legislation.

This also applies to buses. I do not know what effect it is going to be, increasing width, how much more suction or how much more it has to bear, or what will be the result if we have better design for trucks, so that there will be a better flow of air as it goes through down the road.

Dr. BRENNER. I am familiar with Professor Wolfe's study. As a matter of fact, his group is one of the groups that is under contract to us in the accident investigation area. I have known Professor Wolfe for many years and the work there certainly is reasonably accurate.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I understand you do try to do research, more research in this area?

Dr. BRENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am very glad to hear this.

FARBSTEIN "FRIEND OF COURT" IN AIR POLLUTION SUIT AGAINST AUTO COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to intervene in a major suit aimed at reducing air pollution caused by automobile engines.

The suit, which was filed originally on August 7 in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles by two California residents, asks that HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch and Attorney General John N. Mitchell act to prevent the big four auto companies from producing automobile engines which cause high levels of pollution and the five major oil companies from refining fuels with high pollutant additives such as lead. It also asks $2.66 billion in damages and $7.67 billion in treble damages.

The defendants, in addition to the two Cabinet members and the automobile and oil companies, are the Automobile Manufacturers Association and the American Petroleum Institute.

I shall file a amicus curiae—friend of the court—brief in the revised suit, which was filed September 16.

If we do not act now, millions could die from air pollution in the next 10 years. My decision to file this brief was prompted in part by the Justice Department's decision to halt the prosecution of the major automobile companies for collusion in failing to develop and install pollution control devices. Since the Nixon administration has apparently given up Government's traditional role as a defender of the public interest, it is time now for private citizens to act.

The medical link of several disorders including lung cancer and genetic mutation to air pollution from automobiles makes action against automotive pollution imperative.

Several weeks ago, I introduced legislation to do something about auto-caused air pollution. One bill would prohibit the manufacture or sale of cars powered by internal combustion engines after January 1, 1978. A second would require a health warning on all advertising for leaded gasoline, while the third would make oil companies producing leaded gasoline ineligible for tax relief under the oil depletion allowance.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY HIGHLIGHTS OF 1969 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, several extensive reports have already been given on the success of the 1969 Captive Nations Week observance. I should like to add to them with a descriptive account of the highly impressive 10th anniversary banquet, which highlighted the observance in this country, and also further examples of the breadth and diversity of the week's activities. All of this and more proves the degree by which large segments of our population continue to preserve the precious idealism of America and perceive the natural alliance that exists between the whole family of captive nations and our Nation.

Sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee, the 10th anniversary banquet was held on July 16 at the University Club in Washington, D.C. Specially honored on the occasion was Dr. Ku Cheng-kang of the Republic of China, who received an Eisenhower freedom plaque for his tremendous work in Asia in behalf of all the captive nations. Also, 10 special Eisenhower medals were bestowed upon the following for their long service and contributions in the Captive Nations movement: Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe; Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut; House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan; Representative THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York; Representative

WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana; Representative LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York; Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin; and Representative JOHN BUCHANAN, of Alabama.

Concerning this event and other illustrative aspects of the 1969 observance, I submit the following select material:

First, a full report of the banquet in the July 26 issue of Svobada, with a letter of appreciation from Dr. Ku Cheng-kang;

Second, proclamations of the week by Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh of Detroit, County Executive John Tutuska of Erie County, N.Y., Legislator William E. Doering of the Erie County Legislature, and Mayor Stephen P. Clark of Miami, Fla.

Third, pertinent data on the observance in the July–August issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin;

Fourth, the Captive Nations Week resolution of the World Anti-Communist League;

Fifth, the program, declarations, and statement of the Philadelphia Captive Nations event, with a report in the August 14 issue of America;

Sixth, an editorial and an article in the Wanderer of July 17;

Seventh, the program, prayers, and news reports on the Buffalo Captive Nations observance; and

Eighth, from an entire issue devoted to "The Captive Nations" in the WACL Bulletin of July 1 an article on "Ten Years of Captive Nations Week" by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University.

The aforementioned material follows:

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 26, 1969]

CHINESE LEADER HONORED AT CAPTIVE NATIONS OBSERVANCE IN WASHINGTON—NOTABLES OF DIPLOMATIC CORPS, ACADEMIC WORLD AND ETHNIC COMMUNITIES ATTEND CAPTIVE NATIONS EVENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Over 300 persons represented the U.S. Congress and government, the diplomatic corps, the academic world and the ethnic communities in the United States gathered on Wednesday, July 16, 1969, at the University Club in the nation's capital to honor Dr. Ku-Cheng-kang, outstanding Chinese statesman, diplomat and leader of a vast Asian anti-Communist movement. Dr. Ku, who is currently visiting the United States as a guest of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC), headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the UCCA, received a special plaque for his leadership in the captive nations movement in Asia.

Honored along with Dr. Ku were the Hon. George Meany, President of AFL–CIO, an honorary member of the NCNC, who also received a plaque, and 10 U.S. Congressmen, who received special "General Eisenhower Medals" in recognition of their services to the cause of the Captive Nations.

Dr. Dobriansky, who opened the banquet, introduced Congressman Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois to serve as master of ceremonies, and Dr. Peter Lejins, of the University of Maryland and vice chairman of the NCNC, who read the citations and presented the medals to the U.S. legislators. Receiving the "Eisenhower Medals" were Congressman Derwinski, and Congressmen Daniel J. Flood (Pa.), Gerald Ford (Mich.), William G. Bray (Ind.), Clement J. Zablocki (Wisc.), Michael A. Feighan (O.), Thaddeus J. Dulski (N.Y.), Leonard Farbstein (N.Y.), John Rarick (La.), John H. Buchanan (Ala.), Donald Lukens (O.), and Senator Thomas J. Dodd (Conn.).

Dr. Ku, speaking through an official interpreter, stated that there exists a great and natural "community of interests" between the peoples of Asia and the captive nations of Europe, and that the plight of the latter is of great concern for the Asian nations which also struggle against alien Communism, brought upon them by Moscow and Peking and their subservient puppets in North Korea and North Vietnam. He called for greater cooperation between the American people and representatives of the captive nations here and elsewhere for a more effective coordination of purpose and methods in the common struggle for freedom and justice for the captive nations.

Among those present, in addition to the U.S. Congressmen enumerated above were the Hon. John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, who was one of the speakers, Ambassador and Mrs. Show Shu-kai of China, Madame Claire Chennault, Mrs. J. Kajeckas, wife of the Lithuanian Charge d'Affaires, Con. and Mrs. Joseph P. Vigorito and Mr. Rutledge, representing Mayor Walter Washington.

In addition to Dr. Lev E. and Mrs. Dobriansky and his assistants, Miss Vera A. Dowhan, Maj. M. Sydorko, and Mr. and Mrs. Walter Pretka, there were several Ukrainians in attendance. Among them were Very Rev. Msgr. Vasyl Makuch, Rector of the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary in Washington, Very Rev. Msgr. Meletius Wojnar of Catholic University, Rev. Constantine Berdar, Dr. M. Dankevych, Stephen J. Shubik and Volodymyr Mayewsky—all of Washington.

Also Joseph Lesawyer, Dr. Walter Dushnyck, Dr. Stephen Woroch, Dr. Walter Gallan, Dr. Peter Sercho, Walter Masur, and Ignatius M. Billinsky, representing the UCCA; Mrs. Stephanie Wochok and Dr. Yaroslav Bernadyn—the Providence Association; A. Nykonchuk—the Ukrainian National Aid Association; Mrs. Valentina Kalynyk and Valentin Koval—American Committee to Free the Captive Nations; and Dr. Alexander Sokolyshyn and Michael Spotak—the American Friends of the ABN, and Mr. Peter Mohylyn of Brooklyn, N.Y. and Mr. Volodymyr Chopivsky from Phoenix, Ariz.

Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning gave the invocation, while Father Berdar delivered the benediction.

At the conclusion of the banquet Dr. Dobriansky, who was mainly responsible for the well-attended event, thanked all present for their cooperation and called for further effort and coordination of work toward the overall objective—making the plight of the captive nations known to the American people and thus help advance the day of the ultimate liberation of the captive nations.

WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE,
CHINA CHAPTER,
Taipei, August 21, 1969.

DEAR DR. DOBRIANSKY: I am most thankful for your kind invitation and elaborate arrangements for me to participate in the Captive Nations Week activities in the United States. And I want to thank you, too, for the hospitalities you extended to me during my stay in your country.

Among the one week commemorating activities, the most unforgettable for me was the presentation to me by your Committee on July 16 of the Eisenhower Medal as a symbol of freedom and anti-enslavement. The event signifies the unification of Western free forces with that of the East. It also proves that the great Captive Nations Week movement in the U.S. has won enthusiastic response and support in Asia. Personally, it is an encouragement for me to carry on our struggle for the liberation of enslaved peoples from behind the Iron Curtain.

I was very much impressed with the anti-enslavement mass demonstrations in Phoenix, Philadelphia and Chicago. These are, of course, resulted from the unflagging efforts of your organization and have greatly strengthened our confidence in carrying forward the movement.

It is my hope that, from now on, the cooperation among free and anti-enslavement forces can be further consolidated. For the purpose of establishing a united front of interntional anti-Communist forces, I also hope that you and your friends will prop up the drive to create a WACL Chapter in the United States. We expect you will attend at the third General Conference of the WACL to be held next December in Bangkok so that we can discuss and decide the guiding policy for future development of our common struggle.

Thank you again and wish you every success.

Sincerely yours,

KU CHENG-KANG,
Honorary President.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 13 TO 19, 1969

Whereas Foreign intervention has deprived the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others of their independence, and

Whereas the peoples of these nations look to the United States for leadership in their struggle to regain the freedom which was taken from them, and

Whereas the hope for lasting peace rests on the desire of these nations as well as all the nations of the world for independence and freedom, and

Whereas the American Friends of the Captive Nations is a dedicated organization celebrating its tenth anniversary of encouraging all Americans to voice their moral support for these freedom-loving nations

Now, therefore, I, Jerome P. Cavanagh, Mayor of the City of Detroit, do hereby proclaim July 13–19, 1969 as "Captive Nations Week" in Detroit and call upon all citizens to support the men, women and children of these nations in their struggle for independence, freedom and peace.

Given under my hand and seal this 3rd day of July, 1969.

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Public Law 86–90 was enacted 10 years ago. This law establishes Captive Nations Week, and in so doing, our representatives themselves also established that we, Americans, do not bow to despotism whether it comes from the Court of St. James or the Kremlin or Peking; and

Whereas, To-day Communism has erected a cruel barrier of barbed wire, minefields, man-hunters, bloodhounds and machine-guns. It has re-established colonialism behind an Iron Curtain, where civilized nations labor under the boot of tyranny. The same ruthless armed oppression has been used against the open resistance in Budapest or the peaceful attempt for changes in Prague. This political oppression and economic exploitation of the Captive Nations is committed in the name of a political system which has been proven to be obsolete and reactionary. Communism attempts to stabilize its system through the bloodshed and misery of others. Fomenting small wars throughout the world is an oft-used strategy; and

Whereas, The peoples of the Captive Nations look to us for sympathy, encouragement and help. We have witnessed that bridges cannot be built to these countries. The puppet governments of Moscow insist that any contact with the West and Freedom be denied their people; and

Whereas, We should ensure that these puppet governments receive no economic help from the West. To this end, we should

avoid buying any products of these countries because the hard currency so acquired by these governments is used to subvert our own freedom. We must keep in mind that these goods we buy were denied our enslaved brothers.

Now, therefore, I, B. John Tutuska, County Executive of the County of Erie, do hereby proclaim the week of July 20–27, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" and urge the citizens of Erie County to support and observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the County of Erie to be affixed this 2nd day of July, 1969.

B. JOHN TUTUSKA,
County Executive.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, The United States has just days ago celebrated the one hundred and ninety-third year of her Glorious American independence, and

Whereas, In 1959, President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed Public Law 86–90 mandating that Americans set aside the third week of July each year for the solemn observance of Captive Nations Week, and

Whereas, The people of Western New York have been among the leaders, nationally, in implementing Public Law 86–90.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Erie County Legislature recognizes and supports the efforts of the Erie County Citizens Committee to observe Captive Nations Week, to focus public attention during the week of July 20–27, 1969, on the plight of the Captive Nations, on the just aspirations for a return of their national independence, and on the deprivations and suffering of the more than one billion souls suffering under Communist totalitarian rules in a "Prison House of Nations".

WILLIAM E. DOERING,
Legislator, 20th District.

Attest:

BENJAMIN DE YOUNG, JR.,
Clerk of the Legislature of Erie County.

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.

Whereas the imperialistic policies of the Communist monolith have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of various peoples throughout the world, and

Whereas an overwhelming majority of the peoples in these conquered nations have an ever-burning desire for liberty and independence, and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of America as leaders in hopefully bringing about their freedom and independence some day, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by unanimous vote, passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and, further, invited Americans to observe the week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities, thus expressing their sympathy with and support for the captive peoples of the world,

Now, therefore, I, Stephen P. Clark, Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida, do hereby proclaim the week beginning Sunday, July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week.

In observance thereof I urge my fellow Miamians to join with me in honoring the noble principles that guide the Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C., and to support, by both word and deed, the desire of captive peoples to some day be free of the yokes that bind them.

In witness whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause the seal of the City of Miami to be affixed.

Done in the office of the Mayor of the City of Miami, Florida.

STEPHEN P. CLARK.

THE WHITE HOUSE—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A proclamation

By Joint Resolution on July 17, 1959, the Eighty-Sixth Congress authorized and requested the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. Ten years have passed and there have been many changes in international affairs. But one thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to renew their devotion to the high ideals on which our nation was founded and has prospered and to sustain with understanding and sympathy the just aspirations of the peoples of all nations for independence and human freedom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of July, 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-fourth.

RICHARD NIXON.

NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE: PURPOSE, ACHIEVEMENTS AND OBJECTIVES

The National Captive Nations Committee is an educational organization founded shortly after the passage of the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) in 1959.

Its members are Americans with conviction, faith and perseverance, voicing concern for the lost basic freedoms and human rights of the approximately one billion captive peoples of the captive nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar Curtains.

Local committees function in almost every major city throughout the United States. Internationally, the World Anti-Communist League (of which this committee is an affiliate) sponsors the observance of the Week on the basis of a resolution passed at its first congress in Taipei in September 1967.

Annually, Governors and Mayors in 35 States and 42 major cities, as well as in hundreds of towns, consistently issue proclamations patterned after the resolution. National and international statements appear regularly in the *Congressional Record.*

PURPOSE

The purpose of NCNC is broad and multiple in scope:

First and foremost, firm adherence to our Declaration of Independence—that we Americans, in the interest of our own national security, will never forget the captive nations or accommodate ourselves to their present captivity.

Promote and accelerate the freedom aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations, to which they are entitled by their creator.

Throughout the year, but especially during the Week, exposing the Russian fraud of "self-determination" and putting into proper perspective the present-day captivity of the Central and East Europeans, the non-Russian nations in the USSR, the Asians and Cubans; spotlighting the dangerous myths surrounding the Red empire, despite the propaganda and diplomatic pressures of the Communist regimes.

Continuous rejection of existent colonialism affected by Russian aggression and "wars of liberation," and focusing world attention on the last remaining empire, the Soviet Union itself.

Dispel the concepts that the Soviet Union is a "nation" and that Russia is the Soviet Union; prove, historically and geographically, that Russia is only one of the republics in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Restore the great image of America and defend every point of NCNC's purpose—a challenge to every American's courage of convictions and conscience.

Full support of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights; implementation of this declaration to include the captive non-Russian nations the Soviet Union.

A resolute stand against misleading Cold War theories of "peaceful coexistence," "lessened tensions," "trade with Red countries," "bridges of understanding," etc., while the rape of nations exists.

Promulgate the effective achievement of political, social, economic, religious, linguistic and cultural rights of the captive peoples in the captive nations.

Regardless of political persuasion, instill in all men their sacred duty and responsibility for the preservation of freedom in the full tradition of our American Revolution.

ACHIEVEMENTS

Original Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) authored by the chairman of the committee.

Regular Congressional observances of the Week in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives; religious commemoration led by Congressional chaplains.

Expansion of observances through further formation of local and state captive nations committees in all major cities and states; religious observances conducted in many places of worship.

Stimulation of Captive Nations Week activities and proclamations by many heads of state of foreign countries such as Japan, Free China, South Korea, South Vietnam, India, Philippines, Australia, Turkey, Malta, West Germany, England, Sweden and Argentina.

Testimonies before Congressional committees on subjects relevant to our own national security in conjunction with the captive nations, e.g., East-West Trade (1965), US–USSR Consular Convention (1967).

Congressional Record publication of all Captive Nations Week activities both national and international from 1959 on.

Nation-wide educational link with press, radio and TV media, especially before and during Captive Nations Week.

Continuous responses by captive nations committee members to attacks against the resolution and observances on the part of Moscow and its Red syndicate.

Lectures by scholars and experts in the fields of Soviet Affairs, Communism, Red political warfare, etc.

OBJECTIVES

Assistance in the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Total victory in Vietnam.

A first, complete review of U.S. policy toward the USSR.

Reformation of the Voice of America as a genuine projector of the American image in the captive lands.

Pursue the policy of no liberalized trade without political concessions to the captive nations.

Further Cold War education dealing with the crucial importance of captive nations, especially the non-Russian nations in the USSR.

Emphasizing the need for a Freedom Commission and Academy to cope with the Cold War tactics of the Red enemy.

Advancement of ideas to sustain and expand the American image of independence, i.e., concentration on the independence as-

pirations of all non-Russian captive nations in the USSR.

Promotion of public awareness of the Adlai Stevenson memorandum in the UN on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism with a view toward a full-scale debate on the subject.

Generate a consciousness of how various forms of agitation aimed at completely undermining the structure of American civil authority, i.e., university campus eruptions, civil disobedience, certain types of civil right disturbances, etc., are supported by communist sources and conducted along the same lines used in the captive nations.

Urging a basic change in U.S. foreign policy from an economico-military defensive to a psycho-political offensive.

Further expansion of the captive nations movement in all states and communities of the Free World via proclamations, observances and implementation of what the committee is doing in the United States.

Provision of more speakers on the captive nations before chambers of commerce, labor unions, education and religious groups.

Additional publication on developments in the captive nations and their import on U.S. national security.

Preparation and research position papers on current foreign policy issues in the Congress of the United States.

Reports on legislative developments.

Conducting seminars and conferences.

PASTORAL APPEAL ON THE OCCASION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Very Reverend Fathers, Honorable Leaders of church and civic organizations and societies, Dearly beloved brothers and sisters in Christ.

Ten years have passed since our American government has announced the observance of Captive Nations Week. Each year it appeals to the American people to take part in the cultural manifestations against the forced tyranny and captivity of the enslaved nations. Amongst these we find the Ukrainian people. Freedom-loving America with her mayors and individual state governors and the President himself at the head protest against the communist enslavement of the captive nations. We Ukrainians (Catholics as well as Orthodox) can not afford to be indifferent to this slavery and persecution of our brothers and sisters behind the Iron Curtain, who suffer under the hammer and sickle. The prosperity of America should not blind us to the enslavement of our Church and our people behind the Iron Curtain.

Just what this communist enslavement consists in can be told us by eye witnesses who lived through the vast liquidation of the five eparchies in Galicia and the Sub-Carpathian Region with 10 bishops and 2,950 priests. The Bolshevik enslavement forbade the Ukrainian Catholics to profess the Catholic Faith and lead a religious life, which was then organized into 3040 parishes and 4,440 churches and chapels.

Just what this communist enslavement consists in can be told us by those peoples from whom the communist authorities confiscated private property and religious freedom. From this communist enslavement millions of people have suffered and perished from tortures in the concentration camps. Just what this communist enslavement consists in can be told us by millions of Ukrainians, who died of hunger. One can write much about this communist enslavement, but time does not permit.

The communist enslavement at the same time is a warning for Americans and especially for Ukrainians in the free world so that they distinguish the Ukrainian wheat from the communist cockle.

We wish happiness to all peoples, and entreat the Lord God that the communist government with its party make not their happiness at the misfortunes of the captive nations. We do not desire revenge on the cruel enemies of God and the Ukrainian people, but we beg God that today's unbelieving Sauls would be converted and amend the injuries to the Ukrainian Churches and the Ukrainian people.

Our prayers should be joined with alms. Do not forget, Dearly beloved in Christ, that on the occasion of the enslavement of the Ukrainian people by the communist party, many Ukrainians cannot return to their native land, and thus are forced to spend their years in exile. Sickness, old age and lack of suitable means of life cause suffering and despair. I appeal to your hearts, dear friends in Christ, have pity on them. Give your contributions through your local pastor for the Ukrainian Catholic Committee in Philadelphia, so that it may continue to aid the refugees.

On this occasion of Captive Nations Week, we entreat the Lord God that in the near future our Ukrainian churches and people together will be able to celebrate the Independence Day of the Ukrainian Nation and the days of religious freedom in the Ukrainians lands.

The Blessing of the Lord be upon you.

AMBROSE SENYSHYN,
Metropolitan.

Philadelphia, Pa.

U.S. LEGISLATORS ASKED TO GIVE FULL SUPPORT TO CAPTIVE NATIONS CAUSE

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 20.—Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, has asked all U.S. Senators and Congressmen to give their full support to the captive nations cause. In a letter asking support for the Congressional Resolution calling for more enlightened assistance to the captive peoples, he stated:

In the period of July 13–19, 1969 our citizens, as well as those of 17 other nations in the Free World, will be observing Captive Nations Week. This observance is notable because it is also the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passed in July, 1959, and President Eisenhower signed into Public Law 86–90.

With the sobering lesson furnished by the Soviet Russian rape of Czechoslovakia last year, on this occasion it seems almost hardly necessary to appeal to your responsible efforts in making known throughout the Red Empire, our determination never to acquiesce, by deals or default, to the permanent captivity of over 27 nations and ever to seek by all peaceful means their eventual freedom. In the House, and on a bipartisan basis, Representative Flood has reserved time on July 16 for this manifest expression; in the Senate, individual statements of support are promised throughout the Week. The enclosed pamphlet *Ten Years of Captive Nations Week* offers an adequate background; my book *The Vulnerable Russians* contains the original resolution and all the Presidential proclamations.

The basic issues facing our Nation today are the same as they were ten years ago, except that we're at a greater disadvantage in coping with them. Our illusions of the 60's have not rendered the captive nations—the peoples themselves—any less captive. While we attend to derivative issues such as Vietnam, the ABM, etc., it would be fatal to have our attention diverted from the original issue of the captive nations and Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Among the many actions that can be taken both for our security and the freedom of the one billion captive peoples, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations and a full-scale Senate reappraisal of U.S. policy toward the USSR—Moscow being the only formidable enemy—would unleash an Education for Freedom Through Contrast which, more than anything else, would redirect the energies of our youth in constructive union with those of youth seeking liberty and freedom throughout the Red Empire.

With grateful thanks for your support of this Congressional resolution and warmest regards,

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

WOMEN SPEAK FOR THE CAPTIVES

Ten years ago, President Eisenhower proclaimed the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. This tenth anniversary will be observed from July 13 to July 20 in 1969. Each succeeding president has called for appropriate observance of such a week.

In this land of the free, it is difficult to believe that there can still exist in this twentieth century, systems of government which deny their people fundamental human rights, and base their industrial and technical progress on the labor of depressed and deprived masses of their people, or that intellectuals and others are still being imprisoned or exiled to slave labor for daring to question or protest the harsh dictatorships that deny basic freedoms. The guilt of many present-day regimes is all the greater because they are signatories to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in most cases, members of the United Nations dedicated to implementing those very rights, assuring freedom and justice to all.

While condemning colonialism and assisting in the dissolution of empires, what have the Communist nations of the Soviet empire and mainland China done except deny freedom to their own people, at the same seeking to reduce to colonial status whatever territories they could dominate as satellites? What has happened to the basic freedoms and fundamental human rights in Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others? Is there nothing free nations can do when people cry out "Come over to Czechoslovakia and help us!"?

Within these United States are many people of many nationalities whose parents sought freedom here from religious, political and/or economic oppression. There are many others who themselves were forced to flee their native lands after World War II, when Communism took over in Eastern and Central Europe, and soon thereafter in mainland China, Tibet and Cuba. On such an anniversary as this, those who walked out on Communism are saddened by the remembrance of relatives and friends still in the satellites and the "People's Republics," another name for the colonies of the Communists. Unlike most Americans, who have known life only under freedom, they understand the true meaning behind Russia's misuse of such terms as "peace," "democracy," and "coexistence." They know that many are serving out 25-year sentences in slave-labor camps for such "crimes" as establishing schools or Red Cross chapters or instilling children with a love of their own language or cultural heritage!

We have reason to believe that Russia's violent opposition to Captive Nations Week is evidence of its effect upon the people of her own republics and satellites, renewing their hope of freedom, strengthening their will to resist. We believe her greatest fear is that the rift with mainland China, the turning from Moscow of Albania and perhaps soon Rumania, and open criticism of Moscow's policies by the Communist Party of Italy, will continue until the non-Russian peoples within the USSR may break away from Russia's domination. There is no monolith today. The rifts, schisms, fissures are too wide and too deep.

What can we of the free world do to stop this tyranny and treachery? We can be vigilant and careful not to be duped by those who think Freedom is an ideal and not a liv-

ing force. It is both. We can urge free nations to abandon trade with those who use enslaved peoples for the purposes of the State. We can impress upon all statesmen that the choice of human freedom is always a higher ideal than the choice of peace, for peace without freedom is no peace at all.

Therefore, we the undersigned, call upon all people in this and other countries who love freedom to continue their pressure of public opinion and public expression, added to our hopes and prayers, until the Communist bloc crumbles and freedom is restored to all captive nations.

BYELORUSSIAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION.
CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN IN EXILE.
GEORGIAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE.
UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.
WOMEN FOR FREEDOM, INC.

TEN YEARS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCES

This July ten years will have elapsed since the enactment of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which became a law of the land with its signing by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

To be recalled is that the passage of the Resolution provoked ire and much shoe-pounding in the Kremlin. Khrushchev, then at the pinnacle of the Moscow oligarchy, castigated it as a measure designated to disrupt the "happy family of the Soviet people." His subordinates, Podgorny and Suslov, assailed it as an instrument of "American imperialistic aggression" aimed at the USSR and the "people's democracies" in Central and Eastern Europe.

If one re-read the Captive Nations Week Resolution, he would readily understand the rage and furor it touched off in the Kremlin. For the Resolution spelled out in unmistakable terms what the U.S. Congress and the American people thought:

The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others. . .

The Resolution also authorized and requested the President of the United States to issue a Proclamation "designating the third week of July, 1959, as 'Captive Nations Week' and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities." The Resolution concluded:

The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. . .

NO MORE ROUTINE OBSERVANCES

Ever since observances of Captive Nations Week have been held throughout the length and breadth of the United States, each year the official Soviet press and other mass communication media have untiringly attacked the Week as an instrument of the cold war, aimed at disturbing "peaceful coexistence" between the Soviet Union and the United States. Regrettably, some misguided American newspapers, such as *The Washington Post*, have been and still are sniping at Captive Nations Week, seeing it in distorted fashion as an obstacle to a fruitful "understanding" between the USSR and the United States.

The captive nations movement nevertheless has grown steadily, enlisting the staunch support of seventeen Free World countries: the Republic of China, Korea, Turkey, West Germany, Argentina, Australia, and others.

The significance of this historic Resolution cannot be too strongly stressed. It is not an instrument of cold war propaganda, as the Kremlin heatedly claims. It is not a device whereby Washington seeks to disrupt any prospect of "peaceful coexistence" with Moscow.

It remains an official U.S. document expressing recognition on the part of the United States government and the American people at large of the existence of some 22 captive countries of Europe and Asia that have been deprived of their basic freedoms. With this official act of the U.S. Congress we have given the whole world notice that we deplore the fact that some 200 million people of Europe and Asia live in Soviet Russian slavery against their will; that in this year of 1969, at a time when the United Nations is championing the cause of independence and self-determination for the colonial peoples of Africa and Asia, the captive nations under Russian communist rule are being ruthlessly denied these fundamental rights.

INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA: LATEST TRANSGRESSION

The worldwide Captive Nations movement received fresh impetus with the brutal and unprovoked invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet and satellite troops in August, 1968. Even perennial "do-gooders" were stunned and dismayed, never having dreamt that the Kremlin would again dare to unleash naked force against one of its own communist satellites. Were there any need to re-validate Captive Nations Week, this latest instance of aggression discharged it fully.

The subjugation, or rather, resubjugation of Czechoslovakia has completely changed the political and strategical configuration in Central Europe. It has brought Soviet troops to the Bavarian border, it has posed an immediate threat to Rumania and Yugoslavia and, to some extent, Austria and Greece as well. It also has exposed the NATO structure as a weak and ineffectual paper organization that could not even muster a stern warning to the Kremlin.

Again the free world has failed to strengthen its posture. Again it has failed to exhort the captive nations inside the Soviet communist empire to keep their hopes and aspirations high.

Yet—as has been pointed out many times in this review—the Czechoslovak seizure had an immediate and meaningful impact upon Ukraine. Both communist officials and the intellectual circles of Ukraine seized upon the events in Czechoslovakia to begin demanding more freedom for the Ukrainian people. Arrests and trials of Ukrainian writers, poets, professors, artists, literary critics and students—which had been going on long before the invasion of Czechoslovakia—demonstrated the intensity and drive of the Ukrainian people for their freedom. Seen against this background, the Captive Nations Resolution is an important response to a malaise which is threatening the whole body of nations making up the free world.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE "BREZHNEV DOCTRINE"

Encouraged by the timidity of the West in the face of their seizure of Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Russian communist leaders have gone on the offensive.

Leonid Brezhnev, first secretary of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, has boldly enunciated the so-called "Brezhnev Doctrine," which claims that the Soviet Union has a "legitimate" right to intervene in the internal affairs of any "socialist" country. More, the official Soviet reading of this new Soviet rationale suggests that even West Germany may be included in the sphere of its competence.

What is ominous is that the Brezhnev Doctrine indicates a brazen Soviet determination to continue the oppression of the captive nations, to continue to trample underfoot their fundamental human rights, although these rights of self-determination and national sovereignty are expressly set forth in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, adopted unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The Brezhnev Doctrine unilaterally ascribes to the USSR a "mandate" to intervene at will in the internal affairs of other states, in direct contravention to the principles enunciated in the said document of the United Nations—which was signed by the Soviet Union.

The contention of this spurious "doctrine" that Central and Eastern Europe is an exclusive domain of Moscow should be flatly rejected by the free world as immoral, imperialistic and dangerous to world peace and stability.

Therefore, Captive Nations Week, observed this year from July 13 to July 20, provides ample opportunity to condemn the Brezhnev Doctrine and to reaffirm our solemn commitments to the captive nations in their aspiration for freedom and national independence. Not to do so is to encourage Soviet excursions into the Free World.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK JULY 13–19, 1969

In view of the fact that since 1959—when the U.S. Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution and President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed it into Public Law 86–90—All Communist Capitols have bitterly denounced the Annual Week as being inimical to their fundamental interests; and also in view of the fact that to the mounting consternation of Moscow, Peiping, Havana and others, the Captive Nations Week Movement has steadily grown in the United States, and every President in this decade has issued a proclamation in behalf of the independence and freedom of every captive nation in Central Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia and Cuba;

In the belief that the movement to support freedom and liberation of all captive nations has now taken hold in numerous other countries in the free world as evidenced by week observances in the Republic of China, Korea, Argentina, Australia, Turkey Japan and a number of other countries;

Maintaining that, for the security of the free world and for cold war victory over the deadly forces of communism and Sino-Soviet, Russian imperio-colonialism, it is indispensable for all free men regularly to make known their determination never to acquiesce to the permanent captivity of the 27 nations in the red empire;

The Second Conference of the World Anti-Communist League now resolves that:

The League and its members and associated groups will exert every effort to make the 10th Anniversary of Captive Nations Week on July 13–19, 1969 the most successful yet by:

1. Urging each head of state to issue a captive nations week proclamation similar to that of the President of the United States:

2. Conducting observances of the Week in member countries and utilizing all media so that our combined message will be conveyed to the Captive Nations; and

3. Dispatching the published results of this event to the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C., for their appropriate transmission to the United States Congress and the President of the United States.

RAMA SWARUP,
Chief Delegation—India.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE—11TH ANNIVERSARY

PROGRAM

Signing of the Freedom Declaration by Representatives of Member Organizations of the Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee, in the historic Congress Hall.

1. National Anthem.

2. Invocation, Very Rev. John J. Falatek, Representing His Eminence John Cardinal Krol.

3. Opening Remarks, Austin J. App, Ph.D., Chairman, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.

4. Reading of President Richard Nixon's Proclamation, Mr. Henry Wyszynski, Polish-American Congress of Eastern Pennsylvania.

5. Reading of Governor Raymond P. Shafer's Proclamation and Greetings, Hon. Stanley Miller, Member of the Cabinet.

6. Reading of Mayor James H. J. Tate's Proclamation and Greetings, Hon. Warren Weiner, Deputy City Representative.

7. Address, Hon. Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, Republic of China, Honorary Chairman—World Anti-Communist League, President, China Chapter, WACL, President China Chapter, Asian People's Anti-Communist League.

8. Introduction of Guests of Honor and Representatives of Nationalities; Introduction of Girls in national costumes, representing various captive nations, Mrs. Margit Rohtla, Secretary, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.

9. Reading of Statement of the United Organizations of Women from Central and Eastern Europe, Mrs. Alexander Yaremko.

10. Reading of Resolutions, Mr. Wolodymyr Karpynych, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Philadelphia Chapter.

11. Benediction, Rev. Dr. Stephen Benko.

Ceremony of placing Captive Nations Wreath at the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall.

Master of Ceremonies—Mr. Ignatius M. Billinsky, Executive Vice Chairman, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.

GREATER PHILADELPHIA CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY ACCLAMATION AT THE MASS RALLY ON THE INDEPENDENCE MALL, PHILADELPHIA, JULY 20, 1969

Whereas, the U.S. Congress on July 17, 1959, requested the President annually to proclaim the third week of July Captive Nations Week "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world"; and

Whereas, President Nixon on July 14 proclaimed July 13–19 Captive Nations Week for 1969, and Governor Raymond P. Shafer on July 9 for Pennsylvania, and Mayor James H. J. Tate on July 10 for Philadelphia; and

Whereas, the twenty-two captive nations enumerated by Congress in 1959—"Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam"—continue to be subject to communistic colonialism, with Cuba off our shores added to the list, and South Vietnam in danger of a like fate; and

Whereas, U.S. interventions in both World Wars were proclaimed as crusades for the self-determination of peoples; and

Whereas, the captive nations enumerated have proved or can be shown to have the capacity for self-government and independence, for which they yearn and strive as their inalienable right;

Now therefore be it resolved by the Captive Nations Committee of Greater Philadelphia and this assemblage gathered at historic Independence Mall this July 20, 1969.

That the U.S. government should vigorously re-affirm its good will towards the captive nations and its determination to advance their liberation with all moral, economic, and diplomatic means at its disposal and feasible; and

That the U.S. should conduct its cultural and economic relations with the Communist bloc and negotiate any treaties so as not to seem a partner of the puppet governments against the populations and with the frank purpose of helping, not hindering, their liberation; and

That, American delegates to the United Nations and to other conferences should when—and wherever practicable press for exposure of communist Sino-Russian imperio-colonialism; and

That, America should pursue a clear policy of good will towards any agitations, movements, even revolts behind the Iron Curtain aiming at liberation—and short of military intervention, of all practicable support; and

That the U.S. government should make known throughout the Red Empire our determination never to acquiesce, by deals or defaults, to the permanent enslavement of captive nations and ever to seek by all peaceful means their eventual freedom; and

That, however compelling the wish for peace may be, the U.S. should not expose South Vietnam to Red domination but should rather blockade North Vietnam's harbors and bomb its installations until it retreats from South Vietnam; and

That, in the tension between Soviet Russia and Red China, the U.S. should consider Soviet Russia not only the greater threat but also by far the more extensive tyranny, with a Berlin Wall and an Iron Curtain in the middle of once free Europe, and its army in seven satellite nations, and its commissar in fifteen captive nations within the U.S.S.R.; and

That, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty because it in effect makes the U.S. a partner of Soviet Russia and guarantees both Moscow's enslavement of the Captive Nations and permanent military supremacy over the NATO countries, these Free Nations should not be pressured to sign it; and

That, the House of Representatives should establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations and initiate a Congressional Review of U.S. policy towards the U.S.S.R.; and

That, a Captive Nations Freedom Stamp series should be inaugurated and a Freedom Academy established; and finally

That copies of these Resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, both senators from Pennsylvania, all the representatives of the Greater Philadelphia area, and to the newspapers, radio, and television stations of the area.

Presented by the Captive Nations Committee of greater Philadelphia.

AUSTIN J. APP, Ph. D.,
Chairman.
IGNATIUS M. BILLINSKY,
Executive Vice Chairman.
MARGIT ROHTLA,
Executive Secretary.
ALBERT BAGIAN,
Treasurer.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK STATEMENT

Ten years ago, President Eisenhower proclaimed the third week of July as Captive Nations Week.

In this land of the free, it is difficult to believe that there can still exist in this twentieth century, systems of government which deny their people fundamental human rights, and base their industrial and technical progress on the labor of depressed and deprived masses of their people, or that intellectuals and others are still being imprisoned or exiled to slave labor for daring to question or protest the harsh dictatorship that deny basic freedoms. The guilt of many present-day regimes is all the greater because they are signatories to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in most cases, members of the United Nations dedicated to implementing those very rights, assuring freedom and justice to all.

Within these United States are many people of many nationalities whose parents sought freedom here from religious, political and/or economic oppression. There are many others who themselves were forced to flee their native lands after World War II, when Communism took over in Eastern and Central Europe, and soon thereafter in mainland China, Tibet and Cuba. We have reason to believe that Russia's violent opposition to Captive Nations Week is evidence of its effect upon the people of her own republics and satellites, renewing their hope of freedom, strengthening their will to resist.

What can we of the free world do to stop this tyranny and treachery? We can be vigilant and careful not to be duped by those who think Freedom is an ideal and not a living force. It is both. We can urge free nations to abandon trade with those who use enslaved peoples for the purposes of the State. We can impress upon all statesmen that the choice of human freedom is always a higher ideal than the choice of peace, for peace without freedom is no peace at all.

Therefore, we the undersigned, call upon all people in this and other countries who love freedom to continue the pressure of public opinion and public expression, added to our hopes and prayers, until the Communist bloc crumbles and freedom is restored to all captive nations.

BYELORUSSIAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION, CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN IN EXILE, GEORGIAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE, UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC., and WOMEN FOR FREEDOM, INC.

GREATER PHILADELPHIA CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE: FREEDOM DECLARATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1969

Adopted at the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week resolution observance, sponsored by the Philadelphia Chapter of the National Captive Nations Committee, on July 20, 1969 in Philadelphia, and signed in the historic Congress Hall in Philadelphia by representatives of member organizations of the Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.

Whereas, in 1969 the Soviet Russia and her subservient Communist puppets in Europe and Asia continue to oppress and persecute the captive nations stretching from East Berlin to Vladivostok; and

Whereas, the Soviet Russia persists in her brutal policies of Russification, religious persecution, economic exploitation and outright genocide; and

Whereas, in August, 1968 the USSR with members of the Warsaw Pact brutally invaded Czecho-Slovakia, and in defiance of the U.N. Charter and its own treaties as well as the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, has proceeded to suppress the budding liberalization course and imposed its rigid police-controlled regime, thus depriving the Czech and Slovak peoples, as well as the national minorities in that country of their rightful and legitimate freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Kremlin is continuing to supply North Vietnam with the most modern and sophisticated weapons which are used against the U.S. armed forces, the South Vietnamese armies and the troops of their allies in South Vietnam, thus prolonging the bloody war which Moscow, Peking and Hanoi launched against South Vietnam in order to supppress its freedom and independence; and

Whereas, on July 17, 1959 the U.S. Congress enacted the "Captive Nations Week Resolution," which subsequently became Public Law 86–90, and which Resolution stated, in part:

"Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

"Whereas, the captive nations behind the

Iron Curtain continue to struggle for their freedom and national independence, as demonstrated by upheavals in Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, East Germany, and elsewhere,"

Now, therefore be it resolved: that the Greater Philadelphia Chapter of the National Captive Nations Committee appeal to the U.S. Government to raise at all high-level international conferences with the Soviet-Russian rulers the question of the restoration of the right of self-determination to the captive peoples, as enumerated in the "Captive Nations Week Resolution," and;

That we appeal to the governments of the free countries of the world to recognize that the U.N. Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is of universal scope and application and, correspondingly, to oppose the double standard and discrimination against the principles of self-determination in the United Nations, practiced against the Russian-dominated captive nations of Europe and Asia; and

That we appeal to the U.S. Government to adopt a more dynamic and enlightened policy with respect to the captive nations, to be implemented in all U.S. official mass communication media and cultural exchange programs, so as to demonstrate to the captive nations that the United States of America is their friend and ally, and that their eventual liberation, through peaceful means, is one of the main objectives of U.S. Foreign policy, and

That we express our wholehearted moral support and solidarity with the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, and call on the American people to do likewise until freedom and independence shall have been attained by all the captive nations of the world.

[From the America, Aug. 14, 1969]

ELABORATE CEREMONIES MARKED PHILADELPHIA CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE

(NOTE.—Hon. Dr. Ku Cheng-Kang of the Republic of China delivered an address calling for common struggle against Communist enslavers. Representatives of the Philadelphia Committee of Captive Nations signed the freedom declaration in the historic Congress Hall. The city honored Dr. Ku Cheng-Kang by presenting him with a bronze replica of the Liberty Bell.)

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—Captive Nations Week observance here took place on Sunday, July 20, 1969 at Independence Mall, and it coincided with the Apollo 11 triumph for the United States. The observance began with the signing of the Freedom Declaration by the representatives of Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee and its different national groups. This ceremony took place in the historic Congress Hall where the American Declaration of Independence was signed in 1776. Prof. Dr. Bohdan Hnatiuk, Chairman, Philadelphia UCCA branch and Mr. Ignatius M. Billynsky, Executive Vice-Chairman, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee signed the Freedom Declaration in the name of the Ukrainian national group.

The Captive Nations Rally followed the ceremony, and it took place at Independence Mall at 5:30 p.m. National groups with their banners were standing as honor guards in front of the rostrum, decorated by the symbolic wreath of Captive Nations. The Rally was opened by Mr. Ignatius M. Billynsky and the invocation was delivered by Very Rev. Msgr. John J. Falatek, representative of His Eminence John Cardinal Krol. Prof. Dr. Austin J. App, Chairman, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee, delivered an opening address which was followed by reading of President Richard Nixon's Proclamation of Captive Nations Week by Mr. Henry Wyszynski, representative of Polish-American Congress of Eastern Pennsylvania. In turn, Hon. Stanley Miller, member of the Cabinet, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, read Governor Raymond P. Shafer's Proclamation of Captive Nations Week, and Hon. Warren Weiner, Deputy City Representative read the Proclamation of Mayor James H. Tate.

The main address at the Rally was delivered by Hon. Dr. Ku Cheng-kang of the Republic of China. The address was delivered in Chinese and was ably translated into English by Col. Vu of Dr. Ku Cheng-kang's entourage. Hon. Dr. Ku Cheng-kang is Honorary Chairman of World Anti-Communist League and President of China Chapter of Asian People's Anti-Communist League. His penetrating address was published in the previous issue of "America" (No. 138, August 7, 1969), Dr. Ku Cheng-kang stated that President Nixon had spoken out for a mutual security pact among the free Asian nations to cope with the Communist threat, and that free Asian nations would support a regional security plan in the Pacific community of nations of which the United States had been an important member. In the opinion of Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, this Pacific security plan would be contingent upon American economic and military assistance with which the free Asian nations would be able to develop the military and economic capability for defense against Communist armed aggression.

Introduction of Guests of Honor and representatives of various national groups including girls in national costumes, representing various captive nations was an attractive part of the program, followed and was carried out by Mrs. Margit Rohtla, Secretary, Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee. Misses Oxana Myshchyshyn and Marianna Hamaniuk of the Ukraine Youth Organization of America, and Miss Dora Varvara of the Ukrainian Scouting Organization "Plast" were introduced as representatives of Ukraine.

Following the introduction, Mrs. Alexander Yaremko of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America (UNWLA) read the statement on captive nations, prepared by the united organization of women from Central and Eastern Europe, and Mr. Wolodymyr Karpynych, representative of the local UCCA branch read the resolutions which were adopted unanimously. Rev. Dr. Stephen Benko offered a benediction. Local UCCA branch was represented at the Rally by Prof. Dr. Bohdan Hnatiuk, Chairman, and Dr. Ivan Skalchuk, Vice-Chairman.

A wreath-laying ceremony followed the Rally and was held at the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall. Members of the Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee as well as guests of honor took part in the ceremony. After the ceremony, Hon. Warren Weiner, Deputy City Representative presented Dr. Ku Cheng-kang with a bronze replica of the Liberty bell. By this presentation, the City honored Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, its distinguished guest.

In the evening, the Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee sponsored a dinner at the Sheraton Hotel for Hon. Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, Col. Vu and Mr. Tun of his entourage as well as for the invited guests. During the dinner, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang gave detailed answers to numerous questions of the members of the Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee. Mr. Ignatius M. Billynsky served as master of ceremonies.

[From the Wanderer, July 12, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK: JULY 13–19

In the midst of the national problems surrounding us, particularly the rising tide of unrest, demonstrations and violence on the part of those who feel—rightly or wrongly—that they are being deprived of constitutional rights and freedoms, we are too often prone to forget the frightful indignities, terrorism, tortures and death inflicted in our times on uncounted millions of our fellowmen languishing under Communist tyrannies to this very moment.

By way of timely reminder "The Immaculate," monthly publication of the Franciscan Marytown Press in Kenosha, Wisconsin, devotes its entire June-July issue to articles on the Captive Nations.

We reprint from that issue, the following considerations:

Who can appreciate the fact that in the past fifty years of Communism's ascendancy that some 100,000,000 human beings have been murdered through civil wars, man-made famines, purges, genocidal deportations and executions. The very magnitude of this figure of those who lost their lives under Communism escapes us. One must think more of individuals than statistics. Each of these persons loved and was loved. They had relatives, friends, dependents who shared their agony and then had to bear the void in their lives when they were gone. With the murdering of these tens of millions the hopes and plans of a better tomorrow were shattered in the lives of many more millions.

Terrible as this picture of human suffering may be, the fact remains that the greatest evil of atheistic Communism is in the realm of the spirit. We will never know the number of souls that have been subverted by its false philosophy of class warfare and hatred—hatred of God and of one's fellow man. This is the real tragedy of Communism. The political, economic and social evils resulting from this system, which is so contrary to the nature of man, pales before the supernatural dimensions.

The totally committed Communists, past and present, may at times preach coexistence, but invariably their actions betray their deep-seated hatred of God and religion. Murder and lies are considered legitimate means to attain their goal, world domination. In this we see the influence of the devil, for he is the archdeceiver, who "was a murderer from the beginning." Bishop Sheen does not hesitate to say that the men guiding the world Communist movement have a collective diabolical possession. And the late Pope Pius XI, in his 1937 encyclical letter, Divini Redemptoris, referred to Communist propaganda as "truly diabolical," and he called those who spread it "sons of darkness."

God pleasing, this issue of "The Immaculate" will help to dispel some of the darkness surrounding this diabolical movement, and inspire the reader to do something concrete to combat it.

We strongly recommend that you obtain a copy of the Captive Nations issue of "The Immaculate" (single copy 30 cents) and read the frightful record of man's continuing inhumanity to man—and what YOU can do to help bring it to an end.

[From the Wanderer, July 17, 1969]

NIXON HEADING FOR A RED TRAP?

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon may be flying into a carefully laid Kremlin trap in accepting the Rumanian government's invitation to visit that tightly controlled Communist country next month.

The first offer for an American President to visit a Communist country was approved in advance by Soviet leaders according to the information American intelligence and diplomatic authorities have gathered from Moscow and Bucharest.

In an intelligence warning that the President has disregarded, the Central Intelligence Agency has linked the Rumanian invitation to a new Soviet campaign to try to get the Nixon Administration to repudiate a 10-year-old Congressional proclamation on the Captive Nations of Eastern Europe.

The anti-Soviet proclamation designed to give persons living behind the Iron Curtain hope that some day they will be free, was approved by Congress on July 17, 1959, a few days before Nixon, when he was Vice President under President Eisenhower, made his controversial trip to Moscow.

A real thorn in the Kremlin's side, the proclamation called on the President to designate the third week of July "as Captive Nations Week until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the Captive Nations of the World."

Although President Nixon has never fully understood the cold war significance of this Congressional action, he did record its impact upon the Soviets at the time, stating:

"The Captive Nations Resolution was the major Soviet irritant throughout my tour."

In his book, "Six Crises", Nixon later added that upon his arrival in Russia, "Khrushchev was lambasting the U.S. generally and me personally for the Captive Nations Resolution."

Nixon went on to say how difficult it was for him to imagine "that the resolution truly disturbed the Soviet Premier because it was simply the expression of a well-known opinion in the U.S. and not a call to action."

TORCH OF HOPE

Since Eisenhower issued the first Captive Nations Proclamation in 1959, all Presidents have followed his lead although over the years their official statements have been considerably watered down.

All mention of Communist aggression or Soviet domination of the Eastern European nations was dropped from the most recent White House pronouncements because of pressure from Moscow.

While the Soviets have been unable to get an American President to go so far as to repudiate the Congressional proclamation on the Captive Nations, they have never stopped trying.

In recent weeks, the Soviets and the Rumanians have both let President Nixon know that the issuance of a hard-hitting, Eisenhower-type Captive Nations proclamation could lead to events causing the Rumanian invitation to be withdrawn.

President Nixon's decision to accept the invitation under these circumstances, according to U.S. intelligence authorities, has left Moscow and Bucharest with all the diplomatic aces.

The box that Nixon has worked himself into, these experts point out, is as follows:

Should the President give the slightest hint that he plans to link his trip to a direct appeal for more freedom for the people behind the Iron Curtain, Moscow will force a cancellation of the visit.

If Nixon takes the soft-shoe approach, as is now his policy, the Soviets plan to launch a huge propaganda campaign to show that Nixon's trip means U.S. acceptance of Communist control of Eastern Europe.

The President's timing of his Rumanian visit is tailor-made for the latter. His journey will begin during the third week in July-or the time usually set aside for Captive Nations Week in this Country.

THE SEVENTH CRISIS

Republican Congressional leaders, who have privately raised serious questions about the timing, have been told the arrangements for the trip were made by Henry Kissinger, the President's adviser on national security affairs.

The Rumania part of the trip as the stopovers in the Far East and Asia, they were informed, were timed to take advantage of the unprecedented good will for the U.S. which Administration officials expect to follow the Apollo 11 Moon landing.

This information has only heightened the concern of the GOP legislative leaders. If anything should go wrong in space or Congress, they have cautioned the President, the trip could develop into his seventh crisis.

They questioned the wisdom of the President being out of the Country while Congress is debating the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) and the extension of the 10 percent surtax, the keystones of the Administration's defense and economic policies.

"What happens if the Senate should defeat either of these measures while the President is traveling?" asked one of the GOP leaders. "A defeat on either measure could be disastrous for him."

Senate debate on the ABM, which began last week, is expected to be at its peak when the President reaches Rumania. A showdown vote on the President's request to extend the surtax could come about that time in the Senate also.

OTHER SIDE EFFECTS

Nixon's coming trip to Rumania already has had the effect to demoting West German Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger below Rumania's Communist President Ceausescu.

Three times the White House has asked Chancellor Kiesinger to postpone his planned visit to Washington at President Nixon's invitation.

Originally scheduled for June, Kiesinger's trip was moved back to late July at the White House request. This date, too, was postponed because it would conflict with the Apollo 11 Moon shot.

The trip was finally set for August 4 and 5. Then, because of Nixon's impending visit to Bucharest, he asked the Chancellor to wait again. Kiesinger now is scheduled to be in Washington August 7 and 8.

While German officials here are tight-lipped about the postponements, they have privately let the White House know that Kiesinger doesn't like the treatment he is receiving.

In contrast, they pointed out, Nixon goes out of his way to court President Ceausescu, who runs a Stalin-like government in Rumania. Also, Ceausescu, they noted, signed the final document at the recent Communist summit meeting in Moscow.

The Moscow document called on all Communist and progressivist governments to actively disrupt U.S. troop movements and supplies to Vietnam and condemn the U.S. as "The aggressor in Vietnam."

THE COUNTY OF ERIE OFFICIALLY SALUTES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 20 THROUGH 27, 1969

MESSAGE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Whereas, Public Law 86-90 was enacted 10 years ago. This law establishes Captive Nations Week, and in so doing, our representatives themselves also established that we, Americans, do not bow to despotism whether it comes from the Court of St. James or the Kremlin or Peking; and

Whereas, Today Communism has erected a cruel barrier of barbed wire, minefields, manhunters, bloodhounds and machine guns. It has re-established colonialism behind an Iron Curtain, where civilized nations labor under the boot of tyranny. The same ruthless armed oppression has been used against the open resistance in Budapest or the peaceful attempt for changes in Prague.

This political oppression and economic exploitation of the Captive Nations is committed in the name of a political system which has been proven to be obsolete and reactionary. Communism attempts to stabilize its system through the bloodshed and misery of others. Fomenting small wars throughout the world is an oft-used strategy; and

Whereas, The Peoples of the Captive Nations look to us for sympathy, encouragement and help. We have witnessed that bridges cannot be built to these countries. The puppet governments of Moscow insist that any contact with the West and Freedom be denied their people; and

Whereas, We should ensure that these puppet governments receive no economic help from the West. To this end, we should avoid buying any products of these countries because the hard currency so acquired by these governments is used to subvert our own freedom. We must keep in mind that these goods we buy were denied our enslaved brothers.

Now, Therefore, I, B. John Tutuska, County Executive of the County of Erie, Do hereby proclaim the week of July 20-27, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" and urge the citizens of Erie County to support and observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the County of Erie to be affixed this 2nd day of July, 1969.

B. JOHN TUTUSKA,
County Executive.

HIGHLIGHTS OF EVENTS

Sunday, July 20

A.M. Religious Observances and Prayers in the Churches of Erie County.

2:30 P.M. Civic Opening of Captive Nations Week Program in front of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library in Lafayette Square.

1. Presentation of Colors—Arthur F. Kilichowski, New York State Commander, Army and Navy Union of America.
2. National Anthem—The Misses Marika Zahariev and Pam Merz.
3. Invocation—Rev. Paul Kantor, Pastor, Hungarian Reformed Church of the West Side.
4. Placing of wreaths at the Memorial to the Captive Nations.
5. Welcome by Mr. Albert J. Weinert, Chairman, Erie County Civic Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week.
6. Introduction of Master of Ceremonies, Walter V. Chopyk, by Mr. Albert J. Weinert, Chairman E.C.C.C. to Observe C.N.W.
7. Proclamation: Hon B. John Tutuska, Erie County Executive and Honorary Chairman E.C.C.C. to Observe C.N.W.
8. Speaker: Mr. Michael J Kogutek, Department of New York State Commander, American Legion; President, Chamber of Commerce, Lackawanna, N.Y.
9. Benediction: Rev. Paul Kantor, Pastor, Hungarian Reformed Church of the West Side.
10. "Youth Salute the Captive Nations"—Library Aud.

Wednesday, July 23

12:30 P.M.: Civic Luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo, President Harry W. Halbersleben presiding, and the ECCTO-CNW in the Buffalo Athletic Club in Niagara Square.

Speaker: Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, National Chairman and Founder of Captive Nations Week, Washington, D.C.

Topic: "Education for Freedom Through Contrast."

Tickets: $2.80 (includes gratuities).

Reservations: Call 634-1166.

A special art exhibit will be held in the Buffalo and Erie County Library, Lafayette Square from July 22-August 4, 1969. Paintings and other materials depicting the plight of the captive nations, completed by recent refugees from the Iron Curtain countries.

All events are open to the public. No admission charge will be made except for the Civic Luncheon on Wednesday, July 23, at the Buffalo Athletic Club.

ERIE COUNTY CITIZENS COMMITTEE TO OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Honorary Chairman: Hon. B. John Tutuska, Erie County Executive.

Chairman: Albert J. Weinert, United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

Public Relations Director: Walter V. Chopyk, United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

Secretary: Mrs. Marjorie Lovejoy, United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

Treasurer: Clement Sakas, Lithuanian Club of Buffalo.

Resolutions: Dr. Lazlo B. Szimonisz, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Ass'n.

Youth Concert: Vladymyr Kowalyk, Ukrainian American Youth Ass'n.

Color Guard: Arthur F. Kilichowski, New York State Commander, Army and Navy Union.

Captive Nations Flags: Zef Priszka, Albanian Societies.

Arrangements: William J. Tracy, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Dr. John Juhasz, Actio Hungarica.

Dr. Michael Saikewicz, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Rev. Paul Kantor, American Hungarians of the Niagara Frontier.

Dr. Voldemar Kirss, Estonian Committee.

Francis M. Kindl, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Tacho D. Kuntscheff, Bulgarian Club of Buffalo.

Eugene V. Massucci, Army and Navy Union of America.

Wasyl Sharvan, Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

George M. Wong, Chinese Golden Dragon Society.

A. O'Neil Kline, Kiwanis Club of Buffalo.

Dr. Stephen Gredel, Croatian Delegation.

Ting Fong Wong, Chinese Golden Dragon Society.

Romas Masiolonis, Lithuanian Club of Buffalo.

Vidis E. Malejs, Latvian Society.

Charles Quagliana, United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

THE CHANCERY, DIOCESE OF BUFFALO,
Buffalo, N.Y.

The plight of those people who have lost their liberty and independence and who must live under foreign rule is a matter of great concern to the people of the United States. We sympathize with them and we pray that some day soon they will once again enjoy those basic freedoms and human rights that are rightfully theirs. We commend the Erie County Citizens' Committee on Captive Nations for their work in behalf of these captive peoples.

We urge the prayers of our good people for the enslaved millions throughout the world, asking God to comfort them in their trials and to grant them the freedom their hearts desire.

JAMES A. MCNULTY,
Bishop of Buffalo.

TEMPLE SINAI,
Buffalo, N.Y., July 14, 1969.

Mr. WALTER V. CHOPYK,
West Seneca, N.Y.

DEAR MR. CHOPYK: As President of the Buffalo Board of Rabbis I join with all our fellow Americans in the fervent prayer that the millions of persons in "the captive nations," will soon achieve liberty, freedom and spiritual comfort. We mourn especially the lack of elementary and basic decencies which we as free men enjoy but which are denied millions of persons in the other continents of the world. We pray that America will lead the way in demonstrating the truth that as long as one man is enslaved, no man is free.

Sincerely,

Rabbi JOSEPH D. HERZOG.

THE MARJORIE MITCHELL MCKINLEY HOUSE, DIOCESE OF WESTERN NEW YORK,
Buffalo, N.Y., July 7, 1969.

WALTER V. CHOPYK,
Director of Public Relations,
Office of the County Executive,
Buffalo, N.Y.

DEAR MR. CHOPYK: In response to the County Executive's request of July 2nd for a paragraph concerning Captive Nations Week, I have prepared such a statement which you may use for any publicity purposes you desire in connection with this observance. It is as follows:

"Wherever and whenever in this world man's freedom is denied, our own cherished freedom is diminished. This is a truth we have a tendency to face too seldom and sometimes too late. Captive Nations Week provides us a great opportunity to remember prayerfully those in bondage and to seek Divine guidance in sustaining and strengthening them and us, in the search for human freedom and dignity for all men everywhere."

With every good wish, I am

Yours faithfully,

LAURISTON L. SCAIFE,
Bishop of Western New York.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, July 21, 1969]

PLIGHT OF CAPTIVE NATIONS CITED

Americans should remember the cause of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain as a matter of self-preservation, Michael J. Kogutek, former state commander of the American Legion said here Sunday.

Kogutek, of Lackawanna, spoke at the opening ceremonies of Captive Nations Week at the Buffalo and Erie County Library, Lafayette Sq.

WELFARISM HIT

"The rugged individualism that made this country great has been subverted by welfarism," Kogutek told the 100 persons attending the ceremony. "Some place along the way we have lost a little freedom," he added.

"People today have forgotten that the founders of this country expended a great deal of effort to ensure freedom and liberty for the people.

"We must continue to point out that there are captive nations in the world so that we will not forget that it might be our fate if we relax our guard.

WREATHS LAID

"Let us think about the freedoms we have in this country. Then it behooves us to go home and tell all our neighbors of the plight of the captive nations. In this way we can work for their freedom and guarantee our own," Kogutek added.

The program included a laying of wreaths in honor of the people held in the captive nations, a welcome by Albert J. Weinert, Chairman of the Erie County Civic Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week, and an address by County Executive B. John Tutuska. Walter V. Chopyk was the master of ceremonies.

The observance continues this week with the opening Tuesday of a captive nations art show in the Library which will run through Aug. 4, and a luncheon at 12:30 p.m. Wednesday in the Buffalo Athletic Club with Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, national chairman and founder of Captive Nations Week, as the speaker.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 16, 1969]

LOST FREEDOMS

The 10th observance in Buffalo of Captive Nations Week will begin with prayers Sunday in area churches and will be highlighted by the annual luncheon next Wednesday.

The week is observed to voice concern for the lost freedoms and human rights of the peoples living in countries under Communist domination.

Local sponsor of the observance is the Erie County Citizen's Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week. County Executive B. John Tutuska is this year's honorary chairman.

The chairman and founder of the National Captive Nations Committee, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, will speak at the luncheon at noon next Wednesday in the Buffalo Athletic Club.

PLIGHT OF REFUGEES

The Kiwanis Club of Buffalo will co-sponsor the luncheon.

The Voice of America will tape Dr. Dobriansky's speech, "Education for Freedom Through Contrast," for broadcast behind the Iron Curtain.

Opening ceremonies for the week will be held at 2:30 PM Sunday in Lafayette Square. Michael J. Kogutek of Lackawanna, state commander of the American Legion, will be the main speaker.

The ceremonies will be followed by a youth concert in the Erie County Library auditorium.

An exhibit of paintings done by recent refugees from communism will be held in the library through Aug. 4. The exhibit will depict the plight of people in the captive nations.

Albert J. Weinert is general chairman of the committee. Others on the committee are: Mrs. Marjorie Lovejoy, secretary, and Walter V. Chopyk, public relations, both of the United Anti-Communist Committee of Western New York; Clement Sakas, treasurer, from the Lithuanian Club.

YOUTH CONCERT

Dr. Lazio B. Szimonisz, resolutions, from Hungarian Freedom Fighters Association; Vladymyr Kowalyk, youth concert, Ukrainian-American Youth Association; Arthur F. Kilichowski, color guard, Army & Navy Union; Zef Priszka, flags, Albanian Society, and William J. Tracy, arrangements, VFW.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 21, 1969]

SPEAKER CONNECTS VIETNAM TO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Participants in Captive Nations Week ceremonies were warned Sunday not to let their own freedom make them insensitive to the problems of those living in countries under Communist rule.

Michael J. Kogutek, past commander of the New York State American Legion, told a Lafayette Square crowd of about a hundred persons, including children dressed in traditional East European attire, that "freedom is never free."

"It behooves all of us to go back to our communities and tell those who are not here what Captive Nations Week means; to preserve freedom and democracy as we are now doing in Vietnam," he said.

County Executive B. John Tutuska read his proclamation naming this "Captive Nations Week." It calls for citizens to "avoid buying" goods made in Communist countries.

Earlier, wreaths representing captive nations were placed in front of a wooden cross on the steps of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library.

A resolution adopted by the County Legislature supporting the activities of Captive Nations Week was read by Mrs. Marjorie Lovejoy of the United Anti-Communist Committee of Western New York.

The Rev. Paul Kantor, pastor of the Hungarian Reformed Church of the West Side, gave the invocation and benediction, and read letters of support from the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, Episcopal bishop of Western New York; Bishop James A. McNulty of the Buffalo Catholic Diocese, and Rabbi Joseph D. Herzog, president of the Buffalo Board of Rabbis.

Albert J. Weiner, chairman of the Erie County Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week, spoke briefly. Walter V. Chopyk was master of ceremonies.

A youth concert in the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library auditorium followed the ceremonies.

The week's formal activities conclude Wednesday when Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Washington, D.C., chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, speaks at a noon luncheon in the Buffalo Athletic Club.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, July 6, 1969]

CEREMONIES WILL OPEN CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Opening ceremonies for the 10th Captive Nations Week observance will be at 2:30 p.m. July 20 in front of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library in Lafayette Sq.

A procession of children dressed in the costumes of the captive nations will form at the side of the library and march up the front steps. The procession will be followed by a youth concert in the library auditorium.

ART EXHIBIT

An exhibit of paintings done by recent refugees of captive nations will be displayed in the library during Captive Nations Week, July 20–27, and through Aug. 4.

A luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo and the Erie County Citizens' Committee to observe Captive Nations Week will be at noon July 23 in the Buffalo Athletic Club. The main speech, given by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Washington, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, will be taped by the Voice of America.

Albert J. Weinert is general chairman of the activities. Other officers are: Walter V. Chopyk, public relations director; Mrs. Marjorie Lovejoy, secretary, and Clement Sakas, treasurer.

Chairmen for the week are Dr. Lazlo B. Szimonisz, resolutions; Vladymyr Kowalyk, opening ceremony and youth concert; Arthur F. Kilichowski, closing ceremonies; Zef Priszka, flags display, and William J. Tracy, arrangements.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, July 17, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK TO OPEN

Captive Nations Week, observing concern for lost freedoms of peoples living in Communist countries, will begin at 2:30 p.m. Sunday with ceremonies in Lafayette Sq.

The week-long activities will include luncheons, a youth concert and an art exhibit of the work of communist refugees.

Albert J. Weinert is general chairman of this 10th annual observance sponsored by the Erie County Citizens' Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week. County Executive B. John Tutuska is honorary chairman.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, July 19, 1969]

DOBRIANSKY TO SPEAK AT OBSERVANCE

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, national chairman and founder of Captive Nations Week and professor of Economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., will speak at a luncheon here Wednesday as part of the local Captive Nations Week observance which begins Sunday.

The county's 10th annual observance will open at ceremonies in the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, Lafayette Square, at 2:30 p.m. Sunday.

KOGUTEK TO SPEAK

Michael J. Kogutek of Lackawanna, state commander of the American Legion, will speak on the plight of nations held captive behind the Iron Curtain. Walter V. Chopyk will be the master of ceremonies.

Dr. Dobriansky will speak on "Education for Freedom Through Contrast," at the luncheon at 12:30 p.m. Wednesday in the Buffalo Athletic Club.

A graduate of New York University, Dr. Dobriansky is an author and a recipient of the Freedom's Foundation Award, the Vigilant Patriot Recognition Award and the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Award.

A special art exhibit in the library, featuring paintings and other pieces depicting the plight of captive nations completed by recent refugees from Iron Curtain countries, will be displayed from Tuesday to Aug. 4, as part of the observance.

[From the Jersey City (N.J.) Ukranian Weekly, July 14, 1969]

ERIE COUNTY MAKES PLANS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

BUFFALO, N.Y.—The 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week observance will take place in Buffalo from July 20–27. It is being planned by the Erie County Citizen's Committee.

County Executive B. John Tutuska is honorary chairman. The opening ceremonies will take place in front of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library followed by a youth rally concert in the Library Auditorium.

During the week, an exhibit depicting the captive nations' plight will be held in the Library until August 4. Paintings done by recent escapees from behind the Iron Curtain will be on display.

A luncheon will be held at noon on July 23, at the Buffalo Athletic Club. It is being sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo and the Committee. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National CN Committee, will be the principal speaker. His speech will be taped by the Voice of America.

Mr. Albert Weinert is general chairman of the committee; Walter V. Chopyk, public relations director; Mrs. Marjorie Lovejoy, secretary; (members of the United Anti-Communist Committee of W.N.Y.); Mr. Clement Sakas, treasurer from the Lithuanian Club; Dr. Lazlo B. Szimonisz, chairman, resolutions committee from the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Association; Mr. Volodymyr Kowalyk, chairman of the youth rally opening ceremony from the Ukranian American Youth Association; Mr. Arman, closing ceremonies, from the Army and Navy Union; Mr. Zef Priszka, chairman of the captive nations flags display, from the Albanian Societies; and Mr. William J. Tracy, chairman of arrangements from the Erie County Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 23, 1967]

TO APPRECIATE UNITED STATES, COMPARE WITH OTHERS, KIWANIANS TOLD

(By Franklyn Buell)

The freedom of all nations—particularly the captive nations—should have received equal attention with peace on the plaque left on the moon by the Apollo-11 astronauts, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Washington said at a civic luncheon observing Captive Nations Week in the Buffalo Athletic Club today.

"From a propaganda angle, the United States missed the boat," he said.

A banner proclaiming "Remember the Captive Nations" draped the head table as Dr. Dobriansky, founder of the observance and a faculty member at Georgetown University, declared:

"You can't have an appreciative understanding of the material and spiritual goods that we have in the United States until you contrast what we have with the lot of those who are deprived—particularly in the various captive nations from the Danube to the Pacific."

This was the 10th observance of the special week in Buffalo and the speaker emphasized:

"The importance of perpetuating this special attention to captive nations is in education for freedom by contrast."

The civic luncheon, attended by about 125 persons, was the regular Kiwanis Club meeting.

Dr. Dobriansky said if there were no captive nations held in thrall by the Soviet Union, "many of the problems that confront us would be no problems at all."

He named the ABM, Vietnam and inflation as issues that are prominent because of the "single threat posed by Moscow."

Dr. Dobriansky said Moscow seeks American "acquiescence to the permanent captivity of captive nations."

He urged Americans "to keep things in perspective by continually contrasting what we have with what people in the captive countries don't have."

The Georgetown professor said he and his associates in founding the annual observance "have never been against better relations with Russia—but we are greatly concerned about the matter of better relations on what basis."

Harry W. Halbersleben, Kiwanis president, was chairman.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 19, 1969]

CLUB RECOGNIZES CAPTIVE NATIONS

In observance of Captive Nations Week, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky will speak to the Kiwanis Club at 12:10 P.M., Wednesday, in the Buffalo Athletic Club on "Education and Freedom Through Contrast." Dr. Dobrianski is national chairman of Captive Nations Week.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, July 18, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS EXPERT INTERVIEWED

Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, national chairman of Captive Nations Week and professor at Georgetown University, will appear on Dialogue at 12:45 A.M., Sunday (Ch. 7). In the absence of Dr. Alan Drinnan, Dr. Joseph Ertavy of the State University at Buffalo will serve as host.

Dr. Dobriansky originated the Congressional resolution which officially established National Captive Nations Week in the United States. He has written over 400 articles on the Soviet Union and authored several books, including "The Vulnerable Russians," and "Nations, Peoples and Countries in the U.S.S.R."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, July 24, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DISCUSSED BY SPEAKER

Strong opposition to any form of coalition government in Vietnam was expressed Wednesday by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman and founder of Captive Nations Week, Washington.

Dr. Dobriansky was principal speaker at the 10th local observance at Captive Nations Week luncheon sponsored by the Buffalo Kiwanis Club and the local Captive Nations Committee in the Buffalo Athletic Club.

INVASION ASKED

Terming himself an educator and politician, Dr. Dobriansky outlined the gradual take-over of one country after another by the U.S.S.R. and advocated invasion of North Vietnam to prevent the creation of another captive nation.

Instead of dwelling primarily on the captive nations of Europe, Dr. Dobriansky outlined the persistent and "insidious" propaganda means used by the Russians to promote dissent and trouble all over the world.

"Last year at both the Democratic and Republican conventions I fought hard to get strong planks in the platforms to curtail this U.S.S.R. activity.

VAIN EFFORTS

"My efforts were fruitless. I was told that conditions were improving with the Russians and that nothing should be done to rock the boat. Three weeks later there was the rape of Czechoslovakia."

The speaker referred vaguely to Communist influences as a factor in campus unrest in this country. The young militant students, mostly from affluent families, he said, know little about the opposition in captive nations.

INFILTRATION PLANS

"They make perfect dupes for outside influences," he said. "Now these same Communistically-inspired persons are laying plans to infiltrate labor and industry."

Taking up the matter of the Apollo 11 mission, Dr. Dobriansky said the plaque left on the moon, instead of just asking for peace, should have called for freedom of all nations

"If the Russians had landed there first, they also would have called for peace—they always talk peace while attempting subversion," said Dr. Dobriansky. "Their plaque also would have cited the glories of their socialistic state."

WISH FOR FREEDOM

Erie County Executive B. John Tutuska stated that he hoped the observance of Captive Nations Week in this country and other nations would plant a glimmer of hope among captive peoples that their children may someday have freedom.

Local observance of Captive Nations Week began last Sunday with special religious services in Lafayette Sq.

A special art exhibit on the plight of peoples in captive nations is being shown in the Buffalo and Erie County Library and will continue until Aug. 4. Many of the materials were obtained by refugees of captive nations.

[From the WACL Bulletin, July 1, 1969]

TEN YEARS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In July, the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week was celebrated in the United States and seventeen foreign countries. Since that first July in 1959, immediately after the United States Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution and President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed it into Public Law 86–90, we, and then in time our allies have conducted ten annual weeks in symbolic behalf of the captive nations as one of the chief keys to the security of the Free World and the freedom and independence of all nations. A tradition has been built and solidly maintained. This is no mean feat, considering the powerful forces that have in this long period militated against the Resolution and have sought the elimination of the Week.

At the time of the tenth observance many friends inquired of the writer as to how he now felt about the movement, its rate of growth, the main obstacles confronting it, the reactions of the Red regimes, and its prospects and institutional significance. Having been in it from the very beginning the writer was asked on both TV and radio programs to assess these ten observances of Captive Nations Week. "Do you think it has accomplished what it set out to do?" "How has 'the disintegration of the Communist monolith' affected the course and goals of the movement?" "Why hasn't Captive Nations Week received far greater publicity in the United States than has actually been the case?" "What do you think of its future?" "Are the captive nations still captive?"

These are some of the questions that dominated the discussions during the tenth observance. And this article contains the answers that were given to these and other questions raised by interested and concerned Americans. Actually, many of these questions aren't new. They've been raised time and time again in the past. But for some reason, perhaps the "10th" itself, they received more widespread currency than before. Thus, in a real sense, this presentation is an accounting of one's observations and reflections on a movement that will enjoy a tenth anniversary in 1969, during the week of July 13–19. The observations and reflections are purposed not only to answer the recurring questions but also to penetrate the confetti diplomacy of this decade which has really caused many to ask these questions.

THE ERA OF CONFETTI DIPLOMACY

Of course, the easy approach would be to answer these dominant questions in a yes or no fashion and then refer the questioner to a mass of literature dealing with the subject for nearly a decade. Yes, the Week is accomplishing what it set out to do. The so-called disintegration of the Communist monolith favorably reinforces the course and goals of the movement, particularly the force of patriotic nationalism which the Resolution stresses. At the start, Captive Nations Week received world-wide publicity, but as many in powerful places began to fear its implications, the pressure was on to play it down as much as possible. The future of Captive Nations Week is guaranteed by the congressional resolution itself; so long as there are the captive nations in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, the Week has its existential basis for the long and substantiating future. Needless to say, squabbles and rivalries between and among totalitarian Communist Parties, which dominate the regimes of the Red States, do not make the peoples, the nations themselves, any less captive.

In this period of confetti diplomacy, with paper treaties and paper bridges of understanding as far as the captive nations are concerned, these are the direct and well-substantiated answers to the prevailing questions of the moment. The factual bases and detailed background to these specific answers can be easily acquired by consulting the outstanding literature on this fundamental subject. The book by Professor Smal-Stocki will give the inquirer a keen insight into the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.[1] This dimension is a blind spot for most Americans. The writer's own current work provides in outline the origin, development, and meaningful ramifications of the Captive Nations Week tradition and institution.[2] The book has received many favorable reviews, but the one that intrigues the author starts this way, "This is an impassioned volume in which the author depicts the United States as a gigantic fool, unwilling to be convinced of Russian ruthlessness and unwilling to react positively to the Communist's continual aggression."[3] Where the passion comes in the writer himself can't tell, but for the most extensive documentation of the subject, the reader will find this volume valuable.

During this decade numerous other source materials came into being to analyze the congressional resolution, describe the meaning of the movement, and to justify its existence in the light of changing developments in the Red Empire. The book *Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope* furnishes an excellent account of congress role in the *annual Week.*[4] *"Why Captive Nations Week,"* is an informative article, pointing out that despite the Chinese-Russian rift and other rifts in the Red Empire, more than 27 nations are still held captive in the Red Empire.[5] A background article on *"The Roots of Russia"* still goes a long way in contributing to an understanding of Moscow's current repressions in the Soviet Union, its heavy involvement in the Middle East and in Asia, and its graduated handling of the Czecho-Slovak crisis.[6] As we shall see more clearly with the passing of the year, the real enemy is not the mythology of Communism, at best a psycho-political tool of deception and assigned philosophical respectability, but rather a crude Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, which was well depicted with reference to Captive Nations Week a few years ago.[7] The mythical independence of Rumania, the introduction of Liebermanism in the USSR the squeals of a Castro and the ranting of Peking, the demands for Czecho-Slovak reform, and the continued meanderings of a Tito, none of these superficial developments have in any way altered the main thrust of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Equally applicable to today's conditions as they were only a few years ago are a dozen pieces on the captive nations. For example, "Captive Nations vs. Red States" advances the crucial distinction between the nation, the people itself, and the Red-dominated state, and explodes the whole notion of building bridges that serve to entrench the Communist apparatus.[8] Too often, Americans fail to draw this basic distinction, as shown by the erroneous concept of Communist nation, and fall for schemes which only on balance conduce to the benefit of the particular Red regime. Another example is the fundamental deterrent value of the captive nations, taken as a whole, against the outbreak of a global war.[9] With rampant insecurity sown for the Red regimes, the oppressed peoples could alter the aggressive designs of these regimes. There isn't one such regime that doesn't support the aggression of Hanoi against the Republic of South Vietnam. "Forget the Captive Nations?" has been the prime objective of Moscow and its syndicated members, but as the article with this title clearly demonstrates, the realization of this aim in the United States and elsewhere would be a tremendous phycho-political victory for the Red aggressors.[10]

Despite all that has been written, said, and done about the captive nations and their significance for world peace and freedom, the course pursued by two Administrations in this decade has been detrimental to the cause of these nations and inhibiting to the movement in the Free World. Added to this has been the protracted ignorance and even illogic on the part of several of our popular opinion media. The evidence also shows a certain amount of insincerity and self defeating expediency concerning our policies toward the Red regimes and the captive nations in this era of confetti diplomacy.

As the writer publicly stated before an official body of the 1968 Republican National Convention, both Administrations in the 60's have pursued "a confetti diplomacy in regard to the main enemy, which can be accurately depicted as the international dimension of the credibility gap."[11] The statement continued, "The whole train of papermaking—the Test Ban Treaty, Consular Convention, Outer Space Treaty, the Non-Proliferation one and even the Moscow-New York flight run—are so much confetti on the scale of fundamental problems, serving to hoodwink our people as to the harsh realities in the Red Empire and the real threats to our security. The Consular treaty, as written, doesn't even make semantic sense. These superficialities tend, in the myopic tradition of the Roosevelt Administration over two decades ago, to convey an implicit partnership between Independent America and Imperio-Colonialist Moscow. None of these treaties is of any concrete net advantage to Moscow. The confetti helps to enshroud the real enemy of Soviet Russian Imperio-colonialism and its communist weapons which are dramatically at work today in Czechoslovakia."

With regard to the captive nations, which after all involves the basic issues of Soviet Russian power, aggression, and continual threat to the independence of nations in the Free World, the crucial point is the virtual surrender by the United States of its enormous ideologic power in favor of what is deemed a pragmatic "Soviet-American survival pact."[12] The fear of "mutual annihilation," or better "nuclearitis," is what supposedly has led us to placate Moscow with fundamentally meaningless treaties as far as the main issues are concerned, to play down the cause of the captive nations, to permit the historic meaning and significance of America in terms of national independence and self-determination to seriously corrode, and, as Franklin Roosevelt attempted to do in a period devoid of nuclear weapons, to consummate an implicit partnership with the last remaining empire of its size for the ostensible purpose of maintaining world

Footnotes at end of article.

Footnotes at end of article.

peace. We have even sacrificed an across-the-board superiority in weaponry for a tenuous parity in order to display our national desire and want for a live-and-let-live existence. These are the dangerous straits into which Moscow's skillful policy of "peaceful co-existence" has led us.

It is no accident as concern the Tenth Captive Nations Week Observance and the forthcoming elections in the United States that for demonstration effect Moscow plunged into a gestural rash of ratifying the Consular Convention, advancing and signing the non-proliferation pact, calling for new talks on control missile systems, and opening up the Moscow-New York flight run. It sought certain responses and successfully obtained them. Reveling in the web of confetti diplomacy, President Johnson, who still thinks the Soviet Union is a nation, views all this as having "proved that our two countries can behave as responsible members of the family of nations. And that is a very hopeful sign indeed."[13] Not realizing that all this has been from Moscow's viewpoint a vital and integral part of its Cold War against the United States, he sees it as steps toward the cessation of the Cold War for "I believe," he naively proclaims, "that the old antagonisms which we call the Cold War must fade—and will fade."

Viewed against the real background of Russian Cold War operations on all continents, the responses to Moscow's diplomatic maneuvers are almost Pavlovian in nature. This was shown, too, in the President's proclamation of Captive Nations Week which issued on July 10 reads as follows:

"THE WHITE HOUSE.

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968: A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212) authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the free world; and

"Whereas human freedom, national independence, and justice are fundamental rights of all peoples; and

"Whereas the enjoyment of these rights, to which all peoples justly aspire, remains severely limited or denied in many areas of the world; and

"Whereas the United States of America, in keeping with the principles on which it was founded, has sought consistently to promote the observance of fundamental human rights throughout the world;

"Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1968 as Captive Nations week.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this tenth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-third.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

One need only compare this proclamation with previous ones to appreciate the trend of ideologic emasculation so necessary to the illusory content of our confetti diplomacy. For one, the Secretary of State's signature has been quietly disposed of in order to reduce the proclamation's official standing. Also, in sharp contrast to all preceding proclamations, the 1968 one disposed of the President's public invitation "I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and human liberty." This is hightly indicative of the sorry state we have drifted into while Moscow feverishly promotes its Cold War operations.

A quick glance at these operations encompasses an unrelenting drive to demolish NATO, to convert the Mediterranean into a Red lake, to establish Russian hegemony in the Middle East, and to undermine all Free Asian efforts toward expanded freedom. Working directly and also through Red syndicate members and Communist Parties in the Free World, Moscow is striking different keys and playing various tunes as it extends its interests in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Through necessary intermediation, it naturally has a keen interest in political warfare developments on the American terrain. Woven into all of this, its anti-American propaganda continues at a high pitch. Upon the assassination of Senator Kennedy, *Tass* didn't hesitate to call it "a new, convincing example of the terrifying gangster 'democracy' in the United States."[14] Moscow's government paper hammered away at the old reliable, "Imperialism carries violence within itself,"[15] and Brezhnev let it be known that the United States is a "rotting society, a degrading society, a decadent society," word with an old Hitlerian ring.[16] Such statements are a daily diet in Moscow's propaganda network, and the chief aggressive trust against the United States has been and is psychopolitical, for which this country in its illusions of peace and co-engagement is ill-prepared.

PROTRACTED IGNORANCE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

One of the paramount objectives of Captive Nations Week is the education of the American people regarding the captive nations, especially those in the Soviet Union. In this decade, remarkable progress has been made in this respect. But we would be deluding ourselves to think that the task is close to completion. If this were so, our policy toward the Soviet Union and the Red Empire would be sensibly different. Much remains to be done to overcome and eradicate numerous strands of protracted ignorance and even obscurantism in many sectors of our Nation.

For a more thorough study of this unfortunate condition the reader might well find several sections of my book on *The Valuable Russians* of profitable worth. Here, let us just cite a few examples where public opinion is being swayed. A columnist who has been taunting former Vice President Nixon for his performance with Nikita Khrushchev back in 1959, writes that "Just before he arrived, Congress had passed the so-called Captive Nations Week Resolution calling for the liberty of the 'captive nations' of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, now under the Soviet Union."[17] This balderdash is aggravated later when in another article the reader is told that the Captive Nations Week resolution "Was a resolution periodically passed at the initiative of certain Baltic refugees, calling for the liberation of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, now a part of the Soviet."[18] This is the kind of nonsense being fed the American people. It is doubtful that the writers ever read the resolution, which goes far beyond the captive Baltic states, had never anything to do with the initiative of "Baltic refugees," and is not periodically passed. With their nonsense as a background, the reader can safely discount much of what they say about Nixon. The second chapter in my work on "Nixon's Testimony of American Bewilderment" presents an objective account of the episode.

In his acceptance speech in Miami, Mr. Nixon emphasized, "To find the truth, to seek the truth and to live the truth, that's what we will do."[19] Should he win, ample opportunity will arise to apply this commitment in connection with the captive nations. Surely, in the hoped-for environment statements such as this—"Khrushchev was then nettled because just before Nixon's departure, the U.S. Congress had adopted a routine resolution referring to the slave peoples within the Soviet orbit"—could scarcely thrive.[20] The writer, who availed himself of the first New York to Moscow run, significantly during Captive Nations Week, evidently doesn't know how the supposedly routine resolution emerged, and for him the USSR is a "nation."

Considering the appeasement and diplomatic confetti atmosphere in this country, it was no easy task to promote a captive nations plank in the 1968 Republican Platform. It is a general plank that fails to include the captive nations of Asia and Cuba. Some of the reactions in the press cause one to wonder about journalistic knowledgeability and honesty. In a supposedly interpretative report one writer views it as "the usual anachronistic references to the 'captive nations' of the Eastern Europe," as though that area is free, independent, and self-determining.[21]

The editors of the *Washington Post* display their usual fatuousness and disregard for honest expression in an editorial that gloats over the generality of the plank, excluding any enumeration of the captive nations such as occurred in the forthright 1964 Republican Platform.[22] With silly intent, Armenia is compared with Quebec and "the Ukraine" was supposed to have been captured between 1960 and 1964. As for journalistic honesty, the reader should compare this editorial with *Post's* April 28 one on the "Cause of the Ukraine," where concerning Ukrainian independence it states "The last time a separate Ukranian government tried that was in 1918" and "Soviet troops suppressed it with a vengeance still bitterly recalled." Many satisfied readers of the article "From Moscow's *'Izvestia'* to *Washington's 'Post'*" can appreciate these dialectics.[23]

STEADY GROWTH OF THE WEEK'S OBSERVANCE

What is truly remarkable is the fact that in spite of the heavy forces opposing Captive Nations Week, the annual observance has steadily grown and expanded over these years. One need only peruse the pages of the Congressional Record since 1959 to see the scope and extent of the annual Week. Traditionally, Congress observes it with impressive report and dedication.[24] About 35 Governors and over 40 Mayors of our large cities issue their proclamations of the Week. Activities under the guidance of the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington are conducted by local committees in cities ranging from Boston to Los Angeles, Miami to Seattle, New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Buffalo, Chicago, St. Louis and many others.

The press coverage in these cities is fairly impressive, and change in circumstances will undoubtedly project it further. For example the column by Ted Lewis in the July 16, 1968 issue of the *New York Daily News* publicized the Week for millions of New York readers. TV and radio reporting of the Week is not as extensive as it should be, but here, too, future international developments will determine more than anything else the range of such reporting. The Georgetown University TV-Radio Forum has consistently staged programs that have had a broad audience through its network. These and other functional bases of the Week would be greatly enlarged should another nation fall captive or Soviet Russian power express itself overtly and massively in Czecho-Slovakia or elsewhere. Tragic though such events may be, we must be prepared for them and their policy implications.

One of the outstanding developments of the movement has been its reception in foreign countries. In seventeen countries, ranging from Korea to Australia, India to Turkey, and West Germany to Argentina, the ob-

Footnotes at end of article.

servance is now held regularly. Particularly in Asia, the movement has gained a firm foothold. For years now the Republic of China has been in the forefront of Captive Nations Week rallies.[25] For the first time, the Republic of Korea issued a Captive Nations Week stamp to commemorate the tenth observance. Requests for a similar stamp in the United States, the home of the Week, were denied. It appears that the closer a nation is to the battleline of freedom the deeper its understanding is of the issues at hand.

A new and highly important development arose at the end of 1967 when the first conference of the World Anti-Communist League adopted a resolution on the 10th Observance of Captive Nations Week. The resolution called for maximum effort on the part of its members and affiliates, representing over 80 countries, to advance the captive nations movement.[26] Meeting in Taipei, Free China, the members of WACL enthusiastically undertook to implement the resolution in the years ahead. They understood quite well the psycho-political nature of the world's struggle and the time element involved. Thus, if America as a sleeping giant follows the present confetti course, the captive nations cause can find permanent support from those nations immediately threatened on an overt basis by the Red Empire. Better that its future is insured by firm hearts rather than confused minds.

THE RED TOTALITARIAN DREAD OF THE WEEK

On evidence, except for our relatively declining military strength, there has been no other factor that the Red totalitarians have dreaded more than the Captive Nations Resolution and Week. This expressed fear is not as some simpletons have scoffed at, induced by the resolution and the Week themselves, but rather by their implications, potential implementation, and practical ramifications. The nature of the prime enemy, the essential history of the Red Empire, the victims of this tragic history, the essence of victory over it, and a firm basis for psycho-political action—all these fundamental ingredients are in the resolution and the forum of the annual Week. It requires only some sober reflection to discern these. Moscow recognized all this instantly, and as the following samples show, so have its syndicate members:

"This resolution stinks." (Then, according to Vice President Nixon, "he spelled out what he meant in earthy four-letter words.")[27] (Nikita S. Khrushchev, July, 1959.)

"Take, for instance, the much-to-be-regretted decision of the American Congress to hold the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' and pray for their liberation. In this case words other than 'rolling back' were used, but the gist remained the same, the same appeal for interference in other people's affairs."[28] (Khrushchev, October, 1959.)

"Some members of the U.S. Congress, who apparently are not too busy with state affairs, deliver 'moving' speeches, using the same mimeographed crib concerning the so-called 'week of captive nations'. . ."[29] (Nicholas V. Podgorny, U.N., October 1960.)

"It is not at all fortuitous that this time the farce presented by the Captive Nations Week's should coincide with the hullabaloo created by American propaganda around the West Berlin question."[30] (Khrushchev again denounced the Week at the Communist Party Congress in October, 1961.) (Moscow, 1961.)

"On the basis of the 'weeks' held in the past we already know what these appropriate ceremonies represent—unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-communist slander . . . Yes, it is only thanks to American bayonets that oppressors of freedom and blood-thirsty dictators are sustained in power in a number of countries of the Latin American continent and Southeastern Asia."[31] (Moscow, 1962.)

(In 1962 the Russian imperio-colonialists scored a victory in getting UNESCO to publish the scandalous and fraudulent *Equality of Rights between Races and Nationalities in the USSR.*)

"Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question'."[32] (Moscow, January, 1963.)

"The President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared 'a week of the Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation." (*Pravda,* Moscow, July 8, 1963.)

"Kennedy is a third-class clown proclaiming Captive Nations Week, which is a despicable animal campaign of the U.S. ruling circles." (*Pyongyang Radio,* N. Korea, July 10, 1963.)

"With every passing year 'Captive Nations Week' becomes a nuisance. The stupid situation in which the Washington legislators and rulers found themselves is becoming evident even for those who earnestly propagate the imperialistic policy of the U.S.A." (*Izvestia,* Moscow, July 15, 1964.)

"An annual, pitiful undertaking. One could treat it as a joke . . . One could treat it like that, if it were not for the fact that Captive Nations Week, an annual undertaking organized by men who have long since lost contact with their nations, is supported by the U.S. Congress and by a proclamation of the President of the U.S." (*Trybuna Ludu,* Poland, July 27, 1965.)

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demagory of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But that will never happen." (Mikhail Suslov, Chief Russian ideologist, Vilnius, Lithuania, July 17, 1965.)

"Criminals . . . are active in the organizations of the so-called 'captive nations' . . . have their own press and conduct war-inciting activities through demonstrations, picket lines, etc . . . are often connected with similar organizations in other countries in Europe and Latin America." (*Political Affairs,* 1966.)

"The thing is that every year in July the rulers in Washington put on an eye-sore of a propaganda spectacle, titled 'Captive Nations Week' . . . This time the advent of the notorious 'Week' is being violently commented upon by the reactionary American press." (*Izvestia,* July 7, 1967.)

These are only a meager portion of the vehemence and vituperation poured on this movement. What, above all, the totalitarian Red regimes need is relative security and stability in their empire in order to gain necessary time for political and economic consolidation, reconciliation between and among the squabbling Communist Parties, more technologic progress and augmented material means to meet expanding Cold War commitments in the undeveloped world, and greater overall military strength to challenge directly the power of the United States. The captive nations cause strikes at the very basis of their strategic plan for the years ahead.

TOWARD THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

As was mentioned above, in the period of July 13–19, 1969 the Tenth Anniversary of Captive Nations Week will be celebrated here and abroad. For it was in July, 1959 that Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution upon which this annual observance is founded. Plans for this anniversary are already under way. But the most effective planning must take into account the fact that the annual observance is in large part a springboard for the discussion of issues which are important to the cause and must be advanced and supported through the year. In the last analysis, it is these issues and their determination that provide the substance for the perpetuation of the Week and the positive progress of the captive nations movement.

The dominant issues are many and require in their own right detailed exposition and analysis. However, here we can review them quickly with brief comment in relation to our fundamental educational task. First, the advocacy of a debate in the United Nations on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Despite President Kennedy's move in this direction in 1961, no such debate has ever been held in the U.N. Forum. As concern the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, the need for this is more urgent than ever before.[33] Russian genocide of these nations will only strengthen Soviet Russian totalitarianism against the Free World. Second, a full-scale review in Congress of U.S. policy toward the USSR.[34] Here, too, never in our history have we undertaken such a review. It would be unprecedented and most productive for our national course.

Third, opposition to liberalized East-West trade without political concessions. Our trade experiences with totalitarian states in the pre-World War II period should provide solid historical lessons for not repeating our mistakes again.[35] Fourth the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the U.S. House of Representatives. There is no agency, public or private, in this country that continually investigates the interrelated developments in the captive nations as a whole. The multiple advantages of such a committee to the fund of knowledge and security of the United States and its allies scarcely require emphasis. Fifth, the creation of a Freedom Academy by congressional passage of the Freedom Academy bill. For the struggle ahead, the deficiencies in the psycho-political warfare preparations and equipment of Americans are grave, indeed. And nowhere have they come to fuller light than in South Vietnam itself. The plain fact is that, as in any other activity, we cannot hope to cope with the thrusts and gyrations of Red political warfare without methodical training in this discipline.

A sixth issue and objective is victory in Vietnam, clearly defined as South Vietnamese liberation of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese. It is one of the sorry aspects of our Vietnam experience that none of our leaders even mention the captive plight of the North Vietnamese people. A positive victory cannot be realized without their freedom. Seventh, close examination of the situation of Russian consulates in our country. Despite the ratification of the U.S.-USSR Consular Convention, our position against it still is valid and true.[36] Bearing on the Dirksen-State Department agreement which made ratification possible, we should oppose the placement of Russian consulates in cities with a heavy East European ethnic complex. And eighth, the evolvement of a new U.S. policy of unfinished liberation.[37] This policy is based on premises of political warfare, such as the totalitarian Red regimes persistently wage, and is the best guarantee against more Vietnams and the outbreak of a global war. The alternative to our present policy of patched-up containment is clear, far less costly, and more productive for world freedom, thus our freedom.[38]

These, then, are the formidable issues confronting all who understand and support the strategic value of the captive nations in toto. One does not expect the average American to grasp the insight that there will never be peace of a genuine sort in the world as long as the Soviet Union exists. But such will be the case until the Free World begins to concentrate on the key captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, peacefully, understandingly, and courageously. Until that time arrives and given the illusion of our confetti

Footnotes at end of article.

diplomacy, we had better keep reciting the long list of captive nations as provided in the new brochure of the National Captive Nations Committee, with the overhanging question "Who's Next?" [39]

FOOTNOTES

[1] Roman Smal-Stocki, *The Captive Nations*, Bookman Associates, New York, 1960, p. 118.

[2] Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*, Pageant Press, New York, 1967, p. 454.

[3] *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, August 1968, p. 133.

[4] *Congressional Record* reprint, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1966, p. 310.

[5] *The New Guard*, Washington, D.C., July 1965, pp. 12–14.

[6] *United States Naval Institute Proceedings*, Annapolis, Md., April 1963, pp. 40–57.

[7] "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism and the Free World," *NATO's Fifteen Nations*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, August–September 1963, pp. 92–97.

[8] American Security Council *Washington Report*, July 19, 1965, pp. 1–4.

[9] "The Captive Nations—A Major Deterrent Against Global War," *The Manion Forum*, South Bend, Indiana, February 6, 1966, pp. 1–4.

[10] American Security Council *Washington Report*, July 18, 1966, pp. 1–4.

[11] "A New Republican Policy of Dynamic Independence," Testimony before Republican Platform Committee, Miami Beach, Florida, July 30, 1968.

[12] Harry Schwartz, "The Soviet-American Survival Pact After Five Years," *The New York Times*, July 8, 1968.

[13] "Johnson, at Glassboro, Urges U.S., Soviet Efforts for Peace," *The Washington Post*, June 5, 1968.

[14] *Moscow*, June 6, 1968.

[15] *Izvestia*, Moscow, June 6, 1968.

[16] "Soviet Leader Assail U.S. 'Rotting Society,'" *The Washington Post*, July 4, 1968.

[17] Drew Pearson, "Why the Russians Don't Relish Nixon," *The Washington Post*, April 20, 1968.

[18] Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, "Nixon Positions," *The Washington Post*, August 4, 1968.

[19] Richard M. Nixon, "This Time We're Going to Win," *The Washington Post*, August 9, 1968.

[20] Ralph McGill, "U.S., Moscow Add Another 'Bridge,'" *The Evening Star*, Washington, July 23, 1968.

[21] Crosby S. Noyes, "A Platform Tuned for Violins," *The Evening Star*, August 5, 1968.

[22] "Rollback in Miami Beach," August 9, 1968.

[23] *Congressional Record*, August 1, 1968, pp. E7230, 7232.

[24] *Congressional Record*, July 17, 1968, pp. E6864–6887.

[25] Captive Nations Rally in Taiwan," *Congressional Record*, August 2, 1968, pp. S7436–7439.

[26] *Congressional Record*, November 29, 1967, pp. H16052–16053.

[27] Richard M. Nixon, *Six Crises*, 1962, p. 252.

[28] *N.S. Khrushchev's Report to Supreme Soviet*, Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, November 2, 1959, pp. 1–2.

[29] Address, U.N. General Assembly, New York, October 4, 1960.

[30] *Pravda*, July 21, 1961.

[31] *Izvestia*, July 17, 1962.

[32] *The New Times*, Moscow, January 23, 1963.

[33] See E. Derwinski, "Anniversary of First Revolution By Captive Nation." *Congressional Record*, November 13, 1967, pp. H15120–15122; also T. J. Dodd, "Persecution of Islam in the Soviet Union," *Congressional Record*, June 28, 1967, pp. S9058–9063.

[34] See J. Broyhill, "Necessity of Review of Nations Entire Diplomatic and Economic Policy in Relations to Soviet Union," *Congressional Record*, July 18, 1967, pp. H8879–H8880; also, Lev E. Dobriansky, *Review of U.S. Policy Toward the USSR*, p. 16.

[35] "Historical Lessons in Totalitarian Trade," *The Intercollegiate Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1966, pp. 55–65.

[36] See "Ten Reasons Against the U.S.-USSR Consular Treaty," p. 16.

[37] See "A U.S. Policy of Unfinished Liberation," p. 22.

[38] See "New Pathways For U.S. Leadership," *Congressional Record*, July 17, 1968, pp. H6880–6882.

[39] *Congressional Record*, July 31, 1968, pp. E7198–7199.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about American policy in Southeast Asia after learning from the Mansfield report that reinvolvement by the United States has reached, in the words of the Senate majority leader, "disturbing proportions."

The United States should not get too deeply involved in Laos. We must not repeat the mistakes made in South Vietnam. The best way to do this is to reduce our military commitments in Southeast Asia. I particularly want to stress the dangers inherent in American escalation in Laos.

I believe Senator MANSFIELD is correct in calling for an immediate freeze on all official personnel increases, both military and civilian, in Southeast Asia pending a full study of the role of the various American Government agencies there.

I hope the reports are correct that President Nixon has sent out orders to reduce the American presence in Southeast Asian countries. But, if some legislation is necessary to insure such a freeze, I will support it.

U.S. reinvolvement in Laos would contradict President Nixon's new Asian doctrine aimed at reducing America's role in Southeast Asia. The increasing level of U.S. activities in Laos sounds ominous. It is very reminiscent of the way the United States became deeply involved in Vietnam.

Any review of the gradual steps that pulled the United States into Vietnam would indicate that the same thing could slowly and almost imperceptibly be happening again—this time in Laos. And our involvement in Vietnam shows clearly that at a certain point, turning back can be almost impossible.

Apparently we have not yet reached that point in Laos. We must make sure now that we do not. Such a course has already been rejected by the United States, during the 1961–62 period. Our presence in Laos declined following the 1962 Geneva accord on Laos.

Mr. Speaker, I also agree with Senator MANSFIELD's call for a shift away from bilateral U.S. commitments to participation in regional and other multilateral efforts to bring about economic development in Southeast Asia.

The United States must not increase its direct military involvement with any Asian government. Our SEATO treaty commitments, along with the bilateral commitments, must be reexamined. Such moves must be taken now.

THE CASE OF THE GREEN BERETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the weirdest—and probably cruelest—trials in the military history of this Nation is about to unfold in far-off Vietnam. Twenty-one years ago, when I first joined this body, I would not have believed that one day I would be obliged to stand in the well of this Chamber to accuse military commanders in the field, as well as civilian authorities here in Washington, of offering American servicemen up for sacrifice for selfish motives. Yet, so great is my indignation—and so deep my dismay—over the handling of the case of the Green Berets, that I simply must speak out.

No words of my own can describe the major issue in this case better than the words of my constituent, Capt. Robert Marasco—a much-decorated officer and twice volunteer for Vietnam duty—one of the accused officers. In writing to his wife, Captain Marasco has said:

> I'm not a criminal and anything I did was done with the most patriotic and purest of motives with the approval of my superiors. It is my feeling that I have been deserted by my Army and my country. Please try to still believe in me and have faith in me. Please ask everyone to pray for me and pray for the generals who will decide my life.

Mr. Speaker, as elected representatives of the people, we have an obligation to assure not only our servicemen but all of our citizens that these men will not be deserted by us.

It is not my intention to turn today's proceedings in the House of Representatives into a trial by discussing the incident which gave rise to the case. Officials in the Pentagon, officials from the CIA, and commanders in the field have already violated the Code of Military Justice by leaking to the press their own self-serving and distorted versions of the incident. As a result, passions have been inflamed and rivalries within the military and the Government have been exacerbated.

Instead, I would direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of my colleagues to some of the facts concerning the handling of the case, which have already tarnished our system of justice, done irreparable damage to the morale of our servicemen, and caused our country to be held up to ridicule.

THE COMMANDERS IN THE FIELD HAVE VIOLATED ARTICLE 13 OF THE CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE BY PLACING THE ACCUSED PERSONS IN SOLITARY CONFINEMENT PRIOR TO THEIR TRIAL

Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Army, Stanley Resor has told Members of Congress that, in his opinion, the handling of this case has been entirely proper—even though he knew that from the very beginning the military commanders demonstrated their bias by violating an act of Congress. When they were arrested, the servicemen were placed in 5-by-7-

foot cells under maximum security in the Long Binh Stockade. They were denied proper ventilation, light, and other appropriate facilities.

Article 13 of the Code of Military Justice expressly prohibits the punishment of persons prior to trial. It states explicitly that—

> Any confinement imposed upon a person being held for trial shall not be more rigorous than the circumstances required to insure his presence.

The legislative history of article 13 removes the slightest shred of doubt as to the impropriety of the punitive confinement that has been imposed in this case. At the close of World War II, one of the most eminent jurists in our Nation's history, the late Arthur T. Vanderbilt—who eventually became the chief justice of the supreme court of my own State of New Jersey—headed a Presidential Commission to investigate military justice. At that time, one of the most flagrant abuses on the part of the military was the practice of confining prisoners who had not yet been tried or convicted under the same types of punitive conditions that were imposed on convicted military criminals. Article 13 was enacted by the Congress to prohibit this type of flagrant miscarriage of justice. In the case of the Green Berets, this law was violated.

As recently as 1968, we in the Congress addressed ourselves once again to the subject of the confinement of military prisoners. In enacting the Military Justice Act of 1968, we made it clear that persons who are actually tried and convicted by our military courts may nevertheless be released from confinement pending their appeal. There is certainly no doubt that we in Congress did not intend that convicted military criminals be treated in a manner more liberal than servicemen who had not yet been tried. Yet, the conditions of the confinement of the Green Berets clearly violated the spirit and purpose of the Military Justice Act of 1968.

THE FIELD COMMANDERS VIOLATED MILITARY REGULATIONS BY KEEPING THE CASE SECRET FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR ALMOST 2 MONTHS

How can the Secretary of the Army possibly say this case has been handled entirely properly when the field commanders did not inform the Secretary of the case as they were required to do under the so-called Blue-Bell procedure that is prescribed by regulations that were first promulgated and insisted upon by our late President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Under this procedure, military regulations require the Secretary to be informed immediately of criminal cases of this type.

In the case of the Green Berets, the alleged murder took place on June 20, the arrests and solitary confinement of the prisoners took place in the middle of July. As late as August 14, no responsible civilian official in the Pentagon was familiar with even the most rudimentary facts concerning the case.

Mr. Speaker, this raises questions which are basic to our entire system of government, questions of effective civilian control over the Army.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FAILED TO KEEP THEMSELVES PROPERLY INFORMED

How can the Secretary of the Army possibly say this case has been handled entirely properly when there has been an appalling lack of information obtained by the Pentagon. It has not been simply a matter of gaps in communication; instead, the Pentagon appears to have totally isolated itself from the forces in the field by a chasm of vast dimension.

At a time when our President, the Commander in Chief, was in direct communication with the Sea of Tranquility on the Moon, not one official in the Pentagon was concerned with the ocean of ignorance that separated Washington from the tragedy that was unfolding in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I can document the existence of this information gap at the Pentagon by personal correspondence, which I conducted with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense. At the conclusion of my remarks I will insert his correspondence in the RECORD.

Once again, it is significant that the alleged murder took place on June 20 and the prisoners were placed in solitary confinement in the middle of July. As late as August 14, I met with the Under Secretary of the Army, Thaddeus R. Beal, and presented to him a list of 17 questions which I had prepared concerning this case. Mr. Beal was able to provide little information other than to inform me that the Green Berets were being confined to a stockade.

He knew absolutely nothing about the circumstances of the confinement. A half hour after my conference with Mr. Beal, I was able, through the cooperation of the Pentagon, to place a telephone call to my constituent, Captain Marasco, in Vietnam. It was from Captain Marasco that I first learned that he and the other Green Berets were being held in 5-by-7-foot cells in maximum security, that he was allowed only 1 hour in the fresh air each day, and that the circumstances of his confinement were such as to prevent him from having adequate access to his defense counsel.

After learning of this, I immediately communicated with Secretary of Defense Laird, expressing my shock and deep concern and asking him to give the matter his personal attention. For the next several days, I received no information from the Pentagon whatsoever.

On August 16, I received a letter from the Under Secretary of the Army, providing brief answers to only some of my questions. Frankly, I was astounded by the information chasm revealed in Mr. Beal's letter. Among other things, he stated:

> To the best of my knowledge, no official in the Pentagon was informed prior to the arrests being made.

I found this statement to be incredible since the Pentagon had also informed me that an inquiry had, in fact, been initiated in the field 1 month prior to the arrests.

Mr. Beal also stated:

> The victim was a Vietnamese national, whose name, as reported in the press, was Chu Yen Thai Khac. However, the individual's name, employment status and confirmation of his death have not been furnished to headquarters, Department of the Army, by the field command. . . . A detailed description of the physical conditions under which the accused were confined is not available at headquarters, Department of the Army. . . . Headquarters, Department of the Army has no information on how long the pre-trial confinement will continue . . . the identity of the commanding officer who ordered the accused confined has not been furnished to Headquarters, Department of the Army, by the field command.

It staggers my imagination to understand the complete lack of information concerning a case of this magnitude.

INFORMATION HAS BEEN DELIBERATELY WITHHELD FROM MEMBERS OF CONGRESS BY SECRETARY RESOR AND GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE ARMY, ROBERT JORDAN

How can the Secretary of the Army possibly say this case has been handled entirely properly when important information has been deliberately withheld from us. I have been able to piece together, from sources other than the Pentagon, at least some of the important facts concerning this case. Although these facts were obviously known at the Pentagon by September 1, they were deliberately withheld from me and other Members of Congress.

Late in August, Secretary Resor sent a young attorney from the staff of the General Counsel of the Army to Vietnam to investigate the case. The Attorney stayed only a few days in Vietnam—and did not interview any of the accused prisoners. On his return to Washington, he was sent to my office to brief me, as well as other Members of Congress.

In providing us with information, the attorney omitted certain crucial facts which indicate CIA involvement in the case. When I pointed out this significant omission to this young man, he was profuse in his apologies and explained that he had simply forgotten to tell me these facts. In addition, I also asked the young man to provide me with information as to the extent of the delay in appointing defense counsels for the prisoners after they were placed under arrest. He informed me that he had also forgotten to obtain this information while he was in Vietnam.

Because of these omissions, I assumed that he was directed by his superiors to withhold the relevant information.

This assumption was more than substantiated at a conference held in my office on September 8 at which I and the following Members of Congress were present: Representatives CARL ALBERT, JOHN CULVER, TOM GETTYS, CLARENCE LONG, PAUL ROGERS, and ROBERT STEPHENS. In purporting to brief us, Secretary Resor and General Counsel Jordan omitted facts which tend to exculpate the Green Berets. They withheld the same information which had previously been withheld by the attorney at the earlier briefing. It was only after this information was called to their attention that they admitted our facts were correct.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that other Members of Congress who were not present at this briefing have ever been objectively briefed.

THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY HAS SHIRKED HIS RESPONSIBILITY BY REFUSING TO ASSUME JURISDICTION OVER THIS CASE WHICH HE HAS AUTHORITY TO DO UNDER ARTICLE 22 OF THE MILITARY CODE OF JUSTICE

How can the Secretary possibly say this case has been handled entirely properly? Frankly, if the Secretary of the Army really believes that, I shudder to imagine just what kind of flagrant abuses of our servicemen and violations of our laws and our military regulations must exist before he would take any personal action.

In enacting article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, Congress expressly gave the Secretary of the Army authority to act as a convening authority in any criminal case that occurs in the Army. If ever there were a case which calls for the Secretary's assumption of responsibility—this is certainly the case.

After our lengthy conference with Secretary Resor on September 8, I, and the other Members of Congress present at the conference, joined in a letter to the Secretary. We pointed out all of the mishandling that had occurred and urged him to assume the responsibility that we believe he has a duty to assume under Article 22. A copy of this letter will also be included for the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

In reply, Mr. Resor has made it clear that he approves of what he refers to as "the normal course of proceedings in this case." He has stated that he has directed that the trial be open only to the extent consistent with security requirements. This means a closed trial.

Mr. Speaker, the proceedings to date have not been normal; they have not been proper; and, in my view, the Secretary is simply shirking his responsibility by bowing to the wishes of the commanders in the field who have already more than amply demonstrated their inability to be impartial.

This trial should be completely open—it should not be conducted in Vietnam and it should not be conducted by the commanders in the field.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, this will go down as one of the weirdest and probably cruelest trials in military history of our Nation. Nothing, however, can mitigate the bungling that has taken place—nor ameliorate the harsh, unjust treatment already imposed upon men whose principal offense seems to have been serving their country.

And, Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues are requesting a meeting with Defense Secretary Laird as soon as is possible. We will make known to him our sense of urgency in this matter, and our strong feelings about the mishandling of the case.

The material previously referred to follows:

AUGUST 14, 1969.

Hon. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I find myself deeply disturbed by the circumstances surrounding the present confinement in a stockade in Vietnam of my constituent, Captain Robert F. Marasco, and the other members of the Fifth Special Forces Group who have been accused of murder and conspiracy to commit murder during the course of their service.

Under Article 10 of the Code of Military Justice, persons who are charged with offenses are subject to confinement of this type only "as circumstances may require". In my view the only circumstances which could possibly justify the type of confinement to which Captain Marasco has been subjected are those in which the arrested person is likely to do harm to others or to himself or is likely to make an effort to escape.

Since the outstanding record of Captain Marasco, who has served with great distinction, indicates beyond doubt that he is a person of moral integrity and that his release from confinement would in no way prejudice the interests of justice, I strongly urge that he be released and be treated in a manner befitting an officer of his caliber. If this is not done, I respectfully request that I be notified of the circumstances which in your opinion justify his continued confinement in a stockade.

As a result of the information which I have received, a number of questions have arisen in my mind concerning this entire case. Some of my specific questions are set forth in detail in an attachment to this letter. I urge your immediate attention and cooperation in supplying accurate and detailed answers.

This matter, which so deeply affects the individual lives of Captain Marasco, the other accused persons, and their families, is one in which the entire nation has a vital concern. I am sure that you share my conviction that it must be handled in an open and forthright manner which will neither prejudice the interests of justice for the individuals involved nor damage our nation's confidence in the role of the military.

Sincerely,

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ALLEGED MURDER AND CONSPIRACY CHARGES AGAINST CAPT. ROBERT F. MARASCO AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE GREEN BERETS IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

1. What is the factual basis of the charges against Captain Marasco and the other members of the Fifth Special Forces Group?

2. What is the name and nationality of the person alleged to have been murdered by Captain Marasco and others? Was such person employed by any agency of the United States prior to or at the time of his alleged murder? If such person was employed by an agency of the United States, describe the details and terms of that employment. Has the death of such person been established?

3. Was the person alleged to have been murdered related to or associated with or employed by or otherwise connected with any important personages or activities in Southeast Asia? If so, please specify.

4. Is there any evidence to indicate that the person alleged to have been murdered was employed by or associated in any way with North Vietnam?

5. In the "fact sheet" provided by the Pentagon it is stated that the charges against Captain Marasco and others were instituted subsequent to the conducting of an inquiry. Who ordered the inquiry to be conducted? Who conducted the inquiry? What prompted the inquiry? Were Captain Marasco and the others informed that such an inquiry was being conducted? If so, when? Was any official at the Pentagon notified of the inquiry prior to the arrest of Captain Marasco and the others?

6. Who ordered the arrest of Captain Marasco and the others? Who initiated the charges? When were the charges initiated and when were the arrests made?

7. Describe in detail why each of the suspects are under suspicion.

8. Describe in detail the physical conditions of the detention of the suspects from the time of their arrest to date.

9. Under Article 10 of the Code of Military Justice persons who are charged with offenses and arrested are subject to confinement only "as circumstances may require." What are the circumstances that require the suspects in this case to be subject to total confinement? Is such confinement customary in cases involving officers on active duty who are unlikely to do harm to themselves or others and who are unlikely to make any effort to escape? If such confinement is not customary under these circumstances, what justification is there for confinement with respect to each of the suspects? How long is it contemplated that this confinement will be continued?

10. Why has the investigation under Article 32 of the Code of Military Justice been suspended? When will the investigation be resumed? In view of the fact that the investigation has been suspended, thereby prolonging the great strain placed on the suspects and their families, why have the suspects not been released from total confinement?

11. During the suspension of the proceedings under Article 32, are any fact finding investigations being conducted relative to the charges in these cases? If so, describe the nature of such investigations.

12. Have personnel trained in investigative techniques been placed at the direct disposal of Captain Marasco and the other suspects to assist them in acquiring evidence of help to them in preparing their legal defense?

13. What is the nature of the general duties and functions peculiar to the Special Forces? Are members of the Special Forces ever subject directly to orders—written or verbal—promulgated by the CIA or any other non-military agency of the United States? If so, specify. Were any of the suspects involved in this case subject to any such order in connection with the incident that gave rise to the alleged murder?

14. What are the names and titles of: (1) The officer immediately superior to Colonel Rheault at the time of the alleged murder? (2) The officer in command of the Green Berets in Vietnam at the time of the alleged murder? (3) The name and title of the officer in the Pentagon in command of the entire Special Forces program at the time of the alleged murder?

15. Press reports indicate that the person alleged to have been murdered was a double agent acting for North Vietnam. Does the Department of the Army have an established policy regarding the treatment afforded such agents by the military? If so, describe that policy.

16. Describe the activities of Captain Marasco's unit, participation in it by non-American personnel and its relationships with the Army and intelligence units in Vietnam.

17. Has the Republic of Vietnam indicated in any way that Captain Marasco and any of the other suspects in this case will be subjected to criminal prosecution in any of the courts of Vietnam in the event that there is no prosecution by military authorities of the United States?

AUGUST 16, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. RODINO: This is in reply to your letter of 14 August 1969 concerning the case of Captain Robert F. Marasco and other members of the Fifth Special Forces Group who have been charged with murder and conspiracy to commit murder.

I certainly share your concern that this case, as well as any other case involving al-

leged criminal conduct, be handled in a manner that will neither prejudice the rights of the persons concerned nor damage public confidence in the military.

With respect to the question of Captain Marasco's pretrial confinement, the Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, 1969 (Revised edition) provides at paragraph 20c that "confinement will not be imposed pending trial unless deemed necessary to insure the presence of the accused at the trial or because of the seriousness of the offense charged."

As you may know, Major General George L. Mabry, Jr., the Commanding General, The Support Troops, on 15 August 1969 denied Captain Marasco's request to be released from confinement. In this connection, Captain Marasco has the right to petition the United States Court of Military Appeals for a writ of habeas corpus. The Supreme Court in *Noyd v. Bond,* decided 16 June 1969, affirmed the right of a military prisoner to seek his release from pretrial confinement through those channels.

With respect to the questions posed in your letter, information is not available at Headquarters, Department of the Army, as to Questions 1, 3, 7, 11, and 12. Answers or partial answers to Questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are inclosed in unclassified form based on information available at Headquarters, Department of the Army.

I trust the foregoing will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS R. BEAL,
Under Secretary of the Army.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE ALLEGED MURDER AND CONSPIRACY CHARGES AGAINST CAPTAIN ROBERT F. MARASCO AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE GREEN BERETS IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

2. Q. What is the name and nationality of the persons alleged to have been murdered by Captain Marasco and others? Was such person employed by any agency of the United States prior to or at the time of his alleged murder? If such person was employed by an agency of the United States, describe the details and terms of that employment. Has the death of such person been established?

A. The victim was a Vietnamese national whose name, as reported in the press, was Chu Yen Thai Khac. However, the individual's name, employment status and confirmation of his death have not been furnished to Headquarters, Department of the Army, by the field command.

4. Q. Is there any evidence to indicate that the person alleged to have been murdered was employed by or associated in any way with North Vietnam?

A. Information has been received that Captain Marasco suspected the victim to be a NVA (North Vietnamese Army) agent. Supporting evidence for such a belief is not available at Headquarters, Department of the Army.

5. Q. In the "fact sheet" provided by the Pentagon it is stated that the charges against Captain Marasco and others were instituted subsequent to the conducting of an inquiry. Who ordered the inquiry to be conducted? Who conducted the inquiry? What prompted the inquiry? Were Captain Marasco and the others informed that such an inquiry was being conducted? If so, when? Was any official at the Pentagon notified of the inquiry prior to the arrest of Captain Marasco and the others?

A. Major General George L. Mabry, Jr., Commanding General, The Support Troops, U.S. Army Vietnam, directed the preliminary inquiry pursuant to paragraph 33*a*, *Manual for Courts-Martial, 1969,* on 20 July, 1969. The inquiry was prompted by the results then available from an Army criminal investigation. The inquiry was conducted by Colonel Ed V. Hendren. It is unknown in Headquarters, Department of the Army, whether Captain Marasco and the other accused were informed of this inquiry. They were informed of the charges against them on 24 July 1969. To the best of my knowledge, no official in the Pentagon was informed prior to the arrests being made.

6. Q. Who ordered the arrest of Captain Marasco and the others? Who initiated the charges? When were the charges initiated and when were arrests made?

A. Colonel Ed V. Hendren preferred charges against the eight accused on 24 July 1969, based on the evidence revealed in his inquiry. The accused were confined on the following dates: CWO Boyle, 12 July 1969; Major Crew, 14 July 1969; Captain Marasco, 16 July 1969; Major Middleton, 17 July 1969; Captain Brumley, 18 July 1969; Captain Williams, 19 July 1969; Colonel Rheault, 21 July 1969; SFC Smith, 24 July 1969. The identity of the commanding officer who ordered the accused confined has not been furnished to Headquarters, Department of the Army, by the field commander.

8. Q. Describe in detail the physical conditions of the detention of the suspects from the time of their arrest to date.

A. All accused are confined in the US Army Vietnam Installation Stockade, Long Binh, Republic of Vietnam, except Colonel Rheault, who is confined in a trailer at Long Binh Post. A detailed description of the physical conditions under which the accused are confined is not available at Headquarters, Department of the Army.

9. Q. Under Article 10 of the Code of Military Justice persons who are charged with offenses and arrested are subject to confinement only "as circumstances may require." What are the circumstances that require the suspects in this case to be subject to total confinement? Is such confinement customary in cases involving officers on active duty who are unlikely to do harm to themselves or others and who are unlikely to make any effort to escape? If such confinement is not customary under these circumstances, what justification is there for confinement with respect to each of the suspects? How long is it contemplated that this confinement will be continued?

A. No person may be placed in pretrial confinement except for probable cause. Only a commanding officer to whose authority the individual is subject may order a commissioned officer or warrant officer into confinement. The person who orders the confinement must have personal knowledge of the offense or have made inquiry into it. Full inquiry is not required, but the known or reported facts should be sufficient to furnish reasonable grounds for believing that the offense has been committed by the person to be restrained. Although charges must be preferred without undue delay, they need not be preferred against the individual prior to his confinement. After he has been placed in confinement, immediate steps shall be taken to inform him of the specific wrong of which he is accused and to try him or to dismiss the charges and release him (Article 10, Uniform Code of Military Justice, title 10, US Code, section 810). Confinement will not be imposed pending trial unless deemed necessary to insure the presence of the accused at the trial or because of the seriousness of the offense charged (para. 20c, Manual for Courts-Martial, 1969 (Revised edition)). The suspects were placed in pretrial confinement because they are charged with premeditated murder and conspiracy to commit murder. Pretrial confinement is customary when a service member is charged with murder, whether he is an officer or an enlisted man. Headquarters, Department of the Army, has no information on how long the pretrial confinement will continue.

10. Q. Why has the investigation under Article 32 of the Code of Military Justice been suspended? When will the investigation be resumed? In view of the fact that the investigation has been suspended, thereby prolonging the great strain placed on the suspects and their families, why have the suspects not been released from total confinement?

A. The Article 32 investigation was recessed on 2 August 1969 as a result of a request by Captain Marasco's appointed defense counsel, and joined in by the other defense counsel, for documents and a witness. Their availability having been determined, the investigation is scheduled to reopen on 20 August 1969.

13. Q. What is the nature of the general duties and functions peculiar to the Special Forces? Are members of the Special Forces ever subject directly to orders—written or verbal—promulgated by the CIA or any other non-military agency of the United States? If so, specify. Were any of the suspects involved in this case subject to any such order in connection with the incident that gave rise to the alleged murder?

A. US Army Special Forces are military personnel with cross training in basic and specialized military skills, organized into small, multiple purpose detachments with the mission to train, organize, supply, direct, and control indigenous forces in guerrilla warfare and counterinsurgency operations, and to conduct unconventional warfare operations. The mission of Special Force is:

(1) Plan and conduct unconventional warfare operations which are operations conducted for military, political or economic purposes within an area controlled by the enemy and making use of the local inhabitants and resources. It includes the three interrelated fields of guerrilla warfare, escape and evasion and subversion. It is usually supported and directed in varying degrees by an external source.

(2) Plan, conduct and support stability operations which are defined as that type of internal defense and internal development operation and assistance provided by the Armed Forces to maintain, restore or establish a climate of order within which responsible government can function effectively and without which progress cannot be achieved.

(3) Plan and conduct direct action missions which are peculiar to Special Forces due to their organization, training, equipment and psychological preparation. Direct action missions are those highly specialized assignments which are directed against specific strategic targets, the destruction of which has been determined to be mandatory.

As assigned members of US Special Forces organizations, individual personnel are not subject directly to orders—written or oral—promulgated outside the military chain of command. From time to time individual Army personnel have been detailed for duty with nonmilitary agencies of the US Government; in such cases the Army personnel concerned are subject directly to orders—written and verbal—of the nonmilitary agency concerned. Special Forces personnel have occasionally been detailed for duty with nonmilitary agencies of the US Government. During such periods of duty they are not officially associated with the US Army Special Forces. Although no information has been received from the field command, Army Staff experience indicates that the suspects involved in this case were not subject to orders from outside the military chain of command.

14. Q. What are the names and titles of: (1) The officer immediately superior to Colonel Rheault at the time of the alleged murder? (2) The officer in command of the Green Berets in Vietnam at the time of the alleged murder? (3) The name and title of the officer in the Pentagon in command of the entire Special Forces program at the time of the alleged murder?

A. The Commanding Officer of the 5th

Special Forces Group (Colonel Rheault) served under the *command* of the Deputy Commanding General, USARV, who is Lieutenant General Frank T. Mildren. This command relationship principally involved the administrative and logistical aspects of the 5th Special Forces Group. The Commanding Officer of the 5th Special Forces Group was under the *operational control* of COMUS MACV, who is General Creighton W. Abrams, whose authority is normally exercised through the J-3, MACV, who is Brigadier General Edward Bautz, Jr. *Operational control* is the authority granted to a commander to direct forces assigned so that the commander may accomplish specific missions or tasks which are usually limited by function, time or location; to deploy units concerned and to retain or assign tactical control of those units.

Robert B. Rheault, Colonel, U.S. Army, was the Commanding Officer, 5th Special Forces Group, at the time of the incident.

There is no officer in the Pentagon "in command" of the entire Special Forces program. Various subordinate elements of the Department of the Army Staff exercise policy supervision over their functional area of the Special Forces program. For example:

Assistant Chief of Staff for Force Development is responsible for supervising policy matters involving doctrine, force structure, and unit training.

Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel is responsible for policy matters concerning individual training, morale, welfare, etc.

Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations is responsible for supervising policy matters concerning operational concepts.

Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics is responsible for supervising policy matters concerning logistics.

The deployed and operational Special Forces units are under the command of the Army Component Commander of the Unified Command in which they are serving. For example, the 8th Special Forces Group in the Canal Zone is under the command of Commander, U.S. Army South, which is the Army Component Command of Commander in Chief, South.

The Chief of Staff of the Army is the senior member of the Army Staff. The position of Chief of Staff of the Army is without inherent power of command.

15. Q. Press reports indicate that the person alleged to have been murdered was a double agent acting for North Vietnam. Does the Department of the Army have an established policy regarding the treatment afforded such agents by the military? If so, describe that policy.

A. Yes. This information is contained in classified Army and Defense Intelligence Agency regulations and field manuals.

16. Q. Describe the activities of Captain Marasco's unit, participation in it by non-American personnel and its relationships with the Army and intelligence units in Vietnam.

A. The subordinate unit of 5th Special Forces Group to which Captain Marasco was reportedly assigned was under the direct operational control of Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. The details of participation in this unit by non-American personnel and its relationships with the Army and intelligence units in Vietnam are not known at Headquarters, Department of the Army.

17. Q. Has the Republic of Vietnam indicated in any way that Captain Marasco and any of the other suspects in this case will be subjected to criminal prosecution in any of the courts of Vietnam in the event that there is no prosecution by military authorities of the United States?

A. No contact has been made with the Government of the Republic of Vietnam with respect to this case. United States military personnel in Vietnam are subject to the exclusive criminal jurisdiction of the United States.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 14, 1969.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This morning I spoke with Acting Secretary of the Army Thaddeus Beal concerning the alleged murder charges against my constituent, Captain Robert Marasco and other members of the Green Berets in Viet Nam. I delivered to the Acting Secretary a letter and series of questions, copies of which are enclosed.

After returning to my office, I spoke on the telephone to Captain Marasco in Viet Nam, and was shocked to learn that he and the others are currently being held under maximum security in 5 x 7 foot cells. In my view, this extraordinarily severe treatment is unwarranted under Article 10 of the Military Code of Justice.

Under the circumstances, I urge that you give this matter your personal consideration.

Sincerely,

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. RODINO: Secretary of Defense Laird has asked that I respond to your letter of August 14 to him concerning the confinement of Captain Marasco and others in Vietnam. As you are aware from the announcement by U.S. Army Vietnam on 18 August, the custody grade of the accused has been changed to that of installation parolee.

The six officers and one warrant officer charged are confined to a BOQ-type building and an adjacent mess hall. The enlisted man charged is under similar confinement in a different area.

Isolation of the prisoners which was necessary during one phase of the investigation no longer is required.

I hope this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS R. BEAL,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 9, 1969.

Hon. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We wish to express to you our distress and indignation over the manner in which the case involving the Special Forces personnel in Vietnam is being handled.

From its very inception, the case has raised serious doubts both as to the ability of the Commanders in the field to conduct fair and impartial proceedings and the extent to which you are exercising your responsibility as a civilian authority over the Army.

It is clear that the original solitary confinement of the accused persons in 5 x 7 foot cells was punitive in nature and in direct violation of Article 13 of the Code of Military Justice. It is also clear from the letter of August 16, 1969, from Thaddeus R. Beal, Undersecretary of the Army, that neither you nor any other responsible civilian official in the Pentagon was properly informed of even the rudimentary facts and circumstances in this case more than two months after the alleged murder took place and one month after the prisoners were placed in solitary confinement.

Further, mishandling of this case is indicated by the failure to provide Defense Counsels in a timely manner, as well as by the fact that General Mabry ordered the original arrests and is, nevertheless, the convening authority of the present proceedings under Article 32. Still further improprieties are indicated by public disclosures made to the press by civilian officials.

All of the facts now available to us lead to the conclusion that the handling of this case to date has been characterized by intra-service rivalries, bureaucratic mismanagement and an irresponsible disregard for the rights of the accused persons, as well as for the serious adverse effects of the proceeding on the morale of servicemen.

Our National interest has already suffered greatly and will suffer even greater and more irreparable damage unless you exercise your authority under the law to preempt jurisdiction over the legal proceedings and to assert jurisdiction in your capacity as Secretary. It is only by taking such a step that the individual servicemen involved, as well as the entire American people can possibly be afforded any assurance that further investigations or legal proceedings will be properly conducted.

We urge that you assert your jurisdiction as soon as possible and we await your prompt reply.

Respectfully,

CLARENCE D. LONG,
CARL ALBERT,
TOM S. GETTYS,
PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
JOHN CULVER,
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C. September 18, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. RODINO: This is in response to the letter which you and your colleagues recently sent me concerning the Green Beret case.

I am enclosing a statement being made today by Major General George Mabry, Jr., the convening authority, announcing that he is referring the charges against six of the eight defendants for trial by general court-martial; charges against the other two defendants will be held in abeyance. In addition, I am announcing today my decision not to intervene in the convening authority's action and to allow the case to take the course prescribed by the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The reasons for my decision are contained in my statement.

I cannot agree with the assertion in your letter that the handling of the case has been characterized by intra-service rivalry, mismanagement, or disregard for the rights of the accused. My investigation of this matter has shown that the charges were preferred and confinement ordered only after careful investigation and serious review by responsible officials in Vietnam who acted at each stage only after consulting their respective Staff Judge Advocates. There has inevitably been some public confusion about the case. The confusion has resulted to large extent from the Army's inability to discuss the facts of the case without prejudicing the rights of the men involved.

I appreciated the opportunity to discuss this case with you and your colleagues during our recent meeting. I have given the views expressed in your letter and during our meeting very careful consideration in reaching my decision.

I am sending a similar letter to each of your colleagues who joined in the recent letter to me.

Sincerely,

STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army.

STATEMENT FROM HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY, VIETNAM

Major General G. L. Mabry, Jr., Commanding General, The Support Troops, United States Army Vietnam, has directed trial by general court-martial of the charges of murder and conspiracy to commit murder against Colonel Robert B. Rheault, Major David E.

Crew, Major Thomas C. Middleton, Jr., Captain Leland J. Brumley, Captain Robert F. Marasco, and Captain Budge E. Williams. All cases will be treated as not capital. Charges against Captains Brumley, Marasco and Williams will be referred for a common trial. It is anticipated that the Government will be prepared to proceed with the trial of their case in about three weeks.

Charges against Colonel Rheault and Majors Crew and Middleton will be referred for a common trial by a different court. The trial date for Colonel Rheault and Majors Crew and Middleton will be determined later. Charges against CW2 Edward M. Boyle and SFC Alvin L. Smith, Jr. are being held in abeyance pending the trial of the other cases.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE ARMY STANLEY R. RESOR

Major General George L. Mabry, Jr., Commanding General, The Support Troops, U.S. Army Vietnam, has announced today that he was referring to trial charges of murder and conspiracy to murder in the case of certain personnel assigned to the 5th Special Forces Group in Vietnam. The convening authority determined that charges against six of the eight men should be referred for trial on a noncapital basis by general court-martial. Charges against two men are being held in abeyance at this time.

I have been urged by some to remove jurisdiction from the Command in Vietnam and dismiss the charges. After careful deliberation, and on the basis of facts currently available to me, I have concluded that it would be unwise and unjustified for me to interfere with the normal course of proceeding in this case. Preparations for a full and fair trial will go forward. I have directed that the trial be open to the extent consistent with security requirements.

Historically, we have placed great faith in our system of criminal trial as a fair and effective way of resolving disputed questions of fact and law and of assuring justice to all. Except where the most compelling reasons exist, our carefully developed legal procedures should not be shortcut. As a lawyer and as Secretary of the Army, I believe firmly in the efficacy of the traditional process and in the fairness of our basic procedures under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. A trial, accompanied by the arguments of counsel for both sides, and the availability of necessary witnesses, will provide a chance for full exploration of matters bearing on innocence, guilt, excuse, justification, mitigation or extenuation.

Comprehensive information will be presented before the members of the general court-martial and will be preserved in a complete record for other reviews which are required under the Uniform Code. Following trial there is a post-trial review by a Staff Judge Advocate. This is followed by action by a convening authority, who may disapprove findings of guilt, if any, and mitigate sentences imposed. Subsequently, there is an opportunity for appellate review with respect to questions of fact and law by the Court of Military Review, composed of senior Judge Advocates independent of the convening authority. Unlike most civilian appellate courts, this court is also required to determine whether any sentence approved by the convening authority is appropriate in the circumstances. The court may reduce sentences but may not increase them. After this appellate review, there is an opportunity to seek review of questions of law in the United States Court of Military Appeals, which consists of three civilian judges. In addition, with respect to sentences, the Judge Advocate General as well as the Under Secretary and Secretary of the Army can exercise clemency power. Because this matter will be coming to trial, it would not be appropriate for me to make any additional comments.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: We are writing to you in behalf of our Son Capt. Robert F. Marasco.

In the course of our daily lives many questions are being asked concerning our Son Bob. One in particular which is very upsetting to us is, that Bob would talk to the youngsters in our family and others about his feelings for the Army and the Military, explaining to them that what he was doing was for the good of our country. That he was helping to make this a better world for them to live in.

They were so proud of him and now they come to us and say Aunt Em or Mr. & Mrs. Marasco if Bob was doing the right thing then, why are they doing this to him now? Of course we had no logical answer and we would explain that we would write to our Congressman to see if he could come up with an answer for them. Another thing when Bob announced that he was returning to Vietnam after he had finished his tour of duty there, many people told him he was crazy for going back to Vietnam and further risking his life for something which to us & them seems hopeless, but being a dedicated Soldier he felt that this was his duty, so that some day his children could also live in a better world.

Our Son has always conducted himself with honor as a boy and a man and needless to say we always have felt very proud of him because his endeavors were always honestly motivated.

Words cannot express our deepest gratitude for all you have done and are doing in behalf of our Son and all the other men in this with him. May the good Lord continue to give you the strength to fight for just causes.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK J. MARASCO.

[From the New York Times]

MAKING A MESS MESSIER

If Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor really believes that the Green Beret murder-and-espionage case in Vietnam "is being properly handled by all concerned," he must be very nearly alone in his conviction. It is dismaying that he did not take advantage of the trip to Vietnam to clear up a host of questions about this tragic and messy affair.

The question of whether Col. Robert R. Rheault and the seven other Special Forces men will be court-martialed for the killing of a South Vietnamese agent is *sub judice*, but some puzzling aspects of the case could be clarified without prejudice to that decision.

Indeed, one of the most disturbing aspects of the whole episode is that—even though Secretary Resor deems it inappropriate to release any more "substantive" information at this time—nearly every other involved party is releasing or leaking what purports to be "substantive" information that tramples on the rights of the not-yet accused and bewilders the public.

Central Intelligence Agency sources, for example, have now leaked their version of events, denying that the C.I.A. ever advised the Green Berets to "terminate" the suspected double agent. Earlier leaks, obviously from Army or Special Forces sources, indicated that the C.I.A. first recommended killing the agent; then, after the event, ordered for the record that he be spared, presumably to absolve the C.I.A.

No one has yet explained why the Army, while presumably merely investigating the affair, felt it necessary to put seven of the men in solitary confinement in a maximum security prison—then wait two weeks to make it public in a release that left unclear if they were being charged with murder or not.

The fact is, *pace* Mr. Resor, that the case has been abominably handled "by all concerned," and clarification is long overdue. Has this affair been used to prosecute old feuds among the intelligence agencies? Were the Green Berets operating on too loose a rein? Has the Army tried to use the occasion to curb the Special Forces and discredit the C.I.A., or is it the other way around? Answers can be obtained without interfering with the administration of justice.

Spying is a dirty, murky—but necessary—business. Most Americans are still uncomfortable about having to be in it at all. But there are aspects that Congress and the country have a right to know about. The unpopularity of the Vietnam war is merely enhanced by the present evidence of interagency back stabbing.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, September 21, 1969]

JUSTICE FOR BERETS

One of the weirdest, if not cruelest, trials in American military history will culminate in the court martial of six Green Berets.

The six officers—a colonel, two majors and three captains, all with exemplary records—are charged with complicity in the slaying of a Vietnamese suspected of being a double agent. The other Special Services troopers who had been subjected to the same privations as the officers won't be tried, at least not right away. Defense counsel concludes, and quite reasonably, the two will be called as prosecution witnesses.

What will be used to substantiate a charge of murder is one of the mysteries of this bizarre case. For one thing, there is no corpus delecti. If there is one, it's supposed to be somewhere in the South China Sea.

The prosecution is said to possess an alleged murder weapon. If so, the defense contends it was obtained by illegal means. Illegalities, whether under civil or military law, abound. Charges, which are supposed to be read within 24 hours after arrest, weren't presented for a week. Initially the defendants were denied access to counsel. In fact, they were kept in virtual solitary confinement for 30 days, some in 5x7 cells.

One of the defendants, Capt. Robert F. Marasco of Bloomfield, managed to send word to his family saying he acted under orders at all times. A key question remains, whose orders? Another is, which one? For there appears to have been at least two, one ordering the suspected agent's assassination, the other sparing his life.

The CIA is implicated but denies any responsibility. In the Army the buck has been passed all the way up the chain of command to the theater commander, Gen. Creighton Abrams.

A trial may be needed, not only to pentrate the confusion surrounding the case but also to allow the Green Berets a chance to clear their names. "Nothing, however, can mitigate the bungling that has taken place—nor ameliorate the harsh, unjust treatment already imposed upon men whose principal offense seems to have been serving their country."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida who has already joined with me in conference with Secretary Resor and has worked hard on this matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say that on my own part—and I am sure for the other Member of Congress as well as the public—we are all very grateful for the leadership that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) has shown and the initiative which he has taken in order to see that a full investigation is carried on as to actually what has happened. I cer-

tainly join with the gentleman and all of my colleagues in expressing my concern over the manner in which the Department of the Army has mishandled the "Green Beret" case.

The whole sorry situation has created, or re-created, an air of buckpassing within the military. The American public witnessed the military's ineptness in the *Pueblo* and later the flying *Pueblo* and now sees eight American servicemen literally captured by our own forces. Combined with the *Pueblo* and the flying *Pueblo*, we have now witnessed incompetence of leadership on land, sea, and in the air.

I am disappointed that the Secretary of the Army has refused to enter into this case and I am equally disappointed that the Secretary of Defense and the President have allowed this to continue in such a haphazard fashion to the present point.

The eight men have been charged with murder and conspiracy to commit murder. These charges are based on the assumption that they killed an enemy spy—a double agent working for the Government of North Vietnam, the enemy of the United States.

For following orders, they have been charged with murder, subject to loss of their constitutional rights and were confined in solitary confinement in 5 by 7 cells.

I am afraid that if this case continues along the same lines it has proceeded, it will establish a dangerous precedent where any American serviceman can be charged for murder when, in the course of his following orders, he kills an enemy.

I sincerely hope that the protest raised here today will indicate to the Secretary of Defense and the President that the American public has reached the point where they want to know that the military will stand behind its fighting men.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his remarks.

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

Mr RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for taking the time this afternoon to present this case in the manner in which he has presented it. I would also like to commend him for quite properly taking the lead among Members of Congress in a dialog between the legislative branch of Government and the Secretary of the Army.

I think that any fair and impartial observer and any person who would look at this matter objectively would certainly agree that the gentleman from New Jersey acted in a proper manner to let the Secretary of the Army know of the deep concern which Members of Congress feel over the manner in which this case involving eight members of the 5th Special Forces Group has been handled.

Mr. Speaker, in the first place, the action of whatever commander was involved in ordering confinement—solitary confinement—of these eight American servicemen is, to the best of my knowledge, unheard of in the history of military justice, certainly in the history of American military justice since the Uniform Code of Military Justice was enacted following World War II.

As the gentleman from New Jersey so well pointed out, the only purpose which is supposed to be served in ordering confinement of any military personnel who only stands accused is to assure the presence of such military personnel when his case is called for trial. No such doubt was present in this case.

In this case the six officers, one warrant officer and one noncommissioned officer were ordered into confinement and into solitary confinement, without any justification which has been made known to interested Members of Congress.

In our effort to notify the Secretary of the Army, and through him the commanders in the field, of the deep concern which we feel, Mr. Speaker, in return we have been given misleading statements, possibly amounting to misstatements in fact, and certainly including deliberate omissions of material information to which Members of Congress are entitled.

In the statement of the Secretary of the Army which was released contemporaneously and simultaneously with his letter to some of us dated September 18, 1969, the Secretary of the Army made this statement:

> I have been urged by some to remove jurisdiction from the command in Vietnam and dismiss the charges.

The first clause of that sentence is accurate. It is true that certain people, including Members of Congress, urged the Secretary of the Army to remove jurisdiction from the command in Vietnam, but to the best of my knowledge not any one of us, nor anyone else with whom I have been in communication, has ever urged the Secretary of the Army to take any substantive action on the merits of this case such as dismissing the charges. We have not gone into the question of guilt. The most that we have ever asked is that he take a procedural action.

Several newspaper articles which followed the Secretary's statement of September 18, and his letter addressed to us of same date referred to Members of Congress urging the Secretary of the Army to dismiss these charges. While I certainly would not attempt to speak for any other Member of Congress except myself, I would like to say that I certainly have never urged the Secretary of the Army to dismiss the charges.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we have urged the Secretary of the Army to take certain procedural action in connection with this case because we feel that it is necessary for him to do so in order to preserve the legal rights, military rights, and the constitutional rights of the six officers who have been ordered to trial under the charges of first, murder; and second, conspiracy to commit murder, as well as the two against whom charges are being held in abeyance.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we do not have all of the facts of this case which we would like to have. We do not feel we have been given the information to which we are entitled to be given by the Secretary of the Army.

Each of us has continued to express grave concern about the disregard of the rights of the eight accused. We feel among other things that it is imperative that the jurisdiction be preempted by the Secretary of the Army and that it be removed from the command in Vietnam because of certain command influences and certain command pressures which we feel will make it impossible for these men to receive a fair trial as we in the Congress understand the meaning of the term "a fair trial." These pressures, even if unspoken, are already sufficient to preclude a fair trial.

As one who has studied law and one who has had at least a modicum of experience in the practice of the law, I feel that several legal, military, and constitutional rights of these men who are charged with murder and conspiracy to commit murder have been violated by certain commanders in the field and by the Secretary of the Army.

I think the action announced by the gentleman from New Jersey today in now going to the Secretary of Defense and asking him to now do what the Secretary of the Army should have done weeks ago is in the interests of justice, not only as it applies to these eight members of the Special Forces, but as it applies to every member of the Armed Forces of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any American citizen forfeits his legal or constitutional rights when he joins the U.S. Army or any other branch of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The members of the Special Forces are what we might refer to as triple volunteers. They are Regular Army. They are jump qualified. Each has specifically volunteered for service in the Special Forces.

It sems to me that the Army has been unfair and unjust in the handling of these charges against these men. I hope the gentleman from New Jersey will communicate with his constituent, Captain Marasco and tell him that while he may feel he has been deserted by certain people in the Army—to emphasize to him that he has not been deserted by the gentleman from New Jersey or by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman and thank him for his contribution, especially I want to thank him for emphasizing again and clarifying the point which we made and which he joined in making, in our letter to Secretary Resor that we wanted him merely to preempt jurisdiction in this case and we did not ever urge him to dismiss the charges.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for having provided the opportunity for us to speak on this subject. There are only two things I would like to add to what has been said. First, I wish it to be understood very clearly that none of us is in anywise seeking to interfere with military justice or a trial under military law. Also, however, I want it to be very plain

that we are not satisfied that once the present procedure was decided upon, it was the right course for the case to take. That is the chief protest I would like to make.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I will not consume a great deal of time on this subject, but I would like to thank and commend the gentleman from New Jersey, my good friend (Mr. RODINO), for the leadership he has demonstrated in tackling this great problem for all the people of this country.

I am also glad to observe the participation of so many Members of the House in this protest that we have made to the Secretary of the Army and others in authority over the treatment of these fine, dedicated American officers who have been maligned and who were apprehended in such a manner that even the lowest criminals in civilian life are not treated. The image that has been created with the American people about military justice and its procedures is at its lowest ebb in the history of our country. I associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon, and I pledge to you my continued support of protest and efforts in behalf of these fine young men and also the people of this country, who are entitled to be assured that if their boys are going to foreign soil to fight an enemy, they will not get over there and discover that we are fighting among ourselves. I think it is our duty as Members of the House to attempt to protect the rights of our boys in Vietnam who are fighting our battle against communism.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to join in thanking the distinguished gentleman for his leadership in this matter. I share his concern about these American servicemen and their families, and his determination that their rights shall be protected.

The gentleman has raised some basic questions in his statement which ought to be answered. The people's Representatives have the right to nothing less than the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth from the Pentagon in all matters, and specifically from the Secretary of the Army in this matter, and the American people have the right to know, and the servicemen who are their husbands, fathers, and sons have the right to know that when they put on the uniform of this country, their rights as American citizens will be protected, that they shall not have to sacrifice basic rights as a part of the price they pay for fighting for our country and risking their lives in its behalf.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership in this case, and I want him to know that I share his determination that in this case justice shall be done and the rights of these men shall be protected.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

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

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from New Jersey for the leadership he has shown in behalf of the Green Berets. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Congressman RODINO and his colleagues for the work they have done in behalf of these accused men.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to bring to the attention of my colleagues some facts about the forthcoming court-martial being brought against Maj. David E. Crew, Maj. Thomas C. Middleton, Jr., Capt. Leland J. Brumley, Capt. Budge E. Williams, Capt. Robert F. Marasco, and Col. Robert B. Rheault, the former commander of the Special Forces in Vietnam.

These men will soon be standing trial on charges of conspiracy and noncapital murder in the second degree as the result of the absence of Thai Khac Chuyen on June 20. Chuyen, a Vietnamese national, is alleged to have been a double agent, working for both the Americans and the North Vietnamese. The court-martial will be held in Vietnam.

The accused servicemen had been kept in solitary confinement, in 5- by 7-foot cells, until the charges against them were made public. These officers, considered to be of the highest caliber in order to have qualified for the Special Forces, were not permitted to telephone their families when informed of the charges being brought against them. They were told that their families could read about it in the newspapers. They could not even contact their attorneys at will, since telephone lines were not made available to them. Under our judicial system, anyone charged with even the most heinous crime is entitled to his rights under the Constitution, and surely, being locked in a small and solitary cell is punitive to the victim. It is therefore questionable, in light of their earlier treatment, whether the accused servicemen could receive a fair trial should the proceedings be held in Vietnam, as now scheduled.

Since the Army has played the role of cop and prosecutor in this case, should it now play the role of judge? The charges against the servicemen are grave ones. The Army is prosecuting the case against them, and I think it would be a saner and wiser course of action were Secretary Resor to assert his civilian authority and remove the defendants to a neutral arena.

Capt. Robert F. Marasco of Bloomfield, N.J., one of the accused servicemen, has said:

> Anything I did was done with the most patriotic and purest of motives, and with the approval of my superiors.

We must remember that these are men who have offered to their country the most precious gift a man can make; his life.

I want to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from New Jersey for his determination in behalf of the eight Green Berets.

I conclude by inserting in the RECORD two editorials that I think will prove of interest to my colleagues:

[From Forbes magazine, Sept. 15, 1969]

FACTS AND COMMENTS

Have you heard in a long time of anything more stupid than the Army's arrest of the eight green berets, including the commanding officer? I hope the Army guys who made that decision are not still in charge of anything important to this country's military well-being.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1969]

MAKING A MESS MESSIER

If Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor really believes that the Green Beret murder-and-espionage case in Vietnam "is being properly handled by all concerned," he must be very nearly alone in his conviction. It is dismaying that he did not take advantage of the trip to Vietnam to clear up a host of questions about this tragic and messy affair.

The question of whether Col. Robert R. Rheault and the seven other Special Forces men will be court-martialed for the killing of a South Vietnamese agent is *sub judice*, but some puzzling aspects of the case could be clarified without prejudice to that decision.

Indeed, one of the most disturbing aspects of the whole episode is that—even though Secretary Resor deems it inappropriate to release any more "substantive" information at this time—nearly every other involved party is releasing or leaking what purports to be "substantive" information that tramples on the rights of the not-yet accused and bewilders the public.

Central Intelligence Agency sources, for example, have now leaked their version of events, denying that the C.I.A. ever advised the Green Berets to "terminate" the suspected double agent. Earlier leaks, obviously from Army or Special Forces sources, indicated that the C.I.A. first recommended killing the agent; then, after the event, ordered for the record that he be spared, presumably to absolve the C.I.A.

No one has yet explained why the Army, while presumably merely investigating the affair, felt it necessary to put seven of the men in solitary confinement in a maximum security prison—then wait two weeks to make it public in a release that left unclear if they were being charged with murder or not.

The fact is, *pace* Mr. Resor, that the case has been abominably handled "by all concerned," and clarification is long overdue. Has this affair been used to prosecute old feuds among the intelligence agencies? Were the Green Berets operating on too loose a rein? Has the Army tried to use the occasion to curb the Special Forces and discredit the C.I.A., or is it the other way around? Answers can be obtained without interfering with the administration of justice.

Spying is a dirty, murky—but necessary—business. Most Americans are still uncomfortable about having to be in it at all. But there are aspects that Congress and the country have a right to kow about. The unpopularity of the Vietnam war is merely enhanced by the present evidence of interagency back stabbing.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) for his comments.

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

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

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from New Jersey and commend him for his leadership in directing the attention of this body very effectively to the outrage which has been perpetrated in the case of the Green Berets.

I have no intention of making any statement that would appear that I have a fixed opinion on the guilt or innocence of the accused in the case concerned. My purpose is to express a deep personal reaction to the manner in which the affair has been handled.

There are those who charge today that too much is being done to protect the criminal. In this case, I feel too much has been done to make these men criminals before they had a chance to protect themselves.

I join my colleagues in asking that this case be reviewed by the Congress immediately, before any further proceedings are attempted.

There are too many basic freedoms involved to continue the prosecution of this matter without the Congress knowing, in detail, what has happened and what the military intends to do.

The individual liberties that we so proudly hold up before the world as principles of democracy are in danger of violation. Our democratic processes stand trial in these proceedings. God grant that our actions will not seem to be mockery before the world.

Again I commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for his leadership in this matter.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI).

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have had this time reserved by the dean of the New Jersey delegation (Mr. RODINO) to speak on the matter of the Green Berets.

We are in a war in Vietnam, however immoral, and our young men serving there are quite aware that each of them must protect himself or give his life in that unjustified conflict.

To lessen the chance of being killed, our forces must resort to many operational tactics to obtain advance information regarding the intention of the enemy. Similar tactics are employed by the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

The elite corps, known as the Green Berets, has been charged with obtaining information to give us an advantage over the enemy who employs many devious methods to hide his activity.

Dedicated men of the United States, ferreting out important military information which would aid us in battle, are now facing court-martial.

A general court-martial on the charges of murder and conspiracy to commit murder have been directed against Col. Robert B. Rheault, Maj. David E. Crew, Maj. Thomas C. Middleton, Jr., Capt. Leland J. Brumley, Capt. Robert F. Marasco, and Capt. Budge E. Williams. Charges against CW2 Edward M. Boyle and Sfc. Alvin L. Smith, Jr., are being held in abeyance pending the trial of the other cases.

These men, as all our military personnel in Vietnam, have been working under orders and assigned to specific duties. To disobey or neglect these orders is justification for reprimand or court-martial by the authorities. Paradoxically, in the carrying out of these orders, and there must have been orders issued, these men are being charged with the slaying of a counterintelligence officer, a Vietnamese national whose name, as reported in the press, was Chu Yen Thai Khac.

The information which has been released to the press and the public is, in my opinion, far from complete, and mine is as scant as that of the public. It will not be fully revealed unless these men are given a public trial, instead of a closed door court-martial. If the authorities have sufficient evidence to court-martial these men, then there should not be any timidness to open this investigation to public scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, whoever decided that these men must be tried behind closed doors has done our servicemen in Vietnam a great injustice. The immediate effect of such a decision is the lowering of the morale of our young men who must be in a quandry as to whether they should follow orders; and in doing so, speculate on the possibility of later being brought up on charges.

We have trained our men to protect themselves in battle, yet in doing so they may run into circumstances which could result in disciplinary action from their superiors.

In this present situation, I am of the belief that the Green Berets charged with this act will not obtain proper and unbiased consideration of the charges filed against them. I contend that the legal rights of these men will be better protected if the entire proceedings were to be transferred to an area outside the immediate Vietnam sphere of operations and any external command influences.

It is apparent that there is much confusion surrounding this case. The initial action of solitary confinement, under difficult substandard conditions, stresses my point. The later release of these men to better quarters would indicate that this earlier arbitrary treatment was in error based upon the allegations then presented.

Mr. Speaker, I do not seek to interfere in the orderly process of justice but, these cases are of vital importance to the entire Nation; all eyes are upon the proceedings as they occur from day to day. Justice can prevail only when these men, who were acting under orders from their superiors, are given an open public trial.

This matter, which so vitally affects the individual lives of the accused, and their families, is one in which every American should have concern. I am certain that each American who has followed this incident with deep interest shares my conviction that it should be held in an open and forthright manner which will neither prejudice the interest of justice for the individuals involved, nor do damage to our Nation's confidence in the military services of this Nation.

Because of the widely publicized aspects of this case, it appears to me that there are innumerable obstacles which have to be surmounted in order to give these men a fair and impartial trial in the field. The issue is not judgment of guilt or innocence. The issue does not lie in the conflict between military and civilian authority. The issue is the need to preserve the legal and constitutional rights of each and every individual as set forth in the principles of our American Constitution.

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

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

Mr. HUNGATE. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey could tell me whether, from the investigation and studies, to his knowledge they have ever found the body of this alleged victim of this offense?

Mr. RODINO. The body of the alleged victim has never been found.

Mr. HUNGATE. If the gentleman will yield further, it seems to be my information, from reading the papers, some time after the charges were brought they had ships and divers and things looking for the body. It would seem to me, from my limited experience as a prosecutor, it is always a good idea, before filing charges of homicide, to have a body, to establish such things as the cause of death and whether or not the actions of the defendants caused the death, and perhaps, sometimes, even to establish that the alleged victim was dead, at least before placing the accused in solitary.

I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey and his colleagues on this very able action in bringing this difficult problem to light.

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

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me.

I only rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well.

I was just about to raise the exact point that the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HUNGATE, raised a moment ago as to whether or not we have established the corpus delicti, the body, in the crime. Certainly we would not approach this from a strictly legal standpoint without it. I might say that I am concerned overall above the esprit de corps not only of the Green Berets but the military forces themselves. We do have one of the young men charged, a Mr. Middleton, who is a resident of South Carolina. His wife teaches in my congressional district, I know from friends and family of his illustrious background. Certainly there is no more dedicated individual to the military and his country than this young man. I am sure the same feeling he had existed in the hearts and minds of all of these men now charged.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one thing additionally. Earlier my esteemed colleague from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) made a very fine statement, and I subscribe to what he said with perhaps one exception. He mentioned that the Secre-

tary had alluded to the fact that in the letter from Members he had urged upon him both the change of the situs of the trial as well as the dismissal of the charges but he was not aware of any Member of this body who urged dismissal of the charges. Perhaps in my anxiety to help these men and try to stop any further erosion of the morale of our forces I went too far, but still I do not apologize for it, Mr. Speaker, because I did urge that the charges be dismissed. I did so because as one experienced to a very limited degree in the trial of cases I thought that the evidence was woefully insufficient to support such charges. I am concerned about the families of these men and their future in the military forces as a result of these very grave charges against them.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman who has worked so hard in this matter. I am concerned about the effect that this will have on the overall morale of our Armed Forces. In my judgment, already irreparable harm has been done not only to the Green Berets, these courageous men, but to our fighting men everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. RODINO. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the matter that the House is discussing today involving these members of the U.S. Army points very graphically, I believe, to certain difficulties that confront the Armed Forces in applying the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the vague and shadowy area of counterinsurgency and unconventional warfare which is waged on the twilight battlefields of the cold war.

An action at law before the courts has begun. It is not for me to pass on the guilt or innocence of the accused.

The trial of the Special Forces personnel in question is not the first time that uncertainty and ambiguity of conventional rules of land and sea warfare has raised serious questions as to the scope of their application. The *Pueblo* affair presented some very difficult problems that related to the application of the Code of Conduct and the application of specific provisions of the Uniform Code to responsible commanders and members of their commands which, in combat situations, such as World War II, could be more clearly answered.

Today, however, the type of struggle in which we find ourselves engaged in South Vietnam is a multidimension conflict cutting across accepted lines of set-piece battle and conventional war that over centuries have evolved into certain prescribed rules of land warfare. These rules applied to historic situations define quite clearly the obligations and duties of members of the Armed Forces.

We should remember that to some extent, certain actions envisioned in military law are, in effect, triggered by certain conditions precedent that make it easier to determine the application of the provisions of military law. In the case of a declaration of war, for example, the declaration would clearly state the definition of the enemy and what would be "aid and comfort" to the enemy. However, we are fighting an undeclared war in Southeast Asia and, as a result of that, it seems at times we find ourselves in an "Alice in Wonderland" situation, with propaganda appeals made directly to the American people from the enemy camp, demonstrations on behalf of the Vietcong in our own Capital and solicitations in some areas of the American public for help and assistance through blood donations for North Vietnam.

However, this "Alice in Wonderland" type of war has some vary hard realities for American commanders and fighting men in the field, particularly those who have to make decisions. Not infrequently, by the very nature of the struggle, military forces find themselves projected into areas of conflict that they frequently would prefer to avoid. Often not of their own choosing, but because of the type of struggle we wage, they find as a part of their military duties, civic action, economic development, and psychological warfare directed more to civilian than military targets.

It is a war of espionage, subversion, insurgency, counter-insurgency, police action, intrigue, blackmail, double agents, and sabotage. Many of these subjects are not in the area of principal thrust or consideration of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

One of the most confusing and least understood areas of military law is the law that surrounds guerrilla warfare. Unknown to many people, there are certain defined legal principles that relate to guerrilla struggles. There are certain very basic and fundamental differences, though, in rules of land warfare as applied to conventional, vis-a-vis unconventional forces.

It should be further remembered that we have no status of forces agreement with South Vietnam. This, in itself, can raise some rather complex questions that can relate to jurisdiction of military courts and the possible lack of a legal forum for crimes alleged to have been committed against an indigenous civilian population which otherwise might not have been prosecutable in a military court.

There may be need, also, not only to update and more clearly define the Uniform Code of Military Justice insofar as it relates to the personnel in the armed services, but also to modernize and review our entire field of Federal statutes that relate to questions of subversion and as to what is aid and assistance by American citizens to governments and forces in which we find ourselves in actual combat, as in Vietnam, but without a declaration of war.

In this connection, it must be acknowledged that improvements in the code were made by the Military Justice Act of 1968, which became effective August 1, 1969, but experience may well indicate further changes.

The cold war battlefield and the pending trial of the Special Forces personnel certainly suggest a need for the Congress to look at the total fabric of military justice in order that commanders in the field will more clearly know the boundaries of their authority and at what point their jurisdiction ends on making decisions that in questions of doubt they might reconcile on the basis of military exigencies. Prosecution of a limited war is difficult enough. Let us make a greater effort to more clearly define the rules of this struggle so that we can be certain that in our effort to do justice, which we all seek, we do not permit an injustice to occur to anyone, whether through lack of legal safeguards, failure to follow judicial procedures, or by an attempt to provide judicial safeguards through a code that in some instances may be unclear and ambiguous with respect to the particular situation at hand.

War is a dirty business at best. The "no holds barred," multidimension battlefields of the cold war have, if anything, made it worse. Even though at home, in a strict sense, the Nation is at peace, let us at least set up the guidelines and safeguards for our men in the field who find themselves in the midst of a strange but total war.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commending the gentleman in the well, the distinguished dean of our New Jersey delegation (Mr. RODINO), for performing this very useful service. He is particularly to be commended for bringing various ramifications of the problem to light and exposing the lack of compassion which has been shown to these eight men who wear so well the uniform of the United States.

The Special Forces are ill-equipped, by training, inclination, or choice, to involve themselves in clandestine intelligence operations. It is inexcusable by any standard to allow these brave and courageous men to be treated like base, common criminals.

I happen to be privy to some information about this situation which may be unavailable to others and, at this time, based on what I consider to be reliable data, the question which must be asked is: Why are we, as a nation, proceeding in this manner?

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about the personal tragedy these eight men are enduring and their families' agony should make us think twice before we proceed in a public trial. But equally, it must be a source of concern as to what is going to be inside the Pandora's box: Is it going to be bloody entrails in which we may read a disastrous future for ourselves?

Mr. Speaker, the question on many lips this afternoon is just what is going to happen to our Military Establishment? What is going to happen to our intelligence services? What is going to happen to our international posture throughout the world? For if we proceed in an open and public trial—as we must to adequately protect the constitutional rights of these eight men who gave so much for that Constitution—then we are going to cause some harm to our military, our

intelligence organizations, to our foreign policy, and our Nation itself.

It will truly be a Pandora's box and there will undoubtedly be more there than any of us can imagine. The question which keeps bothering me is why the decision was made to proceed down a public path and why we could not have proceeded in a more prudent direction.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the echoes of this case will linger in America long after all of our voices here today have been stilled. When will the scars on the face of America heal, especially since they will be caused by what seems a precipitous and almost negligent operation? Other people obviously have greater knowledge than I about this matter but have they considered the effect on our young men. There have been 500,000 sent to Vietnam to engage in war, and are we fully prepared to accept the Nuremberg principle that no man may be ordered to kill another? How can we say to a protestor that he has no moral right not to kill, when we do not defend those who did whatever they did because they believed they were defending us in a moral cause.

This is what unfortunately occurs in wars. It would seem we have taken these eight men out of the context of the insanity war after allegedly they may have committed a warlike act. But war was their business in Vietnam in the first place. And fighting and killing so-called bad Vietnamese in behalf of the so-called good Vietnamese is the purpose of the exercise in Vietnam.

In addition to the personal tragedy of these eight men, we must also dwell upon what will happen to our country. It may be a possible effect of this trial that we are going to unilaterally disarm the conscience of American soldiers and in this imperfect and unpeaceful world, that may be the greatest disaster.

I think that the greatness of Colonel Rheault and some other people will come out in this trial. Some of them were quite prepared to sacrifice their careers, their futures and their families in order to protect the interests of our country and what they believed was the best interests of each of us. For that is what is meant by national security.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled, baffled, and frankly very intrigued as to why the decision was made to proceed publicly. I do not believe that our top leaders could possibly have been oblivious to the ramifications which I and others have discussed here today.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and in numerous briefings I hear about many problems we face in the world. Why should we bare our souls as a nation at this time of crisis in our country when we are trying to extricate ourselves from Vietnam and bring the war to an end? Why do we choose now to open what is sure to be a tragic spectacle? For I am convinced that this will make the Bay of Pigs look like a peaceful harbor and the U-2 incident look like little league stuff in comparison to what we are about to begin.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) for his concern, courage, and compassion for these great men who did their duty as they saw it under extremely trying conditions. For they were in a business they were not supposed to be in and a business other people had put them in. And so I compliment the gentleman for this exercise of the highest traditions of the House of Representatives.

I believe that every step of the way in this business is fraught with peril. It is a personal disaster for these brave, courageous, religious men whose records are outstanding in every way. They volunteered to do everything they were called upon, but they never volunteered to be in the clandestine intelligence business: this was imposed upon them. What truly happened in Vietnam, or why it happened, will be developed and the public will be informed of it and see the folly not only of war but the tragedy of men.

Mr. Speaker, the central question over and above what we are doing to these honorable American soldiers is why are we doing this to the United States of America?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) on obtaining this special order. I commend him because, as he has in all of his career, been a champion of justice and that is what he is doing today.

I support the gentleman wholeheartedly and strongly urge all of our colleagues to join with him in sustaining this demand of justice for American boys.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the Secretary of the Army has not seen fit to exercise his civilian authority to put an end to the vast damage which this incident has already done to the rights of the men involved and to the interests of our country as a whole.

From the beginning, this case has been fraught with clear examples of mishandling and irresponsibility. The men were originally placed in solitary confinement in 5- by 7-foot cells—an act punitive in nature since it far exceeded any rational requirements of security. Moreover, the men were not provided with defense counsel in a timely manner and inappropriate disclosures were made to the press by civilian officials.

Further prosecution of this trial against these men under the present conditions involves a serious risk that their fundamental legal rights will not be sufficiently protected, and the attendant publicity clearly will not serve the best interests of the United States.

I therefore strongly urge the Secretary of the Army to reconsider his decision and to exercise his authority to this end.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the mishandling of the Green Beret case and am fearful that these men will not get a fair trial. The decision of Secretary Resor to leave jurisdiction of the case to the command in Vietnam raises grave questions:

How can the Green Berets get a fair trial when proceedings will be conducted by those who have already disregarded the rights of the accused?

How can the Green Berets get a fair trial without a completely open trial?

How can the trial be fair when the convening court has the authority to close the proceedings to the public any time "national security" is being discussed—any time they get to the heart of the matter as to who may have ordered the death of the double agent?

How will this court martial affect the morale of our fighting men who are risking their lives for our country?

How many young men will want to make a professional career in the armed services when they realize their leaders stand ready to throw them to the wolves any time the reputation of a "higher authority" is at stake?

On Thursday, September 18, I sent a telegram to President Nixon urging his intervention into this case. Since that time, one of the letters I have received in response to my action—from a lady in Soquel, Calif.—says:

> If I thought a letter would ever reach President Nixon, I'd write him. Thanks again for expressing the opinion of most of the American people.

I received a similar letter from a man in Scottsdale, Ariz.—the father of a member of the special forces who has been missing in action since February—scoring the "inexcusable abuse of these dedicated Americans."

Mr. Speaker, we speak for the American people, and our letters reach the President. Today, I would like to ask every one of my colleagues—regardless of party—to join in urging the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, to intervene in this case and see that justice is accorded these eight men.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, when the now-notorious Green Beret case rocketed to the attention of a shocked American public it appeared to be an Alice-in-Wonderland affair; it appeared that members of a specially organized U.S. military force, unprecedentedly trained in the brutal art of "kill or be killed," were to be punished for their line-of-duty killing of one agent of a vicious enemy which, too long, has been permitted to take too many thousands of American lives in this Nation's most nightmarish and controverted foreign military involvement.

In the ensuing weeks, however, the Army's incredible mishandling of the case has escalated it from the ludicrous to the outrageous.

The crowning affront against the individual human rights of the men involved and against the intelligence of a justifiably resentful public came when Army Secretary Resor persisted in continuing to permit the field commanders to proceed without civilian control—an action clearly tantamont to putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop.

Even the most cursory student of the self-defensive character of military "brass" under verbal fire must conclude that these military commanders who have so greatly mishandled the case so far will only compound a travesty of justice which they have set in motion.

As the governmental branch constitutionally empowered to raise armies and levy the taxes with which to pay for them, as the one branch of Government directly elected by the people whose views it is compelled to respect and represent, the Congress now has no choice

but to speak out, most vociferously, in behalf of the growing concern of the American people for the obvious miscarriage of the most basic form of justice to which the six accused Green Berets have, too long, been subjected.

Under the circumstances so well recorded as to require no itemization nor specification from me at this moment the very least that must be done—by the President, if necessary—is the ordering of the immediate removal of this now scandalous miscarriage of justice from the hands of those who have made it so—the military commanders in Vietnam—and the prompt granting of a change of venue to the United States and, preferably, to a civil court of justice.

These, clearly, must be the minimum stipulations in the interest of a fair trial for the accused and in the companion interest of the people's right to know.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks many of us here in the Congress have become greatly concerned over the case of the Green Berets. It has begun to appear as though the men selected for trial are really being made scapegoats for an unfortunate rivalry that has developed between the Green Berets, the Regular Army units, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Our Green Berets are a special group of men engaged in what is probably one of the dirtiest conflicts in which this Nation has ever fought. Assassination, torture, and mass murder were a way of life with the Vietcong and North Vietnamese long before the United States came into the conflict. Our enemies have been taught well by their Communist masters. Therefore, if a mistake was made by our Green Berets, and this happens in combat, the fact of these men having to fight under unbelievable conditions in defense of all our freedoms should be taken into account. Today, I am sending a letter to President Nixon expressing my concern over the matter and suggesting his intervention. It is my hope that he will do so and not permit this affair to become a circus that hurts the morale of our Green Berets and our Army as well.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) in expressing deep concern over the treatment accorded the eight members of the Green Berets allegedly involved in the murder of a Vietnamese civilian agent. Full justice for all members of our armed services accused of a crime is a matter that should and must concern all Americans. I am particularly concerned about this case because the mother of one of the accused resides in the 23d District of New York, which I have the honor to represent.

Two conditions are essential if these Green Berets are to have a fair trial: First, that the trial be conducted in a jurisdiction that is entirely free of individuals or influences that might prejudice the case, and, second, that it be conducted entirely public.

Reports and charges that have been issued concerning the case and the events leading up to it already suggest that American field commanders in Vietnam, including Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, may have an interest in the outcome of this case. Lest we have another instance of a branch of the military trying itself, as we did in the Naval Court of Inquiry into the *Pueblo* capture, I feel that this case must be heard here in the United States, preferably under civilian jurisdiction.

I regret that Secretary of the Army Resor has so far denied congressional appeals to exert his jurisdiction over the case, which would assure that it would be taken out of the hands of the field commanders in Vietnam and would instead be conducted in this country by civilians. I also regret that the Secretary has taken the position that the trial, when it does occur, will be open and public only "to the extent consistent with security requirements." I certainly recognize that in cases like these there may be information of a highly sensitive nature dealing with the conduct of the war and the safety of American troops in Vietnam that is material to the case but cannot be made public. It is impossible, however, to have assurance of a completely fair trial—and to avoid all suggestion of a "star chamber" proceeding—unless all aspects of the trial are open to public scrutiny.

So the Army must choose, it seems to me, between bringing the case to trial and revealing secret information, or having no trial at all. Certainly the latter would be a wiser course than to conduct an inherently unfair semiprivate trial, as the Army now proposes to do. Such semiprivate trials are not permitted in civilian courts, where prosecutors are often forced to refrain from prosecuting cases because they would reveal sensitive information. They should not be condoned in the military system of justice, and the Army should decide now whether it is going to hold a totally public trial in the interests of equity, or drop the charges against these men altogether in the interests of security.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are confused by what is commonly termed the "Green Beret Case." Frankly, I am one of those who is confused and just as frankly, I am extremely concerned about the way this entire matter has been handled.

First of all, it is my understanding that the Secretary of the Army has refused to assert his civilian authority over this case as I understand he is authorized to do under the law. In my opinion, this is a serious mistake.

There simply is too much confusing data concerning the case to let many of us feel that these men will receive a fair and impartial trial. Personally, I would prefer that these men be returned to the States instead of allowing the military commanders in the field to court-martial these men.

The service of these men was generally considered to be exceptional prior to reports of this unfortunate and tragic incident. We are told that a double agent may have been murdered.

We wonder on what authority did the alleged murder take place.

The effectiveness and morale of the Green Berets cannot help but be affected. War is a horrible business at best.

I am deeply concerned that we may be allowing some brave men to become scapegoats to cover up evidence which the military may consider to be damaging.

The accused are not hardened killers, but rather we are told they are highly trained and dedicated American fighting men.

I am in agreement with those who feel that the court proceedings may not be handled fairly and objectively by the Army commanders in Vietnam.

A great deal more concern should be shown by the Secretary of the Army, Government officials, and the American people toward the rights, lives, and reputations of these men who were sent into Southeast Asia to fight under our flag.

We should not run out on them at this time. This entire case is highly suspicious and the way the military has handled it thus far gives me considerable question about their ability and their intent to protect the rights of the accused.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the case of the eight Green Berets accused of killing an alleged South Vietnamese double agent, has unfolded with an incredible amount of confusion, doubt, mismanagement, and a strong inclination toward the miscarriage of justice. Certainly, our taking a special order to closely examine the matter does not come a moment too soon. For as the case has been revealed the mishandling of it has become increasingly impossible to ignore.

Eight men are on trial. But, in effect, it is the entire judicial and military structure which are on trial with them. Yet this case has been mishandled as if the whole situation was little more than an everyday occurrence.

Yesterday, as it was noted, the Secretary of the Army refused to assert his civilian authority over this case, preferring instead to let the military handle it. He acted in this manner despite the strong and consistent urgings of several Congressmen that he approach this delicate matter from his civilian role.

Today, the civilian attorney for these men informed the media that the two men who will not be on trial have been the brunt of "tremendous embarrassment" and accusations that they might be playing "stoolie roles."

Moreover, we have heard the wives and families of all these men express justifiable anguish and bitterness that the case has been presented with flagrant dereliction of judicial rights and complete lack of focus.

All of these incidents, plus the facts that we know and the wealth of facts I feel we have not been given, point toward a trial that I strongly doubt will be fair and objective should the military undertake it at this juncture.

Consequently, I would respectfully urge that we immediately call for a board of inquiry to begin to collect and present the sum total of the facts, thereby clearing up once and for all what is fact and what is merely rumor, supposition, and allegation.

I would also urge that we establish a congressional ad hoc committee as soon as the board of inquiry has completed its fact gathering. Composed of House Members of both the Judiciary and Armed Services Committee it would be

responsible for putting the facts in perspective. Its duty would be to show where and in what way mismanagement in the case took place, and how we can prevent this needless and dangerous situation from happening again.

By placing Judiciary and Armed Services Committee members on the panel, we will be afforded a better chance of covering every conceivable aspect of the case. This is particularly important if we intend to prevent a repeat of this problem.

This committee should be established immediately. For each day that we wait, the confusion surrounding the matter increases tenfold. And concurrently, while we dawdle, the morale of our servicemen grows considerably weaker, while public annoyance and bitterness on all sides gains a firmer foothold. Do we intend to wait until the situation is totally beyond recall, until our men's morale has plummeted to rockbottom, and until there is no hope that we will ever reveal every possible fact in this case?

Mr. Speaker, this case marked by confusion, lack of communication and mismanagement by the defense and CIA, is a festering sore which threatens to affect not only our judiciary system but our entire military structure and our civilian population as well. If we obtain all the facts in this case, however, we can arrest this infection and insure that justice is carried out.

I trust that we have enough foresight and convictions to prevent the erosion of our men's morale and insure that the case of the Green Berets does not become synonomous with a miscarriage of justice.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the Green Berets and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

COURT-MARTIAL OF THE GREEN BERETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my good friend, the distinguished Congressman from New Jersey, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr., who has taken this special order. I congratulate him for taking the initiative in airing the facts on the Green Beret case and for affording this opportunity to Members of Congress to hear all of the facts relating to this case.

Congressman RODINO is an outstanding lawyer. He is the third ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee. He has served his constituents and his country with honesty, ability, and dedication for more than 20 years. During World War II, as a captain in the U.S. Army, he served our country with distinction in the European theater.

As a lawyer, as a Congressman, and as a former officer in the Armed Forces, Congressman RODINO is particularly qualified to question the inaction of the Secretary of the Army and to demand that the Secretary assert his civilian jurisdiction in the Green Beret case as he is authorized to do under the existing law.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Congressman RODINO's condemnation of the recent attack on the Army's Special Forces. The obvious mistreatment of the Green Berets suspected in the alleged murder of Thai Khac Chuyen, a South Vietnamese citizen, must be explained in greater detail. As Mr. RODINO pointed out several weeks ago:

> I think it's a miscarriage of even military justice.

At issue in this case are the civil rights of the Green Berets. Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor has refused thus far to assert his civilian authority over the case. Instead, the Army proceeded to announce on September 17 that six of our Special Forces officers will be brought before a court-martial on charges of murder and conspiracy to murder.

To add insult to injury the Army has been reported to have locked up Green Beret Maj. Thomas Middleton, Jr., in a 5- by 7-foot cell with virtually no light or ventilation. His attorney, Mr. George Gregory, states that the confinement of his client under these "inhumane" conditions will only succeed in impairing his ability to assist in his own defense.

In another mysterious move Colonel Rheault, commander of Special Forces troops in Vietnam, was removed from his command and jailed on suspicion of murder. I might add that Colonel Rheault has been regarded with much respect and admiration. He has dedicated himself to a military career since childhood. He attended West Point and eventually became an officer of exceptional competence. In the course of the last few weeks he has been linked with all the mystifying rumors about the Green Berets' activities in Vietnam—most notably, that they are hired assassins and CIA "enforcers." Assuredly the credibility of these men and the Green Berets as a group has been assaulted.

In the absence of solid facts, rumors have given rise to dozens of theories to explain the killing and the Army's surprising harsh reaction to the incident. Some have said that the victim, Thai Khac Chuyen, was a close official in the South Vietnamese Government and perhaps a double agent.

One Green Beret rightly noted that the future of the organization is seriously in doubt:

> Why . . . should a bright young captain join the Special Forces when he sees Colonel Rheault, a fine officer and gentleman, slapped into a cell like a common criminal.

Any attempt to sweep this incident under the rug will never do. The integrity and sincerity of the men being held for these alleged crimes is of paramount importance. I do, therefore, feel that an explanation of these charges of premeditated murder must be aired and amended in the open. Justice must prevail.

It is in this spirit that I, and many of my colleagues in the Congress, join PETER RODINO in urging that the Secretary of the Army reverse his position and assert his civilian authority. Only by so doing can fairness, objectivity, and justice prevail in the Green Beret case.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished and able friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for his remarks on the Green Beret case and to express to him my appreciation for his kindness in yielding to me. I find myself in complete agreement with what he has said. I deplore the procedure which has been followed in this unfortunate case, and I strongly urge that the entire procedure be reconsidered before further harm is done. I do not know all the facts in the case. I am not certain that anyone does, but I am certain that the case has been mishandled and that great harm has been done to the morale of the services. The case deals with what happened to a traitor of the worst order—a double agent. The charges involve career servicemen, most of them decorated veterans of long years of service who time after time have been called upon to perform extremely difficult and perilous assignments. To subject them to trial in the press, to destroy their careers, to embarrass their families—as has been done—must be counted as inexcusable and extremely improper action. I join my colleagues in deploring what has happened and again I urge in strongest terms that the entire matter be returned to the Secretary of the Army for further consideration and hopefully for a more appropriate procedure.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I thank my distinguished colleague from Florida for his contribution, and I want to commend him for his devotion and diligence throughout the years in protecting the needs and wants of the servicemen of America.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate, as I know do all our colleagues who have spoken today, the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), who, as everyone knows, is one of the most knowledgeable men, not only in the Congress, but in the country, in the area of military matters. Like him, I do not know all the facts. I doubt that anyone knows all the facts except those directly involved in this matter.

Neither, Mr. Speaker, do I know any of the accused. One of them, Capt. Leland J. Brumley, is from Duncan, Okla., in my district. While I do not know Captain Brumley, I have talked with his wife and mother, both of whom live in Duncan. Also, I have heard from many of his friends and acquaintances from across the Nation. These are people who

knew him as a Boy Scout, as an outstanding young man, and as a brave and distinguished soldier. All of these people, Mr. Speaker, have the greatest respect and admiration for Captain Brumley and the highest confidence in him. I, too, have confidence in this brave soldier and in this brave soldier's brave family and am sure that whatever he may have done he did with the highest of motives out of great love for his country.

It has been said that some of us have undertaken to have the charges dismissed. That, of course, is a matter of judgment. It is clear, I think, that most of us have been pressing for the Secretary of the Army to assume jurisdiction and then decide whether the charges should be dismissed. It would be his decision then, based on the evidence which would be submitted to him. I feel that the Secretary of the Army should do all under the law he can do. He should preempt the jurisdiction of the field commanders. I commend my colleagues for what they have done in this regard both today and in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly wish to commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO). As has been pointed out, he has taken the lead in this matter in an attempt to insure fair and just treatment for these eight individuals. He has spent much time and energy on this case and I am sure that the accused men and their families appreciate his efforts just as we do. He has performed a great public service in calling this information to the attention of the American people.

TO CONTROL THE DRUG TRAFFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ROGERS of Colorado). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, this weekend the U.S. Government attempted to intercept drug smugglers all along the United States-Mexico border. These efforts included a search of every private vehicle crossing at land points, searches of aircraft entering at all ports, and so far as I can tell, an effort to search boats traveling between the two countries. Not one smuggler has been caught. But it also produced huge traffic jams along the border, which will inevitably cause the Government of Mexico to protest. Such large-scale searches cannot help but discourage the tourist trade on which Mexico relies, and cannot help but irritate the citizens of both the United States and Mexico. There is no doubt whatever that the illicit trade in drugs must be halted, but Operation Intercept is at best a palliative; it may prove spectacular, but in the long run far more basic changes in law enforcement are required before the great drug traffic will be appreciably reduced. More is needed than mere large-scale raids from time to time, which is what Operation Intercept essentially is.

Effective long term control of the drug traffic is an international problem, one that requires sound basic planning and the full cooperation of all governments concerned. That is why I believe that an international commission is required to study the illicit drug traffic, and to recommend and implement efforts to deal with it. The task force appointed by President Nixon to study the drug traffic has as one of its key recommendations "greater United States-Mexico collaboration" in action to control drug production and traffic, according to the New York Times and the Christian Science Monitor. As yet there seems to be little except for a tiny detachment of U.S. narcotics agents attached to the U.S. Embassy at Mexico City, which works with law-enforcement agents of the Mexican Government.

There is literally nothing being done at a higher level, except that the State Department is being urged to have its Ambassador to Mexico take the problem up with the Government of Mexico. I suggest that what is required is an effort at a much higher level, a joint effort that shows that the United States and Mexico are equally concerned, and will create action that will be effective and acceptable to both Governments. As it is, we are merely making headlines, stopping a little traffic and irritating a government that is willing to help, but which is not really being asked to collaborate.

Mr. Speaker, a kilo of marihuana sold from a farmer in Mexico to a wholesaler there nets the farmer $4—not much, but far more than any other crop he can raise. And that same kilo reaches a value of $75 in Los Angeles and $150 in Minneapolis. Is it any wonder that we have college students renting airplanes, buying a half ton of marihuana, and attempting to fly it home? This is a traffic where a $27,000 investment will buy 532 bricks of marihuana, which would sell at $75 per brick for a total of $40,000 in Los Angeles—or a minimum 50-percent profit. The attractions for our citizens are clear. And when you consider that the Mexican wholesaler in this case has a markup of from 1,000 to 1,200 percent—that is, selling bricks that he bought at $4 apiece for $50—it is plain why he is in business, too. A farmer who has very little hope of cash income except from marihuana is also inevitably drawn into the system. It is not a problem that can be halted by close border inspection; the economics of the drug traffic exist on both sides of the border. The powerful attraction of spectacular profits go far beyond anything that such tactics as Operation Intercept counteract or even deter. Only an international effort that reaches the very fundamentals of the production and traffic in drugs will approach the needs and give us reasonable hope to control this insidious traffic. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House should ask for realistic action, and that is action on an international basis, through an international commission.

I believe that articles in the New York Times dated September 21, and the Washington Post dated September 22, clearly show the need for an international commission for the study and control of the drug trade.

The articles follow:

UNITED STATES IMPOSES BORDER CHECKS IN DRUG DRIVE

SAN DIEGO, September 21.—The United States clamped a land, sea and air surveillance on 2,500 miles of the U.S.-Mexican border today in a dramatic move to cut off the flow of marijuana and dangerous drugs.

Federal agents said the pilot of a light plane carrying about 1,000 pounds of marijuana had been caught and arrested after he flew over the border and was followed by a government plane to an airport at Bakersfield, Calif.

With split-second timing "Operation Intercept" was not begun until all agents were at their posts. The government then started intensified inspection of vehicles and persons crossing the border at 31 land points and at 27 airports at which international flights are authorized to land.

The operation, utilizing radar, search planes, Coast Guard and Navy ships and a sharply augmented force of inspectors at crossing points covered the border of Mexico where it adjoins the states of California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas.

"Operation Intercept" went into effect at 5:30 p.m. EDT but some units had been activated earlier and the aerial smuggling was detected Friday night.

Officials identified the pilot as Michael Thomas Mitchell, 23, a student at the University of Washington. They said his rented Cherokee plane was loaded with suitcases and burlap sacks containing 532 bricks of marijuana weighing about two pounds apiece.

Federal agents said Mitchell told them he purchased the marijuana in Mazatlan, Mexico, for $27,000 and planned to fly it to Berkeley.

Mitchell was arrested when he landed to refuel by agents on the pursuing plane.

The federal announcement said the program would be continued for an "indefinite period," adding that the Mexican government was kept fully informed.

"The objective of the program is to reduce the volume of narcotics, marijuana and dangerous drugs which are smuggled into the United States from Mexico . . ." the announcement said.

Within an hour after the operation went into effect today at Tijuana, cars were backed up for blocks and honking furiously. All 16 customs and immigration lanes were being used but instead of searching perhaps one car out of 20, the inspectors halted all vehicles.

MEXICAN FARMERS DISCOVER BIG MONEY IN "GRASS"

(By Juan de Onis)

MEXICO CITY, September 17.—Thousands of small farmers have discovered that the real treasure of Sierra Madre is marijuana.

From Guerrero, a poor state southwest of here, to Sonora, which borders Arizona and California, the going price in the plazas of the isolated villages where marijuana is brought down from unseen plots on pack donkeys is $4 a kilo (2.5 pounds).

Dealers in the towns, with ready cash, small warehouses and friends in the local police, moisten the gray-green leaves and flowers with sugarwater, pack and re-dry them in one-kilo blocks, wrap them in cellophane or newspaper, and accumulate enough to prepare a truck lot for shipment.

Each one of these one-kilo blocks that reaches Los Angeles becomes worth $75. As it moves northward a kilo of marijuana can come to be worth $150 in Minneapolis.

Clandestine factories in Mexico reduce marijuana to the more potent hashish, which then sells for $500 to $650 a kilo.

For the thousands of small farmers in Guerrero, Jalisco, Nayarit and Sinaloa who supply the trade, cash income from marijuana of $500 to $1,000 a year is far more than they could dream of earning from any other crop on the poor soil.

For the successful dealers, the risks of arrest and prosecution under Mexican federal narcotics control laws have been relatively slight measured against the huge profits to

be reaped from moving marijuana, as well as more potent drugs, to the United States. Although all estimates in this area are guesswork, the marijuana and hard-drug traffic is probably a source of millions of dollars of income.

With the announcement last week of a major new drive by United States authorities to reduce the inflow of narcotics from Mexico, this traffic has become a highly sensitive issue in relations between the United States and Mexico, which share a border from Brownsville, Tex., to San Diego of 1,700 miles.

The traffic was one of the major points discussed at the meeting between President Nixon and President Gustavo Días Ordaz at the inauguration of the Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande nine days ago. Mr. Díaz Ordaz, like other Mexican Presidents, said that Mexico was aware of the seriousness of the problem and would cooperate in attempts to halt the illegal flow.

OTHER PROBLEMS STRESSED

In disclosing the discussion on narcotics, Mexican officials have also emphasized other problems in United States-Mexican relations, such as the treatment of Mexican migrant farm workers who enter the United States illegally but are employed for wages below union levels, and damage to irrigated Mexican farms near Mexicali from salt waste in the Colorado River originating in Arizona.

Tightened control of automobile and truck crossings by United States officials at border points went into effect today, with serious delay reported at the international bridge uniting Ciudad Juarez with El Paso, Tex.

The Mexican press, which closely reflects official views, has been critical of the decision by the San Diego Naval District to place Tijuana, across the line in lower California, out of bounds for uniformed United States servicemen.

There have also been pained editorial comments over a law passed by the California state legislature to prevent unaccompanied minors from crossing into Mexico. The intent was to reduce access to narcotics that are readily available in Tijuana and other border cities.

MAIN ROUTE FOR SHIPMENTS

Faustino Félix Serna, the governor of Sonora, said in an interview published by Excelsior, a major Mexico City newspaper, that United States actions were "not those of a good neighbor." He said that it was false that Mexico was the main source of narcotics reaching the United States from abroad.

A report to President Nixon by a United States task force on narcotics traffic, released in Mexico City by the United States Embassy last week, said that the main route for overland shipments from Mexico to the United States passed through the state of Sonora.

The report, submitted jointly by Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy and Attorney General John M. Mitchell, said that adequate inspection of northbound traffic on Route 5, which links Santa Ana, Sonora, with Mexico's marijuana-growing states to the south, would be an important step in "impeding the flow of these drugs to the border."

The task force called for greater United States-Mexican collaboration in the eradication of marijuana fields and poppy plantings, which are a source for heroin produced here. Mexico is also said to be a major trans-shipment point for cocaine from Andean countries in South America and for heroin from France and the Middle East.

The report also recommends that an agreement be reached with Mexico on the development of electronic sensory techniques, using satellites and aircraft, to detect planting of marijuana and poppies, and that aerial spraying of remote planting sites with chemical substances be adopted to supplement "search-and-destroy" action by the Mexican Army.

"When you consider that marijuana grows all over this country," an observer familiar with present practices said, "these forays destroy only a drop in the bucket. These are horse-and-buggy methods for a jet-age problem."

U.S. AGENTS AT WORK

A small United States team of narcotics agents from the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has been attached to the United States Embassy here for three years. They work closely with Franco David Rodriguez, Mexico's deputy attorney general, who is regarded as an energetic enemy of narcotics traffic, and the federal judicial police that have jurisdiction over such traffic.

Only about 25 judicial police agents are assigned to the narcotics problem, however, in this large country of 45 million people, where the spread of marijuana and hard drug usage among high school students is becoming a problem causing growing concern. Marijuana purchases in Mexico City night spots and cafes where students gather is virtually uncontrolled.

The task group called on the State Department to "persuade Mexico to place a program for eradication and control of dangerous drugs among the highest of its national priorities." It also said that the United States Ambassador, Robert McBride, should put this problem on his "highest priority list on a continuing basis."

However, Mexican and United States officials interviewed here after the Presidential meeting indicated that no basic agreements had been worked out on new methods to intensify drug control on the Mexican side, although the task force report was delivered to Mr. Nixon June 6.

Mexican officials said privately that the political implications of such methods as use of aerial chemical spraying had to be weighed carefully, particularly because of the United States involvement in the proposed effort.

The United States has supplied helicopters and small planes through grant aid to Mexico in recent years for aerial inspection and raids on inaccessible fields, but five of the helicopters originally supplied are reported to be down now to one in good operating condition.

TRUTH IN POSTAL RATES

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk about the administration's postal rate increase proposal but little actual interest or support for these rate increases on the part of the Post Office or other elements of the administration.

Frankly, attendance at the Postal Rates Subcommittee hearings has been so poor of late that last week I had to cancel out a scheduled hearing because of lack of attendance even though the witnesses from Chicago, Birmingham, Richmond, and other places were sitting in the hearing room.

The administration evidently feels that the rate increases will help rid the Post Office of its so-called deficit but, frankly, this is just a revenue producing measure that strikes hardest at the ordinary citizen because most of the increase is loaded on first-class mail. This bill will produce $663 million in postal revenue. Five hundred and fifty-seven million dollars of it would come from increasing the first-class stamp from 6 to 7 cents.

In order that my colleagues can read the truth about the rate bill, I would like to call their attention to the following article from a recent publication of the Democratic National Committee:

TRUTH ABOUT NIXON'S PLAN TO HIKE POSTAL RATES

While proclaiming a need to remove the Post Office Department from politics, the Nixon Administration has been playing what Wyoming Sen. Gale W. McGee describes as a "numbers game" in "seeking to hang around the necks" of the Johnson Administration a deficit in the postal budget.

Postmasters around the nation recently received from Washington "mimeographed orders" and a "fill-in form . . . to be disguised as original thought" for release to local newspapers, McGee told the Senate.

The Administration-authored "news" release stated that an "inherited" $1.2 billion postal deficit "compelled" President Nixon to seek postal rate increases.

CANNED RELEASE

McGee reported that postmasters were warned: "You have to exercise extreme caution so that this does not look like a canned operation."

"Apparently, somewhere downtown a conscious decision has been made to take this obviously partisan approach to the conditions in the Post Office Department, at the same time that we in Congress are being asked to take politics out of the postal service," commented McGee. "What kind of hamming up is this?"

To "answer the strange arithmetic and innuendo which the nonpolitical Post Office Department has engaged in," McGee compared the Nixon rate increase proposal with the recorded accomplishments of the Johnson Administration. The following is excerpted from his remarks as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"SLY OLD POLITICAL TRICK"

"In the first place, the $1.2 billion deficit is grossly misleading. The new administration has acquired the habit of referring to the postal deficit as $1.2 billion when it is proposing rate increases, and as about $600 million when it is requesting appropriations from Congress—a sly old political trick that I would not expect from sound business management.

"Of the $1.2 billion deficit cited in the President's first message on postal matters, $735 million is the direct cost of public services required by law to be paid out of the general fund of the Treasury and not from postal rates. The actual postal deficit is less than $500 million.

The Johnson rate increase in 1967 produced $518.4 million additional revenue from first-class mail; $49.7 million additional revenue from airmail; $33.2 million additional revenue from second-class mail; $6.4 million additional revenue from controlled circulation; $264.7 million additional revenue from third-class mail; $12.6 million additional revenue from fourth-class mail.

"The proposal from the Nixon Administration would produce, if enacted by July 1, just 56 days from now, $557.2 million additional revenue, or $39 million more from first class than the Johnson rate bill.

NOT ALL EFFECTIVE IN 1970

"The Nixon proposal recommends a $15.8 million increase for second-class mail; $17.4 million less than the Johnson rate bill, and only $300,000 of which would be effective in fiscal year 1970.

"The Nixon proposal recommends a 5-percent increase in controlled circulation, $6.4 million less than the Johnson rate bill.

"The Nixon proposal recommends a 5-percent increase in third-class mail, producing $63 million, $201.7 million less than the

Johnson rate bill, and only $37.5 million of which would be effective in fiscal 1970.

"The Nixon proposal recommends no increase in books and records, $12.6 million less than the Johnson rate bill.

"In all, excluding non-first-class mail, the Johnson rate bill raised rates by $396.2 million; the Nixon proposal by $105.8 million, of which only $74.3 million would have any effect whatever on the postal deficit in fiscal year 1970."

SUPPORT GROWS FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

(Mrs. DWYER asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that I have today introduced two bills, both identical to H.R. 13793, the Consumer Protection Act of 1969 which I originally introduced on September 15.

I am especially pleased that I have been joined on these bills by 28 of our colleagues as cosponsors. Together with the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN), who introduced an identical bill last week, this brings the total number of sponsors to 30.

Those Members joining us today are: Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MIZE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. WYDLER.

The broad support which the Consumer Protection Act of 1969 is receiving encourages the hope that our bill, or something very close to it, can be enacted into law during the present Congress, possibly even the present session.

That support starts with the premise, accepted by nearly everyone today, that the Federal Government has a responsibility to American consumers to help protect their right to safety and quality in the goods and services they buy and to assure their access to adequate and reliable information.

In determining that this protection be provided most effectively, the kind of organizational structure that is chosen and the depth of the Government's commitment are essential considerations.

Our bill meets the first test. It provides the permanence, the clear lines of coordination and authority, the simplicity of administration, the comprehensiveness and visibility, and the direct representation which consumer protection requires.

As for the commitment, enactment of our bill would be a major expression of congressional determination to advance the interests of consumers, and I am confident it would be supported by this and subsequent administrations.

Last week's hearings on this bill and the alternative bill to create a Cabinet-level Department of Consumer Affairs demonstrated the advisability of the approach we recommended. Witness after witness, including such recognized leaders in the area of consumer protection as former Food and Drug Commissioner James Goddard, former Presidential Assistants Esther Peterson and Joseph Califano, former USDA Administrator of the Consumer and Marketing Service, Rodney Leonard, and such consumer spokesmen as Ralph Nader, either specifically endorsed our bill or strongly indicated their preference for the principal provisions of our bill as opposed to the proposal for a new department.

The introduction last week of an identical bill by Congresswoman SULLIVAN, certainly one of the Congress' most notable leaders on behalf of consumers, was a further significant indication that we are on the right track.

The same can be said of the 28 colleagues who today are joining in the sponsorship of our legislation. It is especially meaningful to me that they represent both parties, all geographical areas, and the range of political and ideological opinion in the House.

It is also noteworthy, I believe, that over the weekend the principal sponsor of the bill to create a new department, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL), announced that he was preparing to revise his own bill by dropping his central proposal for a new department in favor of our principal feature, the proposed Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President.

All of this suggests very strongly the virtual unanimity of conviction in Congress that consumer protection legislation is both necessary and desirable and it indicates a groundswell of opinion that our particular method of assuring better consumer protection is the potentially most effective means.

I want to extend at this time my deep appreciation to our colleagues who have joined us today in introducing the Consumer Protection Act of 1969 and I urge others among our colleagues who share our concern to join forces with us.

AEROSPACE-AVIATION EDUCATION YEAR IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, Gov. Ronald Reagan proclaimed the 1969–70 school year as "Aerospace-Aviation Education Year" in California.

Because of his belief in the ultimate value of aerospace-aviation education and its future potential in the California public school system, Governor Reagan has taken the lead in this important field of endeavor.

As chairman of the Governor's Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force, it has become increasingly apparent to me that a realistic and well-rounded aerospace-aviation program can and will bring the excitement and success of our moon landing into the problem-solving process of today's society.

Knowing of the interest of my colleagues in education in all its forms, I am inserting the Governor's proclamation in the RECORD so that my fellow Members may be made aware of California's leadership in the field of aerospace-aviation education.

Governor Reagan's proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, The successful flight of Apollo 11 has kindled the spirit and captured the imagination of mankind as have few events in history, and was a demonstration of man's ability to soar beyond the limitations of earth and to achieve the apparently impossible; and

Whereas, Its success goes far beyond the beginning of space exploration and proves beyond doubt that in a creative society we can do anything we truly commit ourselves to do; and

Whereas, In January of this year I appointed the Aerospace-Aviation Education Task Force, which is chaired by Congressman Don Clausen, to study and submit recommendations on California's educational program in the field of aerospace and aviation.

Now, therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, Governor of California, do hereby proclaim the year beginning with the opening of our schools in September, 1969, as Aerospace-Aviation Education Year; and urge all educators in the State of California, at every scholastic level, and in every field of study, to: (1) enrich their own courses with aerospace-aviation material, (2) inform their students of the depth and breadth of career opportunities in aerospace-aviation—already the largest non-agricultural industry in California, (3) develop insights into the vital social factors involving aerospace and aviation with the lives of all Californians, (4) seize every opportunity to translate the excitement of our success in the moon landing to optimism for finding solutions to our pressing problems on earth and (5) prove again that cooperation is the best weapon against confrontation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this 19th day of September, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Nine.

RONALD REAGAN,
Governor.

Attest:

FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
THELMA E. SMITH,
Deputy Secretary of State.

TAX REFORM VERSUS SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the special interests are hard at work in the halls of Congress trying to maintain their privileged and unjustified tax positions. Because of the hubbub, it may be easy to lose sight of the fact that the House-passed tax reform measure was a response to a greater special interest group—a group that has systematically been ignored—the American middle-income taxpayer.

The tax reform measure is not everything that many of us wanted. In my opinion, it does not go far enough in the direction of tax relief. I wish to point out, however, that even though the measure is a compromise, it is a long overdue step in the direction of tax equity.

We dare not let the cries of the special interest groups dictate further action on

this measure. Simply because they are better organized, have louder voices, and have easy and frequent access to the means of mass persuasion, is no reason for Congress to relent on its goal of tax reform this year.

The status of the debate now raging over the House-passed tax reform bill was well summarized in the recent article in the Los Angeles Times. I append that article to my remarks with the hope that all Members will consider the points made therein as they parry the assaults of the special interest groups.

THE DILEMMA IN TAX REFORM

(By Ernest Conine)

A massive counterattack against the tax reform bill is under way in the Senate, and out of this campaign of attrition a Great Truth emerges:

The loudest and most politically potent defenders of tax "loopholes" are not the so-called fat cats whose tax returns are directly involved, but the museums, foundations, universities and charities who are beneficiaries of the wealthy man's tax deductible generosity.

To put the matter more harshly, we are being reminded that some of the most worthwhile enterprises in this country depend for their survivial——or think they do—on the perpetuation of stark inequities in the tax structure.

The Senate Finance Committee is told by spokesmen for private colleges that the tax reform bill, as passed by the House, would bring on their financial "strangulation" by discouraging contributions from wealthy donors.

A foundation representative objects that the measure, if enacted in its present form, would "probably constitute the death knell of the foundations as we know them."

The same warnings of impending doom are sounded by museum directors—and by local and state officials who are alarmed by a prospective change in the tax exemption of income from state and municipal bonds.

Undoubtedly the tax reform bill as passed by the House does have some rough edges which need smoothing. The measure may have gone too far in some respects.

If the reformers in Congress allow themselves to be talked or pressured out of the substance of their reforms, however, they—along with the Nixon Administration—may find that the "silent majority" of "forgotten Americans" will not in the future be silent, forgetful or forgiving.

There is no question but that the taxpayers' revolt which gave birth to the current drive for tax reform is basically a middle-class uprising.

Most of the taxes in this country are paid by people who work for a wage or salary ranging from $8,000 to $25,000 a year, and who have become convinced that they are getting the short end of the stick.

Unlike the poor, they get very little direct and visible help from the government and, unlike the rich, they do not qualify for fancy deductions that drastically reduce the actual rate of taxation on their incomes.

People in the middle brackets were particularly incensed a few months ago at the revelation that there are at least 150 individuals with incomes over $200,000 who do not pay one red cent in federal income taxes.

In outlining his own tax reform program last spring, President Nixon promised that, while "we shall never make taxation popular, we can make taxation fair."

The House took him at his word and then some. The reform package which was ultimately sent to the Senate went much further than the Administration had proposed—or desired—in demolishing tax shelters.

Take the example of a wealthy man who donates to a museum a painting for which he paid $10,000, but has since grown in value to $22,000.

Under present law, he is allowed to deduct the entire $22,000 fair market value—$12,000 more than its cost to him—although he has never paid a capital gains tax on the appreciation in value. If he is in a high tax bracket, his donation thus becomes not so much an act of charity as a profitable transaction.

Take next a man who inherits a fortune and invests it all in municipal bonds. Since the interest on the bonds is tax exempt, he can escape income taxes entirely.

The House bill would eliminate the first kind of tax avoidance, and severely curtail the second.

It may be true that, in the cases cited, the House approach would work an unacceptable hardship on museums which depend on the "generosity" of wealthy donors, and on cities which might find it difficult to sell their bonds.

But there is something fundamentally wrong when, in the name of culture, charity or municipal financing, an astute citizen with an enormous income is allowed to get by with paying a smaller share of it out in taxes than a school principal making $14,000 a year.

LAOS—THE ADMINISTRATION'S NEW VIETNAM

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation longingly awaits positive White House action which will bring about a significant extrication of the American presence from the combat now raging in Vietnam. Yet President Nixon's rhetoric flies in the face of statements by the Government of South Vietnam and regular figures on American military strength released by the Pentagon. Doubt and unease grow domestically as events abroad defy logic we are asked to believe at home. The President is consistently unavailable to the press, and the Nation is bewildered as to what is actually happening. Meanwhile, another situation is developing along ominously similar lines in Laos. It seems that the administration is allowing or perhaps even encouraging development of a second Vietnam there.

Certain facts are incontrovertible. American involvement in Laos is lengthy, sizable, overt, and growing. Abroad, the entire diplomatic and military community of all Southeast Asia is aware of what is transpiring. The administration is committing American Armed Forces of all kinds into Laos in combat roles. Yet the entire American population is given almost no information of a factual nature on this massive military commitment being made in their name. This is exactly what happened in Vietnam years ago, and it is utterly intolerable. Further, as questions are raised quite legitimately by the Congress, the administration shunts these inquiries aside with mumbling excuses and denials which are pure fabrications, to put it bluntly.

Fairy tales used to begin with, "Once upon a time." Now they commence with, "The State Department announced today." This time the Department of State, a contradiction in terms, tells us that the only American military personnel in Laos are the 19 members of the air attaché's staff in the capital of Vientiane. How grotesque can evasion become?

We now have an American air offensive in Laos approaching World War II dimensions—12,500 sorties monthly are being flown, which certainly matches the effort once mounted against North Vietnam. American advisers, civilian and military, are functioning on all Laotian military levels. Thai troops have made appearances in Laos, functioning under heaviest possible American air and supply support. We are now heaving $30 million annually into that country, and it will surely go the way of the mountains of cash we have dumped into South Vietnam. Is there no end to this insane stupidity?

In South Vietnam, the argument was advanced that ethnically, the Vietnamese could claim a right to create a national state. This does not hold water in the case of Laos. There is no national Laotion identity as we know it in the west, or even in other parts of Asia. Most of these tribal people simply wish to be let alone in order to grow and smoke opium. Red China looks right down the Laotian gullet. Yet we are seeking to create "a bastion of anticommunism" in her shadow, ignoring the basic dictum that any major power casts a shadow around its immediate geographical periphery. It is like building dikes of wet sand on a beach to keep the tide from rolling in. It is incredible political, economic, and military imbecility.

There are those in our Military Establishment who have long viewed Laos as a new Asian battleground, and it is obvious that the President of this Nation is lending an open ear to their arguments. Hit the North Vietnamese regulars who are stationed and operating in strength in some parts of that nation, they argue, and President Nixon listens.

How many American troops are there in Laos? What are they doing there? What are their combat roles, if any? Who are they responsible to? Who committed them there, and when? Are we operating with the Thai armed forces in that country? How fast is the war in Laos widening and spreading? To what extent is this involving American Armed Forces? Are any of them being killed or wounded, or are they mainly support advisers? Are there plans afoot for a widening of this surrogate combat? What role would the Armed Forces of the United States play in such a combat?

The Congress of the United States dares not allow this Nation to slip into a new Vietnam through a series of executive orders committing our Armed Forces in piecemeal, cumulative fashion. It is our duty to stand up and prevent this action by the administration. How dare any American government dare to do such a thing in light of the previous national reaction and present mood? The Congress can and must prevent it. We can and must require the administration to reveal what it is doing with American lives, American money, and American constitutionality.

SST APPROVAL—AN AMERICAN MASS TRANSIT CATASTROPHE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been formally announced by the White House that President Nixon has approved a further $96 million in Government subsidies for construction of two prototypes of an American SST, or supersonic transport. These two prototypes, to be built by the Boeing Corp., will cost in the neighborhood of $1.4 billion, with the National Government paying 90 percent of the entire cost. That means that the President today decided that the American taxpayer was going to pay the freight to the tune of another $96 million for a highly speculative, unnecessary private venture in the field of supersonic transportation. This decision is an unmitigated disaster for the entire Nation in the area of transit. President Nixon has succeeded in a few short months in turning our complete mass urban transit order of priorities around.

The SST is designed to move small numbers of people who can afford it across vast distances, such as the world's oceans, in a few short hours. Marvelous, although it will not aid masses of people who wish to travel. Further, what good is it to move people across an ocean in 2 hours when they will be stuck in traffic jams for 3 more hours? Is this sense? Then so should the city of Miami order 15,000 snowplows.

Further, the SST produces an intolerable sonic boom when it flies, breaking the sound barrier. Already, national monuments have been damaged in the western part of our country by such booms. Sonic boom tests were conducted over Oklahoma City, with devastating results to peace of mind and property. If an SST crosses a continent, it would leave behind it a network of 50-mile-wide bang zones, complete with shattered nerves and broken glass, to say the least. Nor does the feeble excuse that it would not fly over land sound credible, for commercially feasible routes would demand flight over land areas.

Costs of this plane are skyrocketing. Taxpayers have already heaved $600 million into this project. Private contractors are paying a mammoth 10 percent of the cost in this ultimate risky adventure. Further, the delivery date has slipped ever further backward, ignoring marvelous possibilities of new jumbo jets in terms of convenience and safety.

The jumbo jet can range further without refueling, which is a basic SST problem. It has no sonic boom, has no route restriction, is more spacious and comfortable, costs less in terms of fare and is lower in price per aircraft. It is estimated that a fleet of even 200 SST's would cause $3 million damage daily, complete with a sonic boom for 20 million people with each SST's continent-spanning flight.

The President ignores real problems of mass transit confronting the entire Nation with ever more pressing urgency. Our long-distance rail transportation is almost destroyed. Nothing has been or is being done about it. The mass urban transit trust fund, which would have allowed us to move people swiftly and in large groups in our urban areas has been ignored and destroyed by the President. Commuters to our cities may be damned, for all he cares. The chance to curb auto exhaust pollution in our cities through a Justice Department suit against major auto companies has been destroyed. Why? Because the administration did not think it was wise to let people know how auto companies, choking our cities with overpriced, unsafe cars, had conspired to prevent both development and installation of antipollution devices. The administration endorses the truck-train bill, which would allow larger, wider trucks pulling extra trailers to take to interstate highways of the Nation. It allows buses which consistently violate safety rules of the Government to ply the roads of our land.

In anguish, millions of people demand a solution to our transportation crisis. They ask for an end to auto pollution and less cars in the cities. They request better subways, trains, and passenger service. Instead, President Nixon decides to subsidize the SST, which is a rich man's toy, the ultimate in noise pollution and a taxpayer's assumption of the burden for the most risky private venture in transportation. The mule and cart are overloaded, as in the old story. Now the administration proposes to reform transport by placing the jackass in the cart.

FRESHMAN ECONOMICS—5: OUR DEVASTATED HOUSING INDUSTRY

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, as of this moment, our Nation's housing industry, one of the pillars of a once-prosperous economy, lies in ruins, victim of deliberately destructive economic policies being pursued by the Nixon administration.

Middle-class families are finding traditional home purchases more costly and younger houseseekers with minimal incomes find it unattainable because supplies of lower-priced dwellings are declining. We are facing a disastrous housing shortage, unheard of since the early days following the Second World War.

Hundreds of thousands of families must sell their own homes before they can consider purchase of a new one. Financing which previously made such deals possible is now out of reach due to disastrous interest rates. We are heading into a tunnel labeled "Depression," artificially created with malice aforethought by our fearless leaders, who would not know up-to-date economics if they stumbled over them in their council rooms.

Decline in housing starts has driven up cost of existing homes to an extent that the median figure rose from $18,750 in 1966 to $20,000, or about 7 percent. High interest rates mean the difference between owning or not owning a home to lower income families, especially younger ones. Yet the administration continues its self-defeating squeeze on these struggling people, mercilessly driving them to the economic wall, and forcing them to remain where they are. The once almost automatic guarantee of their own home has disappeared in the smoke of the devastating recession we are entering.

Savings and loan institutions are finding it more lucrative to utilize existing astronomical rates of interest in other areas than financing housing starts. It is estimated that for every $1 billion in funds shifted by them to commercial banks, there are 21,500 fewer housing starts in the short run and 80,000 fewer over the longer course. In January, housing starts were 1.9 million annually. In July, the rate had fallen to 1.3 million annually and the plunge downward continues unabated. It is believed by some observers that they will eventually drop below 1 million. Hundreds of thousands of Americans dependent on this basic industry are either out of work or heading for unemployment windows across the country, and the administration fiddles on.

Rich men's platitudes fill the air while American workers who depend upon full employment are given their walking papers. But in the eyes of people making and enforcing these policies, they are only working men, and do not matter. If they were corporations or wealthy people, they would matter an awful lot, indeed.

As millions of people across the country turn in increasing anger, bitterness, and disappointment, searching for the cause of their painful situation, let them know who and what is causing it. Labor unions have nothing to do with it. Only the administration's economic policies allowing high interest rates and cutting off money supplies are to blame. No capital is available for financing of these new housing starts. No Democratic President ever did this. We have had economic disaster created and prosperity annihilated in less than a year of Republican rule. Let these people who are losing their jobs, watching their paychecks shrink because of inflation and losing their jobs altogether look to the White House. For it is all coming from there and there alone.

How incredible that such policies can be followed with such determination by an administration which used such fine rhetoric when it ran for office. All any American has to do is glance around at multiplying and ominous signs of economic downturn and recession. Large corporations hide knowing grins behind their hands as their price rises fill financial pages of the Nation's papers. And every day in every way the people, who are paying the ultimate penalty, are told that all will be well if we wait a bit longer.

Until when, Mr. President? Till we are standing in bread lines or at the doors of soup kitchens? Till we are selling apples on street corners as so many did under another Republican President? Until mortgages start reverting back to the banks? Until factories close and the wind blows over another 1 million abandoned farms? Until people in rags and deprivation multiply across

the land, looking at the wealth concentrated in fewer and fewer hands?

Mr. Speaker, the administration is running the economy of this Nation toward a cliff marked "depression." It must be stopped.

REJECT CUT-AND-RUN POLICY

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has taken yet another step in his determined search for an honorable and lasting peace in Southeast Asia.

Last Thursday, he appeared before the United Nations General Assembly in New York and called upon the representatives of 126 nations to urge Hanoi to take part in serious negotiations which could end the war.

He reminded the U.N. members that many of them had urged that if only we halted our bombing of the north, peace would follow. Nearly a year has passed since the bombing of the north was stopped. Yet, the north continues its aggression.

The President noted that 3 months have passed since we began the process of troop replacement, signaling both our own genuine desire for a settlement and the increased readiness of the South Vietnamese to manage their own defense. Still there is no response from Hanoi.

The President again spelled out for all to hear our objective in Vietnam.

> What the United States wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing.

The President said—

> What North Vietnam wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing. What is important is what the people of South Vietnam want for South Vietnam. To secure this right—and to secure this principle—is our one limited but fundamental objective.

What is needed to end this war in a way that will assure self-determination for the people of South Vietnam is a willingness on the part of Hanoi to compromise. Thus far there has been no such response from Hanoi, no indication of a desire on their part for meaningful negotiations and compromise. It would appear that Hanoi is gambling that the advocates of "cut and run" in the United States will have their way; that Hanoi will be handed the victory it could not win on the battlefield; and that our South Vietnamese allies will be left to suffer the fate of their countrymen at Hue who were slaughtered and buried in mass graves during the Tet offensive of 1968.

I predict that President Nixon will be steadfast in his determined efforts to negotiate an honorable and lasting peace—a peace that will not lead to another "Vietnam" in some other part of the world in which today's 14- and 15-year-olds will one day fight.

I urge the Members of this body to reject a policy of "cut and run." Strong, vigorous, and outspoken support for our President's policy on Vietnam is our best assurance of a peaceful settlement that will not encourage further Communist aggression.

MORE ON THE 1969 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as in previous years Radio Moscow blasted our 1969 Captive Nations Week observance. Americans who participated in this latest successful event were painted as "dinosauros," "reactionaries," and "anti-peacemakers." These choice slurs are reserved for those who know the totalitarian Russians and their game well and cannot be fooled by their tactical gestures and blandishments. It has been common knowledge for many years now that the one propaganda weapon which the Russians seek desperately to destroy is the institution of Captive Nations Week. Judging by the growing success of this annual event, their chances are considerably less than zero.

To amplify previous data on the 1969 week, I submit these further examples of the week's activities and topics which prepossessed certain groups participating in the event. They are as follows:

First, proclamations of the week by Gov. William G. Milliken, of Michigan; Mayor Joseph J. Grzecki of Hamtramck, Mich.; and Mayor Antonina P. Uccello of Hartford, Conn.

Second, a press release and two informative letters by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on Russian persecutions in Ukraine.

Third, an address by Dr. Ku Chengkang, of the Republic of China, at the Philadelphia Captive Nations Week rally.

Fourth, releases, reports, and events of the Louisiana Captive Nations Week observance conducted by the chamber of commerce of the New Orleans area.

Fifth, an article by Father Denis Dirscherl on "Flaws in Red Russia's Armor," which was distributed during the week.

Sixth, also used and discussed at meetings during the week, an article and a letter in Svoboda and America, respectively, on the Washington Post's attitude toward the captive nations movement.

Seventh, accounts in the New York Times and the Sunday News on the New York Captive Nations Week rally.

Eighth, a report in the July 27 issue of the Free China Weekly on Dr. Ku Chengkang's itinerary during the week.

Ninth, authoritative accounts of the observance as assembled in the September issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin.

Tenth, an editorial in the Texan the Midland Reporter-Telegram, July 14, on "Captive Nations Week":

PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations of the world look with hope to the United States as the world's primary example of individual freedom.

Captive Nations Week provides an excellent opportunity for all Americans to voice in public their moral support for the freedom-seeking peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others. The observance of Captive Nations Week provides another tangible demonstration of the free world's support of the aspirations of the peoples of East-Central Europe and all other parts of the world where the love of freedom is subdued by iron rule.

There were never any plebiscites held on the question of voluntarily joining the Soviet Union nor have these nations ever renounced their independence and freedom to become Soviet satellite countries.

The citizens of Michigan share deeply the aspirations of all the captive nations for their national independence. We pledge to continue efforts to promote the right of self-determination and restoration of freedom, human rights, and dignity for all the people.

Therefore, I, William G. Milliken, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim July 13–19, 1969 as "Captive Nations Week," in Michigan and urge citizens of Michigan to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Michigan on this third day of July in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred sixty-nine and of the Commonwealth, one hundred thirty-third.

WILLIAM G. MILLIKIN,
Governor.

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Whereas, by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world, and

Whereas, the people of many nations throughout the world are enslaved by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism and deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties, and

Whereas, the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent, and

Whereas, the observance of Captive Nations Week calls attention to the tragedy of those enslaved by Soviet Russia and manifests to the people of the captive nations the support of the government and the people of the United States of America for their aspirations for freedom and national independence, now

Therefore, I, Joseph J. Grzecki, Mayor of the City of Hamtramck, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13th through 19th, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" and urge that it be observed as such in recognition of the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations, and I urge all citizens of the City of Hamtramck to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of these captive nations.

Given under my hand and seal at Hamtramck, Michigan, on this 1st day of July, A.D. 1969.

JOSEPH J. GRZECKI,
Mayor of City of Hamtramck.

PROCLAMATION—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 13–19, 1969

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North

Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others, and

Whereas, The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of people in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war, and

Whereas, The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Antonina P. Uccello, Mayor of the City of Hartford, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week and call upon the citizens of Hartford to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

ANTONINA P. UCCELLO,
Mayor.

[News release of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America]

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS PROTESTS TO U.N. ON RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION AND ARCHIVE-BURNING IN UKRAINE

NEW YORK, N.Y.—"Should you disregard our protest, you will certainly harm the prestige and purpose of the United Nations, to say the least, inasmuch as no nation or ethnic group in the world should be excluded from your consideration," stated Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in a protest to Secretary U Thant of the United Nations. The protest was in the form of a Memorandum to the United Nations today over the arrest of Archbishop Vasyl Welychkovsky of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Lviv, Ukraine, and over the burning of Ukrainian and Jewish archives and libraries in Kiev and Odessa recently.

The arrest of the Ukrainian Archbishop was reported by *America*, Ukrainian Catholic daily in Philadelphia, on February 21, 1969 and by *The New York Times* on February 27, 1969. The report has since been confirmed by reliable and unimpeachable sources.

The fire in the Church of St. George at the Vydubetsky Monastery in Kiev and at the Great Synagogue in the Ukrainian port of Odessa took place on November 26, 1968. In the Vydubetsky Monastery fire thousands of manuscripts relating to Ukrainian history, folklore and culture were destroyed, including documents of the Czarist and Hapsburg past when Ukraine was divided between Russian and Austro-Hungarian rule. In the Odessa fire a great library of Jewish documents was destroyed.

In its protest the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America appealed to the U.N. to establish a special Committee to investigate the violations of human rights in Ukraine and to make a strong demarche with the Soviet government to live up to its obligations as a signatory to the U.N. Charter and the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.

"For the continued abuse of Russian communist power in Ukraine would endanger the precarious situation behind the Iron Curtain and would provoke further disorders and unrest which could lead to a world conflagration," the Ukrainian protest concluded.

(Text of Protest to the U.N. Secretary General is attached.)

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 14, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We take the liberty of sending you herewith copy of a protest lodged with U.N. Secretary General U Thant by the Board of Directors of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, against the renewed religious persecution and against the destruction of Ukrainian historical archives and other documents by the Soviet government in Ukraine. The protest was voted unanimously by our Board of Directors at a meeting held on March 1, 1969 in New York City. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, founded in 1940, speaks on behalf of over two million American citizens of Ukrainian descent.

The protest to the U.N. Secretary General is based on reliable reports regarding the stepped-up persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the burning of Ukrainian archives, containing thousands of documents dealing with the history of Ukraine, its culture and folklore as well as archives containing Hebraic documents.

According to well-informed sources, the KGB, Soviet secret police, arrested on January 27, 1969 the Most Rev. Vasyl Welychkovsky, Archbishop of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Lviv, who went to confess a sick person. Scores of other arrests were made in several Ukrainian cities. As you know, the Soviet government destroyed the Ukrainian Catholic Church, forcing some five million Catholic faithful to join the Russian Orthodox Church. Although the church organization was annihilated, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian Catholics practice their ancestral faith secretly, for which they are being ruthlessly persecuted by Moscow.

Another method of Russian communist policy in combatting the aspirations of the Ukrainian people to freedom is wanton burning of Ukrainian libraries and archives.

On May 14, 1964 a fire destroyed the library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, with priceless records of Ukrainian folklore, literature and history, including documents of the period of the independent state of Ukraine, 1917–1920. On November 26, 1968 a mysterious fire destroyed the Church of St. George at the Vydubetsky Monastery in Kiev, along with rare manuscripts pertaining to the historical and cultural past of Ukraine. On the same day, November 26, 1968, another mysterious fire was reported to have gutted the Great Synagogue in the Ukrainian port of Odessa, destroying a library with priceless Jewish documents.

Knowledgeable specialists and analysts of Soviet affairs both in this country and in Europe regard these mysterious fires as attempts by the Soviet government to eradicate the Ukrainian national heritage, and to force some one million Jews in Ukraine into Soviet cultural assimilation.

It is to be recalled, Mr. Secretary, that both the Soviet and the Ukrainian SSR constitutions assure their citizens full religious freedom. The USSR and the Ukrainian SSR are also signatories to the U.N. *Declaration of Human Rights* as well as the Atlantic Charter which expressly prohibit the practice of such barbarities.

On March 8, 1968 when we protested the arrest and secret trials of Ukrainian intellectuals, John McH. Stuart, Jr., Deputy Director, Public Affairs, U.S. Mission to the U.N., wrote in reply:

"Ambassador Goldberg asks me to thank you for your telegram of March 4, 1968, bringing to his attention your resolution concerning steps by the United States to bring the question of self-determination in the Soviet Union to the attention of the United Nations.

"The United States Government is maintaining its uncompromising support for the cause of self-determination. On various occasions, United States delegates at the United Nations have taken appropriate opportunities to remind the USSR, and the world community, that the peoples within the USSR have the same right to self-determination which the people of so-called "colonial" countries possess, and we have urged the Soviet Union to permit the full exercise of this right. We shall continue to express this viewpoint emphatically as occasions arise.

"Please be assured that the denial of freedom from the Baltic to the Black Sea remains a matter of great concern. Our Government's policy continues to be one of support for the just aspiration of all peoples to determine freely the political arrangements under which they live."

We earnestly urge you, Mr. Secretary, to transmit our protest to the Hon. Charles W. Yost, our new Representative to the U.N., instructing him to raise the matter of the cultural and religious genocide of 45,000,000 Ukrainian people by Communist Russia during the debates on human rights in the U.N. and its associated agencies. We would also appreciate it if you would make this letter known to any other U.S. government department which you think should be informed of these latest developments in Ukraine.

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 14, 1969.

Hon. U THANT,
Secretary General,
United Nations, N.Y.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: The Board of Directors of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, an organization speaking on behalf of over two million American citizens of Ukrainian background and origin, at its meeting held on March 1, 1969 in New York City, decided unanimously to submit to you a protest regarding the religious and cultural persecution against the Ukrainian people being conducted systematically by the Soviet government on an unprecedented scale.

You will recall, Sir, that on December 7, 1968, we sent you a protest regarding the U.N. Human Rights Award given to Prof. Peter E. Nedbailo, delegate of the Ukrainian SSR to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, for "outstanding achievements in human rights." In asserting our most vigorous protest against granting the U.N. award to Prof. Nedbailo, a representative of a government which consistently violates the provisions of the U.N. *Declaration on Human Rights*, we termed your organization's step as "a mockery of justice for which the U.N. should not stand."

Our present communication to you is a protest against renewed religious persecution in Ukraine and the wanton destruction of Ukrainian monuments and historical archives by the Kremlin.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN UKRAINE

The Soviet Union is a signatory to the U.N. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, and it makes much of this fact in its massive propaganda drives outside the USSR. But within its own jurisdiction the Soviet government has been ruthless in eradicating the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church (independent of the Kremlin-controlled Russian Orthodox Church); it harasses and persecutes the Protestant denominations as well as the Judaic and Islamic religions.

As a signatory to the U.N. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, the Soviet government is bound to observe Article 18 of the *Declaration*, which reads:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of

thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

But how does the Soviet government observe this right in practice?

On February 27, 1969 *The New York Times* reported from Vienna the following dispatch:

"The Soviet security police in Lvov arrested the secretly consecrated Ukrainian Catholic Bishop Vasyl Welychkovsky, according to Kathpress, the Austrian Catholic press service.

"Kathpress said the arrest took place several weeks ago when the Bishop was on his way to a private house to receive confession from a sick man . . . Bishop Welychkovsky, a Redemptorist father, was among about 1,000 Ukrainian Catholic priests arrested and deported after the end of World War II. Since his return he has lived in Lvov on an old-age pension paid by the state, the Kathpress reported . . ."

Dealing with the same case, *America*, Ukrainian Catholic daily in Philadelphia, reported on February 21, 1969 that Archbishop V. Welychkovsky was arrested by KGB agents on January 27, 1969, when he went to confess a sick person. The arresting officers are reported to have said, "You will never see him again." After his arrest, the Soviet secret police made a search of private homes of several Ukrainian Catholic priests in Lviv and in other Ukrainian cities. In Stanyslaviv (now Ivano-Frankivsk) Soviet agents visited several Ukrainian Catholic nuns and distributed leaflets which forbade them to receive priests, help in baptisms or facilitate confessions.

"It is to be recalled that in 1945–46 when the Soviet troops occupied Western Ukraine, there were three Ukrainian Catholic Dioceses of Lviv, Peremyshl and Stanislaviv, and the territory of the Apostolic Visitator in Volhynia and an Apostolic Exarchate in Lemkivshchyna. Together with Carpatho-Ukraine, which was incorporated into the Ukrainian SSR in 1945, this compact Ukrainian territory contained approximately 5,000,000 Ukrainian Catholic faithful, 1 Archbishop-Metropolitan, 10 bishops, 4 dioceses, 2 areas of Apostolic Administration, 2,950 diocesan priests, 520 monastic and religious priests, 1,090 nuns, 540 seminarians, 3,040 parishes, 4,440 churches and chapels, 127 monasteries and convents, 1 theological seminary and 5 ecclesiastical seminaries.

"In addition, the Ukrainian Catholic Church possessed a great number of cultural centers, primary and secondary schools, institutes, publishing houses, libraries, welfare and aid associations, orphanages, student and youth leagues, and societies."

All these were ruthlessly destroyed in 1945–46 by the Soviet government, which simply put the Ukrainian Catholic Church outside the law. All the bishops were deported and tried in secret trials as "enemies of the people." Of all the ten Ukrainian Catholic Bishops only one survived. He is Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine, who spent 18 years in Soviet jails and concentration camps. Released in January 1963, upon the intervention of the late Pope John XXIII, he was allowed to travel to Rome, where he was made in 1963 Archbishop-Major of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and Cardinal in 1965 by Pope Paul VI.

The brutal destruction of the Catholic Church in Ukraine was deeply deplored by Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Orientales Omnes Ecclesias* (December 23, 1945) and later, in *Orientales Ecclesias* (December 15, 1952), and by many church and lay leaders of the western world.

Despite the destruction of the church organization in Ukraine, millions of Ukrainian Catholics remained faithful to their ancestral faith and continued to be Catholics by practicing their religion in secret. There exists an underground Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine, and the aforementioned Archbishop Welychkovsky is said to have been consecrated secretly.

The existence of the underground Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine was and continues to be a thorn in the Soviet side, and consequently the Soviet government relentlessly persecutes Ukrainian Catholics more than any other religious groups.

The intensification of religious persecution in Ukraine by the Soviet government was stepped up after the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact forces last August. During the brief period of "liberalization" under Alexander Dubcek, the Prague government had allowed the restoration of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Eastern Slovakia and released the Ukrainian Catholic Bishop, the Most Rev. Basil Hopko, from 13 years of communist captivity. The Ukrainian-language radio broadcasts and newspapers and magazines which were allowed the Ukrainian minority in Czechoslovakia aroused considerable fears and apprehension in Moscow, hence intensified anti-religious and anti-Ukrainian persecution. Official Soviet propaganda against the Ukrainian Catholic Church and Ukrainian culture in general was stepped up, linking them with the ideology of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" (Cf. *Kultura i Zhyttia* [Culture and Life], No. 6, January 19, 1969). A professor of the T. Shevchenko University in Kiev, V. Tancher, in *Pravda Ukrainy* (as quoted by the January 1969 issue of *Digest of the Soviet Ukrainian Press*), wrote:

"All churches served the interests of exploiting classes. But the Uniate church (Ukrainian Catholic Church) played a particularly reactionary role. Uniate believers desired opposition between the Ukrainian and Russian nations; they wanted to see the countries quarrel; they attempted to isolate these friends from each other. But religious differences shook the foundation of Ukraine's national unity . . ."

Clearly, such editorial and commentaries in the Soviet official press organs can mean only one thing: the Soviet government is determined to eradicate all traces of Catholicism in Ukraine.

DESTRUCTION OF HISTORICAL ARCHIVES IN UKRAINE

Another crime committed by the Soviet government in Ukraine which is the subject of our protest is the deliberate burning of Ukrainian archives, libraries and other centers of documentation of Ukrainian history, culture and ethnic heritage.

On February 20, 1969, *The New York Times* in an article, entitled "Archive Fires in Ukraine Stirring Suspicions of a Plot," by Peter Grose, reported extensive fires in the 17th-century monastery in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, in which priceless Ukrainian and Jewish archives were destroyed. The same night, as fire swept through the Church of St. George in the Vydubetsky Monastery in Kiev, a mysterious fire was reported to have destroyed the Great Synagogue in the Ukrainian port of Odessa, destroying a library of Jewish documents. The fire at St. George's Church in Kiev was the second time in recent years that archives of Ukrainian history had been destroyed by a large fire of obscure origin. In the first fire, in 1964, documents of Ukrainian history and culture were destroyed in the library of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. The official version was that an employee named Pohruzhalsky, an emotionally unbalanced person, set fire to the library; he was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment.

Dr. George Luckyj, professor of Ukrainian and Russian literature at the University of Toronto, was in Kiev at that time and witnessed the fire, which he subsequently described in the academic journal, *Problems of Communism*, (July–August, 1968) published by the United States Information Agency (USIA). Among the manuscripts destroyed were records of Ukrainian folklore, literature and history, including documents of the short-lived Ukrainian government of 1918–1920.

In the Vydubetsky Monastery fire on November 26, 1968, Ukrainian archives from the Czarist and Hapsburg past, when Ukraine was divided between Russian and Austro-Hungarian rule, were destroyed.

The renewed religious persecution and archive-burnings in Ukraine by the Soviet government are another phase of the general assault against the Ukrainian nation to break down its aspirations for freedom and national statehood. In 1965–67 the Soviet government conducted several secret trials of Ukrainian intellectuals whose calls for cultural freedom are often blended with their pride in the Ukrainian national heritage. Russian Communist masters of Ukraine denounce this interest as "bourgeois nationalism," and incompatible with the Soviet ideology. The existence of nationalist dissent in Ukraine is ascribed by reliable Western observers and analysts as one of the main reasons why Moscow decided to invade Czechoslovakia and suppress the liberalization movement in Prague, before its influence and effects spread across the Carpathian Mountains to Ukraine.

Your Excellency!

We appeal to you to earnestly consider our protest against the consistent and barbaric violation of human rights of the Ukrainian people by the Soviet government, a member of the United Nations and its permanent Security Council.

We cannot believe that the United Nations can remain indifferent to the persecution and oppression of the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia and still claim to be the organ of international justice and peace.

In Ukraine, where the U.N. *Declaration of Human Rights* is considered to be a subversive and seditious document, where men and women who demand the right of their native language are put behind bars as dangerous criminals—the Soviet government commits enormous crimes against human rights daily and thus is guilty of violation of the U.N. Charter and the U.N. *Declaration of Human Rights*.

The cause of international peace and justice would be served if you would look deeply into the matter of Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism in Ukraine.

We, therefore, respectfully suggest that you, Sir, as Secretary General of the United Nations and the custodian of peace and respect of human rights everywhere, do the following:

(1) Institute a Special Committee to Investigate the systematic violations of human rights and the persecution of the Ukrainian people and the national minorities in Ukraine by the Soviet government, a signer of the U.N. *Declaration of Human Rights;*

(2) Inform the representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations that the continuation of Soviet Russian infractions against the U.N. Charter and the covenant of human rights in Ukraine, contributes to the denial of human rights to a nation of 45,000,000 people, which practice is not only contrary to the United Nations Charter and the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights but against the constitution of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, which speak eloquently of the human and civil rights which allegedly each citizen of the USSR and Ukraine is free to enjoy.

Should you disregard our protest, you will certainly harm the prestige and purpose of the United Nations, to say the least, inasmuch as no nation or ethnic group in the world should be excluded from your con-

sideration. For the continued abuse of power by communist Russia in Ukraine would endanger the precarious situation behind the Iron Curtain, and would provoke further disorders and unrest which could lead to a world-wide conflagration which is not in the interest of the United Nations or mankind at large.

We are taking the liberty of sending copies of this protest to the U.S. Department of State and to each member of the United Nations.

Respectfully yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President.

ADDRESS GIVEN BY DR. KU CHENG-KANG AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE, INDEPENDENCE MALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JULY 20, 1969

This meeting in Philadelphia recalls memories of the spirit and example of Americans of previous generations who fought for freedom and overthrew a power that sought to enslave them. This gathering also serves as a reminder to all the people of the free world that they hold a grave moral responsibility toward the captive nations and enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

It was in this city in 1776 that the Declaration of Independence was adopted. The Declaration preaches the basic tenet that man has the inalienable right to be free. Americans have turned this article of faith into reality through actions that have called for the shedding of their blood, the flowing of their sweat, and the loss of their lives. This occurred when the United States twice took part in world wars; again, when she offered aid to peoples in all parts of the world in the post-war period to help them protect or attain freedom; and, most significantly evident, when Americans shed blood and lost lives in Korea and now in Vietnam. This American spirit of fighting to preserve their convictions long ago won the admiration and respect of all the peoples in Asia.

We in Asia have the most profound respect for these words of Thomas Jefferson: "The arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume we will, in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die free men rather than live slaves."

These words are more than apt in describing the sentiments of all the peoples at present oppressed or threatened by Communist enslavement. As an Asian, I wish to speak frankly to you about the expectations that we in Asia hold for the United States.

A critical question that now confronts the American leadership is how to end the Vietnam War honorably, while at the same time preserving the independence and freedom of the Republic of Vietnam. This is an end also devoutly hoped for by all the free peoples of Asia.

The fundamental reason why the Vietnam War has troubled the United States lies in the fact that Vietnam herself and the other free nations of Asia do not possess the necessary defense capability. Unless this defect is corrected, even if the Vietnam War is momentarily halted, the security problems of Vietnam and of Asia are still not solved.

The United States is an important member of the Pacific community of nations. A secure Asia constitutes a shield for the security of the United States. If Communist aggression is to be halted in Asia and the Pacific region, then the nations of this region must be encouraged to form an effective regional security organization, which organization will gradually assume a larger share of the burden of the United States in the defense of that region.

President Nixon has spoken out for a mutual security pact among the free Asian nations to cope with the Communist threat. We in Asia support this viewpoint and are united in our belief that the regional security organization produced by such a mutual security pact will definitely lighten the responsibility of the United States in resisting Communist aggression in that part of the world. This regional security plan is contingent upon American economic and military assistance with which the Asian nations may develop the military and economic capability for defense against Communist armed aggression.

The threat of war in Asia will significantly be reduced. Equally vital, however, is the American government's lasting firm stand, without lapsing over compromising with Communist tyrannies, to protect and inspire the morals of the Asian peoples in their fight against Communism.

I do not for a moment suggest, however, that the United States should take direct action against that Communist regime that is the source of all Asia's troubles. I believe that helping us of the Republic of China to build up our strength would prove the more effective means of cutting away that cancerous source of Asia's ills, just as the establishment of an Asian-Pacific regional security organization would be the most effective means of maintaining peace and freedom in Asia.

In his June 4 address at the Air Force Academy, President Nixon said that he believed "a resurgence of American idealism can bring about a modern miracle—a world order of peace and justice." A positive China policy on the part of the United States is crucial to the establishment of this new world order.

We appeal, therefore, to all nations of the free world not to tolerate a situation in which a billion people is enslaved. The free nations must unite to destroy the Iron Curtain, to set free all the captive nations and enslaved peoples, and to build a new world of security, freedom and peace.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE NEW ORLEANS AREA,
July 3, 1969.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Churches and Synagogues of the New Orleans Area.

GENTLEMEN: The 11th annual Captive Nations Week, established in 1959 by an act of Congress and subsequently proclaimed by presidents, governors of states and mayors of leading cities, will be observed July 13–19, 1959.

In a spirit of ecumenism, we are enclosing a special issue of the Immaculate magazine dedicated to the Captive Nations. Valuable source material for sermons and church bulletins may be found in the articles written by such churchmen as the Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, Lutheran minister who spent fourteen years in a Rumanian prison; Protestant minister Ladin Popov in "Bible Smuggler" Underground Evangelism; and Father Werenfried Van Straaten, founder of Iron Curtain Church Relief.

Sunday, July 13th: The Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area has scheduled Dr. Alexander Sas-Jaworsky, refugee from the Ukraine, and Cuban refugee Leonardo Villalon to speak over radio WTIX (690) from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. Dr. J. D. Grey, pastor, First Baptist Church, has invited Dr. Sas-Joworsky to attend, be introduced and speak briefly at the 7:00 p.m. service, which is carried by radio WSMB (1350). Other features to be announced.

In connection with Captive Nations Week the suggestion is offered *that church calendars for July 13th* include a paragraph requesting prayer during that week for the one billion captive peoples under Communist rule.

Sincerely,

ALTON OCHSNER, Jr., M.D.,
Chairman, Americanism Committee.

[From the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce News Bulletin, July 11, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE SET

The Congress of the United States in 1959 passed Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and invited the people of the United States to observe the event with appropriate programs, ceremonies and activities expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence. Mayor Victor H. Schiro has proclaimed the annual observance here and Governor John J. McKeithen has proclaimed the observance throughout Louisiana. Dr. Alton Ochsner, Jr., chairman of the Chamber's Americanism Committee, said that the observance here will be highlighted by a WTIX (690) radio program from 9:30 a.m. to 11 a.m. on Sunday, July 13. Featured speakers will be Dr. Alexander Sas-Jaworsky, refugee from the Ukraine, and Leonardo Villalon, refugee from Cuba. Dr. Ochsner added that the Americanism Committee has suggested that church calendars for July 13 request prayer during the week for the one billion captive peoples under communist rule.

[From the Jennings Daily News, March 1969.]

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Dr. Alexander Sas-Jaworsky is recognized nationally as an unofficial Ambassador of the enslaved Ukraine, and all other Captive Nations.

His life story reads like fiction: Born 53 years ago, came to this country in 1949 and began his job as a dishwasher in the Valley Forge Military Academy. In 1954 he became a citizen of this great country. In 1957 he appeared on the $64,000 Question Show on the category of American History winning $136,000. He was awarded Man of the Year of the Professional Society of North America; outstanding Immigrant of the 1949–1959 decade; he received a gold medal of Americanism from the Daughters of the American Revolution. He was named Lion of the Year; he received an award from the National Red Cross for outstanding services; over 60 cities in the United States and Canada named him an honorary citizen.

Among his hundreds of plaques, recognitions and citations, from civic organizations such as the Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Sas treasures the most being an honorary member of the Louisiana State Senate, and also an honorary member of the United States Congress.

Dr. Sas has delivered over 2100 lectures to colleges, universities, high school student bodies, civic and religious organizations.

Dr. Sas is a son of a Catholic priest of the Byzantine Rite and the father of five American born children.

Let me present you Dr. Alexander Sas-Jaworsky, the most awarded foreign born American.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, July 17, 1969]

RESIST SOVIET AGGRESSION, EX-UKRAINIAN WARNS UNITED STATES

An Abbeville veterinarian who was born in the Ukraine called for the United States to resist Soviet aggression throughout the world.

Dr. Alexander Sas-Jaworsky, who was forced to work for both the Germans and the Russians during World War II when the two enemies took turns occupying the Ukraine, was in New Orleans to observe the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, which was established by an act of Congress in 1959.

Dr. Jaworsky stressed the fact that he is opposed to all forms of totalitarian rule but feels he would be wasting his time fighting fascism, which he called a "dead issue."

The Soviet Union, however, despite its recent friendly overtures to this country, has always had the goal of "overthrowing our government—by force if necessary—and establishing a Soviet-ruled United States," according to Dr. Jaworsky.

A resident of this country since 1949 and a citizen since 1954, Dr. Jaworsky was familiar with American history long before he moved here.

"History is my hobby," he said, adding, "Ukrainian kids know much more about American history than do American kids. That's one of our weak points: Ignorance. We don't know and we don't want to know."

Dr. Jaworsky is proud of the fact that all five of his children were born in the United States. And he can say, "I believe in American democracy."

The 53-year-old "unofficial ambassador of the enslaved Ukraine" said that along with pictures of Nazi atrocities from a quarter of a century ago Americans should be shown examples of Soviet outrages which are being committed now.

He cited the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia as one such outrage.

The independence of such Soviet-occupied lands as the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Czechoslovakia is "necessary for our security," said Dr. Jaworsky.

On the subject of Vietnam, Dr. Jaworsky said that although "the Vietnam war is the most nonsensical war in history because we started a war we had no intention of winning," complete American withdrawal from Vietnam would be a "disaster" to the rest of Southeast Asia.

He said the best solution for ending the war there would be for South Vietnam, using American weapons but not American troops, to invade North Vietnam.

Asked about the possible outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Communist China, Dr. Jaworsky replied that we should determine "how real" the Sino-Soviet split is and then "aid China now. We should play politics to help the weaker one."

Dr. Jaworsky called for Congress to pass a resolution which would create a special House committee to study captive nations and establish a Freedom Academy.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Maud O'Bryan)

It's has been estimated that one billion people live behind the Iron Curtain. The 11th annual observance of Captive Nations Week is being observed July 13–19. The Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce asks all churches and individuals to observe this week by praying for the one billion captives under Communist rule.

[From the Clarion (New Orleans, La.) Herald, July 10, 1969]

THE ARCHBISHOP SPEAKS . . .

(By Archbishop Philip M. Hannan)

Is there any need this year to observe Captive Nations' week? Isn't Communism gradually granting more freedom, especially freedom of religion? Let's look at the situation.

"There is no persecution of religion in Yugoslavia. Of course, a young man won't get ahead at all if he believes in God. He won't do anything except hand labor if he doesn't believe in the party and renounce religion."

This was a report that came from Yugoslavia, the country that first "broke away" from the control of Communist Russia. In fact, our country believed that it was so valuable to encourage this schism among the Reds that our country contributed over a billion dollars to Yugoslavia to help it maintain its "independence" from Red Russia.

The matter-of-fact attitude, the casual acceptance of the official repression of religion is the striking aspect of the matter in a country that is not even behind the Iron Curtain. The attitude behind the Iron Curtain, especially in Russia, is as intolerable as the authorities dare to make it. Naturally, they keep open a few churches, as stage-props, to prove that there is "religious freedom" in Russia. Father Elmo Romagosa reported on this fact recently in the CLARION Herald after his trip there.

They can afford to be "tolerant" of the remnant of instructed Christians left. The remnant reminds us that after World War II the whole hierarchy of the 4,000,000 member Catholic Church in the Ukraine (the Byzantine Rite) was destroyed except Metropolitan Joseph Cardinal Slipyi. I well remember the emotion-packed scene at the Vatican Council when he entered St. Peter's after his release by the Reds.

Despite the few "believers" left in Russia, the Reds savagely persecute those who become active in spreading the Gospel of Christ. The case of Aida Skripnikova, a Baptist, illustrates this. She was first arrested on Dec. 31, 1961, for distributing 46 handwritten New Year cards with biblical quotations. She was arrested three more times for the "crime" of distributing Bibles or religious literature. The fourth time she was arrested was on April 12, 1968, Good Friday, and she has not been seen since.

Where there is no religious freedom, there is no hope of any other type of freedom—political, cultural, social, economic. Freedom of religion is the heart of freedom. If a man is not free to worship God he is not free in any sense.

This was the reason that prompted the declaration in 1959 by President Dwight D. Eisenhower of Captive Nations' week, which is observed this coming week, July 13-20.

We rally to this call by praying for those deprived of freedom back of the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain. They are our brothers in God, whether they are Russian, Chinese, Hungarian or Polish. We suffer with them, begging God to give them the blessed freedom for which they were created. "For as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, many as they are, form one body, so also is it with Christ . . . and if one member suffers anything, all the members suffer with it, or if one member glories, all the members rejoice with it." (1, Cor. 12, 12-26).

We can do more for the cause of freedom than pray for its triumph. We can practice it. This is the ultimate vindication of the cause of freedom—the practice of fredom. "Live as free men, yet not using your freedom as a cloak for malice but as servants of God." (1 Pet. 2, 16-17).

The cause of freedom is secure only when men use it for God's purpose. We use it foi God's purpose when we support the relief of the needy, when we believe that any man, regardless of his color or national background, has equal opportunities in the hiring halls, in offices, in purchasing a home, in educational facilities. The practice of freedom in this sense has an irresistible attraction for all men. There is no substitute for it and counterfeit freedom is subverted freedom.

It is to the great credit of so many black leaders in Africa among the new nations that they have recognized the inherent denial of freedom in Communism. From Ghana, to Kenya, to Tanzania—from west to east—they have rejected the fake claims of Communism. The late and respected leader in Kenya, Tom Mboya, was a typical example of this. I remember speaking with him and hearing his strong views on this matter. He was a labor leader and at one time had leftist leanings but he was shrewd and sincere. He saw through the perfidy of the Communists and chose God's freedom. May God grant him eternal rest.

We owe it to God to support here, and everywhere, His freedom so that all men can enjoy as equals the brotherhood in Christ.

[From Our Parish Family Caller (Violet, La.), July 13, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

WTIX (690) From 9:30 to 11:30 AM, July 13, has scheduled special program for interested radio listeners to refugees from the Ukraine and Cuba, observing gratefully Captive Nations Week! We request prayers for the one billion captive peoples under communist rule—from July 13 to 19, 1969. Thank God that we do not live in a Captive Nation!

[From the New Chicago, March 21, 1969]

THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(By Lev. E. Dobriansky, New York: Pageant Press)

It's time to zero in on the weakness of the Russian bear. That's the theme of "The Vulnerable Russians", by Professor Lev Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. In an age of computerized analysis and mass-research facilities, books which do not make the headlines at once or do not have the backing of a publicity bonanza are often relegated to the dusty shelves of the publisher and the libraries.

"The Vulnerable Russians" warrants some special considerations. The volume merits attention not because it has any startling facts or new appraisals of the Russian scene, but because of the peculiar concepts that the author develops in presenting his account of the Soviet grip on the political and economic fate of the various peoples and nationalities officially living under the banner of the hammer and sickle.

The notion of the "captive nations" provides the superstructure of this volume. The substance of the book is explained by way of this concept.

Professor Dobriansky originated the idea of Captive Nations Week in the late '50s and, each year in July, this week is commemorated in the United States as a result of an Act of Congress in 1959.

The response of the Soviets to this annual event is particularly enlightening and informative of the ideological make-up of the Soviet camp. In July, 1965, for instance, Michael Suslov, chief Party theoretician, commented on the observance of Captive Nations Week:

"Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But this will never happen."

This response, a typical Soviet approach, means to accuse others of what the Communists either are perpetrating themselves or planning to put into practice.

One of the major emphases of the Captive Nations concept is to bring out into bold relief the gun barrel philosophy of the Soviet and its allied powers.

Unquestionably much of the Communist success in the past has been achieved because of this old philosophy. As Mao Tse-Tung once said, "Every communist must grasp the truth that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun . . . in fact we can say that the whole world can be remolded only with the gun."

The bulk of Soviet and other Communist acquisitions and annexations have resulted from a three-pronged attack: by force through overwhelming military superiority, internal infiltration, and political blackmail.

Soviet imperialism started in the early 20s with the Outer Mongolia area. Poland was partitioned in 1939; Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and a portion of Finland followed in 1940; Bulgaria and Albania in 1944; Hungary, Yugoslavia, Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands

in 1945; Rumania in 1947; Czechoslavakia in 1948; East Germany in 1949, followed by North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba in the 50s.

Paradoxically, it is interesting to note that, though the Soviets base their world outlook on Marx's philosophy, Marx himself held Russia in low esteem, chiefly in military and diplomatic matters. According to Marx, the only way to deal with Russia was the fearless way.

Writing for the *New York Tribune*, April 19, 1853, Marx says: "What had to happen? The ignorance, the laziness, the pusilanimity, the perpetual fickleness and the credulousness of Western Governments enabled Russia to achieve successively every one of her aims."

According to Marx, Russia's covetous power-policies have a long tradition. "In the first place the policy of Russia is changeless, according to the admission of its official historian, the Muscovite Karamzin.

"Its methods, its tactics, its maneuvers may change, but the polar star of its policy—world domination—is a fixed star."

Marx called Russia "decidedly a conquering nation." Marx summarized Russia's spirit of aggrandizement under the categories of Imperialism, Pan-Slavism, and Oriental Despotism.

The nationality question also has a major function in the Captive Nations concept. Here it is important to recall that the words "Russia" and "Russian" have been bandied about in the past with little care for necessary distinctions and explanations. The Soviet Empire is made up of many different nationalities. These other nationalities play an important factor in the character of the Soviet Empire.

Professor Dobriansky elaborates on this fact. He says, "I repeat, Russia itself would be only a second or third-rate power. Economic parasitism and exploitation enable it to bluff diplomatically a great power status, and most amazing is the degree to which Free World powers have fallen for this."

Dobriansky then highlights the advantages which Soviet power has reaped from these countries that have been swept forcefully into the Soviet orbit and used as buffer zones to the West and as objects of exploitation.

Other crucial notions suggested or brought out in "The Vulnerable Russians" include the role of wordsmanship and propaganda, Russification, the emasculation of Marx and Marxism, and the general cold war apparatus that the Soviets have built since the Bolshevik take-over.

In his book, except for excessive repetition, Professor Dobriansky has done well in attacking the weakness of the Soviet power machine.

From time to time we need to recall that the opposition is not an almighty force in spite of the facade that the Soviets have often erected. All the concrete walls, war zones, barbed wire fences, guard towers, trenches, empty wastes, and no man's lands betray the rapacious nature of the Soviet Empire.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, Mar. 29, 1969]

THE WASHINGTON POST AT IT AGAIN

NEW YORK, N.Y.—"The Washington Post," an outstanding American newspaper, well-known for its acerb anti-Ukrainian editorials before the unveiling of the Shevchenko statue in Washington in 1964, came out again with a powerful feature article casting a shadow of doubt on the Ukrainian liberation movement.

In his article, "The Ukraine: Questing for Pride," Stephen S. Rosenfeld, staff correspondent (who also spent some time in Moscow a few years ago), starts off by stating that "the American black community has its counterparts in many places, and not least in the Ukraine, 'a state' in the Soviet Union . . ."

He then proceeds to throw in a mixture of some "100 national minorities," and the Great Russian fear of national disintegration at "the edges." He dwells on Ukrainian "nationalism" (always in quotation marks!) and says that "the Ukraine" is the largest non-Russian republic. "Its culture and history offer the stuff of national identity for those who seek it." This means, according to him, that apparently, Ukraine has no objective basis for national statehood; he ignores the fact that the Russian Imperial Academy in Petrograd recognized the separateness of the Ukrainian language in 1908; that the Russian Provisional Government had recognized the Ukranian Central Rada, and that the Soviet of People's Commissars recognized the Ukranian Central Rada public in 1917, as did the Central Powers in 1918, and that Lenin always spoke of Ukraine and Finland as two non-Russian nations which must be given freedom and national independence.

"POOR REPUTE IN U.S.A."

Then, Rosenfeld writes:

"The Ukraine has not enjoyed a very high repute in the United States. For one thing, many Russian, Jewish and Polish immigrants brought to this country a condescending view of Ukrainians, formed on European soil. Moreover, the organized Ukrainian-American community is dominated by men with ties to the Western Ukraine. Washington's Lev Dobriansky, author of 'Captive Nations Resolution,' is prominent among them. They tend to favor Ukrainian statehood, which would mean the dismemberment of the Soviet Union, and in pursuit of this goal they have practiced the harshest tactics of the cold war. Hence they have set themselves apart from the mass of Americans who, unconcerned with Ukrainian affairs per se, desire better relations with the Soviet Union . . ."

Again, Rosenfeld implies that only "men" from Western Ukraine, and their descendants favor Ukrainian statehood, thus disparaging against Ukrainians from Eastern (Soviet) Ukraine, whom he light-heartedly labels as "traditionally Russian-oriented," which historically is untenable.

Apparently, the writer knows little of the Ukrainian National Revolution of 1917–1920, and the fact that it was these "Russian-oriented" Ukrainian patriots who broke away from Russia and proclaimed the independence of Ukraine: Hrushevsky, Petlura, Vynnychenko, Doroshenko, Porsh, Mikhnovsky, Shvets, Makarenko, Hermaize, Lototsky, Mazepa, Martos—and hundreds and thousands of them. That does not mean that Western Ukrainians did not play an important part in the general Ukrainian movement for national rebirth!

For good measure, Rosenfeld then proceeds to discuss the ferment among Ukrainian intellectuals, citing the writings of Karavansky and Oles Honchar ("Sobor"), and the protests of Ukrainian students from Dniepropetrovsk. It's all to the good. But as an "instant expert" on Ukraine, Rosenfeld contributes to the general confusion dominating our mass communication media by talking about the sanctity of "Mother Russia" and implies that 46 million Ukrainians should not aspire to their God-given right to freedom.

In the matter of Ukrainian-Russian relations, British specialists are far more objective and are unbiased. For instance, "The Times" of London (January 30, 1969), in reviewing "The Chornovil Papers," wrote:

"The 'Away-from-Moscow' polycentrism—which has been manifesting itself not only in a vast and rich country like the Ukraine, with a population of more than forty million, but also in Georgia, Armenia and even 'backward' countries like Bashkiria. . . ."

Of course, "The Washington Post" has been on record as favoring freedom to only a few countries outside the USSR, and it has a particularly psychopathic antipathy toward Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

[From "America" (Philadelphia), April 3, 1969]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. Rosenfeld's article of March 14, 1969 "The Ukraine Questing For Pride" was interesting but quite disappointing in content and message and clearly demonstrates the ignorance and misconceptions which continue to abound among the Post's editorial writers when writing on matters regarding the "Soviet Union." After the Post's stunning defeat in attempting to block the erection of the Shevchenko statue (Ukraine's poet laureate) and its inability to succeed in negating Captive Nations Week through its annual downgrading of the Week, one would hope that finally, the Post has become more knowledgeable and sophisticated in its views regarding the "Soviet Union." Unfortunately, most of the old myths still linger in the minds of the Post's writers.

One immediately gets the feeling on reading the article that perhaps the subject article should have been entitled "Ukraine: Questing For Freedom." A great deal is made of "pride" in the article as related to Ukrainian "culture, history and language." But doesn't it inherently follow that such intense pride in the rudimentary elements, which form the basis for distinguishing one nation from another would concurrently include a strong and immediate desire for national independence and self determination and an equal place among the family of free nations? This follows as surely as night follows day.

The Post's answer to this line of reasoning surely would be a resounding NO with the explanation that such an event would upset delicate east-west relations and in this day and age a desire for freedom should manifest itself only in nations not under the control of Soviet Russia. Or, to use the Post's own words this would be "practicing the harshest tactics of the cold war." To the Post's way of thinking I suppose the wars of liberation past, present and future conceived and supplied by Moscow largely from the resources of its vast empire costing Americans billions of dollars and rivers of blood are mild tactics in the cold war.

The vital distinction between nation and state apparently still hasn't been grasped by the Post. Ukraine is given a regional connotation throughout the article being described as "the Ukraine" and also a "state" in the "Soviet Union" rather than a conquered nation forcibly included in the "Soviet Union." Moreover, the article attempts to convey the impression that the Soviet Union is composed of "more than 100 national minorities" leading the reader to conclude therefore that apparently the Soviet Union is composed of more than a hundred tiny nations. These so called "minorities" taken together comprise more than half the total population of the Soviet Union with approximately 90% of this majority ethnically identifiable as belonging to one of a dozen non-Russian nations included in the Soviet Union. The remaining 10% would constitute the more than 87 national minorities quoted by the Post which include a scattering of groups of people which do not possess the necessary historical elements to constitute a nation.

To correct a few more of the numerous inaccuracies in Mr. Rosenfeld's article, (1) support was not bought by Moscow with a permissive nationality policy in Ukraine after 1917 but by the authority of the conquering Russian army, (2) the Ukrainian liberation movement was born in the "Orthodox and traditionally Russian oriented eastern Ukraine." Prominent leaders of the movement were Eastern Ukrainians such as Schevchenko who I'm sure is no stranger to the Post. Western Ukraine fell under the Austro-Hungarian Empire so Western

Ukrainians had very little direct contact with the Russians.

Perhaps the most offensive passage in the article is the renewed attempt of the Post to stir up feelings of Americans from different ethnic backgrounds toward Americans of Ukrainian background. After failing miserably to evoke similar response from Americans of these diverse backgrounds during the Post's attack against the erection of the Shevchenko statue it is surprising that the Post is still trying. This passage is an affront to all Americans of Ukrainian background. Surprisingly, the Post now includes Russian immigrants among those offended. Russian immigrants enjoying the blessings of freedom and the American way of life should be in the forefront of promoting freedom and independence for the nations held captive by Soviet Russia. But to the contrary, eager to perpetuate the "Holy Mother Russia" complex, these same Russian immigrants prefer to deny non-Russian captives their aspirations for freedom and to discredit their contributions to the GIP, i.e., gross imperial product.

The Post's article on Ukraine at least does devote a good deal of space to pride among Ukrainians in their own history, language and culture. Perhaps in due time the Post may learn that such intense pride logically can lead ultimately and only to freedom and independence.

Hopefully,

WALTER PRETKA.

ROCKVILLE, MD.

[From The New York Times, July 14, 1969]

350 RALLY IN PARK TO DECRY RED RULE

About 350 people dressed in the colorful aprons and wide trousers of European folk costumes gathered in Central Park yesterday morning to solemnize their continuing opposition to Communist rule over "captive nations."

"It is easier for us to break the bonds of gravity which God has forged than it is for us to break the chains of cruelty, prejudice and tyranny that bind many people on earth," the Very Rev. Serhij K. Pastukhiv, administrator of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Exile, told the people who grouped around the bandshell near 72d Street.

As part of the tenth annual observance of Captive Nations Week two organizations sponsored different meetings here yesterday.

One of them, the Captive Nations Week Committee, which arranged the program of speeches, folk dances and songs in the park, includes among its long list of captive nations such countries as North Korea, Cuba, and formerly independent areas like the Ukraine and Byelorussia now in the Soviet Union.

The other group, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, held a mass simultaneously at St. Patrick's Cathedral at 10 A.M. It limits its opposition to Communist control of European countries, such as Rumania and East Germany.

[From the Sunday News, July 13, 1969]

CITY TO HONOR CAPTIVE LANDS AT PARK RALLY

Captive Nations Week, the annual commemoration of those nations and peoples living under Communist rule, begins here today with church services, a rally in Central Park and a luncheon at the Commodore Hotel.

A Mass for the captive nations was to be offered at 10 a.m. at St. Patrick's Cathedral and similar services were to be held an hour later at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

At 10:30 a.m., the Very Rev. Serhij K. Pastukhiv, administrator of the Ukranian Orthodox Church in Exile, was to open the Central Park ceremonies at the band shell with a prayer for the success of the American Apollo 11 moon mission.

"It is easier for us to break the bonds of gravity which God has forged," said Father Pastukhiv, "than it is for us to break the chains of cruelty, prejudice and tyranny that bind many people on earth."

After the prayer there will be an address by Yaroslav Stetsko, former prime minister of the Ukranian Republic, one of 28 captive nations, and folk dancing by groups wearing their national costumes.

The 1:45 p.m. reception and luncheon at the Commodore is sponsored by the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations. On Tuesday Deputy Mayor Robert Sweet will issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation at City Hall.

[From Free China (Taipei, Taiwan) Weekly, July 27, 1969]

NIXON URGED TO REAFFIRM NONRECOGNITION OF PEIPING

Ku Cheng-kang, president of the China chapter of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, has urged President Richard Nixon to reaffirm the U.S. non-recognition policy toward the Peiping regime.

Ku made the call in Washington on July 18 when asked by a group of American journalists what President Nixon ought to say to Asian leaders during his Asian tour.

Ku's meeting with the press was arranged at a luncheon given by Chinese Ambassador Chow Shu-kai.

In reply to a question about American withdrawal from South Vietnam, Ku said that he did not believe the unilateral American troop withdrawal would have any effect on the position of the Republic of China. However, it would downgrade the morale of all Southeast Asian nations, he added.

Turning to Asian regional security, the Anti-Communist leader said that the concept of regional security arrangements have long been in the minds of the free Asian countries, but positive U.S. support of such arrangements is still not much in evidence. He proposed that the present Asian and Pacific Council should serve as a basis for any prospective formation of an effective regional Asian security system.

American columnist William S. White said at the gathering that, in his judgment, change of American non-recognition policy toward Peiping is about "as remote as anything I can think of." White was also doubtful that the U.S. Senate would under any circumstances consent to such a change.

Ku, a member of the National Assembly and honorary president of the World Anti-Communist League, is in the United States for a three-week visit at the invitation of the U.S. Captive Nations Committee.

He has met with Marshall Green, assistant secretary of state for Asian and Pacific affairs at the State Department, and Congressman William T. Murphy, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific affairs.

Ku said that Marshall Green had assured him that the United States would not change its present non-recognition policy toward Peiping.

The anti-Communist leader was presented by the U.S. Captive Nations Committee with a plaque known as the Eisenhower Award in recognition of his dedicated service to the world-wide anti-Communist movement.

The award presentation took place at a dinner celebrating the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week at the University Club in Washington on July 16. Since 1959, the United States has observed the third week of each July as Captive Nations Week to support the aspirations of people all over the world for justice and freedom.

Speaking at the dinner, Ku called on the free world to unite and form a global anti-Communist frontline.

He said, "To realize this sacred mission of mankind, we free peoples have as our immediate and urgent task the taking of effective steps to unite into a global anti-Communist frontline. We must progress from anti-Communist cooperation among peoples to cooperation among governments. We must expand the anti-Communist efforts of individual nations to achieve regional security organizations. We must turn from merely assisting the efforts of the people behind the Iron Curtain to achieve freedom by tearing down the Iron Curtain."

"Over and over again, the history of mankind has proved that the force of freedom always wins over tyranny and that tyranny can never quench the flame of freedom. The ten years that the Captive Nations Week movement has been active has already shown us the way to freedom. We have only to remain steadfast in our struggle and firm in our faith in freedom. We have only to unite together even closer, work together still harder, and the day of defeat will come all the more speedily for Communist enslavement and tyranny." Ku emphasized.

Some 200 distinguished guests attended the dinner. Both Dr. Lev Dobriansky, chairman of the U.S. National Captive Nations Committee, and Congressman Edward Derwinski, commended Ku for his world-wide leadership. They stressed that Ku typifies the unshakable confidence and indomitable spirit of the free Chinese in their unrelenting efforts to liberate their compatriots from Communist tyranny.

On July 20, Ku signed a freedom declaration at Independence Hall in Philadelphia in observance of the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week. Signatures were also signed by representatives of member organizations of the Philadelphia Captive Nations Committee.

The declaration expressed support for captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, including the Chinese people on the mainland, and urged the U.S. government to adopt a more dynamic policy regarding the captive nations.

Following the ceremony, Ku addressed a rally in the mall of Independence Hall, with more than 400 people attending.

Ku said that the United States should give material aid to Asian nations in their struggle against Communism. "We do not want American youths to shed blood or take up arms on our behalf", he added.

He said that all Asians hope the United States, as leader of the free world, will uphold the freedom of mankind and take on its moral responsbiility of assisting the Asian nations to effectively remove the scourge of Communism.

Ku called the attention of the United States to the Peiping regime's effort to involve the world in an armed revolution.

To eliminate the Peiping Regime, Ku said, the United States need not take direct action against the Chinese Communists.

He said, "I believe that helping the Republic of China to build up its anti-Communist capability would prove the more effective means of cutting away this cancerous source of Asia's ills, just as the establishment of an Asian Pacific regional security organization would be the most effective means of maintaining peace and freedom in Asia."

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, Sept. 15, 1969]

DR. KU CHENG-KANG, CHINESE FREEDOM LEADER, HONORED IN WASHINGTON CEREMONY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—More than 300 persons representing the U.S. Congress and government, the diplomatic corps, the academic world, and the ethnic communities in the United States attended the captive nations dinner at the University Club here on July 16, 1969, to honor Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, outstanding Chinese statesman, diplomat and leader of the Asian captive nations movement. Dr. Ku was visiting the United States as a guest of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC), headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Con-

gress Committee of America. Dr. Ku received a special "Captive Nations Award" plaque in recognition of his leadership in the captive nations movement in Asia.

Honored along with Dr. Ku were the Hon. George Meany, President of AFL–CIO and honorary member of the NCNC, who also received a "Captive Nations Award" plaque, and ten U.S. Congressmen who received Commemorative Medals bearing Dwight D. Eisenhower's portrait in recognition of their services for the cause of the captive nations.

After a brief talk on the purpose of the banquet, Dr. Dobriansky presented Congressman Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois, who served as master of ceremonies, and Prof. Peter Lejins, of the University of Maryland and vice chairman of the NCNC, who read the citations and presented the medals to the U.S. legislators. Recipients of the "Eisenhower Medals" were Congressmen Derwinski and Daniel J. Flood (Pa.), Gerald Ford (Mich.), William G. Bray (Ind.), Clement J. Zablocki (Wis.), Michael A. Feighan (O.), Thaddeus J. Dulski (N.Y.), Leonard Farbstein (N.Y.), John Rarick (La.), John H. Buchanan (Ala.), Donald Lukens (O.), and Senator Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut.

"CAUSE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS—INDIVISIBLE"

Speaking through an official interpreter, Dr. Ku said that a natural "community of interest" exists between the peoples of Asia and the captive nations of Europe, and that the aspirations of the latter to freedom are of paramount concern to the Asian nations, which also fight for liberation from communist oppression. He called for greater cooperation between the American people and representatives of the captive nations here and elsewhere towards a more effective coordination of objectives and methods in the common struggle for freedom and justice of the captive nations.

Among those present, in addition to the U.S. Congressmen enumerated above, were the Hon. John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, who was one of the speakers, Ambassador and Mrs. Shuikai of China, Madame Claire Chennault, Mrs. J. Kajeckas, wife of the Lithuanian Charge d'Affaires, Cong. and Mrs. Joseph P. Vigorito and Mr. Philip Rutledge, representing Mayor Walter Washington.

LARGE UKRAINIAN GROUP PRESENT

In addition to Dr. and Mrs. Lev E. Dobriansky and his colleagues, Maj. M. Sydorko, Miss Vera A. Dowhan and Mr. and Mrs. Walter Pretka, several prominent Ukrainians were in attendance. These included the Very Rev. Msgr. Vasyl Makuch, Rector of the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary in Washington, Very Rev. Msgr. Meletius Wojnar of Catholic University, Rev. Constantine Berdar, Dr. M. Dankevych, Stephen J. Skubik, Stephen Boychuk, Volodymyr Mayewsky and George Kulchycky—all of Washington, D.C.

Representing the UCCA were Joseph Lesawyer, Dr. Walter Dushnyck, Dr. Stepan Woroch, Dr. Walter Gallan, Dr. Peter Stercho, Walter Masur and Ignatius M. Billinsky; the Providence Association: Mrs. Stephanie Wochok and Dr. Jaroslav Bernadyn; The Ukrainian National Aid Association: A. Nykonchuk; American Friends to Free the Captive Nations: Dr. Valentina Kalynyk and Valetin Koval; American Friends of the ABN: Dr. Alexander Sokolyshyn and Michael Spontak; and the Captive Nations Committee: Walter Chopiwsky, Phoenix, Ariz. and Peter Mohylyn of Brooklyn, N.Y.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, Sept. 15, 1969]

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MARKED THROUGHOUT THE NATION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—Nationwide observances of the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution were held this year between July 13–20, featuring rallies, dinners, mass meetings and liturgies in churches.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) issued a special circular to its Branches and Member Organizations, calling on their numerous membership to take an active part in the observances. The National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC), headed by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, President of the UCCA, coordinated all the observances throughout the land. Every U.S. Senator and Congressman, every State Governor and the mayors of major U.S. cities were invited to issue special proclamations in support of the captive nations.

President Nixon issued the Presidential Proclamation on July 14, and over 60 U.S. legislators in Congress responded on behalf of the captive nations.

OBSERVANCES IN NEW YORK

New York City saw a series of events in commemoration of the 10th Anniversary of Captive Nations Week. On July 13 a solemn liturgy was celebrated at St. Patrick's Cathedral by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Bela Varga, at which Rev. George Muresan, of East Chicago, Ill., delivered a sermon on the persecution of the Eastern Catholic Church behind the Iron Curtain.

On the same day, the New York Chapter of the NCNC under the chairmanship of Judge Matthew Troy, and the American Friends of the ABN under the chairmanship of Dr. Ivan Docheff, staged a protest parade of the captive nations on Fifth Avenue, which was followed by a program at Central Park Mall, with guest speaker Mr. Yaroslav Stetzko, former head of the Provisional Government of Ukraine and president of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), with headquarters in Munich, Germany. The audience numbered more than 400 persons, many dressed in national costumes and bearing the flags of their respective captive countries. The program began with an impressive religious service conducted by Rev. Serhiy K. Pastukhiv, Administrator of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Exile. He offered a prayer for the American astronauts who were about to travel to the moon, and then, referring to the captive nations under Communist oppression stated:

"It is easier for us to break the bonds of gravity which God has forged than for us to break the chains of cruelty, prejudice and tyranny that bind many people on Earth."

The entertainment part of the program consisted of vocal numbers rendered by a Byelorussian women's group and by the Ukrainian SUMA Dance Ensemble "Verkhovyntsi" under the direction of Mr. and Mrs. Oleh Genza.

PROGRAM AT THE STATUE OF LIBERTY

On Sunday, July 27, 1969, a Captive Nations Week observance was held at the Statue of Liberty that was sponsored by Americans to Free Captive Nations (AFCN).

The principal speaker at the program was Laszlo C. Pasztor, Director, Heritage Group Division, the Republican National Committee. He called for a joint effort toward regaining the freedom of all the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Pasztor, who took part in the Hungarian uprising in 1956 before coming to the United States, assured the audience that President Nixon has a deep understanding and appreciation of the plight of the captive nations.

In addition to Mr. Pasztor, other speakers at the program were Mr. T. S. Tso, of the Free Chinese Mission to the U.N., Dr. Walter Dushnyck, representing the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the National Captive Nations Committee, and Mario Aguillera, president of AFCN.

Numerous messages were read during the ceremony: besides President Nixon's Proclamation, there were messages from Governors Nelson A. Rockefeller and Richard J. Hughes, Mayor John V. Lindsay, and Sen. Jacob K. Javits, Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe and from the Office of Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, Sept. 15, 1969]

U.S. CONGRESS OBSERVES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. opinion makers availed themselves of the opportunity offered by nation-wide observances of this year's Captive Nations Week to show their sympathy with the captive peoples.

In addition to the traditional Presidential Proclamations, signed on July 11, and proclamations by many Governors and Mayors, the week of July 13–19 also witnessed a debate in the U.S. Congress on the timely subject of the captive nations.

Fifty-three Representatives and six Senators took the floor and helped demonstrate the continued concern of American lawmakers for the plight of 100 million people living under Comunist regimes in East-Central Europe.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

The debate in the House of Representatives was once again initiated by Congressman Daniel J. Flood (D.-Pa.) who stressed the relevance of Captive Nations Week:

". . . The remarkable feature of the annual Captive Nations Week is its steady growth and extension from year to year. As countless of our fellow citizens come to learn the long list of captive nations, dating back to 1920, the more they are impressed by the significance and importance of the week. Following the leadership of several of our Presidents, our State Governors and our Mayors also proclaim the week, urging our citizens to dedicate themselves anew to the study of all the captive nations."

Other members of the House who spoke on the same subject were: Joseph P. Addabbo (D.-N.Y.), Frank Annunzio (D.-Ill.), Silvo O. Conte (R.-Mass.), Edward J. Derwinski (R.-Ill.), Gerald R. Ford (R.-Mich.), Joseph M. Gaydos (D.-Pa.), Henry Helstoski (D.-N.J.), Martin B. McKneally (R.-N.Y.), William T. Murphy (D.-Ill.), Edward J. Patten (D.-N.J.), Robert Price (R.-Texas), Charlotte T. Reid (R.-Ill.), John J. Rhodes (R.-Ariz.), Dan Rostenkowski (D.-Ill.), J. William Stanton (R.-Ohio), Lester L. Wolff (D.-N.Y.), Louis C. Wyman (R.-N.H.), and John M. Ashbrook (R.-Ohio).

DENIAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS

A large number of Congressmen scored continued violations of fundamental human rights by Communist regimes.

Rep. James M. Hanley (D.-N.Y.) pointed out: "Oratory alone will not rent the Iron Curtain, nor will it remove the shackles of slavery. We must resolve not to offer our suffering brothers behind the red wall a hollow bone. We must constantly remind the world of the prostitute governments which rule those people illegally and immorally. And we must afford the people themselves a measure of hope."

Speeches on this topic were also delivered by William S. Broomfield (R.-Mich.), James A. Burke (D.-Mass.), Harold R. Collier (R.-Ill.), Barber B. Conable, Jr. (R.-N.Y.), James J. Delaney (D.-N.Y.), Samuel L. Devine (R.-Ohio), Dante B. Fascell (D.-Fla.), Martha W. Griffiths (D.-Mich.), Seymour Halpern (R.-N.Y.), John R. Rarick (D.-La.), John S. Wold (R.-Wyo.), and John W. Wydler (R.-N.Y.).

DENUNCIATION OF THE BREZHNEV DOCTRINE

"Certainly the bluntly imperialistic crushing of Czechoslovakia's move toward more freedom cannot be ignored," declared Representative John D. Dingell (D.-Mich.), "indeed, the Soviet military aggression on Czechoslovakian soil cannot be interpreted as anything but a desperate, 11th hour attempt to suffocate the hopeful stirrings of

democratic and libertarian sentiment which threaten to weaken the Soviet grip on that conquered nation."

Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D.-Mass.) stated:

"The repressions that we have witnessed in the past year in Czechoslovakia have drawn our sympathy; the reaction of the courageous Czech people has elicited our deepest respect. Theirs was a daring experiment; one, it seems, that was too daring, too threatening to the Russian system, whose continuance depends on hard-line adherence to all its precepts and laws. We must continue to oppose the precepts of that system. Our opposition should be focused on its defects, the limits it imposes on the individuals and minorities and the freedoms it abridges."

Speeches on this topic were also delivered by Glenn M. Anderson (D.-Cal.), John H. Buchanan (R.-Ala.), James A. Byrne (D.-Pa.), Glenn Cunningham (R.-Nebr.), Dominick V. Daniels (D.-N.J.), John H. Dent (D.-Pa.), Harold Donohue (D.-Mass.), Robert N. Giaimo (D.-Conn.), William J. Green (D.-Pa.), John E. Hunt (R.-N.J.), Robert McClory (R.-Ill.), John S. Monagan (D.-Conn.), John M. Murphy (D.-N.Y.), Robert R. Taft, Jr. (R.-Ohio), Thomas J. Meskill (R.-Conn.), William V. Roth, Jr. (R.-Del.), Charles S. Joelson (D.-N.J.).

THE LUNAR FRONTIER AND THE DIVIDED WORLD

The epic flight of Apollo 11, ushering in the Lunar Age, gave food for thought about the state of this world. Rep. Howard W. Robison (R-N.Y.) placed the problem of captive nations in a new dimension: "The three lone Americans who have now embarked on history's most incredible venture represent more than this nation; they represent mankind. . . They will be helping men everywhere in their determination to meet the challenges which, for a moment only, these three earthlings have left behind. One of the greatest of these challenges is to push forward the frontiers of freedom, and it is entirely fitting that we pledge to do so, on this occasion, by reaffirming our nation's devotion to the principle of self-determination for the people of all lands."

Rep. Roman C. Pucinski (D.-Ill.) concurred by succinctly observing: "The very idea of enslaving whole peoples and whole nations behind a wall of silence and injustice belongs to the dark ages of man's past. It has no place in this age of exploration, discovery and universal rejoicing over man's accomplishments and achievements."

SENATE DISCUSSION

The Captive Nations Week debate in the Senate reiterated the support of freedom and self-determination for the captive East-Central European peoples.

Sen. George Murphy (R.-Cal.) said, in part:

"We live in an era of progress that has brought man to the threshold of the moon, in a time when the sum of man's knowledge has more than doubled . . . But, this has been a barren decade for the 100 million people in Europe who had the misfortune of being 'liberated' by the Soviet Union at the conclusion of World War II."

Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R.-Nebr.) stated:

"Our history, our struggle for independence, teaches the meaning of freedom. From this knowledge comes the obligation not to abandon those who have lost their freedom."

Senators Gordon Allott (R.-Colo.), Thomas J. Dodd (D.-Conn.), Gaylord Nelson (D.-Wis.) and Carl T. Curtis (R.-Nebr.) also took the floor during the debate.

[From the Midland Reporter-Telegram, July 14, 1969]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The 10th anniversary of the adoption by Congress of the Captive Nations Week Resolution is being observed across the land.

The observance is sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee which works continuously in behalf of the peoples of captive nations of the world.

To many persons, particularly since the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Communists, the resolution has a somewhat hollow ring, and this is why the sponsoring committee has stepped up its program, nationwide.

"It is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive," the Captive Nations Week Resolution declares.

It further points out that "the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace," and "it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world."

The committee's purpose, first and foremost is "firm adherence to our Declaration of Independence—that we Americans will never forget the captive nations or accommodate ourselves to their present captivity."

The panel's objectives include "assistance in the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nation's in the House of Representatives; total victory in Vietnam; generate a consciousness of how various forms of agitation aimed at completely undermining the structure of American civil authority are supported by Communist sources and conducted along the same lines used in captive nations; further expansion of the captive nations movement . . ." and others.

CREDIT UNIONS HELP HURRICANE VICTIMS: PREVENT PAYLESS PAYDAY

(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, I have often said that next to the church, credit unions do the most good for people than any other institution. The September issue of CUNA Briefs, a weekly publication of CUNA International, the worldwide credit union association, bears out my belief. The publication points out that credit unions in the Biloxi, Miss., area went out of their way to help victims of the hurricane that struck in that area, including emergency signature loans and car loans often "for over 100 percent of the value when insurance did not fully cover . . . ." The publication also reports that the credit unions stayed open 14 to 16 hours a day to help service the members.

This is the news clip from CUNA Briefs describing the credit union operations in the hurricane area:

CREDIT UNIONS ARE VALIANT HELP IN STORM AREA

BILOXI.—All except one of the 20 credit unions in Biloxi and surrounding area are open and valiantly assisting hurricane victims with emergency loans and all kinds of help, following one of the worst storms in the nation's history. The exception is a limited income credit union with all its funds out in loans already and its volunteer officers busy trying to restore their personal effects. Immediately after the storm, checks could not be honored, and credit union cash was water-soaked following three to six feet of water in offices. Ingalls Employees CU ($7 million) did manage to open in two days after shoveling out mud, crowbarring drawers open, and getting hand posting under way. The computer was out for 10 days for lack of power. Lights and water were out, too. Ingalls CU, Keesler AFB FCU and others made emergency signature loans, and plenty of car loans—often for over 100% of value when insurance did not fully cover—and stayed open up to 14–16 hours a day to take care of members' needs. Due to communications being out, martial law and chaotic conditions, the credit union story was unavailable until a member of CUNA International's Public Relations Department visited the area last weekend. Even then, housing for visitors was difficult to obtain, with plenty of residents still homeless.

The same issue of CUNA Briefs describes how a Santa Fe, N. Mex., credit union prevented the payless payday in the New Mexico Health and Social Services Department. The credit union issued loans for the amount of paychecks when the computer that makes out the paychecks broke down. Had the credit union not provided this assistance, the employees of that State department would have had to have gone without paychecks until the machine was repaired.

Mr. Speaker, these are but two examples of the hundreds of outstanding jobs that credit unions are performing every day.

It is no wonder that there are nearly 24,000 credit unions in the United States with new credit unions opening every day.

DIRECT LOAN FUNDS FOR VETERANS' HOUSING

(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, today I appeared before the Rules Committee to request an open rule on a bill which the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee will soon be bringing to the floor. I did this in order to be able to offer an amendment to this bill which would again provide the vehicle to raise veterans' housing interest rates again. As my statement points out, raising interest rates does not provide any more housing.

My amendment, which I shall offer to this legislation, would provide that the funds accumulated by payment of premiums by veterans under the national service life insurance program shall be used up to an amount of $5 billion for lending to veterans on fully guaranteed veterans' housing paper. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of the House on both sides of the aisle are in support of my amendment.

I feel sure that this is the only way

in which funds can be provided for veterans' housing and I trust all Members of the House will support this amendment, when offered.

My full statement before the Rules Committee follows:

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN'S STATEMENT BEFORE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe—as I argued on the Floor of the House in March of 1968—that increasing the interest rate cost on veterans housing, the mortgages of which are guaranteed by the Federal Government, will in any way increase the amount of housing starts and mortgage loans for veterans. You will recall that on May 7, 1968, the President signed into law an Act which gave the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of the Veterans Administration discretionary authority to raise mortgage interest rates on FHA and VA-guaranteed housing loans above the statutory rate of 6 percent.

In May of 1968, the FHA and VA rate was raised from 6 percent to 6.75 percent. In January of 1969, the 6.75 percent rate was raised to 7.5 percent. Therefore, within a period of less than a year these two insured loan programs experienced a rate increase of 1.5 percent—amounting to a percentage increase of 25 percent. Without making reference to the FHA program regarding housing loans—the experience of which is the same as that for the VA—let me show you what happened to VA-insured housing starts.

From January to May of 1968, VA housing starts were running at an annual rate of a low of 52,000 units per year to a high of 63,000. In June of 1968, just after the 7.5 percent rise, VA housing starts were down to 54,000. We ended up the year of 1968 regarding VA housing starts with 56,000 new VA-guaranteed housing units.

At the beginning of 1969 VA housing starts were running at an annual rate of 57,000 units—an annual rate equal to the 57,000 units in May of 1968 when the rate was increased ¾ of 1 percent. As I have indicated, in January 1969, the rate went up another ¾ of 1 percent to 7.5 percent.

And where are we now? Currently, according to the latest figures, VA housing starts for the month of July are down to a level of 46,000 units.

These figures conclusively indicate, Mr. Chairman, that increasing interest rates do not elicit more VA-guaranteed housing.

It can be argued, of course, that if we got the rate up high enough, there would be more VA housing starts. But how high would it have to go, Mr. Chairman? Would these insured mortgage loans have to be above 10 percent? Remember this House just recently established an effective 10 percent rate on Government-guaranteed student loans. How many veterans could afford a 10 percent mortgage rate? Very few in my opinion could do this.

I must agree that we cannot just outright kill the VA-insured loan program for housing. We owe an obligation and a debt to our veterans. There are other solutions and, in my opinion, the most effective one is contained in a bill introduced by the Honorable Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, my close associate, Mr. Teague of Texas. This bill, H.R. 9476, would establish an investment fund on a revolving fund basis. It would provide an amount not exceeding $5 billion to be used for the purchase of VA-guaranteed loans. The $5 billion would come from a transfer of this amount from the National Service Life Insurance fund. This fund, as we all know, was established in 1940 as the financing mechanism for World War II servicemen. Over 22 million policies have been issued under this program. The issuance of new policies ended in 1951. Currently the assets of the fund, which are almost exclusively invested in special Treasury interest-bearing securities and in policy loans, amount to $7 billion, and it is anticipated that by the end of June 30, 1970, the fund will have an amount of $7.2 billion.

Since 1960, the investment of the National Service Life Insurance fund in special Treasury obligations has been at a rate equal to the current market yield for marketable Treasury securities with maturities over three years. This has meant that the average rate on investments held by the fund is now less than 4 percent.

The legislation introduced by the esteemed Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee could provide financing for at least 300,000 VA-guaranteed homes on such mortgages of 7.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, personally, I would have felt much better, and I am sure the veterans more so than me, if the Veterans Affairs Committee had passed out Chairman Teague's bill, H.R. 9476, rather than H.R. 13369. I am appearing before your Committee at this time to request that if a rule is granted on H.R. 13369, it be an open rule—as I know Chairman Teague wants—so that I may be in a position to offer either as a substitute or an amendment, the substance of H.R. 9476, which would, in essence, increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and, at the same time, increase the income of the National Service Life Insurance fund.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

(Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is generally acknowledged that the Federal Government has paid too little attention to the needs of the Nation's consumers.

I believe this Congress faces the need to correct this unfortunate situation. Therefore, I rise to express my support for the Consumer Protection Act of 1969, which I am proud to cosponsor, and to express at the same time my great admiration for its initiator, the distinguished Congresswoman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER).

It is the intent of the Consumer Protection Act of 1969 to both enlarge and enhance the power of the Government to protect the interests of the American consumer and to increase the flow of information which the consumer needs to make knowledgeable decisions about goods and services.

In part, this would be done by the establishment within the Executive Office of the President of a permanent, statutory Office of Consumer Affairs which would have broad powers to coordinate the programs of Federal agencies; to provide for maximum exposure of consumer information—such as the testing of products—developed within the agencies; to represent the consumer in agency proceedings, and to initiate legislation serving the interests of the American consumer.

By putting the responsibility for the coordination of consumer protection at the President's right hand—in his office where decisions originate—I believe we can give more meaningful direction to the overall program.

There is presently, as we are aware, a White House assistant who is responsible for the coordination of Federal consumer protection programs. But the position was created by Executive order. It is not a statutory position. This official, despite her recognized competence in this field, has little actual power beyond that of persuasion.

By providing increased leadership and coordination at the White House level, the Consumer Protection Act of 1969 will increase the interest and awareness of Federal agencies of the need for enhanced consumer protection. This bill makes mandatory the publication of test results and public discussion of any action taken by Federal agencies affecting consumer interests. It offers new safeguards for consumer interests—with only the minimum necessary restrictions on the suppliers of goods and services. The protection of the consumer's "right to know" is one of its most basic features.

This is a measure which, I believe, is badly needed in the face of the technological explosion because it balances protection of the rights and needs of consumers with fairness to the manufacturer and the supplier of goods. The rights of both should be considered in the legislation we enact.

Again I commend the distinguished Congresswoman from New Jersey for her presentation of an effective and fair solution to a difficult and vital problem.

ACTIVITY TO COMPLY WITH PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE ON POPULATION

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, in President Nixon's message on population he recommended four Government activities dealing with population that could be immediately initiated. As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population I was delighted to learn last week of the rapid progress being made in these areas.

I received letters from Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Daniel P. Moynihan, Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, informing me of the latest activity within the administration to comply with the President's recommendations.

This immediate attention is certainly evidence of the high priority that this administration gives to our population problems. To know that this action is now being executed is very encouraging.

For the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I would like these letters entered in the RECORD at this point:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 16, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
Chairman, House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUSH: In view of the Task Force's considerable interest in the subject of population, I thought you might be interested to know of some steps the Ad-

ministration has taken to follow up on the President's Message of July 18.

As you know, the bill to create a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future has been introduced in the House and the Senate, and the Senate Government Operations Committee has held hearings. We hope for Congressional approval of this measure in the near future.

Secretary Finch and Director Rumsfeld have undertaken a major review of existing family planning services in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity. This review will lead, among other things, to a reorganization of portions of the HEW service structure, to a substantial expansion of the programs of both agencies, and to much improved coordination between the two.

A comparable review of research into family planning and related matters is underway under Dr. Egeberg's direction in HEW. Within a few months, we anticipate this review to lead to the enlarged research effort described in the President's Message, an effort that will also seek to coordinate much of the family planning research being conducted throughout the nation.

This office, together with the Department of Labor, has mounted a study of manpower needs and training programs for domestic and international population activities, and will report to the President this autumn.

A staff group from the Office of Science and Technology has been working closely with representatives of the departments of Agriculture, Interior and HEW, and the Agency for International Development, in the areas of food resources and the environmental consequences of population growth. The Environmental Quality Council will receive a report from this group, and we expect to continue to pay close attention to this important matter.

In the international area, Secretary Rogers has several projects underway, including an assessment of our participation in international population and family planning programs, a determination of ways of upgrading our own foreign assistance programs in this field, and an interdepartmental effort to deepen the awareness of population growth and its consequences among all representatives of the United States abroad.

Each of these activities will lead to specific actions and also to a report to the President, which he will be able to use in further decisions concerning the Administration's continuing response to the problems associated with population growth.

I hope that the members of the Task Force will continue their interest in this subject, and I want you to know how much we appreciate your continued support.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1969.

Honorable GEORGE BUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUSH: I have been especially gratified to learn of the interest and support of the House of Representatives Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population in the efforts of this Department to achieve the goals established by the President in his Message to Congress on Population Growth.

The Department has developed a draft bill for the support of family planning services through project grants, training of professionals and sub-professionals to provide family planning services, and for research into the improvement of the delivery of family planning services and the evaluation of service programs. The draft of this bill is now being reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget.

As of today, we have taken the first step in effecting the reorganization of the Department's family planning services. The maternal and child health services program has been transferred from the Social and Rehabilitation Service to the Health Services and Mental Health Administration. The establishment of a separate unit for family planning services will follow shortly.

Last year the Department established a Center for Population Research at the National Institutes of Health. During its first year the Center launched successfully a program of collaborative research in contraceptive development. The Administration has sought additional funds for this program for this fiscal year, but they were eliminated by the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, I shall continue to request substantial additional funds for research.

I want to assure you of my personal interest in the field of population. Among the many pressing problems with which we are faced I assign it a very high priority.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER O. EGEBERG, M.D.,
Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.

AT 7 CENTS, MAIL MUST GO "PHEW"

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this month's issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains a short essay taken from the New York Times among its editorials entitled 'At 7 Cents, Mail Must Go 'Phew'!" It reads as follows:

AT 7 CENTS, MAIL MUST GO "PHEW"!

Planners in the post office have been burning the midnight oil since President Nixon announced that he wanted another rise in the postal rates.

Traditionally, every time the price of mailing a letter goes up a penny, the post office devises a new scheme for making its service even worse than it was before.

Archibald David, known in postal circles as "the father of the zip code," points out that the department, with each successive increase, has curtailed deliveries, shut down post offices, eliminated collections, placed aggravating restrictions on letter sizes and shapes and ordered collection trucks to double-park in clogged thoroughfares and hounded people to remember long sequences of digits.

When first-class postage went to six cents, David devised the intricate system known in the department as "snail mail." The purpose was to guarantee that a letter would not travel any faster than a snail.

Take, for example, a letter mailed from Washington to New York. Normally it would make such a trip in perhaps six hours. The postoffice has worked out a scheme for shipping it to New York, where it is sent back to Washington with instructions that the bag is not to be opened until after the weekend.

Unfortunately, "snail mail" has not lived up to the hopes held for it. Many letters from Washington still takes only five days to reach New York, which is considerably faster than any post office test snail ever has made the trip.

Understandably, David is discouraged about the possibilities of making the service worse, once the seven-cent rate takes effect. Young Turks in the department say privately that David is tired and "over the hill."

They have a number of radical new schemes which are about to go to Postmaster General Winton M. Blount for approval. The most conservative calls for an expensive new promotion plan using the slogan: "The postman only rings once."

Under this scheme, the postman would ring once and, if no one answered, he would throw all your first-class mail down the sewer.

A less controversial plan, almost certain to be approved, calls for abolishing collection boxes and installing in their place sidewalk plaques which state: "Deposit mail on curb." Postoffice planners believe wind, rain, children and dogs will do the rest.

The planners are interested in dogs. One of the most controversial plans to be sent to the Postmaster General calls for the post office to keep large packs of ravenous hounds chained in railroad mail cars.

Before the train pulled out, postal workers would open all mail bags, leave the car, seal the doors and then, from outside the car, unchain the dogs. Proponents of this plan argue that the dogs have had their day with the mailman and that it is now time to give them a crack at the mail.

The younger men in the department doubt that the country is ready yet to have scows dumping all the mail at sea. "If we take that step now," they warn, "there will be nothing left for us to do when the first-class rate goes to eight cents."

Now, I wonder if articles like this have any proper place in respectable publications. Do they serve any useful purpose? While the postal service can be improved as well as any other public or private enterprise, it has been subjected to unreasonable criticism. The Post Office Department has advised me that in the fiscal year 1969 it delivered a total of 82,-005,000 pieces of mail, 40 percent of the world total volume. It further advised that the average delivery time for first-class mail was:

Local: 1.1 days.
1–50 miles: 1.3 days.
50–150 miles: 1.4 days.
151–300 miles: 1.9 days.
301–600 miles: 2.2 days.

And the average for airmail was:

150–300 miles: 1.7 days.
300–1400 miles: 2 days.
1800–3000 miles: 2.3 days.

Of course we want to improve the service and I am sure it can be improved. Our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is even now considering postal reform legislation. But I doubt that a satire, if such it be, of the nature of the essay above is warranted or if it will stimulate the serious thinking necessary to improve the service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. SLACK), for today and September 24, on account of illness.

Mr. CORMAN, for Tuesday, September 23, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS), for Tuesday, September 23, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BETTS, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, September 30; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LUKENS, for 1 hour, on September 29; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 60 minutes, on September 30.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GRAY in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances.

Mr. HARVEY to follow the remarks of Mr. DEL CLAUSON during his 1-minute speech today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUTTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. MESKILL in two instances.

Mr. TAFT in three instances.

Mr. SCHADEBERG in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. KEITH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOSS in three instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in 12 instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. ALBERT in four instances.

Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in three instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. OLSEN in four instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2601. An act to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 22, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9526. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations; and

H.R. 11582. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1165. A letter from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under this act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1166. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (procurement and production), transmitting a report on Department of the Navy research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1167. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Kilmer Job Corps Center for Men under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Edison, N.J., Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1168. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Government's helium conservation program administered by the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1169. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif., for research and development of a portable instrument to be used routinely by mine inspectors for rapidly ascertaining total float dust and respirable dust concentrations in mine atmospheres, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1170. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to Docket No. 80-C, *Bands of Mission Indians of California, Plaintiffs* v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1171. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration, transmitting a report of claims settled by the Department of Agriculture under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, as amended, for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1172. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore balance in the Federal form of Government in the United States; to provide both the encouragement and resources for State and local government officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems; to achieve a better allocation of total public resources; and to provide for the sharing with State and local governments of a portion of the tax revenue received by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 538. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 91-498). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 555. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4314, a bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child care centers for preschool and school age dependents of employees (Rept. No. 91-499). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 556. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13369, a bill to extend for 2 additional years the authority to set interest rates necessary to meet the mortgage market for guaranteed and insured home loans to veterans under title 38 of the United States Code and for other loans (Rept. No. 91-500). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 754. Joint resolution to amend section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 92. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 265. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 330. An act for the relief of Dr. Konstantinos Nicholaos Babaliaros; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1110. An act for the relief of Nickolas George Polizos; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2019. An act for the relief of Dug Foo Wong; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 540. Resolution opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4560. A bill for the relief of Sa Cha Bae; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5106. A bill for the relief of Rogelio Tabhan; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5936. A bill for the relief of Kong Wan Nor; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10156. A bill for the relief of Lidia Mendola; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON or California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STRATTON, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 13919. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards for railroad passenger service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 13920. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards for railroad passengers service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13921. A bill to authorize the District of Columbia to compensate holders of class A retailer's licenses issued under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act who return such licenses to the District of Columbia for cancellation; to the committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 13922. A bill to improve farm income and insure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities by extending and improving certain commodity programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 13923. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 13924. A bill to continue the golden eagle program established under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13925. A bill to provide for the establishment of a lifetime fee for persons 65 years of age or over for admission to outdoor recreation areas administered by certain agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 13926. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Tallahassee, Fla., of a portion of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by that city; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 13927. A bill to establish a national program of assistance to the States with the goal of achieving equalized excellence in schools throughout the Nation over a 10-year period; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself and Mr. DEL CLAWSON):

H.R. 13928. A bill to amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. NIX, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. LUKENS, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 13929. A bill to provide mail recipients with the option not to receive through the mail unsolicited and potentially offensive sexual materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 13930. A bill to declare that certain public domain lands are added to the XL Ranch Indian Reservation, Calif., and are held by the United States in trust for such Pit River Indians of the State of California as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 13931. 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. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13932. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in the monthly benefits payable thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of $100 and subsequent cost-of-living benefit increases, and to increase the amount of outside earnings which an individual may have without suffering any loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13933. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to extend for 1 year the period during which grants may be made to a community for water or sewer facilities even though such community has not yet completed its program for a coordinated areawide water and sewer facilities system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. KEITH, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, and Mr. PHILBIN):

H.R. 13934. A bill to amend the act of September 21, 1959 (74 Stat. 591) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise the boundaries of Minute Man National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 13935. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide candidates for congressional offices with certain opportunities to purchase broadcast time from television broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13936. A bill to amend the Military Service Act of 1967 to provide for more equitable deferment procedures, to provide for a random system for selecting individuals for induction into the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13937. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, to provide health insurance benefits for the disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13938. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards for railroad passenger service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13939. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority to limit the rates of interest or dividends payable on certain deposits and accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13940. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize assistance to small business concerns in financing structural, operational, or other changes to meet standards required by Federal law or State law enacted in conformity therewith; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 13941. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13942. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that deafness developing a 10 per centum or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service during a period of war shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13943. A bill to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13944. A bill to extend for 3 years the period of time during which certain requirements shall continue to apply with respect to applications for a license for an activity which may affect the resources of the Hudson

Riverway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13945. A bill to provide that the imposition of fees, charges, and taxes the proceeds of which are covered into the land and water conservation fund in the Treasury of the United States shall be suspended during any period when amounts in the fund are impounded or otherwise withheld from expenditure; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13946. A bill to enlarge the classes of persons eligible for servicemen's group life insurance, and to improve the administration of the program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 13947. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in order to provide within the Federal Government for the representation of the interests of consumers, to coordinate Federal programs and activities affecting consumers, to assure that the interests of consumers are timely presented and considered by Federal agencies, to represent the interests of consumers before Federal agencies, and to serve as a clearinghouse for consumer information; to establish a Consumer Advisory Council to oversee and evaluate Federal activities relating to consumers; to authorize the National Bureau of Standards, at the request of businesses, to conduct product standard tests; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MIZE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.R. 13948. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in order to provide within the Federal Government for the representation of the interests of consumers, to coordinate Federal programs and activities affecting consumers, to assure that the interests of consumers are timely presented and considered by Federal agencies, to represent the interests of consumers before Federal agencies, and to serve as a clearinghouse for consumer information; to establish a Consumer Advisory Council to oversee and evaluate Federal activities relating to consumers; to authorize the National Bureau of Standards, at the request of businesses, to conduct product standard tests; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WAGGONNER (for himself, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H.R. 13949. A bill to provide certain equipment for use in the offices of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SLACK, Mr. KEE, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 13950. A bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. CAREY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. NIX, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KARTH, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 13951. A bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. YATRON, Mr MIKVA, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. REES, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI):

H.R. 13952. A bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. NIX, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. POWELL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. POLLOCK):

H.R. 13953. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to collect and disseminate employment information regarding local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13954. A bill to amend the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), so as to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and construct museum support and depository facilities; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 13955. A bill to amend the Act of August 10, 1846, as amended, to provide for additional members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 13956. A bill to amend the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 953; 20 U.S.C. 65a), relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, so as to authorize additional appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution for carrying out the purposes of said act; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 13957. A bill to amend the Act of August 24, 1966, relating to the care of animals used for purposes of research, experimentation, exhibition or held for sale as pets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13958. A bill to create a National Zoological and Aquarium Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 13959. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the many contributions to the founding and early development of the State of Texas and the city of San Antonio by Jose Antonio Navarro; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself and Mr. DOWNING):

H.J. Res. 910. Joint resolution to declare a national day of prayer and concern for American servicemen being held prisoner in North Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution providing that the administration take steps to prevent airplane hijacking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 373. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Government of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam complying with the principles of the Geneva Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H. Con. Res. 374. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of international criteria for endangered species of wildlife and the establishment of international humane standards; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 13960. A bill for the relief of Youghaper Derderian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13961. A bill for the relief of Maria Alexandra Toczyska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 13962. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Sierra Uribe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13963. A bill for the relief of Wayne Leo Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13964. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Buttitta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 13965. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando Balea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 13966. A bill for the relief of Rosswood Enterprises; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13967. A bill for the relief of Sutekazu Yamamori; 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:

257. By Mr. COUGHLIN: Petition of resolution of the Ambler Borough Council, Montgomery County, Pa., regarding tax status of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

258. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y., relative to establishment of a "Childrens Project"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

259. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to the bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

260. Also, petition of the Congress of Mi-

cronesia, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to appointment of Prof. Harrop A. Freeman as the representative of the people of Micronesia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

261. Also, petition of the City Council, Elizabeth, N.J., relative to the weight and size limits for trucks on interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE—*Tuesday, September 23, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Lord of history and beyond, to whom each day belongs, bless all who in their daily vocations serve the government of the people. Let Thy truth inform their minds and Thy righteousness be enthroned in their inmost being.

Strengthen all who are working for peace between the nations, and all who are working for purer and juster laws. Sustain all who are engaged in healing diseases, in the relief of poverty, in the teaching of the young, and in the rescue of the fallen.

Deliver those who thus labor from discouragement or frustration or a sense of futility. Give them a stout heart to bear their own burdens, a willing heart to bear the burdens of others, and a believing heart to cast all their burdens on Thee.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 22, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 22, 1969, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) to extend for 3 months the authority to limit the rates of interest or dividends payable on time and savings deposits and accounts.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-161)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith transmit the Third Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education which functions under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

It is a special concern of this Administration that colleges and universities respond effectively to the needs of local communities and to the desire of their own members to become involved in the task of solving local problems. The increasing level of requests for this type of action, from both inside and outside the campus, raises the question whether Title I of the Higher Education Act is having the impact that it should. This we intend to find out. Therefore, I am instructing the Subcommittee on Education of the Council for Urban Affairs to coordinate a search for ways to improve the performance of this program and report to the Council at an early date.

After we have completed our review of the program under Title I of the Higher Education Act, as well as of the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, we will advise the Congress of the Administration's recommendations.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 23, 1969.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY CONFERENCE REPRESENTATIVES

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of International Atomic Energy Agency Conference Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LT. GEN. LEONARD DUDLEY HEATON, SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is most fitting again to recognize the outstanding career and dedicated service of a distinguished soldier and physician of the U.S. Army. Three years ago I asked the Senate to recognize the service of Lt. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton on the occasion of his approaching mandatory retirement on reaching age 64 and his being requested by then President Johnson to continue as Surgeon General after recall to active duty. Though yearning to retire, and in relaxation to enjoy all the pleasures and comforts of his retirement home in Pinehurst, N.C., General Heaton again responded to the call of duty and has continued to the present to give of himself in service to his country and to his fellow man. Indeed, this devoted public servant was further extended in service by President Johnson until May 1969, and then by President Nixon until September 30, 1969. He was appointed Surgeon General by one President and continued in office for over 10 years by three other Presidents of the United States.

The splendid accomplishments of the