Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that when the amendments are considered, they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his fine words.

It is true that in the committee we did have a very close vote on the amendment as it was submitted at that time. As the Senator from Virginia has indicated, it was 7 to 9. I think the very importance of this circumstance should be debated at length.

I would hope that the efforts made on behalf of those people who are in favor of the surtax would present some economic justification or some evidence that what they have proposed here is something other than truth by assertion. In other words, the classic approach to the matter of the surtax is very simple. You have inflation; everyone admits you have inflation; you need to cure inflation; everyone knows you need to cure inflation; the way to cure inflation is to put on a surtax. They can make that conclusion without any facts whatever, never attempting to justify it.

If you ask them for an explanation, always there is the terminology which is so sweet and simple, and that is that you have an overheated economy. But they never talk about why the economy is overheated. Frankly, some things are in short supply. One of them is skilled labor. You do not increase skilled labor by unemployment. You do not increase skilled labor by shortening the workweek. That does not increase skilled labor.

I would hope the Labor Department would submit some evidence to some of their people who are interested in continuation of the surtax. I hope the Labor Department would demonstrate how they can cure the shortage of skilled labor by increasing unemployment or shortening the workweek.

William McChesney Martin is due to retire on December 31. It has been a long-held theory of his that you can increase the revenue when you cut back on corporate profits. The corporate profit structure is down. It is there. One of the elements in the corporate structure factor is that the 5-percent surtax has been a factor. Along with their misguided theory, they have the negative reserves in monetary policy, which began the last week of March of 1965. It was the first time, from 1961 to 1965, they placed the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve System into a negative position.

All during that time, from 1961 to 1965, we had a continued increase in productivity in America. We had a relatively stable cost of living. We had a continuation of the employment factors. Then they made the decision at that time to come up with this stricture of the economy, this austerity doctrine, and said that they had to go to a negative system. As I understand, that negative reserve last week reached in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

All this does, basically, is to provide, in a country with an increase in population, hopefully, that an increase in its overall economic structure would be provided with additional funds to meet that obligation. That is another part of it. The net result is that the interest rates started to go up immediately. I do not think they have hit their peak, in spite of what some people have said to the contrary. I think they are still going to go up.

I might point out that the increase in interest rates in the United States in the last year and a half has exceeded the increase in any South American country. The increase in the cost of living in the United States in the last year and a half has exceeded the increase in any South American country. We used to laugh at them when they had skyrocketing interest rates and a high cost of living.

It is important that we have something other than the outworn phrases relating to an overheated economy. I am looking forward to tomorrow to see if we cannot have some facts and figures, something other than the worn out expressions. If we do not do so, we will have a situation such as Socrates described about taking two statements which are untrue and drawing false conclusions from them.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 25, 1969, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 24, 1969:

U.S. MARSHAL

Emmett E. Shelby, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Florida for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony D. Marshall, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, November 24, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

He who would love life and see good days, let him turn away from evil and do right; let him seek peace and pursue it.—I Peter 3: 10, 11.

O God, creator and sustainer of the universe and of this planet we call the earth, we Thy children, created in Thine own image, turn to Thee seeking strength for these hours, guidance for our undertakings, and good will for our relationship with other people.

We are burdened by the distressing difficulties of our day and by the perplexing problems that permeate our persistent pursuit of peace. Particularly do we pray for those who, meeting in Finland, are seeking to halt the nuclear arms race and for those who, meeting in France, are searching for an honorable end to war. May real success crown these genuine endeavors.

Grant wisdom to us and to all who are responsible for our Nation's welfare. May peace come to our world with justice and freedom for all.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 20, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 7491. An act to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7491) entitled "An act to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER 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. 11702) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. 1170. An act to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes;

S. 1421. An act to amend the District of Columbia Legal Aid Act;

S. 2602. An act entitled "The District of Columbia Public Defender Act of 1969":

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of manuscript entitled "Separation of Powers and the Independent Agencies: Cases and Selected Readings," as a Senate document; and

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a report entitled "Handbook for Small Business" as a Senate document.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

NOVEMBER 21, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on November 20, 1969, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13018) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
W. PAT JENNINGS, *Clerk.*
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death, through assassination, of our late Chief Executive, President John F. Kennedy, took place 6 years ago last Saturday. On the anniversary of this tragic event, it is well for the House to pause and pay tribute to the memory of our late beloved President.

As a Member of the House of Representatives and of the U.S. Senate, and during his all too brief period as President of the United States, President Kennedy had evidenced in an outstanding manner his dedication to public service, his extraordinary ability, his idealism and vision, and so important in public life—his courage. President Kennedy gave to our country forward-looking leadership on the domestic level, and in the foreign affairs field he gave to the world a leadership of vision and of firmness. This forward-looking leadership both on the domestic and foreign level, and his tragic death, will always be remembered by future generations of Americans, as well as by future generations in other countries throughout the world. The rich qualities possessed by John F. Kennedy will always be an inspiration for this and future generations to follow.

I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the distinguished Speaker yielding to me on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Speaker of the House. It was my good fortune to know the late John F. Kennedy as a Member of the House, and I knew him when he was a Member of the other body and while he was President.

It was also, unfortunately, a responsibility of mine to be a member of the Commission which had to investigate the circumstances surrounding his tragic assassination.

I just wish to state for the RECORD that the public life of John F. Kennedy was a great inspiration to all Americans and to all mankind.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks made by my distinguished friend.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I can remember, as though it were yesterday, the sad news which flashed across the Nation upon the assassination of President Kennedy. The world was in shock over the loss of this brilliant young Chief Executive and great American.

I came to the Congress on January 3, 1947. President Kennedy, then Congressman Kennedy, came here on the same day, as did now President Nixon.

I learned to love and respect this young man, who was the youngest Member of the House of Representatives in the 80th Congress.

Of course, the great contributions of John F. Kennedy, who later served in the Senate, were not in the Congress but in the White House. It was President Kennedy who launched the programs of the 1960's which meant so much to the development of the Nation and to the fulfillment of the American dream. It was he who first made the decision that by 1970 we would see Americans on the moon. It was he who made the decisions that we would get America moving again. Certainly he launched the programs which did these and many other things, and which were carried forward by President Johnson and the great Congresses which served with him.

I thank the Speaker for yielding to me.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of our late beloved President.

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

There was no objection.

PRICES UP, WAGES DOWN—TRADITIONAL REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC POLICY

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, once again the American people have been subjected to, and are suffering from traditional Republican economic policy.

Just the other day the most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living figures were released. Prices are increasing at a 5.6-percent annual rate. Currently it takes $130 to purchase the same amount of goods and services as could be purchased for $100 in 1957.

The Republican economic policy program may be working as they view it, but in my view it is abominable policy because, as in traditional Republican terms, this policy falls exclusively on the working man, the farmer, and those less privileged members of our society, including the aged and the unemployed.

Along with these continuing rising prices, we find that the workweek for American labor has declined by 1 percent, and real buying power for workers in October has also declined by a like amount. Although there was an increase of 1 percent in real wages, it has been more than offset by a fall in the workweek.

Mr. Speaker, one would think our friends in the Republican Party have learned their lesson from the previous few times they have occupied the executive branch of our Federal Government. I believe this policy heralds the end of the current short span of the Republican Party in office.

For the workingman and the American people at large, this is certainly no time for jubilation. Rather, it is a time for sad reflecting and a prayer that the Republicans will come to their senses and not use their traditional economic policies to subject the working people of our country to an economic depression while prices continued to increase.

POPULARITY OF PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in the comments of my friend from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader. I think that the best response, however, is to cite from the Washington Post of November 24, 1969, the headline of which says "Nixon Support Soars to 68 Percent." This indicates that between October and November of 1969 the popularity of President Nixon, according to the Gallup poll, increased from 56 to 68 percent. The record clearly shows that the President's personal popularity and the success of his programs has increased according to this poll.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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. 287]

Abbitt	Flowers	Morton
Addabbo	Flynt	Moss
Alexander	Ford, William D.	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Anderson, Tenn.	Gallagher	O'Neal, Ga.
Annunzio	Gaydos	Ottinger
Ashley	Gettys	Patman
Barrett	Giaimo	Pickle
Belcher	Goldwater	Poage
Bell, Calif.	Gray	Powell
Bevill	Green, Pa.	Price, Tex.
Blanton	Griffin	Pucinski
Blatnik	Gubser	Purcell
Bolling	Gude	Randall
Brademas	Hagan	Reifel
Brock	Halpern	Roberts
Broomfield	Hamilton	Rostenkowski
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Roudebush
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	St Germain
Buchanan	Harrington	St. Onge
Cabell	Hébert	Sandman
Cahill	Henderson	Scherle
Carey	Howard	Scheuer
Celler	Hungate	Shipley
Chappell	Jacobs	Sikes
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Iowa
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Clay	King	Snyder
Conte	Kirwan	Staggers
Corbett	Kluczynski	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	Kuykendall	Stokes
Cowger	Kyl	Stuckey
Cramer	Landrum	Symington
Daniels, N.J.	Leggett	Taft
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Lipscomb	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Long, La.	Udall
Diggs	Lowenstein	Utt
Dorn	Lukens	Waggonner
Eckhardt	McCarthy	Watkins
Edwards, La.	McCloskey	Weicker
Eilberg	MacGregor	Whalley
Esch	Mailliard	Whitehurst
Evins, Tenn.	Mann	Wright
Fascell	Mikva	Yates
Fish	Mills	Zion
	Mizell	Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 292 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DISCHARGING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS AND COMMUNICATIONS AND REREFERRAL TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 740) to establish the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People, and for other purposes, and from the further consideration of the following House bills and executive communications to establish the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, and for other purposes: H.R. 5854, H.R. 7759, H.R. 8416, H.R. 8587, H.R. 8948, H.R. 9330, H.R. 9273, H.R. 9437, H.R. 9570, H.R. 9949, H.R. 10055, H.R. 10298, H.R 11479, H.R. 12184, and Executive Communications 305 and 828, and that said bills and executive communications be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, none of these bills constitutes the basis for the hearings held before the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee dealing with inter-American relations; is this correct? None of the hearings have already been held?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, hearings were set up on these bills.

Mr. GROSS. But none were ever held?

Mr. MORGAN. That is right.

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

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVES VANIK AND MILLER OF CALIFORNIA TO COHOST POSTSPLASHDOWN PRE-THANKSGIVING TRIBUTE TO APOLLO 12 ASTRONAUTS

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I announce to the House that my esteemed colleague from California, Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, and I will cohost a postsplashdown pre-Thanksgiving luncheon tribute to our Apollo 12 astronauts in honor of the second successful American lunar landing. The date will be November 25, 1969, and the menu will be similar to that which awaits the Apollo 12 crew in the Lunar Receiving Laboratory of the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center near Houston, Tex. It is a matter of particular pride to me that most of the menu for the 19-day quarantine of the astronauts will be provided by the Litton Industries' Stouffer Foods Division of Cleveland and Solon, Ohio. The Stouffer Foods Division is making this special luncheon possible.

When NASA Manned Spacecraft Center was selecting the quarantine foods, Stouffer's was picked for either meeting or surpassing the rigid specifications, and the astronauts themselves participated in the taste tests—and approved.

Stouffer Foods has come a long way from its first neighborhood restaurants in Cleveland to this magnificent space venture.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN), chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDING SURVIVOR ANNUITY PROVISIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDGES' RETIREMENT ACT OF 1964

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 2056) to amend title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to permit unmarried judges of the courts of the District of Columbia who have no dependent children to terminate their payments for survivors annuity and to receive a refund of amounts paid for such annuity, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and a parliamentary inquiry, is the bill being considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman from South Carolina has asked unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2056

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 11-1701 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any judge who elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection and who after making such election is unmarried and has no dependent child may elect—

"(A) to terminate the deductions and withholdings from his salary under paragraph (2) of this subsection and any installment payments elected to be made under paragraph (3) of this subsection, and

"(B) to have amounts credited to his individual account under this subsection, to the date of his election under this sentence, returned to him, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter compounded annually to December 31, 1956. Any election under the preceding sentence shall be made in writing and filed with the Commissioner in such manner and at such time as he shall prescribe."

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, S. 2056, is to relieve a hardship situation which may arise under the provisions of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964 which relate to the establishment of survivorship annuities. Prior to the enactment of that act, judges of the District of Columbia courts having only local jurisdiction were subject to the retirement provisions of the act of April 1, 1942—56 Stat. 197—under the terms of which no provision was made for payroll reductions or contributions to any retirement fund.

The Judges Retirement Act of 1964—89 Stat. 810; D.C. Code, title 11, sec. 1701—amended the existing retirement provisions to require that contributions be made by any judge retiring under it, and also provided for the establishing of survivorship annuities at the option of the individual judge.

Judges who were serving at the time of the enactment of the Retirement Act of 1964, could elect to continue under the old retirement system or come under the provisions of the new act. In the latter case, the election to secure coverage un-

der the new law required the purchase of retirement credits for past service, with interest at specified rates to the date of the election and agreement to payroll deductions for contributions for the remainder of active judicial duty.

However, in the case of survivorship annuities, if a judge desired such coverage for the benefit of members of his family, he was required to elect to come under the terms of the Retirement Act of 1964, since there were no provisions regarding such annuities in the previous law.

The problem to which the language of this bill is directed arises out of the provisions of the Judges Retirement Act of 1964 relating to survivor annuities. If a judge elects a survivor annuity coverage for members of his immediate family, 3 percent is deducted from his pay checks and placed into the District of Columbia judicial retirement and survivors annuity fund. A judge must have had at least 5 years of service prior to his death before the beneficiaries become eligible for the survivor annuity payments.

Under the act, a widow or a dependent child may become the beneficiary of a survivor's annuity. A "widow" is defined as the surviving wife who was married to the judge for at least 2 years immediately preceding his death, or is the mother of issue born to the marriage and who has not remarried. A "dependent child" is defined as an unmarried child under 18 years of age or who is older but incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability.

HARDSHIP

The hardship which may arise under the present act occurs when a judge has elected to provide a survivor's annuity for members of his family and the purpose of such an annuity fails for lack of any annuitant. If the judge's wife predeceases him and he does not remarry and any children are no longer dependent or there was no issue born to the marriage, then no annuitant exists.

When the purpose of a survivor's annuity thus fails, existing law requires that the judge continue payroll deductions for the annuity until the date of his death or retirement. Present law does not permit the termination of such coverage. When the judge is deceased, the contributions, plus interest, in the survivor annuity account are refunded to any beneficiary designated by the judge or to other survivors eligible in order of priority established in the Retirement Act.

It is our committee's judgment that the present law presents a substantial hardship in requiring continued contributions toward a survivor annuity when the purpose of such annuity fails. No justification can be found for requiring continued contributions to the annuity fund which would be paid out, with interest, to nondependents after the death of the judge.

Your committee likewise finds that there is no justification, if contributions are terminated, for the continuation of the annuity account at interest, for the benefit of nondependents following the death of the judge. Your committee believes that it is only fair and just that where the conditions described in this bill are met, the judge should have the privilege of discontinuing the contributions and of withdrawing the accumulated funds with interest as provided herein.

As reported and recommended by our committee, the bill S. 2056, amends existing law to permit a judge, who has elected to establish a survivor's annuity for his wife and family and who thereafter becomes unmarried without any dependent child, to first terminate deductions from his salary and any installment payments he may have agreed to make; and second, have refunded to him any amounts, including interest, paid either in lump sum or in installment payments for the purchase of retirement credit for service rendered prior to the date the judge elected to establish the annuity account, plus the amount of any payments credited to the account after that date to the date the account is terminated.

Our committee received no objections from District or Federal Government agencies regarding the terms of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina one or two questions concerning the bill. The first question is as follows:

Is this a special fund that the act of 1964 creates? Do all the District of Columbia judges pay into a retirement fund, their own retirement fund?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then if this action is permitted today there can very well be some unfunded liability with regard to this fund. Where will the money come from to be refunded to this judge, this one judge, except out of the funds that have been contributed for the purpose of providing retirement for all the judges?

Mr. McMILLAN. If the gentleman will yield, he is not asking that his retirement fund be removed or discontinued; only his wife's. He is paying also into a separate fund for his wife.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; he is requesting that there be a drawdown on the fund to that extent. My concern is what happens to this fund if this sort of thing is indulged in by more judges? This is in the nature of an insurance fund.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is only the amount that he paid in with interest.

Mr. GROSS. That may be so, but Members of Congress and Federal employees pay into a retirement fund.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. We have no such drawdown as this. Members of Congress and Federal employees cannot withdraw or make demands upon the funds in this fashion.

My question is what happens to this special fund for the retirement of District judges if there is to be this kind of a drawdown on it, and perhaps additional drawdowns?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is my understanding that the court of general sessions has a different survivors' benefit program. The Federal employees do not pay for their survivors' benefit program, as the judges do in this court.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes, the Federal employees do pay; they pay as they go. The judges of the District court are paying in at the rate of 3 percent; are they not?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir. The only time a judge, as I understand, can collect his suvivorship, is when he retires.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia if the gentleman can clarify the situation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think the main difference between the judges' program and that of the Federal employees is that while the judges are on active duty they will pay 3 percent additional from their salary into a fund for their survivor. The Federal employees do not do that. They do take a reduction of the annuity after retirement in order to provide survivors' annuity.

Now this particular judge to which you are referring has been paid back 3 percent of his back pay plus interest into this fund for survivors' benefits for his wife while, actually, on active duty as a judge and this is what he is asking to be refunded.

Mr. GROSS. What do these judges pay, as a total percentage into their retirement fund?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. They pay nothing into the fund for their own retirement. This was 3 percent extra for the benefit of his survivors and he has to pay it back to the beginning of the time he was surviving as a judge. It is that simple.

Mr. GROSS. This is why I did not understand the situation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Therefore, this will not then impair the fund of the District court judges?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. To the extent that the Federal Government might be called upon to make up any deficit in the fund?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And I may have the assurance of the gentleman from Virginia that this will not result now or in the future, no matter how often it is indulged in—will not result in any demand upon the Federal Treasury for funds to make up any deficit in the District judges retirement system?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is the understanding of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GROSS. May I have the same assurance from the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN)?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is my understanding; yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

PROTECTIVE EYE DEVICES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY) to call up the next bill.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 9528) to require students and teachers in the District of Columbia public schools to wear protective devices for their eyes while engaged in certain activities in those schools, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9528

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each student and teacher in the District of Columbia public schools shall wear, in accordance with such regulations as the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall prescribe, a protective device for his eyes while participating in any of the following courses offered by such schools:

(1) Vocational or industrial shops or laboratories involving experience with—

(A) hot molten metals,

(B) milling, sawing, turning, shaping, cutting, or stamping of any solid materials,

(C) heat treatment, tempering, or kiln firing of any metal or other materials,

(D) gas or electric arc welding, or

(E) caustic or explosive materials.

(2) Chemical or combined chemical physical laboratories involving caustic or explosive chemicals or hot liquids or solids.

The Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall furnish such a device to each student and teacher participating in any such course. Such a device may be furnished by the Board at cost to each student and teacher who participates in any such course, or the Board may furnish such device free of charge to each student and teacher but only for his use while participating in any such course.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That each student and teacher in an elementary or secondary school, institution of higher education, or other educational institution in the District of Columbia or in a work training program conducted in the District of Columbia shall wear, in accordance with regulations of the District of Columbia Council, an appropriate protective device for his eyes while participating in or observing any course of instruction which is offered in such school, institution, or program and which involves experience with—

"(1) hot molten metals or other molten materials,

"(2) grinding, polishing, milling, sawing, turning, shaping, cutting, or stamping of any solid materials,

"(3) heat treatment, tempering, or kiln firing of any metal or other material,

"(4) gas or electric arc welding or any other form of welding,

"(5) electromagnetic or particulate radiation,

"(6) any caustic or explosive material, or

"(7) any other hazard designated by the District of Columbia Council by regulation.

Any protective device required to be worn by this section shall meet such design standard as may be applicable to purchases of such device by the United States.

"SEC. 2. The District of Columbia Council may make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

"SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1970, except that before such date the District of Columbia Council may make such regulations as may be necessary for the Act to take effect on such date."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 9528, is to require students, teachers, and observers to wear eye protective devices while participating in or observing certain courses of study or types of training in public or private facilities in the District of Columbia.

This bill would broaden the minimal precautions now provided by regulation so as to require the wearing of protective devices wherever there is a condition which is hazardous to the eyes in connection with educational or training programs.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At the present time in the District of Columbia, there are no regulations applying generally to all public and private educational and training activities and requiring the use of protective eyewear where hazardous conditions are present. Such regulations as do exist are those adopted by the Board of Education and are applicable only in the public schools of the District of Columbia. Private schools and public and private educational institutions have no uniform policy relating to the use of protective devices to prevent injury to the eyes.

The bill, H.R. 9528, as amended and reported by your committee, is patterned after the model school eye safety law which has been adopted in more than 30 States. The bill specifically mentions the types of programs and instructional activities for which the wearing of protective devices is necessary for those who are participating or observing. This includes in general those activities involving caustic chemical or hot materials, those processes related to the forming, shaping, and surfacing of solid materials, processes involving electromagnetic and particulate radiation, and such other hazards as may be determined by the District of Columbia Council.

PROCUREMENT STANDARDS

Your committee is concerned that the procurement of the necessary protective devices under the provisions of this legislation be subject to specifications which will insure good quality, durable construction, and which will meet recognized safety standards. The bill provides that the District of Columbia shall use standards which are used by the U.S. Government in its procurement schedules for protective eyewear. Thus, whether the District government uses its authority to buy under Federal schedule or issues its own procurement advertisement, the same quality and safety standards would apply. Private facilities also would use standards equivalent to those used by the Federal Government.

Thirty-one States have enacted eye safety laws similar to the reported bill, H.R. 9528: 1963, Ohio; 1964, Maryland—amended 1965—Massachusetts; 1965, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, and Utah; 1966, Delaware, Louisiana, New York, Rhode Island, and Virginia; 1967, Connecticut, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota—effective January 1, 1968—Tennessee, and Wyoming; 1968, Arizona, and Louisiana; 1969, Colorado, North Carolina, and Washington State.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public hearings were conducted by our committee. The views of the government of the District of Columbia were presented by the Office of the Corporation Counsel and testimony was received from the Office of Superintendent of Schools and from the Director of the Industrial Safety Division of the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board. No objections were expressed to the purposes of the bill.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to require students and teachers in educational institutions and work training programs in the District of Columbia to wear protective devices for their eyes while participating in or observing certain courses of instruction."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11193) to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89–774 (80 Stat. 1324), and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11193

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the "National Capital Transportation Act of 1969".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act

(a) "Transit Authority" means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority established by title III of the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact (80 Stat. 1324).

(b) "Adopted Regional System" means that system described in the Transit Authority's report entitled "Adopted Regional Rapid Rail Transit Plan and Program. March 1, 1968 (Revised February 7, 1969)", as the same may hereafter be altered, revised, or amended in accordance with Public Law 89 774 (80 Stat. 1324).

AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 3. (a) In order to provide for the Federal share of the cost of the Adopted Regional System, which System supersedes that heretofore authorized by the Congress in the

National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, as amended, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation is authorized to make annual contributions to the Transit Authority under this section in amounts sufficient to finance in part the construction of the Adopted Regional System by the Transit Authority: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount of such Federal contributions shall not exceed the lower amount of $1,047,044,000, or two-thirds of the net project cost of the Adopted Regional System less the $100,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in section 5(a)(1) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89-173; 79 Stat. 663).

(b) Such Federal contributions shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

(1) The work for which appropriations are authorized herein shall be subject to the provisions of Public Law 89-774 and shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules for the Adopted Regional System.

(2) The aggregate amount of such Federal contributions on or prior to the last day of any given fiscal year shall be matched by the local participating governments by payment of the local share of capital contributions required for the period ending with the last day of such year in a total amount not less than 50 per centum of the amount of such Federal contributions.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $1,047,044,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That the appropriations authorized herein shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized in section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 665).

CONSTRUCTION APPROVALS

SEC. 5. (a) No portion of any rail rapid transit line or related facility authorized hereunder shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

(b) All construction pursuant to this Act in, on, under, or over public space in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall, in the interest of public convenience and safety, be performed in accordance with schedules agreed upon between the Transit Authority and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to the end that such construction work will be coordinated with other construction work in such public space, and the Commissioner shall so exercise his jurisdiction and control over such public space as to facilitate the Transit Authority's use and occupation thereof for the purposes of this Act.

REPAYMENT FROM EXCESS REVENUES

SEC. 6. To the extent that revenues or other receipts derived from or in connection with the ownership or operation of the Adopted Regional System (other than service payments under transit service agreements executed between the Transit Authority and local political subdivisions, the proceeds of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness; and capital contributions received by the Transit Authority), are excess to the amounts necessary to make all payments and deposits, including debt service, operating and maintenance expenses, and deposits in reserves, required or permitted by the terms of any contract of the Transit Authority with or for the benefit of holders of its bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued for any purpose relating to the transit system, other than extensions thereof, two-thirds of such excess revenues shall, at the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year in which the Adopted Regional System (exclusive of extensions) is first put into substantially full revenue service, be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) To finance the District of Columbia share of the cost of the Adopted Regional System, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to contract with the Transit Authority to make annual capital contributions under this section aggregating not to exceed $216,500,000, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the general fund of the District of Columbia such amounts necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, and to remain available until expended.

(b) Section 9-220(b)(3) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking the first clause of the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$216,500,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commission under this subsection shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969: *Provided,* That the District of Columbia may exceed by any amount not more than $166,500,000, the limitation on the aggregate indebtedness established pursuant to this Act:".

(c) The appropriations authorized in subsection (a) of this section shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized on behalf of the District of Columbia in section 5(a)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965.

(d) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is further authorized to contract with the Transit Authority for the service to be provided by the Adopted Regional System and to pay in accordance with the terms thereof the District of Columbia's share of any operating deficiency of the Adopted Regional System.

REPEAL AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 8. (a) The following laws are repealed:

(1) The Act of December 20, 1967 (Public Law 90-220; 81 Stat. 670).

(2) Sections 3, 4, and 5(b) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89-173; 79 Stat. 664-666).

(3) The Act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86-669; 74 Stat. 537).

(b) Section 5(a) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89-173; 79 Stat. 665), is amended by striking the phrase "authorized in section 3 hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of the Adopted Regional System".

With the following committee amendment:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the 'National Capital Transportation Act of 1969'.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

"(1) The term 'Adopted Regional System' means that system described in the Transit Authority's report entitled 'Adopted Regional Rapid Rail Transit Plan and Program, March 1, 1968 (revised February 7, 1969)', as that system may hereafter be altered, revised, or amended in accordance with the Compact.

"(2) The term 'Compact' means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact (Public Law 89-774; 80 Stat. 1324).

"(3) The term 'Transit Authority' means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority established under article III of the Compact.

"AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC 3. (a) To provide the Federal share of the cost of the Adopted Regional System, which system supersedes that heretofore authorized by the Congress in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-173; 79 Stat. 663), the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to make annual contributions to the Transit Authority in amounts sufficient to finance in part the cost of the Adopted Regional System; except that the aggregate amount of Federal contributions for the Adopted Regional System, including the $100,000,000 authorized to be appropriated by section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, shall not exceed the lower amount of $1,147,044,000 or two-thirds of the net project cost of the Adopted Regional System.

"(b) Federal contributions for the Adopted Regional System shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

"(1) The work for which contributions are authorized shall be subject to the provisions of the Compact and shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules for the Adopted Regional System.

"(2) The aggregate amount of such Federal contributions on or prior to the last day of any given fiscal year shall be matched by the local participating governments by payment of the local share of capital contributions required for the period ending with the last day of such year in a total amount not less than 50 per centum of the amount of such Federal contributions.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $1,047,044,000 to carry out the purposes of this section. The appropriations authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized by section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965.

"AUTHORIZATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) To provide the District of Columbia share of the cost of the Adopted Regional System, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to contract with the Transit Authority to make annual capital contributions aggregating not to exceed $216,500,000. To carry out the purposes of this section there is authorized to be appropriated out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $166,500,000.

"(b) The last sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of June 6, 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 9-220 (b)(3), is amended by striking out '$50,000,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commissioners under this subsection shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (D.C. Code, secs. 1-1404, 1-1421—1-1426); and' and inserting in lieu thereof '$216,500,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commissioner under this subsection shall be utilized to make the contributions authorized by section 4 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969. To such extent, not exceeding $166,500,000, as may be necessary for this purpose, the District of Columbia may exceed the limitation on aggregate indebtedness established pursuant to this subsection.'

"(c) The appropriations authorized by subsection (a) of this section shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized on behalf of the District of Columbia by section 5(a)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965.

"(d) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is further authorized to contract with the Transit Authority and to pay in accordance with the terms thereof for the service to be provided to the District of Columbia by the Adopted Regional System.

"CONSTRUCTION APPROVALS

"SEC. 5. (a) No portion of the Adopted Regional System shall be constructed within the United Sttaes Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extention of the United States Capitol.

"(b) Construction of the Adopted Regional System in, on, under, or over public space in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall, in the interest of public convenience and safety, be performed in accordance with schedules agreed upon between the Transit Authority and the Commissioner, to the end that such construction work will be coordinated with other construction work in such public space; and the Commissioner shall so exercise his jurisdiction and control over such public space as to facilitate the Transit Authority's use and occupation thereof for construction of the Adopted Regional System.

"REPAYMENT FROM EXCESS REVENUES

"SEC. 6. To the extent that revenues or other receipts derived from or in connection with the ownership or operation of the Adopted Regional System (other than service payments under transit service agreements executed between the Transit Authority and local political subdivisions, the proceeds of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued by the Transit Authority, and capital contributions received by the Transit Authority) are excess to the amounts necessary to make all payments, including debt service, operating and maintenance expenses, and deposits in reserves required or permitted by the terms of any contract of the Transit Authoritly with or for the benefit of holders of its bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued for any purpose relating to the Adopted Regional System, other than extensions thereof, two-thirds of such excess revenues shall, at the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year in which the Adopted Regional System (exclusive of extensions) is first put into substantially full revenue service, to be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"STUDY OF DULLES AIRPORT EXTENSION

"SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to contract with the Transit Authority for a comprehensive study of the feasibility, including preliminary engineering, of extending a transit line in the median of the Dulles Airport Road from the vicinity of Virginia Route 7 on the I-66 Route of the Adopted Regional System to the Dulles International Airport.

"(b) The study to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be completed within six months after execution of the contract authorized therein at a cost not in excess of $150,000; and there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

"REPEAL AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

"SEC. 8. (a) The following provisions of law are repealed:

"(1) The National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-669; 74 Stat. 537).

"(2) Sections 3 and 4 of the National Capital Transporttaion Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-173; 79 Stat. 664-665).

"(b) Section 5(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 is amended by striking out 'authorized in section 3 hereof' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'of the Adopted Regional System (as defined in section 2(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969)'."

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the committee amendment and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. This will not preclude the offering of an amendment to the amendment, will it?

The SPEAKER. No, it will not.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in behalf of legislation that has been introduced by a majority of the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia and was recently reported unanimously by the committee—a bill which makes it possible to realize the long-sought objective of a rapid rail transit system for the National Capital area; a bill which will provide to the Nation's Capital—the one major Capital in all the world which lacks such a system—a modern, high-speed, transit facility.

This great bipartisan objective, long sought by the Congress of the United States, has occupied its attention for the greater part of two decades. In 1952 the Congress enacted the National Capital Planning Act and directed the preparation of plans for the movement of goods and people in the region. Ever since, the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated its leadership and concern in the solution of this problem. Congressional policy was clearly enunciated at the time it enacted the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. On that occasion it was stated that an improved transportation system was essential—

To the continued and effective functions of the Government of the United States;

For the welfare of the District of Columbia;

For the orderly growth, planning and development of the National Capital region; and

For the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital.

Similarly, four Presidents have supported the rapid transit goal. Most recently, President Nixon, in his message of April 28, 1969, on the District of Columbia urged the enactment of the legislation we consider today, legislation to authorize a regional transit system for the Nation's Capital.

Subsequently, the full membership of the District Committee of the other body introduced S. 2185, a companion bill to the one I support here today. That bill received the unanimous approval of the U.S. Senate on July 8.

So it can be seen that a long bipartisan congressional-executive effort has steadily moved forward the cause of rapid transit for the National Capital region. In fact some 22 separate, significant congressional acts have furthered progress toward our goal. And where do we stand today?

I am happy to report that in response to congressional guidance when it approved the development of an Interstate Compact Agency, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has developed a truly regional transit system and a financial plan in its support.

So, it is no longer necessary to think of rapid transit as a promise for the distant future. Because of the congressional foresight I have described, we can assure the success of this great enterprise through our action here today. We have reached the threshold of realization.

Using funds authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, the Authority is ready to begin construction of the basic system, the central distributor in the District. Groundbreaking on this portion of the system is scheduled for December 9. This will be a great day for the National Capital region and a day of proud realization for the Congress.

And so today is the day which can assure the fruition of the visionary hopes of the Congress, four Presidents, and the citizens of the eight jurisdictions making up this great National Capital area, for the building of a rapid transit system in the Nation's Capital.

I am asking today, that this body affirm its desire once again, that the rapid rail transit program move a giant step forward. To this end, I have, together with my colleagues of the District Committee, introduced legislation essential to the funding of this program.

Every Member, I am sure, is painfully aware of the increasing problems associated with the growth of our population and resulting traffic congestion with its toll in wasted money, time, health, and tempers.

What we are proposing here today is that this body once again reaffirm its determination that this, our National Capital shall set a good example for the Nation to follow. With this legislation we begin to untangle the transportation mess that this Federal City is now suffering.

This legislation, except for several technical amendments, is identical to that of the companion measure approved by the Senate on July 8. The principal aspects of this transit bill are as follows:

Consistent with the intent of the Congress, the financial plan provides that the system be financed to the maximum feasible extent through system revenues and local financial participation. It is thus composed of three elements.

Of the $2.5 billion required for the construction of the 97-mile transit system, the first element provides that $835 million be financed through the sale of revenue supported bonds. Financial advisers and technical advisers of national prominence have assured our committee that revenues in excess of operating requirements will be available to underwrite a bond issue for this magnitude.

Second, the plan provides that $573.5 million must be provided by the eight participating local governments. Last year citizens of the region, voting in referendum, approved by margins ranging upward of 2 to 1 the issuance of bonds by their governments. They strongly demonstrated their willingness to fulfill their obligation to pay for one-third of the net project cost.

Third, the plan recommends that because of the great Federal interests in the National Capital the Federal Gov-

ernment provide the remaining two-thirds of the net project cost. This formula was established by the Congress for allocating Federal grants to other cities for transit improvements.

I might add for the total project cost of $2.5 billion, the amount of $1.408 billion will be local contribution, and the amount of $1.147 billion will be Federal contribution, or approximately a ratio of 55-to-45 representing the local-to-Federal support.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for a Federal contribution toward the regional rapid transit system. It authorizes capital grants to the Authority, subject to subsequent appropriations by the Congress, over the period of construction. The total grant including the $100 million now authorized would be limited to an aggregate of not to exceed $1,147,000,000.

A second purpose of this legislation is to authorize the District of Columbia, as a compact signatory, to enter into a contract for payment of annual contributions on the same basis as is required of the other seven compact participants. This purpose, as provided in section 7, would authorize Treasury borrowing by the District of Columbia.

A third purpose, is to assure that each of the participating local governments will meet its obligations. The bill will require that the Federal contribution during any given year be matched on a two-thirds Federal, one-third local basis.

The financial plan in support of the system projects that over the 50-year life-span of the revenue bonds excess revenues of nearly $1 billion will be generated. Section 6 provides that these earnings are to be returned to the Federal Government and the local participating governments in the same proportions as the capital contributions were originally shared.

Finally, section 5 of the bill creates the requirement for approval of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol for any construction within the U.S. Capitol Grounds. That section would also require that construction work within the District of Columbia on the transit system be coordinated with other construction work in public space.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is growing at a pace that is almost beyond understanding. Here, at the heart of our Nation, in our Capital City, the very machinery of Government is being slowed down to the crawl of overburdened traffic arteries. But, the means to keep our Capital City alive, alert, and useful is in our hands today—yours and mine—we must not fail our Federal City. We must, today, provide the transit program that will help us to grow without strangling our own growth. I urge you, right now, in the interests of preserving our Nation's Capital, to pass H.R. 11193.

Our committee contemplates that the appropriations authorized by this bill would be made over the course of a decade and, as projected, would not exceed $57 million the first year or $127 million the second year. Appropriations in no one year would exceed $188 million, as indicated in the following schedule of capital contributions:

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY—SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

[In thousands]

Fiscal year	Revenue bonds	Federal grants	Local grants	Total funds
1		$56,800	$28,400	$85,200
2		126,112	63,056	189,168
3	$130,000	180,688	90,344	401,032
4	130,000	188,011	94,005	412,016
5	125,000	174,321	87,161	386,482
6	125,000	131,181	65,590	321,771
7	125,000	90,360	45,180	260,540
8	125,000	68,024	34,012	227,036
9	75,000	90,059	45,029	210,088
10		41,488	20,745	62,233
Total	835,000	1,147,044	573,522	2,555,566

The legislation would require approval of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol of any transit facilities to be constructed within the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and provides that construction work to be performed in the public space in the District of Columbia be scheduled and coordinated with other construction work in such public space in the interest of public convenience and safety.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the lucid explanation by the gentleman from Florida of this bill by title and the amounts involved. As I understand it, we in the Congress are wearing two hats when we consider this bill. First we consider the total Federal authorization for the transportation authority, and also we sit as a council, as we so often sit, for the District of Columbia in authorizing their participation, including so much out of the Federal taxpayers' moneys for that matching purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman believe this total project over the long-term period of its construction and usefulness will not exceed roughly $2.5 billion?

Mr. FUQUA. I might say to the gentleman that this consideration was very much in the minds of the committee when it considered this bill. In the projections of the cost they determined by the finest engineering expertise in the country what the total cost would be to build this system today.

Then they added a 10-percent contingency fee for items they were unaware of which might develop in construction. In addition, they have added a 5 percent compounded annually increased-cost-of-construction escalation. So, with that added to it, then we arrive at the $2.5 billion total cost figure. So this has been taken into consideration.

Mr. HALL. I will say to the gentleman that specifications on that basis probably will get more contracts let and more construction started in the future. I compliment him on that. Certainly we need some enhancement of our transportation, if we continue to pile top on top of the Federal administration functions in the federal system, rather than dispersing central government as we should have learned during World War II.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOGAN. With respect to the comment by our distinguished colleague from Missouri, I should like to point out that the money we are talking about, the District of Columbia's share, does not comprise Federal dollars, but is merely an authorization for borrowing authority which will be repaid by locally raised revenues, not by Federal tax dollars.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. With respect to the bonds which are going to be issued, who is going to issue the bonds we are talking about? Will they be issued by the compact?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The Authority will issue the bonds.

Mr. VANIK. Are they contemplated to be taxable or tax-free bonds?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. They will be tax-exempt bonds.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11193.

First I should like to express the appreciation of all the people in the metropolitan area of Washington to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) for his leadership and his hard work in putting this legislation together and having it approved by the committee so that we can consider it here on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we have before us seeks to solve one of the most serious metropolitan area problems with which we are confronted. I am referring to the problem of the movement of people and goods, of transportation in the entire region. I am not ignoring other major urban problems with which we are confronted, such as housing, education, welfare, and recreation, but this is the only problem which must be solved from a metropolitan standpoint, an area standpoint, because we just cannot provide a transit system or highway system and stop at the boundary lines of any political subdivision. However, we can possibly solve most of these other problems within the separate political subdivision themselves.

Compounding this problem is the constant growth of population here in the metropolitan area, a population explosion, soaring from 2 million people in 1960 to an estimated 3½ million people in 1980, and to an estimated 5 million people by the year 2000. I believe the actual figure will exceed even that estimate.

There is also an increase in the number of automobiles, and in the number of automobiles per person or per family. There are more than 800,000 automobiles in the area at the present time, and that number is increasing all the time, as the

people are demanding more comfort, more convenience, and more economy. If this trend continues, we will face the necessity of a roadbuilding program that will create a sea of concrete in this area, unless a better solution is found—or the movement of traffic must surely strangulate.

More and more resistance is developing to the construction of new highways and freeways. As an example, there was the recent delay in the construction of the needed District of Columbia freeway system and the Three Sisters Bridge, because the people in the area just do not want more of their property taken away. Unless we do something to solve that problem, no adequate and orderly means for the movement of traffic will be possible.

I wish to express my strongest support for the enactment of H.R. 11193, which will authorize the financing of the rapid rail transit system for the Washington metropolitan area. The construction of this system is long overdue, and I predict that the need will become critical within a very few years.

The principal provisions of H.R. 11193 are as follows:

First. To authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make annual contributions to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to finance the Federal Government's share of the cost of the adopted regional system. These contributions shall not exceed in the aggregate $1,147,044,000 or two-thirds of the net project cost, whichever is the lower amount. These Federal contributions are to be matched by the local participating governments in total amounts not less than 50 percent of the Federal share.

Second. Authorizes the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to make annual contributions to finance the District government's share of the cost, not to exceed in the aggregate $216,500,000.

Third. Provides that two-thirds of any excess revenues accruing from the operation of the system, after such amounts as are paid for debt service and operating and maintenance costs, shall be put into the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Fourth. Authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to contract with the transit authority for a comprehensive study of the feasibility of extending a rapid rail transit line to Dulles International Airport. The cost of this study is authorized to be appropriated, not to exceed $150,000, and the study is to be completed within a period of 6 months.

Efforts to provide a rapid transit system for the Washington metropolitan area go back over a period of 17 years to 1952, when the Congress enacted a National Capital Planning Act authorizing studies of transportation on a regional basis. In 1954, the States of Maryland and Virginia joined with the District of Columbia in a commission to study passenger carrier facilities in the metropolitan area. The Congress then funded a $500,000 mass transportation survey, the results of which were published in 1959 as the Mass Transportation Survey, Report, concluding that while an expanded system of freeways and expressways was needed to handle existing and future motor traffic in the region, highways alone could not solve the area's eventual traffic problems. The study concluded that a rapid transit regional system would become a necessity by the year 1980.

The National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 authorized the States of Maryland and Virginia, and the District of Columbia, to negotiate a compact which would establish an interstate agency, which would provide adequate and necessary transit facilities for the National Capital region. Also, this act created the National Capital Transportation Agency, to be responsible for the planning and development of such a regional transit system, pending the establishment of an appropriate regional agency by the interstate compact. An original budget of $250,000 for the NCTA was approved by the Congress in September of 1960.

In November of 1962, the NCTA completed plans for a transit development program comprising some 83 miles of regional rapid rail transit, including 65 stations, estimated to cost $782,800,000. This program was presented to the Congress in May of 1963, but even though the House Committee on the District of Columbia approved and reported a bill to authorize a considerably modified and less costly version of this plan, this bill was recommitted to the committee. The reason for this rejection appeared to be too high a degree of financial responsibility which that bill would have placed upon the Federal Government—a fault which we feel has been remedied in H.R. 11193.

In 1965, the National Transportation Act of 1965 authorized the NCTA to proceed with the development of a 25-mile basic rapid transit system to be located principally within the District of Columbia, at an estimated cost of $431 million. This act also authorized the appropriation of $100 million of Federal funds and $50 million of District of Columbia funds toward the cost of providing this facility. The remaining $281 million was to be raised through the sale of taxable bonds to be repaid out of the system, but underwritten as to principal and interest by the Federal and District of Columbia governments in this same two-thirds to one-third ratio.

Under the authority granted by this act, the NCTA then devoted itself to developing a plan for these 25 miles of rapid transit routes which now comprise the heart of the present adopted regional system.

Meanwhile, pursuant to the authority granted in the National Transportation Act of 1960, referred to above, the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners proceeded to enact the compact which created the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The creation of this Authority was approved by Congress in Public Law 89–774, enacted on November 6, 1966, which transferred to the WMATA all the functions and duties of the NCTA. The actual transfer of this responsibility for transit development took place in October 1967.

Thus the NCTA passed out of existence after 7 years of invaluable pioneering service which provided the foundation upon which an adequate rapid transit system will be developed by its successor, the WMATA, for the entire National Capital region.

On December 20, 1967, legislation was enacted amending the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 with respect to the location of certain of the subway routes authorized.

Subsequent to the enactment of the National Transportation Act of 1965, the Congress has appropriated some $67.5 million of the $150 million authorized in that act, to be used for planning and design of the system.

As a result, the WMATA, after detailed planning, engineering studies, and coordination with Federal, regional, and local agencies throughout the area, and after holding extensive public hearings, on March 1, 1968, adopted a regional rapid rail transit plan and program for the Washington metropolitan area, which includes as its heart the system authorized essentially for the District of Columbia in the National Transportation Act of 1965. Some technical revisions of this plan, involving the relocation of a few stations in the proposed system, were adopted by the Authority on February 7, 1969.

The initial responsibilities assigned by the Congress to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority have been fulfilled with the approval of this plan for the Metro system, also known as the adopted regional system, which is the subject of H.R. 11193. The system consists of 97.7 miles of rapid rail service covering the Nation's Capital and its immediate environs. The remaining funds from the $150 million authorization provided in the National Transportation Act of 1965, which will be used for initial phases of construction of the system, are pending in appropriation legislation for fiscal year 1970. It is estimated that rapid rail transit service will begin within 3 years after the beginning of construction, and that the presently authorized 25-mile heart of the system will be in full operation some 2 years thereafter. If prompt action is taken on the pending legislation authorizing the full financing plan, the entire system can be in full operation by late 1979 or early 1980.

The full adopted regional system will include 37.7 miles of service in the District of Columbia, 29.9 miles in Maryland, and 30.1 miles in Virginia. The system will have 86 stations: 44 in the District, 22 in Maryland, and 20 in Virginia. Fifty-three of these stations will be in subway, and the remaining 33 will be at surface or aerial structures.

Forty-seven miles of the system, mostly in the highly developed portion of the area, will be constructed below surface. Forty-two miles will be on the surface, utilizing wherever feasible existing rights-of-way along established rail lines or in the median strips of divided highways. The remaining 8 miles will be on aerial structures, mostly for the purpose of grade separations.

Facilities for parking 30,000 automobiles will be provided at 37 stations. This will include spaces for 5,000 vehicles in

the District, 11,000 in Virginia, and 14,000 in Maryland.

Air-conditioned trains will run every 2 minutes on the main lines during peak hours, and a total of 658 vehicles will be required for full operation of the system. The cars will have a passenger capacity of 175 persons, with seats for 81 and ample room for 94 standees. Except for rush hours, of course, there will be sufficient seating for all passengers.

The adopted regional system will be coordinated with bus and automobile facilities to serve communities for some miles on both sides of the rapid rail lines. Feeder buses with frequent service and special dropoff lanes will make it convenient for a majority of the system's riders to use the combined system.

It is predicted that the population of the metropolitan area will increase from 2 million in 1960 to some 3.5 million by 1980, and to 4.2 million by 1990. Most of this growth, of course, will be in the suburbs.

Employment in the area will increase from 1 million in 1965 to 1.4 million in 1975, and to 1.9 million by 1990. Employment in the system's downtown area will increase from 273,000 in 1965 to 343,000 in 1975, and to more than 500,000 in 1990.

It is estimated further that the percentage of persons using public transportation to downtown Washington in peak hours will increase from some 40 percent in 1955 to 60 percent of a much larger population when the new transit system begins operation. This estimate is based on the experience in other cities which have constructed rapid rail transit systems.

Thus, total ridership for the adopted regional system for the year 1990 is estimated at some 292,610,000, and the total transit trips for the year 1990, including trips by bus only, are estimated at some 348,830,000.

It is planned that the fares will range from 30 cents in the District of Columbia portion of the system to a maximum of 70 cents in the outermost parts of the system. This fare schedule is comparable to the presently existing schedule of bus fares.

The WMATA anticipates that operation of the system will be conducted by private enterprise under contract. Considering all cost-of-operation factors, total operating expenses are projected at approximately $38.7 million by 1990, including depreciation.

Total box fare revenue for the year 1990 is estimated at $124.2 million. Anticipated allocation to the private bus companies for their share of bus-rail joint fares is projected at $37.9 million, leaving a net fare box revenue of $86.3 million.

In addition, it is estimated that revenue accruing from parking, concession leases, and similar sources will amount to some $3.1 million, for an adjusted gross revenue of $89.4 million.

Thus, it is estimated that operating and maintenance expenses of $32 million, plus allowance of $6.7 million for depreciation, will project a net annual revenue of $50.7 million.

The cost of the complete adopted regional system is estimated at $2,494.6 million. Net interest during the period of construction will amount to some $60.9 million, increasing the total project cost to $2,555.5 million, or in round figures $2.5 billion.

The Authority's financial program estimates that approximately one-third of the total project capital costs can be financed through system revenues. To this end, the WMATA's financial consultants anticipate that net revenues of the system will support issuance of revenue bonds during the construction period amounting to $835 million. These revenue bonds issued by the Authority will have a maturity of less than 50 years and will be secured by a pledge of the gross revenues of the system. These tax-exempt revenue bonds, which it is hoped will have an average interest rate of 5 percent, will have a coverage factor of 1.2 times net revenue before depreciation. A sinking fund will be established, in an amount sufficient to provide for the repayment of these bonds within 50 years of issue.

The remaining net project cost—that is, the amount not covered by the authority's revenue bonds—is to be shared by the Federal and local governments. This amounts to some $1,720.5 million.

Under the Federal-local matching formula authorized by the Congress for construction of the 25-mile basic system, the Federal share will be two-thirds of the net project cost. Under the terms of H.R. 11193, however, this Federal share is limited either to that part of the cost or to a total of $1,147,044,000, whichever is the lesser amount. I wish to call attention to the fact that the $100 million of Federal funds authorized for this purpose in the National Transportation Act of 1965, and which is in the process of being completely appropriated at this time, is a part of the above-mentioned amount. That is, the aggregate of future Federal Government contributions to the system is limited to $1,147,044,000. Such a financial program will follow the pattern of the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

This matching formula for Federal and local grants charges the local governments with responsibility for some $573.5 million. The Authority has adopted a cost-allocation formula for the sharing of this local net project cost among the District of Columbia and the neighboring jurisdictions of Maryland and Virginia as follows:

District of Columbia $21.5 million;

Virginia $149.9 million: Alexandria $30.6 million, Arlington County $54 million, Fairfax County $61.9 million, Fairfax City $2.6 million, and Falls Church $0.8 million;

Maryland $197 million: Montgomery County $110.4 million, Prince George's County $86.6 million; Future allocation $10.1 million;

Total required grants $573.5 million.

Because of a desire on the part of the local suburban governments to demonstrate their support of the adopted regional system before any formal requests for Federal authorization were brought before the Congress, referendums were held last year in the five suburban jurisdictions where such referendums are required, based on prelimary estimated allocations which subsequently were revised by extensive further analysis of costs. These referendums were approved by the voters in all five of these jurisdictions by nearly a 3-to-1 margin. As a result, Falls Church became the first area jurisdiction to formally approve contract agreements with the WMATA for the adopted regional system. In addition, authority for Prince Georges County and Montgomery County, in Maryland, to issue bonds for their allocated shares was granted last year by the Maryland Legislature and by the Montgomery County Council respectively. Thus, the support of the suburban jurisdictions is fully assured.

Mr. Speaker, the case for the approval of this proposed legislation is overwhelming. The Congress determined years ago that a rapid rail transit system for the National Capital region is a desirable investment, and that it would become a necessity within a period of a few years. Those few years have passed, and there is no question whatever that the necessity is now a reality, and that the need will grow critical in the very near future.

A team of highly reputable independent economic analysts have concluded that the adopted regional system is a sound financial investment, which will produce financial benefits three times greater than its net cost. The voters in the nearby suburban jurisdictions of Virginia, and the governing bodies of the adjacent counties of Maryland, have strongly attested their approval of this plan and their willingness to pay their fair share of its capital cost.

While it is true that the share which this bill will authorize for the Federal Government to assume is a large sum of money, it represents only the Federal Government's inescapable responsibility to the Nation's Capital in this highly vital area of need. I wish to point out that the Federal Government's contribution is to be made on an annual basis, and that the WMATA must seek approval of the Congress each year of the construction program for that year, so that the Congress will be apprised of every step in the process of development of the system.

If anyone could suggest a less expensive solution for the critical present and future needs for an adequate transportation system for the Washington metropolitan area, I would endorse it immediately. However, I am convinced that there is no such alternative. For this reason, I point out that the cost of the adopted regional system can only increase with any delay in its construction, and with all the eloquence at my command I urge the passage of this direly needed bill which the Senate has already approved in every substantive detail, in order that we may properly meet our responsibility to the entire metropolitan region.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sound approach and a sound proposal. We were directed by the Congress to come up with a formula, or some other provision or program, with which to solve this problem. This adopted regional system has been 17 years in the making, and Mr. Speaker, I

think we have waited too long already. It will take at least 10 years to build this system. We want to break ground next month, on December 9, and hope to have the first portion of this system in operation in 1972 and the entire system completed in 1979.

So, let us get going and get the job done.

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

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are today, with this bill, embarking on another trip into wonderland. I do not care how many subways are built in the District of Columbia, with the extensions into the States of Virginia and Maryland, or how many sport centers and stadiums are built. All I want the people of this area to do is spend their own money to build them.

If this transportation system presents such a wonderful, rosy financial picture; if it will pay for itself as has been stated, why do you not just build it with your own money? Why come to the Federal taxpayers?

I wonder what will happen if any one of the three segments defaults on its obligation for this system. What happens then? Who gets the bill? That is the question I would like someone to answer. I would like some proponent to say he will put his reputation on the line to the effect that this subway—and I think it is a boondoggle—that this subway is not going to cost more than $2.5 billion.

If this is not going to cost more than $2.5 billion then I wish somebody would stake his reputation on it here and now for the record, so that he can live with it in the days to come.

I know what happened in connection with the stadium, and so does everybody else. We had assurances, time after time, that it would not cost the Federal taxpayers a dime, but it is costing the Federal taxpayers, and it has every day since it was completed and occupied.

Now I will yield to anyone who can give me the answers to a few questions.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I tried to point out a moment ago that we did the best we could do to come up with an accurate figure as to what this thing would cost. We used the best information that was available from people who were familiar with this type of construction and this type of operation. We have no way of guaranteeing to the gentleman or anyone else that it will cost less or more than we anticipate. We think they are realistic estimates.

Furthermore, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, we do provide for Federal and State participation in many programs such as education and the Federal highways. We also have proposals pending in the Congress to have a large mass transportation program where the Federal Government will pay two-thirds of the cost, and the local communities will pay one-third. All we are doing here is what we have done on many occasions with other communities in the country.

Mr. GROSS. There is a vast difference in connection with the other programs that the gentleman speaks of. The States of Maryland and Virginia, and the District of Columbia get more than their share of school and highway aid that goes to the other States now, on top of that they are about to get hundreds of millions of dollars for a transportation system that will not be shared by other States. Unlike an education, it is impossible for a citizen to take his or her share of a subway running through the District and into Virginia and Maryland and carry it around the United States as needed. There is no comparison between educational grants and a huge Federal handout for this purpose.

You talk about a population explosion in the District of Columbia. I seriously question whether there will be such an explosion, I think it is going the other way.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, I opposed this legislation back in 1962 or 1963, I have forgotten which is the correct date, because I was concerned at that time that there was an effort to retain what I have called captive customers or clientele, because there was an effort at that time to curtail the highway program. But since that time these problems have been resolved, and I am firmly convinced that if we are going to have an integrated and effective transportation system in the District of Columbia that then we need this rapid transit system.

But let me point out that there is a Federal obligation here, because this is the Capital City, the Federal City of the Nation. The Federal Government has a great impact upon the economy of the region. The Federal Government is the greatest employer in the region. So we have a responsibility as the Federal Government to participate in this program.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that these taxing bodies have a responsibility to fully tax the people who are the beneficiaries of this big and constant Federal payroll? There is no payroll anywhere in the United States more constant, or a better payroll than in this area in and around the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Certainly they have a responsibility, and they are taxing their citizens on the same basis that we ask any other communities that participate in a rapid transit program. But the Federal Government has the added responsibility here, because of the congestion that is involved, because there is a great loss in man hours at work because we cannot get in and out of here. Furthermore, the Federal share is not going to be spent until the local communities have come up with their share. The Committee on Appropriations is not going to put out any money until the local participation has been substantiated and documented. So that we are going along on this on a partnership basis.

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree that there is an obligation upon the Federal taxpayers to spend hundreds of millions for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman, this is the Capital of the Nation. If the Government here is bogged down by inadequate transportation facilities or service, then service to the general public over the whole country suffers, and there would be less service to all concerned than if there were adequate transportation. That is part of the problem.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Transportation is bogged down right now in northern Virginia with a bus strike. What would happen if you had had all this traffic keyed to a subway and then a strike took place? Apparently there is little interest in the strike on the part of the State of Virginia. They have made no effort to get an injunction or taken any other action to restore service pending meaningful negotiations in the strike.

Mr. HARSHA. I am not at liberty to discuss whether or not they have made meaningful negotiations. Certainly we may be confronted with strikes, and I think the employees are entitled to try to advance their own interests by collective bargaining in any manner that is legal and appropriate.

Mr. GROSS. That is right, but if the District of Columbia is so important to northern Virginia or to the State of Virginia as a whole, as we are led to believe here today; why is not something being done about it? That is my question.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. I certainly appreciate the great study that my colleague has made on this issue. In the past I have always supported proposals providing for better public transportation.

The thing that concerns me about this bill is that the Federal commitment is so large that I am afraid it will destroy any real hope of getting any comparable kind of support for other mass transit needs in the rest of the country. I feel that this could just become a bottomless pit which could usurp incredible Federal revenues to support the system. I must confess to the gentleman, I do not think is going to be a profitable operation. I must tell the gentleman that I cannot see where the revenues are going to carry the anticipated costs of this program. But if it would, it would be contrary to all of the experience we have had with transportation systems through the United States.

I think we have to assume this is going to be a money loser and we will be confronted with a deferral and a difficult experience in the repayment.

The thing that concerns me is that in getting into this very multibillion Federal outlay, we may be getting ourselves into a situation where we might have to continue to pour more work and more

bureaucrats into the Washington area in order to support the subway system. I think we ought to try to decentralize the bureaucracy and remove from Washington the activities that can be carried on more efficiently in other areas.

Frankly, I feel that we might, because of the subway system impose upon ourselves the obligation to continue to pour far more and more Government bureaucracy into the area in order to pay off the costs of this tremendous expensive subway system.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out for the information of the gentleman from Ohio that fewer than 10 percent of the Federal Government employees are employed here in the Washington area. So these personnel are pretty well distributed throughout the country at this time.

Second, the local communities involved are guaranteeing that these revenue bonds will be paid.

Third, it is not costing the Federal Government $2½ billion. The cost to the Federal Government is $1.1 billion—two-thirds of the total Federal and local portion of the cost of the system. Revenue bonds will finance the balance.

This is similar to the formula used all over the country for mass transit and many other joint Federal-local programs.

Mr. HARSHA. I might say to the gentleman that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has had the best engineers and the best accountants available, and the most experienced people in the transit business estimating the amortization of this obligation and how the revenues can be realized; and they have come up with a package that they estimate will bring back into the fare box approximately a billion dollars over the cost—that is the capital cost of construction, plus the operating costs over a period of years. This legislation provides that the Federal Government will receive two-thirds of that overage, or that approximately $609 million will go back into the Federal Treasury, so we will have an eventual net outlay of only some $400 million, rather than $1,100,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VANIK. Can the gentleman tell me what the current year's appropriation is for mass transit for the rest of the United States?

Mr. HARSHA. No, I cannot. I do not have that figure. All I can tell you is that the formula for Federal participation in this bill is the same as it is under the Mass Transit Act for the rest of the United States. What the total appropriation is for the rest of the country for mass transportation I do not know. I am sorry.

Mr. VANIK. Am I correct in my understanding that it is less than $175 million in fiscal 1970?

Mr. HARSHA. I could not state.

Mr. VANIK. I ventured a guess. The question I raise is that there is a disproportionate amount in the allocation of Federal mass transportation revenues to the District of Columbia as distinguished from all the rest of the United States. It looks to me as though the program for the Washington area is many times larger than the programs we have in all the rest of the United States.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. We have a different situation in the District of Columbia. We are trying to operate the Federal Government, the Government of the United States. The success of the services rendered by the employees to the rest of the country depends upon their ability to get to and from their jobs. That is why we have a larger participation in terms of dollars, in this particular legislation than we do in the mass transportation program in other cities. Furthermore this is the Nation's Capital and we all have constituents who not only visit here but who are interested in seeing that we have the most effective, efficient Capital in the world. As this Nation's Capital we have other considerations to take into account such as all of the foreign embassies and foreign visitors yet we are probably the only national capital in the world without an adequate rapid or mass transit system.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What has been the fate of the subway systems in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia? Are those enterprises howling successes?

Mr. VANIK. I might point out to the gentleman from Iowa that in Cleveland we have a mass transit system. We have the first mass transit system in America connected to an airport. The revenues are increasing. Traffic volume has grown. We were able to complete this rather fine system with a relatively small amount of Federal money. In that system we received about $13 million as a Federal grant. But I am relating to what was done with this Federal grant to the tremendous commitment in this bill.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOGAN. I point out to the gentleman that that money will be spread over 10 years, not 1 year.

Mr. VANIK. I understand.

Mr. HOGAN. This is the normal formula for participation of the Federal Government in rapid transit programs with jurisdictions—on a percentage basis.

Mr. VANIK. With one exception, in that the local part, the part that is due from the District of Columbia, is also coming as a loan from the Federal Treasury. That is the difference. What would normally be a local contribution is also a Federal contribution.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the Chairman.

Mr. FUQUA. I might point out that the local contribution is being borrowed by the District of Columbia, but the District of Columbia will have the obligation to repay that amount.

I might point out again, as I did in my opening remarks, that all the jurisdictions are putting up approximately 55 percent of the money for the total project work. The Federal Government is putting up only 45 percent.

Mr. VANIK. I cannot understand any distinction between the District of Columbia borrowing from the Federal Government under circumstances of unlikely repayment or getting the money from the Federal Government. I think it is coming out of the pockets of the general taxpayers, and I think it is disproportionate.

Mr. HOGAN. It is coming out of the local District of Columbia taxpayers, the resources of the local government, rather than the Federal Government.

Mr. VANIK. And it is coming right out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. HOGAN. It is a borrowing authority, not a commitment of Federal dollars.

Mr. VANIK. It is coming out of the Federal Treasury if the borrowing fails.

Mr. HOGAN. It will be repaid from local tax revenues.

Mr. VANIK. And if it is not, we will still have to wipe it out or absorb it through action of the Federal Government. The gentleman understands that.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. The Federal Government contributes 25 to 30 percent to the total District of Columbia budget. The rest of the money in the general funds comes from local tax resources. So what you say is true, up to 25 to 30 percent of the amount of the District budget. That is all U.S. citizens contribute their proportionate share of this 25 to 30 percent.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman assure me that he will make every effort to decentralize the Federal Government, and assure me, as far as he can, that we will not have to load on more bureaucracy in the Washington metropolitan area in order to pay off this investment we are making in mass transit?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman that we should do everything to decentralize the Federal Government. There is no arguing with that. We think we have done everything in this legislation to assure that there will be no further requests from the Federal Government to fund this sort of program. I am personally convinced that the engineers who made this study and the Capital Transportation Agency have done an outstanding job in preparing their estimates and that every precaution has been taken to meet any unforeseen problems, yet present the Congress with as realistic a proposal under all the circumstances that could conceivably be made.

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

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. VANIK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this figure is accurate or not, but I have been given the figure of $41 million as the amount already expended on the mass transportation proposed for this area. Is it possible that $41 million has already been expended in one way or another on this system?

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this has been the cost of the preliminary studies and the engineering work that has gone on, that Congress authorized in previous acts. There have been 22 separate acts which Congress has taken relating to mass transportation in the District of Columbia. This expenditure has come about as a result of these previous acts by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. So $41 million has already been expended and not a wheel has moved, not a passenger has been transported anywhere, and not a shovelful of dirt has been turned toward an operating transit system or anything else. Is that correct?

Mr. FUQUA. If the gentleman will come up on December 9, we will be happy to let him participate in moving some of the first dirt, but there have been some soundings made, and there has been some dirt moved.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and good night.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement by Congressman GUDE. There has been a death in Congressman GUDE's family—his mother has died—and he has submitted this statement to be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF HON. GILBERT GUDE

Mr. Speaker, House action today on two separate pieces of legislation will resolve one of our most pressing metropolitan Washington problems, the implementation of our regional balanced transportation system.

Since coming to the Congress I have worked in every conceivable aspect for the development and implementation of such a modern transportation system for this Maryland, Virginia and D.C. region.

Approval of the D.C. Appropriation Bill FY 1970 with $40,322,000 for the District's share for 1970 will provide for the immediate construction of the basic rapid rail transit system. I am pleased that by this action today the House will meet its responsibility for the Capital's modern subway.

At the same time today we have before us the National Capital Transportation Act of '69 of which I am an original sponsor. In this we are pledging our commitment to the 98 mile regional rapid rail transit system, which has been carefully developed by the jurisdictions in Maryland, Virginia and the District. The participating governments in this region have already pledged their financial support for the development of this system.

The Administration has given its considerable backing and attention to both of these transit efforts and I wish to commend their leadership in ending the subway-freeway impasse this past year. This contrasts with the performance of recent administrations, whose lack of positive action left Washington in a period of transportation stagnation and paralysis. I happily endorse the action of my colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee for their making these critical funds available for our transit requirements.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, former Congressman Basil Whitener and I were two of the authors of the subway bill for the District of Columbia. I am under no illusion that this will be a system that can be cheaply constructed. On the original estimates, I think many of us were well aware of the fact that we probably missed the mark by a great deal—and we apparently did underestimate the cost at that time.

I am impressed by the statement made by my colleague that more bureaucracy will be generated, because many of us are hopeful that we can work out a transit system that ultimately will not be operated by the Government but that could be under private management. This is looking to the future.

A very important part of this debate would be missing if I did not comment about the hard work which has been done by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) while this matter was being considered in the subcommittee. I did not serve on that subcommittee, but this will was authored by nine members of the District of Columbia Committee. We have bipartisan support. There has been obviously more enthusiastic support by the outlying districts than we had been able to muster at an early date.

My comment about the transit system is simply this: I think we must view everything we do regarding the District of Columbia in a little different light than when we deal with any other problem for any other city. This is our Federal City, our Nation's Capital, and I think when we look around, we will have to admit there are many areas we have overlooked to which somehow or other more attention should have been given. I am proud to see that in many respects some things we have done are working out. I hope this transit system works out as well as some of the other additions to the District government have worked out.

I refer particularly to our vocational school, which is doing a tremendous job. About 5,000 of the persons living in the District of Columbia in a part-time, if not full-time, way are getting service from our vocational school. Many will have gainful employment as a result of it.

Also, our Federal City College is doing well. I have taken a great deal of ribbing about some of the things that happened there earlier; but, that school is steadying down. We are finding there the school's problems are on the decline, and that its contribution to the welfare of the community may be quite extensive.

When we deal with a metropolitan transit system, when we deal with our entire budget for the District of Columbia, I believe we need to keep in mind that we are dealing with our Federal City. I, as a citizen and a taxpayer from way out Minnesota way, want to make my contribution wherever I can to sensibly look at the problems of our Nation's Capital. There is nobody more conservative, so far as being careful of personal expense or Government expense, than I am. The record will show it. But I am willing to be a little bit on the liberal side when my Federal City is involved, because it should be the model city of the United States of America, and at the present time it is not.

It is my hope that in our commitee we can ultimately bring out a whole package of legislation dealing with crime, education, transportation, and you name it. I believe much of this is on the way.

Mr. Speaker, I favor H.R. 11193, which authorizes a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region and an authorization for the District to participate in this metropolitan program.

H.R. 11193 was introduced by my distinguished colleague (Mr. FUQUA) and was cosponsored by myself and eight other members of the House District Committee.

INTRODUCTION

This matter has bipartisan support of both the House and the Senate—joint hearings having been held on S. 2185 and H.R. 11193 on June 10 and 11, 1969.

The transit authority has the overwhelming support of the Federal and District governments and in fact the neighboring States of Virginia and Maryland are anxiously awaiting positive action on this bill.

It is the final bill in a series of bills proposing a transit development program for the Washington metropolitan area.

It is, in my opinion, that this bill, proposing a transit program for Metropolitan Washington, is the principal part—the subway portion—in a balanced transportation system this is badly needed, not only by the District of Columbia and the neighboring metropolitan areas, but this subway system will be of great value to people from all over this Nation who visit their Nation's Capital in the future.

CONGRESSIONAL MANDATE

Our committee considers that the Authority's adopted financial plan adheres to the congressional mandate as well as the expressed provisions of the compact that, as far as possible, the cost of the transit facilities should be borne by the persons using and benefiting from them. Your committee has carefully reviewed the Authority's estimates of construction costs, passenger traffic, revenues, and operating expenses. The proposed contribution of two-thirds, or $1.147 million by the Federal Government, and one-third, or $573.5 million by the local jurisdictions, follows the pattern for Federal assistance to urban mass transportation improvement programs established in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Financing of the Federal share of the regional rapid rail transit plan through congressional authorization, rather than

under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 302), reflects four very important basic considerations:

First. It carries forward the historical intent and precedent of the Congress established in the legislative history of this project previously mentioned in this report;

Second. It recognizes the special interest of the Congress in the unique characteristics of the Federal City and its long-range development;

Third. It accords with the desire of the President for early enactment of legislative authority for the construction of a regional transit system as an essential element of his program for the enhancement of the National Capital region; and

Fourth. It assures congressional oversight of the project by the committee of the Congress having the continuing interest, broad responsibility, and special expertise in the affairs of the Nation's Capital.

Finally, the provision in the Authority's financial plan and expressed in the legislation before the committee, for overpayment from excess revenues generated by operation of the system, is in accord with the intent expressed by this committee in its report on the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965—House Report 536, 89th Congress, first session. Under that provision, to the extent that the transit system once in substantially full operation, produces revenues in excess of amounts necessary to provide for its operating and maintenance expenses, debt service on the Authority's revenue bonds, and deposits in reserves, two-thirds of such excess revenues—as defined in section 6 of the bill—will be paid to miscellaneous receipts of the United States. The remaining one-third will be returned to the local jurisdictions in proportion to their capital contributions.

NEED FOR RAPID TRANSIT

The streets and highways of the Nation's Capital and its suburbs are beset by massive traffic congestion during the rush hours. The delays encountered in moving from home to work and back are becoming enormous and onerous. The statistics emphasize the magnitude of the problem. In 1960 this region had a population of some 2 million. By 1980 there will be 3.5 million, and by the year 2000, a population of some 5 million people is projected. There are more than 800,000 automobiles in the region today. It is estimated that by 1980, there will be an additional 1 million vehicles traversing the streets and highways of the region.

Traffic congestion is extremely serious today. It will become appalling in the years ahead, unless we move forward promptly with the development of an areawide system of exclusive right-of-way, high-speed, high-capacity, rapid rail transit, to supplement the already stupendous interstate highway systems channeling traffic to and through the area.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR THE LEGISLATION

The bill of our committee was introduced on May 13, 1969; and a companion bill, S. 2185, was introduced by several Members of the other body.

As I stated earlier, joint hearings were held on these bills by the District of Columbia Committees of both Houses on June 10 and 11, 1969. Testimony was heard from the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget; the Under Secretary, Department of Transportation; the Commissioner of the District of Columbia; the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; representatives of the suburban transit commissions and of the Washington business community. Supporting statements were filed by labor organizations, citizens groups, and representatives of local governments.

The entire legislative history behind this project, and the testimony before our committee for the past 10 years and in particular the transit hearings this year, demonstrate beyond doubt that the regional rapid rail transit plan and program have the overwhelming support of the Federal and District of Columbia governments.

The unique and major Federal interest in Washington and the National Capital region, as well as the Federal Government's direct responsibility for assuring efficiency in the conduct of its own business and in preserving the beauty and improving the quality of the environment of the National Capital, necessitate a Federal capital contribution toward the cost of design and construction of the regional rapid rail transit system, which together with contributions by the local jurisdictions and the issuance of revenue bonds by the Authority, will assure completion of the regional transit system.

The local jurisdiction and the public within the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Zone have demonstrated their desire and willingness to commit themselves financially to pay their fair share of the costs of designing, engineering, construction and equipping the regional rail rapid transit system adopted by the Authority by providing funds to meet the administrative expenses of the Authority and by passing bond referenda, where required, authorizing the local jurisdictions, to contribute the necessary non-Federal grants.

The actions of the Authority and the efforts of the local jurisdictions have furthered the transit program to the point where it is essential that the Congress provide at this time the additional authorizations necessary to assure orderly progress toward completion of the long-awaited rapid rail system. I urge that this legislation receive the favorable consideration of the Congress.

CONCLUSION

As stated, I favor this bill and I recommend its enactment to those of my colleagues who wish to provide a balanced transportation system for the Nation's Capital. I believe this subway system is badly needed. I also believe that to delay on this matter further will deny to residents of the entire metropolitan area an integral part of a balanced transportation system that may well stifle the proper growth of this area if indeed it does not paralyze this area totally in time.

I recommend this legislation as one of the most important and most studied bills ever to come before this body from the District Committee.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. As long as demonstrators continue to knock out 150 plateglass windows and other costly vandalism in connection with a parade in Washington, D.C., is not going to have much of a reputation as being the model city of the United States, is it?

Mr. NELSEN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I do not endorse that practice. I hope we can find the answer to problems like that.

Mr. GROSS. And the taxpayers of the Nation cannot make a model city out of it by sinking $2½ billion in a subway.

Mr. NELSEN. I understand your viewpoint. I hope that somehow we can set up a procedure for education and training and law enforcement that will move segments of this Nation's population in another direction. But, I do not see where the decent law-abiding citizens of this city, or the country as a whole, should be denied a subway system in the Nation's capital because of the conduct of some of the moratorium marchers.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the bill before us, because it will authorize the financing of an integral part of a balanced transportation system for metropolitan Washington which is so sorely needed.

Anyone who commutes to the Capital knows the congestion which all Government employees have to contend with daily, and knows, also, the considerable loss of money and frayed nerves which the current situation results in.

I should like to comment on some of the remarks made by my colleagues.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio commented that the system was not likely to ever show a profit. That may or may not be the case, but we do not require that our freeways show a profit, and the rapid rail transit system is as essential for the movement of people and goods as is our highway system. We need highways that are adequate to the population. We need rapid transit, and we need adequate bus service. No one mode of transportation can solve the problems of transportation in Metropolitan Washington.

With regard to some of the comments made by my good friend and distinguished colleague from Iowa, he indicated that the local jurisdictions perhaps were not paying their fair share. I should like to point out the facts.

The allocation of funds is based on the number of miles within the various Maryland and Virginia suburbs. Specifically, Maryland has 30.6 percent of the miles and yet is contributing 34.4 percent of the total net project cost. Virginia has 30.8 percent of the route mileage and is contributing 27.9 percent of the total net project cost. The reason for this is that much of the Virginia line will not be underground, and part of it will be on an already existing railroad right of way and on the right-of-way of the median strip of Route 66.

Maryland is paying a disproportionate share of the total system because it benefits from the total functioning sys-

tem. That is the point I should like to make. One cannot separate this into Maryland segments and Virginia segments and District of Columbia segments. The system only becomes viable when all aspects of it are functioning efficiently.

Some proponents, or opponents, if you will, will say that the Federal Government ought only to become involved in financing the local share.

Mr. Speaker, this loses sight of the fact that it is in the Federal interest to see that employees from the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia have ready access to their places of employment.

I would also like to allude to a study that was made indicating that the Federal Government is the prime beneficiary of this system. Not only is the Federal Government the principal employer, but I might point out to the gentleman from Ohio that the State of California has far more Federal employees than Metropolitan Washington and that other areas have their share as well. However, a study by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission conducted in 1968, in October, indicates that the Federal Government will receive approximately 94 cents in direct benefits for every dollar it contributes toward financing of this regional system. In addition to that, there will be a number of indirect benefits to the Federal Government.

I would also like to point out some of the tangible dollar values to the gentleman from Iowa. The major direct benefits to the Federal Government will result from reductions and avoidance of costs which are the responsibility of the Federal Government as the major employer in the area. Over a 50-year period they are estimated to be as follows: parking construction cost savings, $214,801,500; conservation of land for better use, $167,407,600; interoffice shuttle savings—which is a substantial cost to the Federal Government—$82,417,600; reduction in early departures, $566,949.100. The total dollar benefits amount to $1,496,014,000. These are all direct benefits which the Federal Government will receive if this special system is adopted.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, it will benefit indirectly and the Federal employees themselves will benefit from having a more convenient way to commute to work.

Finally, the experts state that viable transit systems are those planned, financed, and operated on a regional basis, because the benefits to each government in the region, including the Federal Government, is not measurable on a jurisdictionally fragmented basis.

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to do what is right not only by Metropolitan Washington, but by the Federal employees who will be so dependent on this system.

An evaluation of these benefits on a value basis indicates that the anticipated benefits represent 94 percent of the present value of the Federal portion of the costs of developing the system. The benefits to the Federal Government will be far in excess of what they would be in any other city where Federal transit assistance is given.

There are also several other areas in which the Federal Government's role as a major employer would be facilitated by the development of the Metro system. These include reduced absenteeism, less dependence on staggered hours and car pooling, and enlargement of the effective labor pool in the region.

The Federal Government would also benefit indirectly as a result of the personal savings to Federal employees in commuting to work. These benefits are expected to range between $21,987,800 and $34,889,800 annually by 1990.

There would also be substantial time savings to Federal employees, tourists, and others from the more efficient use of these facilities as a result of the Metro system and these savings would indirectly benefit the Federal Government.

The Federal Government also has as a large stake in the overall environment of the regional area. The Metro system will have a significant impact on improving this environment. Improved access to employment, recreational, social, cultural, and educational centers is a major area of regional benefit, particularly to lower income residents, the young, and the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, the plan adopted by the WMATA for financing construction of the regional rapid rail transit plan calls for capital costs to be financed, to the extent possible, through revenues from the operation of the system. The remaining costs are to be shared among the Federal Government and the local jurisdictions within the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Zone.

The cost of the system is estimated at $2,494.6 million, exclusive of net interest during construction and a funded bond reserve. Approximately one-third of the total project cost will be financed through system revenues. The Authority anticipates that net revenues of Metro will support issuance of revenue bonds to finance such costs. Such bonds are estimated to amount to $835 million exclusive of the amount for the funded bond reserve. Revenue bonds issued by the Authority would have a maturity of not more than 50 years and will be secured by a pledge of the revenue of the system. These bonds will have a debt service coverage factor of approximately 1.2.

Long-term service contracts will be entered into with suburban transit commissions or local units of government under which each entity will contract with the Authority to pay for transit services in and for its area.

The remaining net project cost—that amount not covered by revenue bonds—is to be shared by governments. It amounts to $1,720.5 million. Under the congressionally authorized Federal-local matching formula for grants to construct the 25-mile basic system, the Federal share is two-thirds of the net project cost. Extension of this formula to the Metro system will result in a total Federal contribution of $1,147 million, or about 44 percent of the total project cost.

The matching formula for Federal and local grants charges local governments with responsibility for $573.5 million. The Authority has adopted a cost allocation formula for sharing this local net project cost among the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. Suballocation formulas were adopted by the suburban transit commissions for distributing the Maryland and Virginia shares among the local jurisdictions within each transit district. On November 5, 1968, in all area jurisdictions where referendums were required to authorize issuance of bonds to cover each jurisdiction's allocated share of metro's capital costs, the voters overwhelmingly expressed their willingness to tax themselves to bring rapid rail to the region. These referendums were approved in all five jurisdictions by nearly a 3 to 1 margin.

The Maryland Assembly has expressed its legislative policy toward the metropolitan subway system—Maryland House bill 454, article 64B, as follows:

> The development of improved and expanded transit facilities, consisting of rapid transit and bus service operating as a unified and coordinated regional transit system, is essential for the satisfactory movement of people and goods, the alleviation of present and future traffic congestion, the economic welfare and vitality and the development of the metropolitan area of Baltimore, comprising Baltimore City, Baltimore County and Anne Arundel County. Such a regional transit system cannot be achieved by the unilateral action of any one of Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County but requires action by the State of Maryland, through a State Authority which is politically responsive to local needs and which will assure that the development of the regional transit system fosters general development plans for the State, the region and the local development plans of the participating political subdivisions. Adequate provisions should be made for the protection of transit labor in the development and operation of the regional system. Adequate provision should be made for assuring that in the event allocation of state financial resources for the benefit of this regional system are made, it shall be accompanied by a parity allocation for the benefit of taxpayers supporting transit facilities in the political subdivisions of the Washington suburban transit district.

The Maryland Legislature has also appropriated $1.1 million in planning and administrative funds through fiscal year 1970. Both Governor Mandel and Vice President AGNEW, when Governor of Maryland, have indicated strong support for a transit system in the Washington-Baltimore area. House bill 454 passed by the Maryland Legislature, as noted above, contains language which would provide for assurance that in the event that State financial resources are used for the benefit of the Baltimore transit system, it shall be accompanied by a parity allocation for the benefit of taxpayers supporting transit facilities in the political subdivision of the Washington suburban transit district.

The bill imposes two conditions on Federal contributions for the adopted regional system. The first condition is that the work assisted by the contributions shall be subject to the provisions of the interstate compact—for example, article XIV, payment of prevailing wages, and article XV—relocation assistance—adopted by Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules of the adopted regional system.

The second condition relates to the payment by the local participating governments in the compact of their shares in the cost of the adopted regional system. It is required that at the end of any given fiscal year the cumulative amount of contributions made under the compact for the adopted regional system by the local participating governments in the compact shall be at least one-half of the cumulative amount of the Federal contributions made for that system by the end of such fiscal year. It is not required that in any given fiscal year the contributions of the local participating governments be at least one-half of the Federal contributions made in such fiscal year. However, the cumulative total of the contributions of those governments at the end of any fiscal year must be at least one-half of the cumulative total of the Federal contributions made to the end of that fiscal year. In some fiscal years the contributions of those governments may be more or may be less than one-half of the Federal contributions in those fiscal years. Under the capital contributions agreement entered into under the compact by the Transit Authority and those governments, the Transit Authority may, under certain circumstances, increase the contribution of any of those participating governments for a fiscal year. But if such an increase is made, a reduction must be made in the contribution of that government in a subsequent fiscal year so that the total contribution that that government has agreed to make is not exceeded.

Under the bill not to exceed $1,047,044,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation to enable him to make the Federal contributions for the adopted regional system. The authorization is for appropriations without fiscal year limitation. The bill also makes it clear that the authorization of appropriations ($100 million) in section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 is in addition to the authorization of appropriations made by this bill.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority—representing Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia—which will administer the area transmit system projects the following statistics relative to the proposed transit system:

METRO REGIONAL RAPID RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Route miles:	
District of Columbia	37.7
Maryland	29.9
Prince Georges County	13.9
Montgomery County	16.0
Virginia	30.1
Arlington County	12.2
Fairfax County	12.8
Alexandria	5.1
Total	97.7
Stations:	
District of Columbia	44
Maryland	22
Prince Georges County	11½
Montgomery County	10½
Virginia	20
Arlington County	10
Fairfax County	6½
Alexandria	3½
Total	86

METRO REGIONAL RAPID RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY—Continued

Parking spaces:	
District of Columbia	4,925
Maryland	14,175
Prince Georges County	8,125
Montgomery County	6,050
Virginia	11,000
Arlington County	500
Fairfax County	9,000
Alexandria	1,500
Total	30,100
Equipment:	
Number of Cars	556
Dimensions	75x10x10'10"
Total Capacity	175
Seated	81
Standees	94
Speed:	
Average	35 mph
Maximum	75 mph

TRAVEL TIME BETWEEN SELECTED STATIONS

From	To: 12th and G	To: Pentagon	To: Capitol
Rockville	26	35	33
Silver Spring	15	21	21
P.G. Plaza	17	22	21
Ardmore	23	26	17
Anacostia	10	12	9
Franconia	29	20	28
Huntington	22	13	23
Nutley Road	26	26	33

COMPLETION SCHEDULE

First Service	1972
Completion of Basic System	1974
Completion of Regional System	1980
Projected Annual Ridership by 1990	292,610,000

SERVICE

2-minute, rush-hour headways on main routes; 4 to 8 minutes on branch lines. Operation daily from 5 a.m. to 1 a.m.

BOND ISSUES AND GRANTS NEEDED TO MEET TOTAL PROJECT COST

	Dollars (millions)
Total cost of systems [1]	2,494.6
Net interest during construction	60.9
Total project cost	2,555.5
Revenue bond issue	835.0
Net project cost	1,720.5
Assumed federal share (2/3)	1,147.0
Local share (1/3)	573.5

[1] Includes escalation factor of 5 percent per annum.

ALLOCATION OF REQUIRED MEMBER GRANTS

	Dollars (millions)
Required grants	573.5
District of Columbia	208.7
Virginia	149.9
Alexandria	30.6
Arlington County	54.0
Fairfax County	61.9
Fairfax City	2.6
Falls Church	0.8
Maryland	197.0
Montgomery County	110.4
Prince Georges County	86.6
Future allocation	17.9

Note: All net project costs (federal and local) to be phased over 10-year period.

ESTIMATED INCOME STATEMENT FOR 1990

	Dollars (Millions)
Total fare box revenue	124.2
Less bus fare split	37.9
Net fare box revenue	86.3
Non fare box revenue	3.1
Adjusted gross revenue	89.4
Operating and Maintenance Expense	32.0
Net Revenue before Depreciation	57.4
Depreciation Expenses:	
Vehicles	5.4
Other	1.3
Total	6.7
Net Revenue After Depreciation	50.7

AUTHORIZATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTRIBUTIONS

The bill authorizes the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to contract with the Transit Authority to make annual capital contributions for the adopted regional system. The contributions made under this subsection will provide the District of Columbia share of such system. They may not exceed in the aggregate $216,500,000.

An appropriation out of the general fund of the District of Columbia of not to exceed $166,500,000 is authorized to be made without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enable him to make the contributions authorized by the bill. Under the amendment made to the reported bill, the $50 million authorized to be appropriated out of that fund to the Commissioner by section 5(a)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 is to be also used to make the contributions authorized by this bill.

The sums authorized to be appropriated out of the general fund are to be provided by sums borrowed by the District of Columbia from the Treasury under the District's borrowing authority. Sums so borrowed are deposited in the general fund.

The bill further amends the borrowing authority law for the District of Columbia to first increase from $50 million to $216.5 million the amount of borrowed funds that the District of Columbia is to use for making contributions for the adopted regional system; and second, permit the District of Columbia to exceed its outstanding indebtedness ceiling for the purpose of making such contributions.

It is clearly provided that the $50 million authorized to be appropriated out of the General Fund to the District of Columbia under section 5(a)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 is to be in addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated out of such Fund under this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which is so sorely needed by this Nation's Capital, and by the Washington metropolitan area.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 12, strike all of lines 3 through 16.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this is an attempt to salvage a little something out of this bill if it is passed, and I hope it will not be passed.

There is already authority for some 25 or 27 miles of subway in the District of Columbia, and we would be well served to let that develop and see how it operates before sinking hundreds of millions of dollars into a 97- or 98-mile subway system in the area. This amendment would simply strike out $150,000 for a

study of a transit system to and from Dulles Airport to connect up somewhere—and I do not know just where—in Virginia or somewhere else.

Taxpayers have already been hit with a huge bill to provide for a four-lane highway from Dulles to the beltway. Ever since that highway was completed it has carrried almost no traffic. I do not know why the taxpayers should be called upon to spend another $150,000 to find out what use is proposed to be made of this highway.

It is already there. It is usable. What else do they want? It is a mystery to me and I will be glad to yield to anyone right now to tell me why a $150,000 study is needed when there is a superhighway already running from Dulles to at least the beltway.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the purpose of the $150,000 is to study the economic feasibility of a rapid rail transit system to serve that airport. That airport cost the Federal Government in excess of $100 million. We did not build that airport for the people of Virginia and Maryland alone. We built it for the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know for whom Dulles Airport was built but it is still losing $7 million a year. Certainly I had nothing to do with locating it in Virginia. I opposed it. I wanted to see Friendship Airport, near Baltimore, expanded into an international airport capable of serving both Washington and Baltimore, and with some mode of rapid transportation. It could have been built for a fraction of the cost of Dulles as built in Virginia. Now you have a white elephant that is costing the taxpayers $7 million a year and no evidence that as to when it will break even, much less pay a dime on the $100 million dollar investment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I repeat, when this airport was built a number of years ago, back in 1950, many of us in northern Virginia opposed that airport being constructed. It was the Congress that wanted the airport in order to serve the Nation's Capital. That is the reason it was constructed.

I do not deny that it is of some benefit to the people living in the area of northern Virginia, but you did build it.

Mr. GROSS. No; I did not.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. This is an attempt to make it more serviceable and easier to get to and from it for the people in the District of Columbia.

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

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

Mr. FUQUA. This increase was added in the other body to provide for this feasibility study. I do not know that it will be feasible to go into Dulles. It may not be. On the other hand, it may be feasible. But this has the support of the Transportation Bureau, the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority, the National Capital Airport people, and the Air Transportation Association for this feasibility study.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that every agency that spends money around here, and can put some more people on the payroll, are for this so-called study.

There is nothing easier than the spending of other people's money. We have found that out through the years around here. For the life of me, I do not see why we should spend $150,000 studying what use you are going to make of this super-duper highway.

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

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

Mr. DOWDY. This $150,000 is not to study the use of the highway. It is to study extending this subway system out to Dulles Airport.

Mr. GROSS. It is a question of whether you want the subway system extended out to Dulles Airport? Was not that studied in conjunction with the subway system for northern Virginia, the District of Columbia and Maryland at a cost of $41 million? In other words, do we now have to spend another $150,000 to tell us what to do with a super highway?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it has nothing to do with the highway. I agree with the gentleman about what he thinks about this provision, but this has to do with extending this subway another 25 miles in addition to the 97 miles.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean that the Federal taxpayers are going to be called upon to extend the subway to the Dulles Airport?

Mr. DOWDY. I cannot answer that.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. The taxpayers are not going to be called upon to spend it unless the survey indicates it is economically feasible.

Mr. GROSS. Having already spent $41 million on subway studies and engineering surveys, it is proposed to spend another $150,000 to learn the feasibility of digging a subway out to Dulles Airport? This gets worse by the minute. Someone got away with a lot of money in that $41 million study if that is the case. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall not take the full 5 minutes because we have already spent a great deal of time here on the consideration of this legislation.

However, I want to say that I hope the House will not agree to the amendment. The bill provides for a feasibility study to see if it is feasible. It may not be feasible, but this is for studying the feasibility of using the median strip of the road to Dulles Airport and in trying to promote more use of Dulles Airport and bring about a more efficient rapid transit system to and from Dulles Airport.

It does not say that we are going to be committed, or that we will be committed to the construction of a subway system out to the airport, but it was contemplated that it could be done above ground, using the median strip. That is the purpose of the study. I would hope that the House would reject the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), to the committee amendment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I may say that very seldom do I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), but this time I think the gentleman has exactly the right idea.

This airport should never have been built to start with, and the idea of building a subway or any other rapid transit system out to that airport is absolutely preposterous. I am going to support an amendment for once offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA), in rising in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) to the committee amendment. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The language providing for $150,000 is not essential to the success of this mass transit system, but it is an effort to make it more efficient and more effective insofar as serving the Dulles Airport.

The gentleman from Iowa is correct in that this airport has been somewhat of a white elephant since it was built, and it has cost a lot of money. But this is an effort to find out whether we can make this airport more successful and more convenient insofar as getting more people out to the airport, and in the long run maybe we can get back that $150,000 through making the airport a going proposition. And unless we can find more effective ways to get people into and out of that airport, it is going to be a white elephant for years to come.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments. The gentleman is eminently correct in what he says, and I urge the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the committee amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Washington metropolitan area are glad that the Congress is now considering regional authorization funds for our regional rapid transit system.

The bill, H.R. 11193, culminates many years of congressional concern over frustrating traffic congestion, its injurious effects on the economic growth, the social well-being and the physical character of the Nation's Capital.

The urgency of the situation can be understood by examining projections of the future population of the Nation's Capital and its suburbs and the growth

in the volume of traffic. This region had a population in 1960 of some 2 million. There will be 3.5 million by 1980 and a population of some 5 million people is projected by the year 2000. While there are more than 800,000 automobiles in the region today, it is predicted that there will be by 1980 an additional million vehicles operating on the streets and highways of the region—an appalling thought unless we take the proper steps promptly to cope with the problem.

Of course, this is only a part of the solution to our general transportation problem although a very important part. Congress has instructed the District of Columbia government to construct a system of highways within the District and its officials have agreed to do so. In fact, the Three Sisters Bridge is already under construction. However, Virginia needs to complete Interstate 66 from the beltway into Washington, complete the widening of the Shirley Highway, and to add additional lanes on the Capital Beltway between Springfield and the Cabin John Bridge. When this highway construction is completed and coordinated with the rapid transit system, included within this bill, we will have a well coordinated system of transportation for the Washington area.

One feature of the bill which I especially welcome and approve is the provision to authorize not over $150,000 for a feasibility study for a rapid rail line between Dulles Airport and the main metro system, utilizing the median of the Dulles access highway. This study has the support of the Department of Transportation, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the National Capital Airports Bureau, and the Air Transportation Association.

I urge that the measure be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 25, noes 46.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 52, nays 256, not voting 124, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—52

Adair
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Beall, Md.
Betts
Biaggi
Bow
Bray
Broyhill, N.C.
Burke, Fla.
Clancy
Collins
Colmer
Delaney
Denney
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Donohue
Dowdy
Eshleman
Fisher
Foreman
Goodling
Gross
Haley
Hall
Hull
Hunt
Ichord
Jarman
Jonas
Landgrebe
Langen
Latta
Long, Md.
McDade
Mizell
Montgomery
Myers
Nichols
O'Konski
Philbin
Rarick
Ruppe
Ruth
Sebelius
Skubitz
Snyder
Whitten
Wylie

NAYS—256

Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Bennett
Berry
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Boggs
Boland
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conyers
Coughlin
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Dingell
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hakins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kleppe
Koch
Kyros
Lloyd
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Ryan
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyman
Yatron
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—124

Abbitt
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bevill
Blanton
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clark
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Dorn
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Griffin
Gude
Hagan
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Henderson
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
Karth
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McCloskey
MacGregor
Mann
Mills
Mollohan
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Randall
Reifel
Roberts
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
St Germain
Scherle
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Weicker
Whalley
Widnall
Wright
Yates
Zion
Zwach

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. King.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Gaydos.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Lowenstein.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Mann.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Symington.

Mr. Baring with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Jones of Alabama.

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the committee amendment and the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 23, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—286

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Beall, Md.
Bennett
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Boggs
Boland
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Coughlin
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dennis
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kleppe
Koch
Kyros
Landgrebe
Langen
Latta
Lloyd
Lujan
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Quie
Railsback
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Ruth
Ryan
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wyatt
Wydler
Yatron
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—23

Ashbrook
Berry
Biaggi
Bow
Collins
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Dowdy
Foreman
Goodling
Gross
Haley
Hall
Hutchinson
Jonas
Long, Md.
O'Konski
Rarick
Vanik
Wolff
Wylie
Wyman

NOT VOTING—123

Abbitt
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bevill
Blanton
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buchanan
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Denney
Dent
Diggs
Dorn
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gaydos
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Griffin
Gude
Hagan
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Henderson
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
King
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lowenstein
Lukens
McCarthy
McCloskey
MacGregor
Mann
Mills
Mollohan
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Price, Tex.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Reifel
Roudebush
Roberts
Rostenkowski
Ruppe
St Germain
Scherle
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalley
Wright
Yates
Zion
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Zion.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. King.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Mann.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Corman with Mr. de la Garza.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Gaydos.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Hagan.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Pickle.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 2185) to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89–774 (80 Stat. 1324).

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2185

An act to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89–774 (80 Stat. 1324)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the "National Capital Transportation Act of 1969".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Transit Authority" means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority established by title III of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact (80 Stat. 1324).

(b) "Adopted Regional System" means that system described in the Transit Authority's report entitled "Adopted Regional Rapid Rail Transit Plan and Program, March 1, 1968 (Revised February 7, 1969)", as the same may hereafter be altered, revised, or amended in accordance with Public Law 89–774 (80 Stat. 1324).

AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 3. (a) In order to provide for the Federal share of the cost of the adopted regional system, which system supersedes that heretofore authorized by the Congress in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, as amended, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation is authorized to make annual contributions to the Transit Authority under this section in amounts sufficient to finance in part the construction of the adopted regional system by the Transit Authority: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount of such Federal contributions, including the $100,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in section 5(a)(1) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 79 Stat. 663), shall not exceed the lower amount of $1,147,044,000, or two-thirds of the net project cost of the adopted regional system.

(b) Such Federal contributions shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

(1) The work for which appropriations are authorized herein shall be subject to the provisions of Public Law 89–774 and shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules for the adopted regional system.

(2) The aggregate amount of such Federal contributions on or prior to the last day of any given fiscal year shall be matched by the local participating governments by payment of the local share of capital contributions required for the period ending with the last day of such year in a total amount not less than 50 per centum of the amount of such Federal contributions.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Transportation, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $1,047,044,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That the appropriations authorized herein shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized in section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 665).

CONSTRUCTION APPROVALS

SEC. 5. (a) No portion of any rail rapid transit line or related facility authorized hereunder shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

(b) All construction pursuant to this Act in, on, under, or over public space in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall, in the interest of public convenience and safety, be performed in accordance with schedules agreed upon between the Transit Authority and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, to the end that such construction work will be coordinated with other construction work in such public space, and the Commissioner shall so exercise his jurisdiction and control over such public space as to facilitate the Transit Authority's use and occupation thereof for the purposes of this Act.

REPAYMENT FROM EXCESS REVENUES

SEC. 6. To the extent that revenues or other receipts derived from or in connection with the ownership or operation of the adopted regional system (other than service payments under transit service agreements executed between the Transit Authority and local political subdivisions, the proceeds of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness; and capital contributions received by the Transit Authority), are excess to the amounts necessary to make all payments and deposits, including debt service, operating and maintenance expenses, and deposits in reserves, required or permitted by the terms of any contract of the Transit Authority with or for the benefit of holders of its bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued for any purpose relating to the transit system, other than extensions thereof, two-thirds of such excess revenues shall, at the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year in which the adopted regional system (exclusive of extensions) is first put into substantially full revenue service, be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) To finance the District of Columbia share of the cost of the adopted regional system, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to contract with the Transit Authority to make annual capital contributions under this section aggregating not to exceed $216,500,000, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the general fund of the District of Columbia $166,500,000 to carry out the purposes of this section, and to remain available until expended.

(b) Section 9–220(b)(3) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking the first clause of the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$216,500,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commissioner under this subsection shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969: *Provided,* That the District of Columbia may exceed by an amount not more than $166,500,000, the limitation on the aggregate indebtedness established pursuant to this Act;".

(c) The appropriations authorized in subsection (a) of this section shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized on behalf of the District of Columbia in section 5(a)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965.

(d) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is further authorized to contract with the Transit Authority for the service to be provided by the adopted regional system and to pay in accordance with the terms thereof the District of Columbia's share of any operating deficiency of the adopted regional system.

REPEAL AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 8. (a) The following laws are repealed:

(1) The Act of December 20, 1967 (Public Law 90–220; 81 Stat. 670).

(2) Sections 3, 4, and 5(b) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 79 Stat. 664–666).

(3) The Act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86–669; 74 Stat. 537).

(b) Section 5(a) of the Act of September 8, 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 76 Stat. 665), is amended by striking the phrase "authorized in section 3 hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of the adopted regional system".

STUDY OF DULLES AIRPORT EXTENSION

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of the Department of Transportation is hereby authorized to contract with the Transit Authority for a comprehensive study of the feasibility, including preliminary engineering, of extending a transit line in the median of the Dulles Airport Road from the vicinity of Route 7 on the I–66 Route of the adopted regional system to the Dulles International Airport.

(b) The study to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be completed within six months after execution of the contract authorized therein at a cost not in excess of $150,000, and there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FUQUA moves to strike all after the enacting clause of S. 2185 and insert the provisions of H.R. 11193, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11193) was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested.

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to adjourn November 26, 1969, until December 1, 1969.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in explanation of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 and the other bills from the District Committee today.

The SPEAKER. Is here objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2276, CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2276) to extend for 1 year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91–690)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276)

to extend for one year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the first sentence of section 104(c) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857b–1(c)) is amended by striking out 'and', and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ', and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $45,000,000.'."

And the House agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JARMAN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
TIM LEE CARTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
BIRCH BAYH,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
ROBERT DOLE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) to extend for one year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conferene report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

As passed by the Senate, the bill would have authorized $90 million in appropriations for special research projects involving air pollution problems arising out of the combustion of fuels for the fiscal year 1970. The House amendment would have provided $18.7 million for this program and the conference substitute provides a total authorization of $45 million for this program.

Although the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 11102), which passed the House earlier this year contained no funds for this program, because of a lack of authorization therefor, the Managers on the part of the House wish to emphasize that they expect funds to be earmarked for research projects in this highly important area.

The program contained in this Act will be reviewed again in connection with the overall extension of the Clear Air Act later in this Congress.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JARMAN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
TIM LEE CARTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. NATCHER. 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. 14916) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

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. 14916, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, at this time we submit for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1970.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget, it is a distinct privilege for me to serve with Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. GIAIMO of Connecticut, Mr. RIEGLE of Michigan, Mr. PATTEN of New Jersey, Mr. WYATT of Oregon, and Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. All of these gentlemen are outstanding members of the Committee on Appropriations. Earl C. Silsby is an excellent staff assistant to the subcommittee and is well qualified, from the standpoint of training, ability, and aggressiveness, to carry out the duties of his assignment.

This is the sixth consecutive year that an unbalanced budget has been submitted for the District of Columbia. The budget as submitted was out of balance $68,500,000. When expenditures exceed receipts, reductions must be made.

We started hearings on this bill on April 12 and concluded hearings on May 14. The conference report on the revenue bill from the District of Columbia Committee was approved about a week ago and, after enactment of this legislation, our committee was called back into session and we proceeded to hear testimony on a number of amendments and to receive from the city officials a list of priorities which were necessary since the budget was still out of balance $27,300,000. In addition to being out of balance, our committee was confronted with certain limitations placed in the revenue bill which we have strictly adhered to in presenting the budget for fiscal year 1970. The Revenue Act imposed a limitation of 41,500 full-time employees in permanent authorized positions. Current authorized positions total 38,328. The new budget as submitted proposed increases of 6,720. The committee recommends an increase of 3,199. The increase, together with the elimination of 27 positions from the base, then brings the total to 41,500, which is the figure set in the revenue bill.

This is the largest budget ever approved for the District of Columbia. In 1959 the total budget for the District of Columbia was $160,915,914. The Federal payment represented 13.45 percent of the total budget. The amount recommended in this bill is $683,106,300 and we recommend a Federal payment of $102 million. The Federal payment for 1970 will be 17.11 percent of the total budget amount recommended.

The revenue bill authorized an additional Federal payment of $5 million for the fiscal year 1970, which was recommended for use in increasing the effectiveness of law enforcement in the District of Columbia. Our committee recommends the appropriation of the $5 million. Only $3 million of the total Federal payment authorized is not recommended in this bill.

The budget that we present today is a balanced budget and sufficient funds will be available to meet anticipated requirements. A number of new and expanded programs had to be eliminated or cut back, simply due to the fact that we were confronted with a budget out of balance and with limitations on employees, which placed us in a position of having to choose between schoolteachers, welfare employees, employees in the Health Department, new police officers, and other essential positions requested, as against new employees requested for new programs which can be considered at a later date.

Mr. Chairman, within the overall financing that we present today there is a reserve of $10,932,000 for the cost of classified pay increases already in effect and a modest surplus of $309,000 in the general fund. No provision has been made for financing proposed salary increases for policemen, firemen, and teachers, due to the fact that such requests were not before our committee, and so far no program or plan has been approved for funding such increases.

In addition to the $683,106,300 recommended in this bill, the District of Columbia will receive Federal grants totaling $133,372,000. A breakdown by agencies appears on page 2 of the committee report. The usual payments for metered water and sewage service in Federal buildings is recommended in this bill, with the total being $3,928,000. This is in addition to the regular Federal payment and the $5 million special Federal payment. The loan appropriations recommended in the bill total $77,763,000. The reduction of $37,001,000 reflects deletions made in the capital outlay program and lesser requests during the fiscal year due to the conversion of the District's financial plan from an obligational to a cash basis. Unused funds

from previous loan appropriations, along with those recommended in this bill, are estimated to be sufficient for the fiscal year 1970 capital outlay program as proposed by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the freeway system which was approved in the year 1958, is now underway.

On August 23, 1969, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget, I released the following statement:

Our Committee is still of the opinion that there is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system in our Capital City. We believe that in order to meet the tremendous day by day growth of traffic the freeway program must be carried out along with the rapid transit system.

We started appropriating funds for our freeway system following the five year study which was adopted by the District of Columbia in 1958. We now have available over $200 million which must be used for the freeway system.

In 1962 we started having trouble over the freeway system and this has been the situation up to July 9, 1969 when I recommended to the House that the conference report on the Supplemental Appropriations bill deleting the $18,737,000 for the start of construction on the rapid transit system be approved. Following our refusal to again approve construction funds for rapid transit construction until the freeway system was started and underway according to the provisions of the Highway Act of 1968, we have had certain actions starting with the District of Columbia City Council vote which approved a resolution requiring the District Government to comply with the Highway Act of 1968. This was on August 9, 1969.

On August 11, 1969, the Department of Highways and Traffic received an order from the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner directing the Highway Department to proceed immediately to implement the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

On August 11 the House of Representatives approved the District of Columbia Revenue Act which contained the following provision:

SEC. 903. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year under article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–2501a–47–2501b) until the President of the United States has reported to the Congress that (1) the District of Columbia government has begun work on each of the projects listed in section 23(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 and has committed itself to complete those projects, or (2) the District of Columbia government has not begun work on each of those projects, or made or carried out that commitment, solely because of a court injunction issued in response to a petition filed by a person other than the District of Columbia or any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States.

On August 12, 1969, I received the following letter from President Nixon:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 12, 1969.

DEAR BILL: Your diligent efforts through the years to ensure that the District of Columbia will enjoy a balanced transportation system are very much appreciated by all of us who are concerned with the welfare of our Capital City. As you know, I have previously expressed my desire that a fair and effective settlement of the issues involved in the transportation controversy be reached to serve the interests of all those concerned—central city dwellers, suburbanites, shoppers, employees and visitors. It is my conviction that those steps necessary for a fair and effective settlement have been taken.

The City Council of the District of Columbia has now voted in favor of a resolution to complete the requirements of a Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968. Immediately thereafter, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia directed the Department of Highways to implement immediately the requirements of the Act. The Secretary of Transportation has directed the Federal Highway Administrator to rescind the letter of his predecessor dated January 17, 1969, thus placing these projects back into the Interstate System. Furthermore, the Federal Highway Administrator has been directed to work closely with the Highway Department of the District of Columbia in order to continue work until completion of all projects and the study called for in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968. I trust that these actions will fulfill the criteria which you set forth in your statement of August 11, 1969.

The District of Columbia Government is firmly committed to completion of these projects as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 provides. I join the District of Columbia Government in that commitment, and I have directed the Attorney General and the Secretary of Transportation to provide assistance to the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia to vigorously defend any lawsuits which may be filed to thwart the continuation of the projects called for by the Act.

A balanced transportation system is essential for the proper growth and development of the District of Columbia. I hope that this evidence of tangible progress would permit us to assure the citizens of the District of Columbia that your Subcommittee will be in a position to approve the $18,737,000 deleted from the Supplemental Appropriation bill together with the $21,586,000 in the Regular Appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for Fiscal Year 1970.

With cordial regards.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

On August 13, 1969, F. C. Turner, Federal Highway Administrator, directed a letter to T. F. Airis, Director of the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, stating that certain adjustments had been made in the Interstate System for the District of Columbia and that such action had reinstated the system to its status as covered in the Interstate System cost estimate referred to in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

On September 18, 1969, I received the following letter from Mr. Airis, the Director of the Department of Highways and Traffic of the District of Columbia:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NATCHER: On September 17, 1969, the Department of Highways and Traffic, D.C. received bids for the construction of a new Potomac River crossing—Interstate Route 266—vicinity of the Three Sisters Islands—Contract No. 1—substructure river piers, Federal-Aid Project No. D.C.-Va. I-266-2(103)1.

A total of six bids were received, ranging from a low of $1,152,830 to a high of $1,528,480. The low bid, submitted by the Head Construction Company, Washington, D.C. is approximately five percent above our office estimate. The low bidder is considered competent and qualified to carry out the provisions of this contract and, as a result, the contract was awarded to the Head Construction Company on this date, with the concurrence of the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal Highway Administration.

We anticipate that all necessary contract documents will be completely executed sometime tomorrow, and efforts will be made to have the contractors commence operations early during the week of September 22, 1969.

The above information is being furnished in order that you and your Committee may be kept abreast of the progress being made by the District Government in implementing the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely yours,

T. F. AIRIS,
Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia.

On September 18, 1969, I received the following letter from Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to clarify the situation with respect to the District of Columbia appropriation requests for the proposed rapid rail transit system.

I would like to assure you that the appropriation for fiscal year 1970 of the $18,737,000, earlier deleted from the District of Columbia supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1969, together with the appropriation of the $21,586,000 in the 1970 fiscal year appropriation request, would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director.

On September 22, 1969, I received an excellent statement from Mr. Airis, the Director of the Department of Highways and Traffic, covering all of the highway projects listed under the Highway Act of 1968 and the action the Department of Highways and Traffic is taking at this time to comply with the resolution of the City Council and the Highway Act of 1968. This statement clearly shows that the freeway program is underway.

All of these acts indicate clearly that we are in complete agreement that freeway construction as provided under the Highway Act of 1968 must proceed with rapid rail transit construction.

I will now recommend that the $18,737,000 deleted from the supplemental appropriations bill together with the $21,586,000 in the regular appropriations bill for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1970 be appropriated for rapid rail transit construction. I will further recommend that the Federal share for rapid transit construction appropriated for fiscal year 1969 totaling $43,772,000 be released. The provisions concerning this amount is contained in the report accompanying the appropriations bill for fiscal year 1969 for the Department of Interior and related agencies and the following part of the report applies:

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

Appropriation, 1968	----------
Estimate, 1969	$55,147,000
Recommended, 1969	43,772,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1968	+43,772,000
Estimate, 1969	−11,375,000

Funds available under this appropriation item are to enable the Department of Housing and Urban Development to pay the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, as part of the Federal contribution toward expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct, and equip a rail rapid-transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, as amended. Funds included in this bill represent two-thirds of the Federal contribution to this project, the remaining one-third to be provided by the District of Columbia.

The committee directs that this appropriation shall be available only to the extent that an amount equal to one-half the funds provided by this appropriation has been provided by the District of Columbia as required by Public Law 89–173.

The committee's recommendation is based on a total program of $68,163,000 consisting of $8,680,000 for engineering and design; $5,200,000 for rights-of-way and land acquisition; and $54,883,000 for construction. Deducting $3,105,000 representing that portion of the program which will be financed from prior year funds leaves a total of new obligational authority of $65,658,000. Of this total amount $43,772,000 is included in this bill and $21,886,000 would be for provision by the District of Columbia.

The Highway Act of 1968 must be complied with and as long as the freeway system proposed in this act continues underway we will, at the proper time, appropriate funds for continuing the construction of this rapid rail transit system. Mr. Chairman, both systems must continue underway, and if this takes place we are definitely of the opinion that this will be in the best interest of the Nation's Capital.

Funds have been included in the bill under consideration which will be used to place the basic rapid rail transit system underway and the total amount carried in this bill for this purpose is $40,322,000. The $18,736,000 requested for fiscal year 1969 is a part of this bill and this, together with the request for fiscal year 1970 of $21,586,000, makes a total of $40,322,000, which is the District's share of the construction cost for the rapid rail transit system up to this date. Just as soon as the rapid rail transit-freeway impasse was settled, we stated that the requested funds would be included in this bill. In addition, Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the subcommittee, I stated that we would also agree to a release of the funds previously appropriated totaling $37,472,000, with this amount being the Federal Government's share for rapid rail transit construction up to this date. After presentation of the budget for fiscal year 1970 to the full Committee on Appropriations, our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) then on November 20 directed a letter to Gen. Jackson Graham, general manager of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority, releasing the Federal portion for rapid rail transit. The letter is as follows:

NOVEMBER 20, 1969.

Mr. JACKSON GRAHAM,
General Manager, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 7 requesting that the Committee on Appropriations authorize the use of the previously appropriated $37,472,000 for the authorized basic rapid rail transit system in advance of the actual appropriation of the balance of the District of Columbia matching share. We offer no objection to your proposal as set forth in your letter, noting the chief objective of this plan is to avoid additional cost escalation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

The District of Columbia, as you know, Mr. Chairman, is financed out of five funds: a general fund; a highway fund; a water fund; a motor vehicle parking fund; and a sanitary sewage works fund.

Our committee recommends a total of $39,209,000 for general operating expenses for the departments and agencies of the District Government. This is $3,803,500 more than fiscal year 1969 and $4,882,000 less than the budget estimates.

We recommend a total of $130,324,000 for public safety. This is $17,302,000 more than for 1969 and $3,575,000 less than the budget estimates.

For a number of years we have recommended every dollar requested and justified by the metropolitan Police Department. In this bill we recommend a total of $68,352,000. The $25,000 deleted for legal counsel is not necessary and no part of this particular amount appropriated for fiscal year 1969 was utilized.

The Fire Department in our Capital City maintains its Class I rating with the American Insurance Association and is recognized throughout this country as one of the best fire departments in the United States. We recommend an appropriation of $24,451,000 for the operation of the Fire Department. This is $1,018,000 above the 1969 allowance and $562,000 less than the amount requested.

We recommend a total of $213,000 for fiscal year 1970 for civil defense.

We recommend an appropriation of $15,762,000 for the courts of the District of Columbia. This is a decrease of $1,462,000.

For the Department of Corrections we recommend $15,870,000.

We recommend the sum of $5,414,000 for the Department of Licenses and Inspections. This is an increase of $544,700 over the amount approved for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends a total of $140,077,000 for education. For public schools we recommend a total of $124,761,000, which is an increase of $9,387,000 over the 1969 appropriation and $8,748,000 less than the amount requested. We recommend $10,704,000 for the Federal City College, which is $6,371,000 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and $987,000 less than the budget estimates. For the Washington Technical Institute we recommend $4,612,000, which is $1,712,000 more than the 1969 appropriations and $144,000 less than the amount requested.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the appropriations recommended for public schools, it is estimated that $20,799,000 will be available through Federal grants. A list of the Federal grants for public schools estimated for fiscal year 1970 is set forth on page 14 of the committee report.

The committee recommends a total of $18,337,000 for parks and recreation activities. This is $2,084,000 less than requested and $1,031,012 more than 1969 appropriations. We recommend $9,274,000 for the Recreation Department; $6,444,000 for the National Park Service; and $2,619,000 for the National Zoological Park.

Our committee recommends a total of $137,382,000 for health and welfare activities. This is an increase of $13,478,000 over 1969 and $6,632,000 less than the budget requests. For vocational rehabilitation we recommend $943,000. For the Department of Public Health we recommend $81,321,000. This is $5,796,509 more than for 1969 and $3,153,000 less than the amount requested. For the Department of Public Welfare we recommend $55,118,000. This is $7,668,491 more than for 1969 and $3,479,000 less than the budget estimates.

Our committee recommends a total of $18,450,000 for the Department of Highways and Traffic. This is an increase of $666,000 over the 1969 appropriations and $36,000 less than the amounts requested.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends $33,340,000 for the Department of Sanitary Engineering and the Washington Aqueduct. This allowance is $2,126,000 more than the appropriations approved for 1969 and $1,589,000 less than the amounts requested. For the Washington Aqueduct we recommend $3,897,000, which is $95,000 more than the amount approved for fiscal year 1969.

The committee recommends $51,000 requested for the settlement of claims. The total amounts of the claims and suits was $330,503.55.

Mr. Chairman, for capital outlay we recommend a total of $149,928,000 for the next fiscal year. This is $40,828,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and $39,681,000 less than requested in the budget.

For public schools we recommend a total of $43,641,400 for 28 projects, which is $11,379,000 less than was proposed in the budget. Prior to the hearings, the Board of Education and the school administration reviewed the construction program and removed those projects which could not proceed during 1970, and added others that could proceed. A total net reduction of $7,551,000 was made and it is reflected in the reduction in this bill. Since that time other adjustments have been made, further reducing the request. The committee has made all of the adjustments requested and recommends the allowance of all the projects for which it understands funds can be utilized during the fiscal year, with only one exception.

preliminary survey for an educational The request for $630,000 to conduct a park for Washington, D.C., is denied.

We recommend capital outlay items totaling $7,325,500 for new buildings and equipment for the Metropolitan Police Department.

For the Department of Public Health, the committee has deferred action on the request for the Northwest Community Health Center pending a determination of the availability of Federal funds. Action has also been deferred on the air-conditioning program at District of Columbia General Hospital.

The committee approves the entire request for capital outlay for the Department of Corrections, with the major portion relating to the President's crime program. Included is $450,000 for a preliminary survey for a correctional detention facility—a new jail.

For public welfare, with the exception of the new receiving home for children, the committee has approved the revised request for this Department. A site for the receiving home has not been determined and, therefore, funds requested could not be used during fiscal year 1970.

For the Department of Buildings and Grounds, three major building construction projects were considered by the committee: a new jail, estimated to cost $45 million; a new District Court Building, estimated to cost $50 million; and two west administration buildings, estimated to cost $36 million. We recommend the $450,000 for the preliminary survey for the new jail and further recommend that $2,600,000 be approved for a new District Court Building. This amount is to be derived from the $3,500,000 previously appropriated for a site for the courthouse. We recommend that action be deferred on the west administration building.

For higher education, we recommend capital outlay projects totaling $5,500,000 for the Federal City College and $3,654,400 for the Washington Technical Institute.

Our committee recommends a total of $40,322,000 for the District's share of the capital budget of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's budget for fiscal year 1970 for the construction of the basic authorized rapid transit system in our Capital City. A total of $3,353,000 is recommended for the highway construction program during fiscal year 1970. All projects, with the exception of the community street program, have been approved.

For our public library, we recommend the total amount requested of $680,200. For recreation, we recommend $1,428,800. For the Fire Department, we recommend $1,014,300. For sanitary engineering, we recommend $19,064,000 for storm water sewers and sanitation facilities and $12,268,000 for sanitary sewers, together with $1,175,000 for service and trunk water main. This makes a total of $32,507,000 for the Department.

The construction of a new jail, new court complex, start of construction of freeway and rapid transit systems, new methadone system, and 28 capital outlay projects for our school system are all projects which must be considered as milestones in the development of our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The gentleman has done a fine job. I know of no man more knowledgeable about the affairs of the District of Columbia than the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. He handles his bill as effectively as any subcommittee chairman on our Appropriations Committee.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he could give me some information about a problem that I constantly have questions about, and that is the breaking of windows in the school buildings in the District of Columbia. Could the gentleman tell us how much it cost the District to replace broken windowpanes in the public school buildings?

Mr. NATCHER. First, I want to thank my friend for the statement he made about me, and I want you to know that I appreciate it. In answer to the gentlemen's question, during 1968 43,414 windows were broken out of school building in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Forty-three thousand——

Mr. NATCHER. Yes; 43,414. The gentleman will be interested to know that it cost $294,182.46 to replace those windowpanes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I have been told that the school board has a regular team of people who spend all their time replacing school windows that have been broken out. Is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. I will say to my distinguished friend that, in the maintenance section of the school department, we have men who are employed for this particular purpose. Private companies are employed to restore some of the windows. The 43,414 panes are out of school buildings only.

This does not include other buildings in the District of Columbia government.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. One final question I want to ask, if the gentleman will yield further.

Is the team of windowpane replacers able to keep up with broken panes? Can they replace panes as rapidly as they are broken out?

Mr. NATCHER. This cannot be done.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Is there a backlog?

Mr. NATCHER. The replacement cannot take place as rapidly as the panes are broken out. In fact, at the present time replacement is several weeks behind.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Has the gentleman given any consideration to bricking up the windows or putting in steel windows?

Mr. NATCHER. In the construction of some of the new buildings consideration is being given to windows of a type that will not break as easily.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Would that not be cheaper in the long run?

Mr. NATCHER. It probably would.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN). But before yielding I would like the members of this committee to know the city of Washington has a number of people who help fight her battles. No one does it more often than my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. The citizens of Washington should be proud of him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I join in complimenting my associate and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, for the great job he does. A careful and thorough job is done by the committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, my question is more or less designed for the purpose of making legislative history. The gentleman from Kentucky will recall the bill that was passed for the land-grant college provisions to make the District of Columbia eligible. I think our real objective was to reach the vocational side of education as liberally as possible. We found under the law there had to be a mother agency, which in this case turned out to be the liberal arts college, to advance the money to the vocational school.

Now we find HEW at the present time feels the law is not specific enough. I think the gentleman joins with me—I know he does—in wanting to see that legislative history routs this effort and also to see that the law is clarified. I wonder if the gentleman will comment at this point?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I agree 100 percent with the gentleman from Minnesota. The Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee received testimony concerning the land-grant colleges in the District of Columbia. Down through the years the land-grant colleges in the different States have been given land. In my home State of Kentucky we received several thousand acres of land. The University of Kentucky is a land-grant college.

Here in the District of Columbia, there is no land to give. A formula was used whereby the committee took the number of people in the District of Columbia and considered the little over $6 million that was granted the State of Hawaii and came up with a little more than $7 million for the District of Columbia. We approved that amount in the bill.

It went to the other body, and they changed it. They put a little over $300,000, in the bill, the amount they said would be interest on the $7 million, we thought it was a mistake and it was dropped out. The Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute have the right under the law and should receive the land-grant college money.

I think it should be in a grant, the way we had it in the Labor-HEW bill. I think little the over $7 million ought to go back in the proper bill, and we ought to take action on it.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK).

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to observe that I have heard many presentations of bills by chairman of committees or Members in charge of a bill. I never heard any finer presentation of any bill, particularly an appropriation bill, than has just been rendered by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER).

It is as fine a presentation, as clear and as distinct and comprehensible, as I have ever heard. I want to congratulate my friend.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the Speaker for his fine statement.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Speaker. I know of no chairman or subcommittee chairman who has been more objective, or who has been more unfairly attacked by irresponsible news reporting or who has been more falsely accused, than has this chairman, yet he has stayed on the course and has done what has been good for the District of Columbia and what is good for the country.

His objectivity, his calmness in the face of the most unjustified criticism, demonstrates the most lofty character of which he is possessed. He is deserving of the encomiums of all of us.

All of this is climaxed when our beloved Speaker takes note of his dedicated and motivated work for his country and for the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the subcommittee and an outstanding Member of the House.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, when were you through with the hearings on the original budget as submitted? What month was that?

Mr. NATCHER. I would say to my distinguished friend, we started the hearings on this bill in April and we completed our hearings on May 12. We have been waiting ever since.

Mr. PATTEN. Have we made a resolution that next year the people in the District of Columbia ought to know what their budget is before the fiscal year begins, and that we are going to do a better job next year so that they will know by June 1 how much money they have?

The only reason I ask the question is, I know the gentleman did his job but for other reasons here it is the end of November and the District of Columbia does not have its budget, which it should have had well before July 1, so that they could hire their teachers and do the other things they are authorized to do.

You have done a good job, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be associated with you.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to join in the fine compliments which have been paid to our subcommittee chairman not only for his presentation of this bill here today but also for the leadership which he has exhibited throughout the hearings, during the markup, and in the preparation of the report which accompanies this bill. He has always been eminently fair to the representatives of the District government who have appeared before us and certainly to all the members of the subcommittee, who have learned to appreciate him in the manner other Members of this body have expressed their appreciation, in our daily contacts with him as to the presentation of this bill to the House.

In spite of some of the things that have appeared over TV and radio and in the press about our chairman, he has maintained a calm attitude throughout. There certainly is not a vindictive hair in his head. If there were, I am sure there would be some different provisions in this bill from those which appear as it is now presented for consideration.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to our distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to join in applauding the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky for the statesmanlike job he does in dealing with appropriations for the District of Columbia. I know he desired to bring this bill before the House months ago, but this was impossible under the circumstances. We had to await clearance of the District of Columbia revenue bill, which took place only recently.

Not only does the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky do a good job on this bill, he is a valuable member of the committee otherwise, distinguishing himself as the ranking member on the important Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and the important Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

I would also like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, who now has the floor, for his good work on this bill and for his devotion to duty on the other subcommittees on which he serves.

And I wish also to extend our thanks to other members of the committee for their work on this bill.

I believe we have reported a good bill—one that all Members can reasonably support. And in this connection, I applaud the subcommittee for what it has done and is trying to do to promote law and order in the District of Columbia.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that the gentleman from Kentucky exercises the same diligence in his other subcommittee assignments as he does in this one. It makes it easier, although this is not the most sought after or the easiest job on the Committee on Appropriations, to work under the kind of leadership that the gentleman from Kentucky has provided.

Mr. Chairman, just a few minutes ago this House took another step forward in implementing the President's request of a couple of months ago for a balanced transportation system here in the District of Columbia. I can assure my colleagues that no man worked more carefully or more effectively in order to assure a balanced transportation system for the District of Columbia than has the chairman of our subcommittee. Sometimes it has been necessary for him to be very firm, but anyone who is familiar with the legislative process and who is familiar with the approaches that are taken by people in and out of Government on some matters of this kind, will recognize that only through that kind of firmness, and a great deal of patience that went with it, has the goal and the expressed desire of the President for a balanced transportation system for this metropolitan area come into being. I think this is a contribution for which history will properly reward the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership in this area.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no happiness among us, of course, over the constantly increasing budgets for the District of Columbia. Certainly in more recent years we have seen this acceleration of spending here within the District, and have seen it come to more than we would have liked as individuals. However, we have approved the funding for many of these projects even though it did involve a rapid acceleration of the spending.

I think there are two reasons for this which justify the affirmative attitude we have taken. One reason is that we wanted to give this newly created form of government here in the District every opportunity to perform its function as a problem solver for the people of this Federal District. We did not want to hamstring this government in its efforts to do whatever local government—and this is a unique kind of local government—can do to deal with the social and the economic problems of the people that live within the District.

Second, this District has become the recipient of millions of dollars of Federal grants. Sometimes I think they have been concocted and programed not necessarily because the people of the District wanted them so much as the District has been used as a sort of a guinea pig for many of the Federal programs that have been developed in the agencies of the Federal Government.

If you will look at pages 2 and 3 of the report—and, by the way, I think is an extremely well done and informative report that does accompany this bill—you will note that the total Federal grants for the current fiscal year for the District of Columbia will exceed $133 mil-

lion. Even this does not include, I note, anything from the Department of Agriculture. But one of the late requests that we received this year was for $559,000 to administer the expanded food supplement program for the pregnant mothers and for the children of 1 to 5 here in the District.

It cannot help but be surprising, perhaps even shocking, to recognize that this Federal program—and, certainly, we had to provide some administration for it—contemplates that nearly one out of every two of the pregnant mothers and children from 1 to 5 in the District of Columbia, more precisely about 45 percent of them, are scheduled to receive food supplements from the Department of Agriculture in the course of this next year. And, of course, those same people, many of them, are eligible for food stamp assistance. So it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to attempt to estimate in terms of direct Federal grants in money or in kind the assistance which is being funneled into the District of Columbia. This does involve the necessity for local government to administer these programs and to spend some of their own funds on those Federal programs being implemented here.

So, those, primarily are the two reasons for the acceleration of local spending in the District of Columbia in recent years. Oh, we did not approve all of the increases that were requested. The chairman has pointed out that overall some $68 million has been reduced from the requests that were made. This year we did not lean as far over backwards as we had in the past with respect to the plans for the expansion of the local government.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 4 minutes.

The plans were to provide administrative assistants and additional secretarial help for all of the members of the Council, to create neighborhood centers where people could register their complaints with respect to the city government and, by and large, those requests of necessity were denied primarily because they did represent new programs for which funds simply were not available and, secondly, because it appeared to us, or at least it appeared to me, that with the establishment of these neighborhood centers they were creating a means for channeling complaints that would put the people who ought to be listening to those complaints, the people on the Council particularly, on the side so they would not have the necessity for the give-and-take that any representative group of people ought to share with those that they have been in this case appointed to represent.

We did everything that we could within authorizations to implement the President's crime package for the District of Columbia including the methadone treatment, the narcotic rehabilitation corps, in addition to the increase in police force.

Three years ago we had an authorized police force here in the District of Columbia of 3,100. That was increased to 4,100. It now stands at 5,100. And the only reason I believe that we did not fund the full 5,100, in order to get more policemen on the streets, as the recent President's Commission recommended again last night, was because of inability to recruit the men to fill that complement.

So instead of 1,000 new men, 525 additional policemen have been funded.

In one area we found a definite duplication of effort as between an imposed Federal program and an existing traditional activity of the local government. That was in the area of the youth program unit, funded largely by the Federal Government, and the District's Department of Recreation. Because we did find that duplication of effort, we reduced the appropriation for the Department of Recreation by the amount of $1,070,000, which represented the increase for the youth program unit.

In the Federal City College, while we were a little bit concerned by the plans for an expansion more rapidly than we felt could be assimilated, we tried to implement the effort to establish that institution here.

There are not any funds in this project for athletic facilities, but last year under a reprograming action we were able to provide a gymnasium for this new institution. We had some problems in the other body, but finally the Members over there saw the light and did provide what I consider to be a necessity, especially in a new institution, and particularly in an institution created in the environment of this one.

Annually we are requested for information relating to the stadium. I simply want to suggest that in the hearings beginning on page 1363 that information is set out in full for the first time.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have no additional requests for time on this side.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), a member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. I wll be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like the members of the committee to know that it is a distinct privilege and pleasure for my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), the ranking minority member, and myself, to serve with the distinguished gentleman in the well from the State of Michigan.

You know, here in the District of Columbia, Mr. Chairman, from time to time we ask the people and the members of the school board if they would make additional use of their school buildings, open them up for the people in the community. I was having lunch down in the main dining room several months ago and one of the waiters said to me that he was the Boy Scout leader in his community, and that he was being charged from $11 to $16 to open the school building where he was trying to work with these boys, and do something for them.

The distinguished gentleman in the well, since he has been a member of the committee, has gone back to his home State—and I will let him tell you about it—where he has gotten nearly half a million dollars and brought it to the District of Columbia, Mr. Chairman, to help our Capital citizens.

Again I say it is a distinct pleasure and a privilege for me to serve on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) very much for those kind words.

I wish, if I may, to echo the sentiments earlier expressed by the gentleman from South Carolina and others. I too, think that this committee chairman is one of the best that we have in the Congress on any committee.

Also he is a man who is dedicated to meeting the needs of the District of Columbia in a fair and sensitive way.

I know at the meetings of our committee, both public and private, on every occasion I believe he worked to advance the interests of the district.

I want to speak briefly today about community schools that we now have underway here in the District of Columbia.

About 30 years ago in my hometown of Flint, Mich., the community school idea was conceived. It was an idea of opening the schools up pretty much around the clock, 12 months a year, and opening them to a whole variety of activities such as adult education, senior citizens' activities, to the scouts, to young people for recreation purposes and so forth.

In each neighborhood across this land of ours we have a public asset that we call a school. In most cases the school doors are locked at 4 o'clock, and these places are empty during the summertime, so we want to find ways to put those facilities to use in such a way that has unique meaning for the needs of that particular neighborhood.

And there is another point. If we are really going to have education we must think in terms of the entire environment in which a youngster lives and all the influences that he is facing. If a youngster needs glasses and does not have them, he is not going to learn to read. And you have to provide a certain base level of medical care; or if a youngster has a toothache, he is not going to be able to study.

So along with things like opening your school for community activities, we have to think about making sure that the youngsters in the school are healthy and have adequate food.

This concept is working wonders out in my hometown of Flint.

Now, in Flint we have many adults studying at the high school level, yet these same people have youngsters studying during the day at high school. We feel that this idea which has been battle tested and found to be successful may have some application here in the District of Columbia.

About 2½ years ago the vice superin-

tendent, now the acting superintendent, Ben Henley, and I went to Flint and approached the Mott Foundation which had created and developed this community school concept to see if they might be willing to provide the seed money to try this idea out in the District of Columbia on a pilot basis. The Mott Foundation was very interested in helping test this out in our Nation's Capital and granted $60,000 to begin two of these community schools. Beyond the money they and the Flint school system shared their experience, technical and moral support.

These two schools are the Logan School and the Garnet-Patterson School and they are now offering many new kinds of services for youngsters, for example, typing classes, sewing classes, pioneer tent camping, girls' cooking classes, French club, Scouting, and summer tot lot.

Adults in the evening have basic education courses such as reading, English, mathematics, typing, sewing, and high school equivalency courses. They even have a course designed to help people become nurses' assistants and nurses aids classes and things of that kind.

So we are making progress.

The Garnet-Patterson School is very active and effective in the evening. That was 2½ years ago. Last year we expanded the program and where there were only two schools, now there are four.

This year in the budget the original request was for six community schools.

We asked that the school officials go back and increase the six to eight for the District this year.

On the basis of the success generated in the two pilot schools, Ben Henley and I went back to Flint, and asked the Mott Foundation for some more money and we were able to secure enough money to augment those eight schools with five more so that this year we will have 13 schools in the District of Columbia that will be operating as community schools.

I have a map here which indicates where these schools are. You will see that these 13 schools are situated strategically around the District so that each geographic area in the District will have an opportunity to see this concept at work and decide whether this is something other adjacent neighborhoods might want.

Bear in mind, these community schools can and will be tailored to the uniqueness of the particular neighborhood that they are found in. We are finding, for example, that for a 5-percent increase in the cost, we can increase the utilization of these facilities 150 percent. That is a pretty good bargain.

So we have 13 schools this year and, as I say, they have been working out well.

I do not see the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) at the moment. Earlier he spoke about broken windowpanes. But I will indicate to him the fact that in the schools that have been operating the pilot project, about which I have spoken, window breakage has gone down and school attendance has gone up. Examination scores in reading and arithmetic have also gone up. The size of the PTA has increased. The number of parents who are coming into the schools to participate has also gone up. We find that vandalism on school grounds has gone way down relative to other schools in similar kinds of neighborhoods.

This community school concept is working. They have been coming along steadily. We went from two schools the first year to four schools last year, and this year to eight, and then, based on the Mott Foundation grant, up to 13. I think on this pilot basis we can continue to test this program and, to the extent that it works, continue to broaden it across the District.

Earlier there was talk about the fact that neighborhood centers, which were requested in the budget, were not approved by virtue of the fact that there just was not enough money to begin new programs. But I would suggest that in the new 13 community schools that we have, that perhaps this neighborhood center idea could be tested there, because these schools are all neighborhood centered. They are open now pretty much around the clock. I should think that if the city government would want to try this approach, they could do so through these community schools. On one or two evenings a week representatives from the city government could be available to talk with the citizens and hear their problems and suggestions. This would be an effective way to get at these citizen needs and do it in a way that would not require us to finance new buildings or acquire new rental property in order to get the job done.

I have suggested to them that they consider doing this, and I intend to pursue that idea.

Finally, I wish to thank the gentlemen on the subcommittee. I particularly wish to thank the subcommittee chairman and the ranking minority member (Mr. DAVIS) from Wisconsin, for the support they have given the pilot community school program and for the fact that they have been willing to have this idea tested on a limited basis, to be expanded only as it demonstrates its ability to work here in the District of Columbia.

I am hopeful that if we can continue to generate good results in these schools, then, perhaps someday in the future all the schools in the District of Columbia can be community schools, can be open all the time, and available to the citizens in the neighborhoods in which they are found for whatever purposes those citizens find useful.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) who, like the gentleman who just finished speaking, is an effective new member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, as the most junior member of the House District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, I have received during the past year a real education on the problems of the District of Columbia. In hearing testimony in support of requested appropriations for all phases of activity of District of Columbia governmental agencies, I have had a rare opportunity to view the inner workings of these agencies. This view has been sharpened by the great knowledge and ability of our very able chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WILLIAM NATCHER), and by his counterpart on our side of the aisle, my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GLENN R. DAVIS). The hours devoted by these two gentlemen and by other members of our committee on the problems of the District have been of intense interest to me. I might mention that these hours have been labors of love, politically, since there really is no mileage back home in dealing, or in failing to deal, with the affairs of the District. The effective time spent on these problems is indeed a measure of the devotion of members of this subcommittee to the public interest.

We have a very good appropriations bill today. I would only address you today with respect to the fight against crime in the District and the money in this bill dealing with this enormous challenge.

The crime battle in the District is now in desperate crisis. The rate of violent crimes continues each day to increase. Citizens today are less safe than they were 1 year ago, much less safe than 5 years ago. The statistics easily establish these conclusions.

The Washington Daily News has rendered a very great service in this battle in recent weeks by publishing on its front page what it calls "Crime Crisis Countdown." In last Saturday's paper the Daily News reported that between midnight last Thursday and midnight Friday, these crimes were committed in the District: two homocides, one rape, 46 robberies, and six attempted robberies.

The Daily News points out that President Nixon called a conference at the White House on October 9 of this year, an emergency conference, with police officials and leaders of both parties in Congress, to review what the President called the "disgraceful situation" of crime in the Nation's Capital.

Police Chief Jerry Wilson said:

> The total system of justice must be treated. My greatest fear is that Congress may go home without this being done.

This emergency meeting was called by President Nixon 46 days ago and still there is no substantial action by Congress on the President's five-bill anticrime package. The most important part of the package was a proposed court reorganization bill which would add approximately two dozen new judges to the District judicial system, take many local cases out of the Federal court system and make several changes in the criminal provisions for the District of Columbia. He also asked for a bail reform act, a bail agency act, a public defender bill, and a new juvenile code. Most of the administrative changes which he suggested have been put into effect.

In this District of Columbia appropriation bill we have almost fully funded every program useful in fighting crime which is presently authorized.

One of the most promising programs in this appropriations bill is the methadone program.

Testimony of District officials has established that nearly 50 percent of ar-

rests involve persons who are active users of narcotics, and that nearly 90 percent of those are on hard addictive drugs. In all too many of these cases, the addict who has committed a crime of personal violence is freed under our present system with no bail requirement, and statistics show a startling rate of repeated offenses.

The methadone program may not be the ultimate, final solution to the crime problem, but it offers real promise. With this program and if Congress will ever act to approve President Nixon's anticrime bills for the District, we may once again be able to walk the streets of our Capital safely.

Methadone is a synthetic drug, and costs a few cents a day to maintain the substitute habit. Addicts who are unable to free themselves of the habits of heroin and other hard drugs, can be transferred to methadone. Methadone is also addictive, but those on it are not forced to go to the streets to rob, burglarize, and murder for the necessary money to maintain this habit. Chief Wilson has estimated that it costs a heroin addict about $80 a day to supply the necessary quantity of heroin required. To provide this amount of cash, an addict must obtain by holdup or burglary about $800 a day. So, we have the vicious circle of desperate men, often under the heroin-induced "high," being driven each and every day to obtain $800 in merchandise, and/or $80 in cash.

Methadone does not produce a "high." It is therefore much safer than heroin. It is cheap, and should take any addict who has transferred from heroin to methadone out of the crime market. It offers promise of real relief.

Under the program being launched by the District government, total withdrawal from methadone will be ultimately attempted. We have no real evidence to prove that this is possible but it will be attempted.

At the present time I am studying the constitutional and legislative problems involved in a program which I think may have considerable merit. In brief form, it would require anyone arrested who is an addict, or who has a record of addiction, to become bailable only upon his agreement to transfer his addiction and to maintain it on methadone. I believe this program could be most helpful in getting hard-core, desperate narcotic addicts out of the drug-crime cycle.

Promising as the methadone program is, it certainly cannot be considered by anyone to lessen the very great and emergency need for the passage of President Nixon's anticrime program. Congress must assume the full burden of any further delay in the enactment of the President's program. We have been offered leadership in this fight. In fairness, no legislation was received from the Justice Department until about 2 months ago. But 2 months have passed, and I strongly urge the appropriate authorizing committees to complete work on these bills. Unless we give our law enforcement officials the tools they need, their hands are quite securely tied, and the invitation to the criminal world would be loud and very clear: "We intend to let you roam the streets, to rob, murder, burglarize, rape, and plunder at will."

If the respective authorizing committees in Congress will pass the legislation requested by the President, I have confidence that the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee will approve the necessary funds to implement it. Until then, our hands are tied.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding for exciting and good news on Apollo 12.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, is here with me, and we would both like to announce that Apollo 12 has splashed down, and all our astronauts, Conrad, Gordon, and Bean, are safe.

The Apollo 12 splashdown was within visual distance of the carrier, with broken cloud cover, so they were able to follow the descent of the capsule and actual splashdown by TV. So the Moon-Cape Kennedy shuttle has now returned, and we are all pleased, cheered, and relieved. That first Apollo 12 radio report after blackout, "All is OK," certainly is welcome. The U.S. carrier *Hornet* is standing by, and our astronauts will soon be picked up by helicopter, and then arrive aboard.

Hearty congratulations to our U.S. astronauts, highly competent technicians and navigators, and courageous pioneers for America, and for all mankind.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, in corroboration of the comments of the gentleman from Oregon, that, at the White House meeting to which the gentleman referred, Chief Wilson said if he could get 200 or 300 of the hard-core criminals, most of whom—a very high percentage of whom—are addicted to drugs, off the streets of the city of Washington, he would then be optimistic about bringing this certainly unacceptable crime level in the District of Columbia under control.

With respect to the gentleman's reference to juvenile reform legislation, I believe our hearings did develop that under the present law the only legal tool which the police have at their disposal in the case of young children being permitted to roam the streets and to get into difficulty is to charge the parent with contributing to the delinquency of a minor. This certainly demonstrates how outmoded our code is here, for in nearly every State of the Union there is the tool of finding that the child has been neglected, not that he has gotten into the criminal difficulty, but has been neglected. This provides the basis for action by the courts in dealing with problems of this kind.

Both the major points the gentleman from Oregon has made are valid and have been demonstrated to be valid by testimony in recent weeks.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for giving me this time.

I should like to address a question or two to some member of the subcommittee.

As I understand it, the gentleman responded a while ago to a question with respect to window breakage in the schools by saying that in 1968 it cost some $297 million; is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. It cost $294,182.46.

Mr. GROSS. In round figures that is $294,000?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is this considered to be aid to education?

Mr. NATCHER. I would say quite frankly to my friend that it certainly is not an aid to education. I am only sorry that that condition exists here in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. GROSS. Does the District of Columbia get impacted school aid?

Mr. NATCHER. The District of Columbia receives a little over $5½ million a year in impacted school funds. The gentleman would be interested to know that the schools also receive almost $16 million more in grants that are not in this bill. They receive a little over $20 million in Federal grants.

Mr. GROSS. And still it requires nearly $300,000 each year to replace the window glass in the schools in the District of Columbia alone? That is incredible.

Mr. NATCHER. That is the situation. I would say to the gentleman, that means only the windows in the school buildings and not the windows in the other District government buildings.

Mr. GROSS. And the answer to that is what? Is it bulletproof glass, or boarding up the windows, closing the schools or what? What is the answer to a situation of this kind, where they have so little concern for the education of their children that they permit this kind of vandalism?

Mr. NATCHER. I would say to the gentleman that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) made a fine statement and set forth to the committee a number of proposals which I believe will correct this situation.

In the areas in our Capital City where they have more trouble and more windows are broken they ought to interest the parents of those children a little bit more in school affairs and what is taking place in the schools. They ought to open up these school buildings. No charge should be made to the fine man in the dining room who wants to be a little helpful and have a Scout troop use the building. Why should he pay $11 or $16 when they open up a building to bring these boys in? More interest in their community and their schools and the development of a little more pride, I believe, would stop a lot of broken windows, I say to my friend frankly.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think they would be able to regulate

who enters the school buildings at night if they do open them up for meetings? What kind of a situation would then exist?

Mr. NATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. I hope so. I would hope those who enter them would enter with good intentions and be sincere people who wanted to go in and participate in things that are constructive.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIEGLE. I would say this: In the schools that have already been opened up you have two years of experience in those schools. Now, I am not aware of any acts of vandalism or problems occurring or disruption of the area or damage done or anything of that kind where people come into the schools at night to use them. In fact, I might say that the reverse is true. We have so many youngsters and people of all ages, in fact, who come in at night so that we have a lot of potential vandals there who might be out on the street or otherwise at night who are in the school buildings using them for roller skating or other things. Our experience has been that we do not increase vandalism but, as a matter of fact, vandalism has gone down where we opened up the schools at night.

Mr. GROSS. That may be, because they boarded them up. Therefore they are not having that many broken windows there

Mr. RIEGLE. They are not boarding them up.

Mr. GROSS. Or putting in wire mesh screens and things of that kind. They will have to have pretty fine and expensive screens to stop all of the air rifles pellets and other methods of destroying or breaking glass.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: For some years, 37 percent of the teachers in the District of Columbia were equipped only with temporary certificates. Has that situation been improved?

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. This situation is much improved. I am glad to be able to make that statement to the gentleman. I know at one time the temporary certificates were issued in the city of Washington to such an extent that it was detrimental to the best interests of our school system and our public education system. That situation has improved considerably. It is no longer in the one-third category.

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

I have read either in a newspaper or in the gentleman's hearings that there is difficulty in one of the federally supported colleges or other institutions here with regard to the teaching of Swahili. They are demanding that this language be taught and threatening trouble if it is not. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. NATCHER. If the gentleman will yield further, the teaching of this particular subject in the school system and also in the Federal City College was under consideration. I say to the gentleman quite frankly I believe they are working this matter out satisfactorily.

Mr. GROSS. Where would they use Swahili in the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. As far as I know, it would not be used.

Mr. GROSS. Now, with regard to the $30,000 city-owned firetruck that was set afire and destroyed at Howard University when the disorders were going on out there. Has Howard University or anyone else reimbursed the city of Washington, D.C., for the truck those hoodlums destroyed by fire during the disorders?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that no part of the cost of the restoration of that particular piece of equipment was ever refunded. We received no money whatsoever from that incident.

Mr. GROSS. Has the subcommittee been able to put together any overall figures of damage and loss in the District of Columbia beginning with Insurrection City and going on through all the rest of the upheavals in the District. It would run, would the gentleman say, into many millions of dollars?

Mr. NATCHER. If the genteman will yield, I would say to the gentleman that the figures would run between $200 million and $300 million.

Mr. GROSS. $200 million and $300 million as a result of the April riots, Insurrection City, and the moratorium parade of the other day?

Mr. NATCHER. All the damage that has taken place in our Capital——

Mr. GROSS. So-called parade.

Mr. NATCHER. All of the damage would be something over $200 million during the past 3½ years.

Mr. GROSS. One final question, if I may, regarding the District of Columbia stadium which was not to cost the Federal taxpayers any money: What is the contribution on the part of the Federal Government, the percentage of the cost of meeting the interest payments? I do not suppose there has been any payment on the capital investment, what are the taxpayers of the Nation contributing to the support of the stadium?

Mr. NATCHER. If the gentleman will yield, the amount in the bill each year is $831,600 interest on the $20 million worth of bonds issued. Not one single bond has been retired. This year, through the efforts of my good friend who sits over on my right, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), after several years of questioning the people that appeared before our subcommittee, finally last year, 1968, they produced $410,000 in revenue to apply on the $831,600 interest payment. That is over and above the cost of maintenance. This was a little unusual. By virtue of the efforts of my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), that took place.

I recall when they brought this matter to the floor and the distinguished gentleman from Iowa asked the question, how much is the stadium going to cost. The gentleman well remembers the answer, "between $6 million and $7 million." It cost $20 million and not one bond has been retired.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying that it is costing the taxpayers of the entire Nation, how much—$400,000 or $800,000?

Mr. NATCHER. This particular year it is the difference between $410,000 income based on football and the use of the stadium and the $831,600. Other than that the interest on the bonds is $831,600 every year, and those $20 million in bonds must be retired.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I hope that the taxpayers from the district represented by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), who I note is on the floor, are getting that much benefit out of it. I know they are not in the Third District of Iowa.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we are getting some benefit out of the fact that we found out that Mr. Lombardi is neither omnipotent nor omniscient but just a mere mortal man.

Mr. GROSS. We could have found that out on the sandlot.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield further, you would not have found that out in the newspapers because they want to think so in Green Bay.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will look at page 1363 of this year's hearings the gentleman would see a tabulation setting out the income and payments relating to this stadium. However, I should caution the gentleman that that table is not quite updated. It shows $521,000 as the amount being made up out of general funds of the District. But since that time $111,000 has been used as having been derived from income.

So that actually the proper figure is $410,000, representing the difference between income and outgo as far as the District of Columbia stadium is concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think this will go on into infinity—this payment on the part of all of the taxpayers, after having donated the land, the landscaping, parking lots, and the Lord only knows what else for this stadium? Will the interest payments on this bonded debt, by all of the taxpayers of the country, go on endlessly and forever?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I can only tell the gentleman from Iowa that the situation is much better than it was 3 years ago. If we would get a good, contending baseball team here, under the contract we have which relates the rental to the District of Columbia to the basis

of gross receipts, I think there is a chance for getting out from under.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill for the reason that it appropriates money from all the taxpayers for the purpose of constructing a part of the subway system in the District of Columbia. I have just voted against an areawide subway system for the reason that the taxpayers of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia ought to finance it on their own.

I cannot support this bill for the further reason that altogether too much money has been taken from the taxpayers of the rest of the Nation to pay for the costs of the demonstrations that have been staged in Washington, D.C.—demonstrations by hoodlums that have resulted in vandalism and staggering damage.

If the government of the District of Columbia wants visitors of this stripe then let it pay the bills for working police and others around the clock. There should have been a real cut in the Federal handout to the District of Columbia as a warning that it must get its house in order and stop the lawlessness that makes it one of the most crime-ridden cities in the Nation.

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

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

(Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for its work on the appropriations bill for the District of Columbia. I only wish the District of Columbia revenue bill had permitted the committee greater latitude in funding vitally needed programs in the District. I regret especially the denial of the city's request for funding for little city halls and the drastic limitation on new personnel for the public schools. Better communication between the city government and the citizenry and improvement of the schools would have had an immediate impact on District residents and boosted their confidence in their government.

I am pleased, however, to see that the committee has approved funding for substantially all of the President's crime program for the District, including an increase in the police force, and more money for the courts. Particularly promising is the expanded funding for correctional programs aimed at the rehabilitation of persons convicted of crime. Just last Friday, I toured three community correctional facilities in the District, including a work-release center, the Community Treatment Center for young offenders, and the narcotic addict treatment program just getting underway. These centers are helping to ease the transition between the confinement and routine of prison and the return to life in the community. The residents of the community correctional centers told me that the difficulty of starting over, fresh out of the prison environment, is a major cause of recidivism. The scarcity of job opportunities and job training for persons with a criminal record often make adjustment to noncriminal patterns of life close to impossible for all but the strongest candidates for rehabilitation.

There is impressive evidence that correctional facilities in the community, providing intensive personal and group counseling, accomplish the rehabilitative goals of corrections far better than more prisons with higher walls. The substantial increase in these programs approved by the Appropriations Committee will, I believe, increase our safety and decrease the cost of corrections in both the short run and the long run.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I have noted in recent days in the press that the very competent Mayor of Washington has come under some attack with some suggestions being made to the press saying that he should resign. Mr. Chairman, I have great confidence in this man. I think he has done an excellent job in this city under very trying circumstances.

On the occasions when I have seen him appear before our subcommittee, he has been extremely capable, and he has exhibited thorough knowledge of the problems of the city, and his answers to questions have been to the point and informative. I think he has done an excellent job, and as a matter of fact, we would have to look hard and long to find a person better equipped and able to do the job better than he has done.

Speaking only for myself, I want to say that I have great regard for him, and I congratulate him on the work he is doing, and will, I hope, continue to do it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, what is his salary a year, does the gentleman know?

Mr. RIEGLE. I cannot cite it without checking the matter.

Mr. GROSS. You are speaking of the Mayor, or the so-called Mayor of Washington?

Mr. RIEGLE. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I just wondered.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14916

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, namely:

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For payment to the following funds of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970: $107,000,000 to the general fund; $2,504,000 to the water fund; and $1,424,000 to the sanitary sewage work fund, as authorized by the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, as amended (D.C. Code, Sec. 47–2501(a); 82 Stat. 612), and the Act of May 18, 1954 (D.C. Code, Sec. 43–1541 and 1611).

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

For loans to the District of Columbia as authorized by the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 101), and the Act of June 6, 1958, as amended (D.C. Code, Sec. 9–220(b); 81 Stat. 339), $77,763,000, which together with balances of previous appropriations for this purpose, shall remain available until expended and be advanced upon request of the Commissioner to the following funds; general fund, $74,735,000; highway fund, $700,000; water fund, $170,000; and sanitary works fund, $2,158,000.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The following amounts are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided:

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

General operating expenses, $39,209,000, of which $551,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $59,000 from the motor vehicle parking account), $85,000 from the water fund, and $63,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund: *Provided,* That the certificates of the Commissioner (for $2,500) and of the Chairman of the City Council (for $2,500) shall be sufficient voucher for expenditures from this appropriation for such purposes, exclusive of ceremony expenses, as they may respectively deem necessary: *Provided further,* That, for the purpose of assessing and reassessing real property in the District of Columbia, $5,000 of the appropriation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $7,500 of this appropriation shall be available for test borings and soil investigations: *Provided further,* That $920,000 of this appropriation (to remain available until expended) shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $60,000 of this appropriation shall be available for settlement of property damage claims not in excess of $500 each and personal injury claims not in excess of $1,000 each.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Public safety, including employment of consulting physicians, diagnosticians, and therapists at rates to be fixed by the Commissioner; cash gratuities of not to exceed $75 to each released prisoner; purchase of one hundred and ninety-eight passenger motor vehicles (including one hundred and eighty-seven for police-type use and nine for fire-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year but not in excess of $400 per vehicle for police-type and $600 per vehicle for fire-type use above such limitation) of which one hundred and eight are for replacement purposes; $130,324,000, of which $5,012,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $112,000 from the motor vehicle parking account): *Provided,* That not to exceed $50,000 of any funds from appropriations available to the District of Columbia may be used to match financial contributions from the Department of Defense to the District of Columbia Office of Civil Defense for the purchase of civil defense equipment and supplies approved by the Department of Defense, when authorized by the Commissioner: *Provided further,* That the Police Department and Fire Department are each authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicle exceeds three-fourths the cost of the replacement: *Provided further,* That $620,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the judiciary and disbursed

by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency of the District of Columbia.

EDUCATION

Education, including purchase of seventeen passenger motor vehicles of which eleven shall be for replacement only, provision of insurance, maintenance, and acceptance of not to exceed thirty passenger motor vehicles on a loan basis for exclusive use in the driver education program, the development of national defense education programs, and matching of Federal grants under the National Defense Education Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1580), as amended, $140,077,000, of which $125,100 shall be payable from the highway fund: *Provided*, That certificates of the following officials shall each be sufficient voucher for expenditures from this appropriation for such purposes as they may respectively deem necessary within the amounts specified: Superintendent of Schools, $500; President of the Federal City College, $1,000; and President of the Washington Technical Institute, $1,000.

Section 5533(c) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to compensation received by teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia for employment in a civilian office during the period July 1, 1969, to August 31, 1969.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Parks and recreation, including the purchase, acquisition, and transportation of specimens for the National Zoological Park, $18,337,000, of which $32,000 shall be payable from the highway fund.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Health and welfare, including reimbursement to the United States for services rendered to the District of Columbia by Freedmen's Hospital; purchase of eleven passenger motor vehicles, of which ten shall be for replacement only; and care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health; $137,382,000: *Provided*, That the inpatient rate and outpatient rate under such contracts, with the exception of Children's Hospital, and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed $38 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed $6 per visit; the inpatient rate and outpatient rate for Children's Hospital shall not exceed $40 per diem and $6.75 per visit; and the inpatient rate (excluding the proportionate share for repairs and construction) for services rendered by Saint Elizabeths Hospital for patient care shall be $17.94 per diem: *Provided further*, That the hospital rates specified herein shall not apply, beginning July 1, 1969, to services provided to patients who are eligible for such services under the District of Columbia plan for medical assistance under Title XIX of the Social Security Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the furnishing of medical assistance to individuals sixty-five years of age or older who are residing in the District of Columbia without regard to the requirement of one-year residence contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, under the heading "Operating Expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital", and this appropriation shall also be available to render assistance to such individuals who are temporarily absent from the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the authorization included under the heading "Department of Public Health", in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, for compensation of convalescent patients as an aid to their rehabilitation is hereby extended to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation: *Provided, further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the treatment, in any institution under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner and located either within or without the District of Columbia, of individuals found by a court to be chronic alcoholics.

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC

Highways and traffic, including $141,066 for traffic safety education without reference to any other law; $600 for membership in the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and $1,200 for membership in the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission; rental of three passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, and Chairman of the City Council; and purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles, of which forty-three shall be for replacement only; $18,450,000, of which $12,446,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $674,000 from the motor vehicle parking account): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purchase of driver-training vehicles.

SANITARY ENGINEERING

Sanitary engineering, including the purchase of twenty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $33,340,000, of which $9,156,000 shall be payable from the water fund, $7,097,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and $108,000 from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund.

PERSONAL SERVICES, WAGE-BOARD EMPLOYEES

For pay increases and related retirement costs for wage-board employees, to be transferred by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to the appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 from which said employees are properly payable, $5,201,300, of which $207,500 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $3,000 from the motor vehicle parking account), $288,200 from the water fund, $269,800 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and $8,000 from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For payment of property damage claims in excess of $500 and of personal injury claims in excess of $1,000, approved by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), $51,000, payable from the general fund.

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

For reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned in compliance with sections 108, 217, and 402 of the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 103, 109, and 110), as amended; section 9 of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 619), as amended; section 1 of the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183); and section 4 of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 211), including interest as required thereby, $10,807,000 of which $3,829,000 shall be payable from highway fund, $1,453,000 from the water fund, and $512,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned in compliance with section 4 of the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, the Act of May 14, 1948 (62 Stat. 235), and payments under the Act of July 2, 1954 (68 Stat. 443); construction projects as authorized by the Acts of April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244), February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 91), May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 105, 110), June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), and August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 686); including acquisition of sites; preparation of plans and specifications; conducting preliminary surveys; erection of structures, including building improvement and alteration and treatment of grounds; to remain available until expended, $149,928,000, of which $3,136,000 shall be payable from the highway fund, $1,175,000 from the water fund, and $12,268,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund: *Provided*, That $65,170,000 of this appropriation shall not be available for expenditure until July 1, 1970: *Provided further*, That $11,593,000 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioner, and the funds for the use of the Director of Buildings and Grounds shall be advanced to the appropriation account, "Construction services, Department of Buildings and Grounds".

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided herein, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act shall be audited before payment by the designated certifying official and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the designated disbursing official without countersignature.

SEC. 3. Whenever in this Act an amount is specified within an appropriation for particular purposes or object of expenditure, such amount, unless otherwise specified shall be considered as the maximum amount which may be expended for said purpose or object rather than an amount set apart exclusively therefor.

SEC. 4. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized or approved by the Commissioner, for allowances for privately owned automobiles used for the performance of official duties at 10 cents per mile but not to exceed $35 a month for each automobile, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, except that one hundred and sixty-three (fifty for investigators in the Department of Public Welfare and eighteen for venereal disease investigators in the Department of Public Health) such allowances at not more than $550 each per annum may be authorized or approved by the Commissioner.

SEC. 5. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for expenses of travel and for the payment of dues of organizations concerned with the work of the District of Columbia government, when authorized by the Commissioner: *Provided*, That the total expenditures for this purpose shall not exceed $122,700.

SEC. 6. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 7. The disbursing officials designated by the Commissioner are authorized to advance to such officials as may be approved by the Commissioner such amounts and for such purposes as he may determine.

SEC. 8. Appropriations in this Act shall not be used for or in connection with the preparation, issuance, publication, or enforcement of any regulation or order of the public Service Commission requiring the installation of meters in taxicabs, or for or in connection with the licensing of any vehicle to be operated as a taxicab except for operation in accordance with such system or uniform zones and rates and regulations applicable thereto as shall have been prescribed by the Public Service Commission.

SEC. 9. Appropriations in this Act shall not be available for the payment of rates for electric current for street lighting in excess of 2 cents per kilowatt-hour for current consumed.

SEC. 10. All passenger motor vehicles (including watercraft) owned by the District of Columbia shall be operated and utilized in conformity with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), and shall be under the direction and control of the Commissioner, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof, or direct the alteration of interchangeable use of any of the same by officers and employees of the District, except as otherwise provided in this Act. "Official purposes" as used in the section 16 shall not apply to the Commissioner, the Deputy Com-

missioner, and the Chairman of the City Council of the District of Columbia or in cases of officers and employees the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary, but only as to such latter cases when approved by the Commissioner.

SEC. 11. Appropriations contained in this Act of highways and traffic and sanitary engineering shall be available for snow and ice control work when ordered by the Commissioner in writing.

SEC. 12. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized by the Commissioner, for the rental of quarters without reference to section 6 of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945.

SEC. 13. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for the furnishing of uniforms when authorized by the Commissioner.

SEC. 14. There are hereby appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of judgments which have been entered against the government of the District of Columbia, including refunds authorized by section 10 of the Act approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 108): *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as modifying or affecting the provisions of paragraph 3, subsection (c) of section 11 of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended.

SEC. 15. Except as otherwise provided herein, limitations and legislative provisions contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, shall be applicable during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That the limitation for "Construction Services, Department of Buildings and Grounds" shall, during the current fiscal year, be 10 per centum of appropriations for all construction projects: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, the limitation with respect to a central heating system, under the heading "Department of Sanitary Engineering", shall not be applicable.

SEC. 16. Appropriations in this Act shall not be used for the assignment or transportation of students to public schools in the District of Columbia in order to overcome racial imbalance.

SEC. 17. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for the payment of public assistance without reference to the requirement of subsection (b) of section 5 of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 and for the non-Federal share of funds necessary to qualify for Federal assistance under the Act of July 31, 1968 (Public Law 90-445).

SEC. 18. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current year unless expressly so provided herein.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1970".

Mr. NATCHER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the bill?

Are there any amendments to the bill?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14916) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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 appear to have it.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. 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 305, nays 9, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—305

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Beall, Md.
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Caffery
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Coughlin
Culver
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gaydos
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Halpern
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Landgrebe
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Podell
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wold
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—9

Ashbrook
Collins
Gross
Haley
Hall
Montgomery
O'Konski
Rarick
Roudebush

NOT VOTING—118

Abbitt
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Bevill
Blanton
Blatnik
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buchanan
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chisholm
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Griffin
Gude
Hagan
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Henderson
Holifield
Howard
Hungate
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
Keith
King
Kirwan
Kuykendall
Kyl
Landrum
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Lowenstein
Lukens
McCarthy
McCloskey
McFall
MacGregor
Mann
Mills
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neal, Ga.
Patman
Pepper
Pickle
Poage
Powell
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reifel
Roberts
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Scherle
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stuckey
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Utt
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalley
Wright
Yates
Zwach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. King.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Keith.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Price.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Purcell.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Mann.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. McFall.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Pickle.
Mr Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mr. Stokes.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday evening, November 20, at the time of rollcall No. 285 on the motion to recommit with instructions the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, I had been excused by the House and was on official leave of absence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that today's RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "yea".

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26 TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 1

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 48 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 48

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, November 26, 1969, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. Monday, December 1, 1969.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALBERT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALBERT: On page 1, line 4, strike out the period and insert the following: "; and that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, November 26, 1969, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, December 1, 1969."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUT WE ARE WAITING, FOR WE BELIEVE IN GOD

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues an extraordinary letter. It was written by 18 citizens of the Soviet Union now residing there who identified themselves by name and address. The letter was addressed to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations. It sets forth the history of their requests and the requests of many others in the Soviet Union who have sought permission to leave that country. The act of these individuals in signing such a letter and asking that it be made public must be conceded by everyone to be heroic because it places them in great personal danger.

Yesterday, November 23, I marched with approximately 1,000 people in front of the Soviet mission in New York City to demonstrate in a small way our support of these brave people. For me, reading their letter was a most moving experience. The concluding paragraph must surely affect the stoniest of hearts:

We will wait months and years, we will wait all our lives, if necessary, but we will not renounce our faith or our hopes. We believe: Our prayers have reached God. We know: Our appeals will reach people. For we are asking little—let us go to the land of our forefathers.

Many of us who participated, myself included, in the protest before the Soviet mission must have had in our minds the ringing cry of Moses made to Pharaoh so long ago, "Let my people go."

The letter follows:

AUGUST 6, 1960.

To the HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, UNITED NATIONS,
New York, U.S.A.:

We, 18 religious Jewish families of Georgia, request you to help us leave for Israel. Each one of us, upon receiving an invitation from a relative in Israel, obtained the necessary questionnaires from the authorized U.S.S.R. agencies, and filled them out. Each was assured orally that no obstacles would be put in the way of his departure. Expecting to receive permission any day, each sold his property and gave up his job. But long months have gone by—years, for many—and permission for departure has not yet been given. We have sent hundreds of letters and telegraphs; they have vanished like tears in the sand of the desert. All we hear are one-syllable oral refusals. We see no written replies. No one explains anything. No one cares about our fate.

But we are waiting, for we believe in God.

We 18 religious Jewish families of Georgia consider it necessary to explain why we want to go to Israel.

Everybody knows how justly national policy, the theoretical principles of which were formulated long ago by the founder of the state, V. I. Lenin, is in fact being carried out in the U.S.S.R. There have not been Jewish pogroms, pales or quotas in the country for a long, long time. Jews can walk the streets without fear for their lives; they can live where they wish, hold any position, even as high as the post of minister, as is evident from the example of V. Dymshits, deputy chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers. There is even a Jewish deputy in the Supreme Soviet.—A. Chakovsky, editor-in-chief of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*.

Therefore, it is not racial discrimination that compels us to leave the country. Then perhaps it is religious discrimination? But synagogues are permitted in the country, and we are not prohibited from praying at home. However, our prayers are with Israel, for it is written: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning." For we religious Jews feel that there is no Jew without faith, just as there is no faith without traditions. What, then, is our faith and what are our traditions?

For a long time the Roman legions besieged Jerusalem. But despite the well known horrors of the siege—hunger, lack of water, disease, and much more—the Jews did not renounce their faith and did not surrender. However, man's strength has its limits, too, and in the end barbarians broke into the Holy City. Thus, a thousand years ago, the Holy Temple was destroyed, and with it—the Jewish State. The nation, however, remained: Although the Jews who could bear arms did not surrender to the enemy and killed one another, there remained the wounded, who were bleeding to death; there remained the old people, women and children.

And whoever could not get away was killed on the spot.

But whoever could, went away into the desert; and whoever survived, reached other countries, to believe, and pray, and wait.

Henceforth they had to find a way to live in alien lands among people who hated them.

Showered with insults, covered with the mud of slander, despised and persecuted, they earned their daily bread with blood and sweat, and reared their children.

Their hands were calloused, their souls were drenched in blood. But the important thing is that the nation was not destroyed—and what a nation.

The Jews gave the world religion and revolutionaries, philosophers and scholars, wealthy men and wise men, geniuses with the hearts of children, and children with the eyes of old people. There is no field of knowledge, no branch of literature and art, to which Jews have not contributed their share. There is no country which gave the Jews shelter which has not been repaid by their labor. And what did the Jews get in return?

When life was bearable for all, the Jews waited fearfully for other times. And when life became bad for all, the Jews knew that their last hour had come, and then they hid or ran away from the country.

And whoever got away, began from the beginning again.

And whoever could not run away, was destroyed.

And whoever hid well, waited until other times came.

Who didn't persecute the Jews! Everybody joined in baiting them.

When untalented generals lost a war, those to blame for defeat were found at once—Jews. When a political adventurer did not keep the mountain of promise he had given, a reason was found at once—the Jews. Jews died in the torture chambers of the Inquisition in Spain, and in fascist concentrations camps in Germany. Anti-Semites raised a scare—in enlightened France it was the Dreyfus case; in illiterate Russia, the Beilis case.

And the Jews had to endure everything.

But there was a way that they could have lived tranquilly, like other peoples; all they had to do was to convert to another faith. Some did this—there are cowards everywhere. But millions upon millions preferred a life of suffering and often death to apostasy.

And even if they did wander the earth without shelter—God found a place for all.

And even if their ashes are scattered through the world, the memory of them is alive.

Their blood is in our veins, and our tears are their tears.

The prophecy has come true: Israel has risen from the ashes; we have not forgotten Jerusalem, and it needs our hands.

There are 18 of us who signed this letter. But he errs who thinks there are only 18 of us. There could have been many more signatures.

They say there is a total of 12 million Jews in the world. But he errs who believes there are only 12 million of us. For with those who pray for Israel are hundreds of millions who did not live to this day, who were tortured to death, who are no longer here. They march shoulder to shoulder with us, unconquered and immortal, those who handed down to us the traditions of struggle and faith.

That is why we want to go to Israel.

History has entrusted the United Nations with a great mission—to think about people and help them. Therefore, we demand that the U.N. Human Rights Commission do everything it can to obtain from the Soviet Government in the shortest possible time permission for us to leave. It is incomprehensible that in the 20th century people can be prohibited from living where they wish to live. It is strange that it is possible to forget the widely publicized appeals about the right of nations to self-determination—and, of course, the right of the people who comprise the nation.

We will wait months and years, we will wait all our lives, if necessary, but we will not renounce our faith or our hopes.

We believe: Our prayers have reached God.

We know: Our appeals will reach people.

For we are asking little—let us go to the land of our forefathers.

SIGNATURES

Elashvili, Shabata Mikhailovich, Kutaisi, 53 Dzhaparidze St.

Elashvili, Mikhail Shabatovich, Kutaisi, 33 Dzhaparidze St.

Elashvili, Izrail Mikhailovich, Kutaisi, 31 Kirov St.

Eluashvili, Yakov Aronovich, Kutaisi, 5 Mayakovsky St.

Khikhinashvili, Mordekh Isakovich, Kutaisi, 19 Maharadze St.

Chikvashvili, Mikhail Samuilovich, Kutaisi, 38 Khakhanashvili St.

Chikvashvili, Moshe Samuilovich, Kutaisi, 32 Tsereteli St.

Beberashvili, Mikhail Rubenovich, Kutaisi, 9 Klara-Tsetkin St.

Elashvili, Yakov Izrailovich, Kutaisi, 54 Tsereteli St.

Mikhelashvili, Khaim Aronovich, Poti, 57 Tskhakaya St.

Mikhailashvili, Albert Khaimovich, Poti, 57 Tskhakaya St.

Mikhelashvili, Aron Khaimovich, Poti, 18 Dzhaparidze St.

Tetruashvili, Khaim Dadidovich, Kutaisi, 5 Shaumyan 1st Lane.

Tsitsuashvili, Isro Zakharovich, Kutaisi, 5 Shaumyan 1st Lane.

Tsitsuashvili, Yefrem Isrovich, Kutaisi, 6 Shaumyan 1st Lane.

Yakobishvili, Bension Shalomovich, Tbilisi, 4 General Delivery (formerly lived at 91 Barnov St.).

Batoniashvili, Mikhail Rafaelovich, Kutaisi, 53 Dzhaparidze St.

Tetruashvili, Mikhail Shalmovich, Kulashi, 114 Stalin St.

VIETNAM DEMONSTRATORS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the march of an estimated 250,000 Vietnam demonstrators down Pennsylvania Avenue on November 15 was a peaceful protest sanctioned by the Constitution. Because it was peaceful, little attention has been paid to the destruction and violence engaged in by the relatively small radical elements among the demonstrators.

I take this opportunity to inform the House that the 3-day Vietnam moratorium cost the taxpayers over one and a half million dollars and cost private business interests an estimated $240,000 to boot.

In addition to detailing these costs, the Justice Department reports that 606 persons were injured during the moratorium and it was necessary to arrest 361 individuals.

Treatment was administered to individuals at six area hospitals and various first-aid stations for everything from trauma to the effects of teargasing. Twenty-six police officers were among those receiving treatment.

Total estimated cost of the moratorium is placed at $1,816,622 on the basis of reliable estimates made by the Federal Government, the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department, and knowledgeable business firms.

In the aftermath of the demonstrations, 503 area firms placed orders for replacement of broken glass. Of that number, 25 were downtown financial institutions.

In Government buildings, 111 windows were broken. There also was paint damage and damage to nine glass doors. Twenty buildings owned or leased by the Government were involved. Greatest damage was to the Justice Department and Internal Revenue Service buildings. Repairs will cost an estimated $10,000.

Damage of up to $12,000 was done to U.S. park property, and $6,000 damage to 76 law-enforcement vehicles.

Overall costs included $936,088 for standby military support of civil authority; $473,776 in overtime pay for members of the three major metropolitan area police departments during the 3-day moratorium; $91,760 in General Service Administration costs; $38,497 for support personnel of the U.S. Marshals Service and Justice Department legal divisions; and $8,500 for debris removal.

The moratorium record in terms of injuries, arrests, damage, and other costs is as follows:

Summary

Injured	606
Arrests	361
Damage to 503 private buildings	$240,000
Damage to 20 Government buildings	10,000
Damage to 76 law-enforcement vehicles	6,000
Damage to park property	12,000
Military operations costs	936,088
Law enforcement overtime pay	473,776
Department of Justice support personnel	38,497
General Services Administration	91,761
Debris removal	8,500
Total	1,816,622

SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD ADDRESSES DINNER HONORING SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

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

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening I attended a dinner in my congressional district at which a large and enthusiastic audience was privileged to hear Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD summarize the career of my distinguished fellow West Virginian, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. It is the story of one who started from insignificant beginnings but through diligence, determination and plain hard work has fashioned a remarkable career in the public service.

What Senator BYRD has achieved has come about because he was determined to spare no effort to improve himself in every respect, to develop a sound basis for his judgments, and to avoid the pitfalls which would limit the application of those judgments. He has won the admiration of the people of West Virginia.

The story is worth retelling, and I therefore include Senator MANSFIELD's fine address in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, IN HONOR OF SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, AT THE DEMOCRATIC DINNER AT POCA HIGH SCHOOL, POCA, WEST VIRGINIA, NOVEMBER 22, 1969

I am delighted to be here tonight. I am delighted that I have been invited to join this gathering to honor the Democratic Party and to pay tribute to a man whom I have the privilege of calling a friend and colleague in the United States Senate. Robert Byrd and I have worked side by side for nearly 11 years on behalf of our respective States and the United States.

This audience is acquainted with much of the distinguished record of accomplishments which have highlighted Senator Byrd's career in the United States Senate. No member of that body has pursued his state's interest and the public good with more diligence or more effectively.

Coming from Montana, I know the difference between a show horse and a work horse. I also know that in Congress being the former may get your picture and name in the papers. Being the latter will inevitably gain you the respect and admiration of your constituents and colleagues.

Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia is not a show horse. He is a hard worker and the goals he seeks are those that perhaps drew up together early. Both of us speak for places where the land and water are a common language of economic survival; where a concern for nature and for nature's resources demands that they be used for the good of all and not for the profit of a few. Above all, we speak for people who believe in a decent peace and who want it sought by their government without "ifs," "ands," or "buts."

We speak as Democrats, but whatever their party affiliation or absence of it, we try to act on behalf of all of the people of our states.

The character of Robert Byrd is written into his outstanding record in your state and in the House and Senate. His is a fierce integrity of mind and an unbridled independence of spirit. His is a vision of a splendid tomorrow for this Nation and for its diverse peoples. And the people of West Virginia have long recognized these outstanding qualities.

It was at the early age of 28 that Bob was elected to the West Virginia State House of Delegates. Since then he has held more legislative elective offices than any other person in the history of West Virginia, moving from the State House to the United States House of Representatives and on to the Senate. He has succeeded because he has spoken out and he has spoken out forcefully and effectively on the most important issues of the times. Time and again, for instance, Senator Byrd has warned of the dangers of high interest rates, inflation and inequitable taxation. Time and again, he has stood almost alone in beating back one or more of these assaults on the well-being of people of moderate income.

His warnings have gone unheeded for too long. Now the squeeze is on. Inflation is taking its toll out of the standard of living of tens of millions of Americans. Consumer prices have gone up 6 percent this year. Inflation rides the market-basket of every shopper. Food prices are 5.7 percent above the level of a year ago. Beef is up 13 percent. Eggs are up 15 percent. The cost of mortgages, real estate, taxes, insurance, repairs and related expenses are up 11 percent over 1968.

Unemployment was 3.5 percent in August; it was 4.0 percent in September—the highest level in two years, and the highest monthly increase since 1960. It may be a matter of coincidence, but 1960 also happens to be when the last Republican Administration was in charge in Washington. I repeat, it may be a matter of coincidence; then, again, it may also be a matter of stubborn Republicanism. Note that with a 5 percent unemployment rate predicted in 1970, the Administration still declines to say whether this level would be "unacceptable."

Robert Byrd does not decline to say. I know he does not find a 5 percent rate of unemployment acceptable, just as he did not find an 8 percent prime interest rate acceptable. Bob Byrd is not the kind of Senator who will embrace a recession or depression in the guise of curbing an inflation.

Nor is Bob willing to settle for the neglect of older Americans, of those who are unable to pay today's sky-high living costs out of a meager social security pension. Bob advocates a broad overhaul of our social security program. He knows that the elderly simply cannot survive adequately on present pension benefits. He says that eligibility should begin earlier and that widows should obtain a pension when they reach 50. What Bob says is true and not only does he say it with words. He is there, pressing for it with hard work and with a deep commitment as well.

Like Bob also, I have a close affinity for mines and miners, and for the problems that have beset this age-old industry and those who have devoted a lifetime laboring beneath the ground, risking their lives so that others may enjoy the benefits yielded from the earth. Senator Byrd understands these problems. He is working to solve them. During the consideration of the Coal Mine Safety Act two months ago, Senator Byrd took the floor of the Senate to urge the approval of a provision that compensates those who have been disabled by a lifetime devoted to the mines. In pressing this special benefit Bob said—and I quote—"I feel that today we have proposed a measure which will bridge an important gap, and which will bring new hope to the mining population. I feel that it is necessary that we provide a way for old, disabled miners and their families to live without being dependent upon welfare. In so many instances, they long ago exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits, and have been forced to go to the welfare offices, or to their children and stand up with their hats in their hands and hope for assistance. Here today we not only provide for some measure of assistance to the old, disabled, retired miner, but also lend some assistance to his children, who otherwise would have to provide help for their parents."

After he sat down, the Senate approved the Miner Health disability provision by a vote of 91 to nothing. That is what I call a successful Senator.

It has been said that the measure of a man's success may be determined by comparing what he is with what he might have been, what he has done with what he might have done. In other words, a man with ten aptitudes who has developed only five of them is not as great a success as a man who strives to develop himself to the fullest.

Using that yardstick for success, Bob Byrd has achieved more than his fair share. A leading member of the all-important Senate Appropriations Committee, he has worked tirelessly to pare down Government costs where there is fat in the budget and to shore up worthwhile programs that have suffered from neglect. He has worked just as effectively on the Senate Judiciary Committee, a Committee long reserved for the Senate's most able and analytical legal minds. In that respect, let me say that it was while serving in the Congress that Bob somehow found time to obtain his law degree.

But above all, perhaps, Senator Byrd has distinguished himself most in the Senate as a member of the Leadership. It has been as the Secretary to the Senate's Majority Conference, a post he was elected to unanimously by the Senate Democrats, that he has demonstrated his outstanding capacity to bring together the varying viewpoints that represent the Democratic Party in the Senate.

His great success in this endeavor is due in large measure because he himself has shunned the tags and labels that have come to characterize most politicians. If there is a label that fits, it is that of responsibility. For Senator Byrd has exhibited the deepest concern for all of the problems we face as the Nation enters another decade; a concern for the problems at home and the problems abroad and especially for the most difficult problem of all today—the problem of Vietnam.

Insofar as Vietnam is concerned, let me say that I appreciate the President's difficulties in that situation as does Senator Byrd. To be sure, President Nixon did not make the problem of Vietnam. But, then, neither did President Johnson. Nor President Kennedy. Nor President Eisenhower. Its roots are deep and all of us, in a sense, have had a part in the planting.

Nevertheless, the war remains. The responsibility is now. It is the President's problem and, to the extent that we are Constitutionally empowered in the Senate and the Congress, it is our problem.

I am sure the President is seeking a way to peace according to his own lights. That he has a plan I do not doubt but he has yet to illuminate it. A rational peace remains to be achieved and I do not yet see how it can be achieved except by the disengagement of this Nation—not in stops and starts—but in an orderly manner from this involvement which is not now, never was and never can be our war.

This Nation must not be the dog that is wagged by the tail of the Saigon government. It must not be a rudderless ship waiting for the winds to shift in Hanoi. We must make our own decisions in the light of the Nation's highest interests. And so far as I am concerned, those interests call for the termination of our involvement in Vietnam at the soonest possible time.

The decisions must not be made for us by the Vietnamese of any faction. Vietnam is their country, not ours. After we are gone from it, whether they be Nationalists, Viet Congs, Hoa Haos, Buddhists or Cao Daists—the Vietnamese will still live in it and with one another.

On the issue of Vietnam, as on all other major issues of our times, the voice of Senator Byrd has not been silent and must not be silenced. It is a constructive voice in the Senate, for the State of West Virginia and for the Nation.

There are other voices and they are raised, now, on all sides of the question of Vietnam. As the war's frustrations persist, the divisions in the Nation are deepening. The antagonisms are spreading. The decibels of violence and hatemongering are growing.

In the circumstances, it would be well to bear in mind that the First Amendment to the Constitution protects every citizen's rights to speak his mind freely, to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. That is the bedrock of the Nation's freedom. The safeguarding of that right by Constituted authorities is not only a responsibility, it is a sacred duty.

I stress the word "peaceable" assembly as it is involved in the exercise of these Constitutional rights because these are difficult days and threats of disruption hang heavily over the Nation. I do not believe in license or violence. Those who resort to it make a mockery of the Constitution. License and violence are contrary to law and those who violate the law must bear the consequences.

Robert Byrd, I know, holds these sentiments. He knows the profound significance of the First Amendment to the survival of the Nation as well as the necessity for maintaining public order. He has defended both throughout his years in public life. He has stood not only for the peaceful exercise of Constitutional rights by those with whom he may agree but by those with whom he may disagree. That is as it should be, that is

as it can only be if the Republic is to remain free.

In concluding, let me ask all of you to join in working to hold the confidence of the people where we Democrats now possess it and to regain that confidence where it has been withdrawn. I am persuaded that the Democratic perception of the Nation's horizons is in accord with the needs of the people of the Nation. We stand for a determination to bring the war in Vietnam to a rational end as soon as possible. We stand for a redirection of the Nation's resources from wasteful excesses in the name of defense and from other spending of irrelevance to meeting the urgent inner deficits of the Nation—to strengthening education and health care, to safeguarding the air, water, land and recreational resources of the Nation, to improving the livelihood of all of the American people (whether on the farms or in the cities), to advancing the welfare of the elderly and to the reinforcement of public safety throughout the Nation.

There is a pressing need in the entire range of these basic requirements for a stable, progressive and satisfactory society. Democrats, out of power, must probe into these matters, not just with words but with hard work and deep commitment. Democrats in power must act on these matters within the limits of their capabilities.

I know Democrats. I know what they can do. Montana's delegation in Washington is 100 percent Democratic—in both the House and the Senate. The Governor of Montana is a Democrat. Democratic success in Montana was achieved through hard work and a unified effort. Bob Byrd knows the meaning of these terms. He has been practicing both for years in the Senate. With your help he will continue to do so in the years ahead.

CRIME RATE

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in these days of debate over law and order and justice, I have become increasingly interested in any effort that might in any way decrease the crime rate in this country.

For that reason, I was more than a bit concerned when a wholesaler of guns in my district recently told me about the large number of gun thefts he was experiencing in shipping guns through the U.S. mails. He indicated there had been a disturbing increase in losses in recent months.

Upon checking into the situation, I found the Post Office Department had only begun keeping records of this type since March—but that, from March to July, reported losses of firearms being shipped by mail stood at 1,376.

This figure, perhaps, is not significant in numbers or in dollars when you realize that the Post Office Department annually mails 800,000 firearms. But it is significant when you realize it is part of a major increase in the total number of firearms stolen or missing.

The FBI National Crime Information in its report for the period January 1 through August 31, 1969, showed 58,396 firearms "stolen, missing, or recovered." The term "recovered refers to firearms taken from criminals who are arrested and represents less than 1 percent of the total.

What do the thieves do with these firearms? A statistical analysis of New York State crime data conducted in 1968 showed that firearms either stolen or obtained in violation of existing laws were, for the most part, the firearms most often used in crime. The study also showed in 1967 that the number of firearms reported stolen in New York alone was 18,965—with only 155 of them "recovered" from criminals arrested in New York.

So what I am saying is this. Crime begets crime. And stolen guns, by and large, are not recovered, simply because the nature of the larceny of firearms is an extremely difficult one for law-enforcement officers to solve—lack of witnesses, tremendous volume of thefts, the sheer lapse of time between time for shipment and determination of loss, all being major factors.

Therefore, we cannot afford to ignore any solution which will reduce the number of guns stolen and, by extension, reduce the number of guns that can be used in other crimes.

Why are guns stolen?

Obviously, some are stolen for purposes of resale, because stolen firearms reap better than 100-percent profit. Therefore, criminal fences readily invite all business they can get from gun thieves. It is big business.

Second, some guns are stolen to commit other crimes. Records show that guns are far and away the most common weapon used in murders and nonnegligent homicides. To cite the FBI Uniform Crime Reports for 1968, note that 8,900 murders, 65,000 assaults, and 99,000 robberies were committed with guns.

Since 1964, the use of firearms in murder is up 71 percent; in aggravated assault, up 117 percent; and armed robbery, up 113 percent. In addition, since 1960, 96 percent of the 475 police officers killed in line of duty were killed by the use of firearms.

Third, firearms are being used by a number of subversive and extremist groups which advocate the use of force and violence to overthrow our Government. To do so, they strive in every possible way to disrupt law and order and inculcate hatred and bigotry that breed violence.

An ex-member of the Black Panther Party told the Senate Subcommittee on Government Operations, headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, that Black Panther Party projects are financed by armed robberies, with one-third of the take from the robberies going to the Black Panther Party treasury and the other two-thirds split among the robbers.

And, in the same vein, a gun used by a member of the Black Panther Party in Los Angeles in the murder of a member of a rival extremist group was reported stolen from the mail.

It is also significant that about 400 firearms were reported stolen in Detroit in 1967 after militant nationalist leader, H. Rap Brown, made a postriot speech urging militant Negroes in Detroit to "go get a gun, arm yourself for the troubled days ahead."

Police in Detroit found 40 stolen firearms among the 263 guns taken from persons arrested during the 5 days of rioting in that city during the summer of 1967. Significantly, many of the weapons taken from or found near the 22 persons arrested for sniping were stolen guns. Other stolen guns were discovered on several of the 26 persons charged with inciting to riot.

More recently, in fact, an article on March 24, 1969, in the Chicago Tribune pointed out that more than 5,000 guns of all types were stolen in Chicago during 1967 and that the Chicago police were worried about the possibility of large-scale theft of firearms which might be used by extremist groups if racial violence broke out in Chicago.

By all this, I do not mean to imply that all or even most stolen guns are stolen from the mails or would be used in the situations I have mentioned, but what I want to do is to point out that one Post Office Department regulation is contributing, in my opinion, to the increase in the number of guns being stolen and, thus, inadvertently adding to the opportunity for violence.

The situation is this: Current postal regulations stipulate:

> Any parcel which contains one or more firearms and which is tendered for deposit in the mails must display on its exterior the word "Firearms" in at least one-inch-high, bold, block letters. Any such parcel not so displaying such words shall not be accepted for carriage in the mails.

Many firearms manufacturers are concerned about this problem. In examining this situation, I found one firearms manufacturer who was experiencing an average loss of 60 guns per month in mail shipments. Another said he shipped very few guns by mail because of the high theft rate.

They contend—and I think rightly—that the labeling requirement constitutes a "flag" to the potential thief, an open invitation to steal. The National Rifle Association, noting an increase in the number of letters from its members concerning the theft of firearms from the mail, has taken the position that these thefts were a result of the labeling regulation.

As a result of this regulation, the parcels are boldly labeled and the parcels are being boldly "stolen." The Post Office Department cannot readily say with any real certainty in what manner they are missing, for they only began keeping records in March on the theft of guns from the mail.

They cannot tell how much the loss is—since the indemnity paid by the Post Office Department to cover losses is not broken down by category, such as firearms, clothing, and so forth, but the Department can tell you rather quickly that it has experienced a substantial increase in overall indemnity claim payments from fiscal year 1967 to fiscal year 1969—an increase from $4.2 to $5.5 million.

These losses cover all losses in postal transit—including handling by railroads, truckers, and airlines as well as postal handling by regular postal employees.

These losses are in addition to the concomitant housekeeping costs which the reporting entails. All these losses I feel can be greatly reduced. The large part of the answer, in my opinion, lies in preventing the theft—not necessarily in

stiffening or tempering our present penalties for gun theft.

This recognizes, of course, that we have no way to determine how many guns have been stolen while being shipped because of the label on the parcel identifying the contents as firearms. But, neither do we know how many guns would have been stolen had there been no label on the parcel.

However, it seems obvious—in view of the many crimes in which guns are involved—that guns are the first, prime target of thieves intent on bigger, more devastating crimes—whether that crime be murder, assault, robbery, riot, or other criminal acts.

It follows then that a reduction in the opportunity to commit theft is a prime factor in reducing theft. Thus, defining gun theft as a crime of opportunity, we must conclude, if there were no big, bold, one-inch-high letters on a parcel vividly portraying it as a container for firearms, there would be less recognition of the content, less temptation to steal.

While I realize the theft of firearms from the mail is a major problem, I also realize it is not an insurmountable one. But the problem will increase if an effort is not made to remove the labeling which makes it a prime target for those intent on stealing guns.

I definitely feel the elimination of the "firearms" label on guns shipped by mail will contribute substantially to a reduction in the number of guns stolen.

Today, I have written the Postmaster General urging him to take the necessary steps immediately to rescind the postal regulations requiring parcels containing firearms to be so labeled. I hope that the Postmaster General will promptly act to rescind a regulation which serves no worthwhile purpose but which apparently operates as an assist to the gun thief.

PFC. CLAUDE E. ELLARD, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

(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, as the October and November Vietnam moratorium demonstrations have come and gone, and as the December demonstration is being planned, perhaps it is a good time to pause and pay our respects to a young man and his family who have supported the President of the United States in his efforts to find an honorable solution to the war.

The young man is Marine Pfc. Claude E. Ellard, Jr., of Mobile, Ala., who was killed in action in Vietnam, October 8, 1969. On October 7, 1969, the day before he was killed, he wrote his parents that he and his buddies were well aware of "the reason we are here."

He said:

> We may not be able to see the day when good results are shown from our involvement, but it is a good cause and peace will come.

The next day his vehicle hit a land mine and ended the young life of this fine marine.

Perhaps this could be a time of bitterness for the Ellard family, for you see, Mr. Speaker, Claude Ellard, Sr., lost an arm and a leg almost 25 years ago when a land mine exploded beneath him in Europe during World War II.

Sometimes the privilege of being an American requires great sacrifice and the Ellard family understands this better than most. While their hearts are heavy, they nevertheless feel even stronger their pride in their country.

In a letter to me, Mr. and Mrs. Ellard said:

> Our son was a proud and happy Marine, who loved God and his Country, and he died for us all. This we have accepted as God's will. If we had more sons of age we would not hold them back either, for self comes last, our country comes first.

Mr. Speaker, the impact on the parents of the death of a young son can be traumatic and therefore it is important that the military services handle notification and burial details with great care. Mr. and Mrs. Ellard have stated to me that Marine Corps personnel have been most sympathetic and helpful. They pay particular tribute to Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps. Mr. and Mrs. Ellard feel that a special commendation is due Maj. C. W. Gibson, Jr., and 1st Sgt. Tom Sparks, 13th Force Reconnaissance Company, Mobile, Ala., who have been most considerate in their time of despair.

I join Mr. and Mrs. Ellard in their tribute to these fine marines.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one story, but it should be told at this time. It is a story of love of country, devotion to duty, sympathetic understanding, and pride in the Marine Corps. It should be read by all who argue that we should just pick up and leave Vietnam; it should be read by all the demonstrators. As Mr. Ellard said:

> President Nixon is doing all he can to have peace. So the demonstrations are really useless in that direction. But the demonstrations are dangrous and the demonstrators are actually causing the death of some of our boys.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time to unify behind our President, that time is now.

GALLUP POLL SHOWS 68 PERCENT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE APPROVE OF THE WAY PRESIDENT NIXON IS DOING HIS JOB

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll this morning shows that 68 percent of the American people approve of the way President Nixon is doing his job. The poll was taken during the recent surrender-now demonstrations here in Washington. It is an increase of 12 percent over the last Gallup poll.

I think the poll shows several things. First of all it shows that despite all the noise from the doves, the American people are not willing to settle for bugging out on our commitments to South Vietnam or anyone else. Second, it shows that given all the facts, as the President gave them last November 3, the American people are perfectly capable of making the right decision. Third, it shows that the American people are indeed responding to the President's leadership, that he is indeed bringing us realistically together.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be one of those who supports the President and I am even more proud, in this case, to be one of an overwhelming majority that also supports the President.

The results of the poll follow:

THE GALLUP POLL: NIXON SUPPORT SOARS TO 68 PERCENT

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—President Nixon's popularity has jumped to a new high in the latest nationwide survey conducted following his Nov. 3 Vietnam speech and during the latter stages of the Nov. 13–15 anti-war demonstrations.

Of the 1,465 adults interviewed in 300 localities across the nation, 68 percent say they approve of the way he is handling his overall job, while 19 percent disapprove and 13 percent do not express an opinion.

The President's latest rating represents a dramatic 12-point gain from the previous survey conducted one month ago, Oct. 17–20, when 56 percent of Americans voiced approval of his performance in office. That percentage was the President's lowest score to date.

The President's previous high was 65 percent approval and was recorded on four occasions: in mid-March, mid-May and late May, and most recently, in a survey conducted following the first moon landing, July 20.

The President's gains since the previous survey in late October have been registered among all major population groups, but have been most pronounced among men and persons living in the East.

Key factors in the President's popularity gains are his speech, Nov. 3, outlining the administration's Vietnam policies and unfavorable reaction to the recent anti-war demonstrations.

In a nationwide 500-interview survey conducted by telephone immediately following the President's Nov. 3 speech, the Gallup Poll found 77 percent of those who had heard the speech in favor of President Nixon's plan for ending the war.

It should be borne in mind that the survey taken at that time represented first reactions and the views of only those who had heard the speech.

Comments from persons interviewed indicate that the President's speech convinced many Americans that he is working hard to end the war and has left them with the expectation that he will get our troops out within a reasonable period of time.

A large number of Americans back the President himself for "doing the best he can under the circumstances" and his Vietnam policy as "the only one possible as of now." At the same time, they are impatient for an end to the war and for the return of our troops and will be keeping a close eye on the actual rate of withdrawal in the months ahead.

As a matter of fact, a September survey found 57 per cent of Americans in favor of Sen. Charles Goodell's proposal that all U.S. troops be withdrawn from Vietnam by the end of 1970 and the fighting turned over to the South Vietnamese.

The following question was asked in a survey conducted Nov. 14–16, with the bulk of the interviewing undertaken on Saturday, Nov. 15, the final day of the recent Vietnam demonstrations:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Nixon is handling his job as President?

Here are the latest results and the trend since President Nixon took office:

NIXON POPULARITY TREND LINE

[In percent]

Interviewing dates	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
Nov. 14-17	68	19	13
Oct. 17-20	56	29	15
Oct. 3-9	57	24	19
Sept. 19-22	58	23	19
Sept. 12-15	60	24	16
Aug. 15-18	62	20	18
July 26-28	65	17	18
Moon landing: July 20			
July 11-14	58	22	20
June 20-23	63	16	21
May 23-26	65	12	23
May 16-20	65	12	23
May 2-5	64	14	22
April 11-14	61	11	28
March 28-31	63	10	27
March 14-17	65	9	26
Feb. 21-24	61	6	33
Jan. 23-29	59	5	36
Average	62	16	22

NIXON PEACE PLAN

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the widely-read columnist, John Chamberlain, discussed recently the dangers of attempting to deal with Communist governments. I commend his column which appeared in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, to the attention of my colleagues:

RAPID VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL WOULD RESULT IN BLOODBATH

(By John Chamberlain)

President Nixon, in his gallant effort to end the U.S. involvement in South Vietnam without selling out an ally, has to contend with students who have never traveled and have no firsthand memory of the crises that have created the pattern of the post-World War II world.

The students, being young, will live and learn, and one hopes it won't be on the beaches of Australia or Hawaii. But what do you do about a man like Averell Harriman, who has spent a lifetime dealing with the Communists and still seems unable to form any valid generalizations from the things he has experienced?

Just after President Nixon had warned his listeners that any sudden Viet Cong takeover in South Vietnam would surely be followed by massacres of the anti-Communist and Catholic populations, Harriman went on the air to hem and haw when asked about the probability of bloodbaths in case of a U.S. withdrawal.

It was quite impossible to know with certainty what Harriman was driving at, but he seemed to be saying that a coalition government in South Vietnam could be trusted to hold murder to a minimum, and, anyway, he didn't think the Viet Cong would want to kill large numbers of their enemies. He had told the Yale students the same thing the previous week, throwing in a gratuitous slap at columnist Joseph Alsop, who thinks Communists are murderous by conviction.

Harriman hasn't always been wrong in his predictions of Communist behavior; during World War II he warned Washington that Joseph Stalin intended to take all of Europe that the Russian marshals could get their hands on. But his flashes of good judgment have been intermittent, to say the least.

In 1945 he badgered the Romanian non-Communist leaders into entering a coalition with Communists. Naturally, the non-Communists didn't live very long to tell the tale, or, if they did, their words were wasted on the silent walls of Joe Stalin's prisons.

It may be quite true that Romania, being on the lee side of the Soviet armies when World War II was concluded, had no choice save to go Communist. However, Harriman might have warned the non-Communist Romanians to take a night train to Turkey while the going was still good.

Harriman didn't do much better when, as our Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, he had to deal with the "neutralization" of Laos, where he tried to force the local anti-Communists into a coalition.

Harriman is now bemoaning the "unrepresentative" character of the Thieu-Ky government in South Vietnam. But, as one of the State Department group that advised John F. Kennedy to get rid of the Diem regime in Saigon, Harriman bears some of the blame for whatever has taken place in South Vietnam since 1963. As the late Marguerite Higgins, said, the destruction of the Diem government wiped out almost everyone in the country who had had any important experience in administration. Query: how do you advance "democracy" by killing off expertise?

If there is one generalization that can be made above all others, it is that Communists murder the opposition wherever they take power. Has Harriman forgotten the mass slaughter of the Polish army officers in the Katyn forest? Has he forgotten what happened in the Baltic provinces in 1940? A good estimate is that 70 million people have been killed by Communists since 1917.

Does anybody in his right mind belive that the successors to Ho Chi Minh would be less likely to indulge in massacre than the men who taught nice old Uncle Ho his business? I'd like to give Averell Harriman a second chance to answer that question.

GUARDING AGAINST THE EMPLOYMENT OF ILLEGAL ENTRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the resolution adopted by the Western Growers Association of California and Arizona pertaining to farm labor. I particularly point out that the resolution sets forth that the Western Growers Association of California and Arizona does hereby reiterate the objective of guarding against the employment of illegal entrants in the United States in the production of fresh vegetables and melons for the public welfare.

RESOLUTION OF WESTERN GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas, the vegetable and melon industry of Arizona and California contributes to the nation's food supply crops valued in excess of $900 million annually, represents 49% of the United States' total production of such foods, and

Whereas, in excess of 825 thousand acres of land are being cultivated for the production of these fresh food commodities, and

Whereas, the ratio of per-man units required for the production of vegetables and melons is foremost among the total labor needs of the various segments of agriculture, and

Whereas, this eminent ratio of farm labor requirements for the production of fresh vegetables and melons exacts need for a mammoth force of farm workers, and

Whereas, it is the unalterable aim of the vegetable and melon industry to recruit and utilize legal residents of the United States for its farm work force in its firm desire to minimize the unwarranted problems and costs accruing through the United States Immigration Service as well as to taxpayers,

Be it resolved, that the Western Growers Association, assembled at its 44th Annual Meeting at Phoenix, Arizona, October 30, 1969—in behalf of its members—does hereby reiterate the objective of guarding against the emploment of illegal entrants in the United States in the production of fresh vegetables and melons for the public welfare.

Engrossed:

WESTERN GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
FRANK W. GASTIGLIONE,
Secretary.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO MAKE LOUD PIPERS OF DISCORD AND PROTEST PAY FOR THEIR RAUCOUS TUNES AND REPEATED VANDALISM

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, I discussed the need for legislation to make the loud pipers of discord and protest in this country pay for their raucous tunes and repeated vandalism.

I urge it again.

Those who offered high praise for the marchers in the recent so-called moratorium once again overlooked the fact that somebody is stuck with the bill for their visit—the good old American taxpayer.

This time in broken windows, stolen property, use of troops, cost of police overtime, and cleaning up the litter, the bill for the Government alone amounts to more than $1½ million. It will be much higher, Mr. Speaker, when all the bills are in. It always is.

And, as always, the marchers, protesters, and planners left major portions of our city in a shambles as they departed. They left more than 150 businesses with shattered windows and other damage. They left behind the uncounted expense of restaurants without diners, department stores without customers, for three normally busy weekend days.

Let us make them pay the bill, Mr. Speaker; let us make them responsible for their vandalism; let us settle this account with our taxpayers, our businessmen, Mr. Speaker, before the next invasion of vandals and disrupters arrive.

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to include a tabulation I have prepared of the costs to the Government of the November 13–15 weekend at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

Estimates of moratorium costs to Government: Nov. 13–15, 1969

Army: troop movement, billeting, buses (not including pay and allowances), round figures ---- $1,000,000

Estimates of moratorium costs to Government: Nov. 13–15, 1969—Continued

National Guard: No appreciable costs, since they planned for moratorium by arranging their monthly weekend activation for that weekend. Transportation costs were included in Army figure	----------
GSA: damage to public buildings $7,700, shrubs $2,230. Other expenses, including overtime for protection people and maintenance personnel	$102,000
Metropolitan Police: including overtime, food, tear gas and equipment, housing, plus damage to vehicles and equipment	350,000
Interior: Park Police estimate 5,831 hours of overtime at $40,800, plus $10,000 regular pay to diverted men: cleanup of Mall $6,100; cleanup of G. W. Parkway $1,300; property damage $9,900; damage to plants and shrubs $1,100; installing and removing drinking fountains $2,600; portable comfort stations $11,150; personnel assigned to protect memorials $500	83,450
Total	1,535,450

Approximately 150 businesses in Washington received some damage. Board of Trade now attempting to obtain estimates by asking all members to report own damage plus damage to others in neighborhood. Report due on November 26.

EL PASO, THE INTERNATIONAL CITY

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would not consider the floor of the House a proper place for a Member to simply extol the virtues of his hometown; but there are occasions when it becomes evident that some Members are uninformed about the changes that have come to that vast area between the east coast and our most populous State. Evidently, there are those who believe that my section of west Texas is still on some distant frontier and deprived of all the embellishments of civilized society.

At a recent hearing of the Appropriations Committee on the subject of military construction, one of my colleagues saw fit to belittle the Army's plans to move some of its language instruction facilities to El Paso. Speaking of the language instruction personnel, the gentleman remarked:

> They are professional types, rather than construction workers or combat personnel who like to live out in the desert or some place like El Paso. They were affronted to think that we would move a language teaching facility to a place like El Paso. They were concerned and shocked that the upper echelon in the military would move a university type institution to an abandoned military base just because it had a vacant hangar there.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, El Paso, the international city, has a population of more than 330,000 and together with its sister city, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, constitutes a metropolitan area with three quarters of a million population. It is the site of the University of Texas at El Paso, with an enrollment of more than 10,000; and during the hearings about moving the Defense Language Institute to El Paso, it was established that the University of Texas system would make its extensive language instruction facilities available in cooperation with the Army.

The "abandoned" military base, which my colleague mentioned, was transferred to Fort Bliss, and all of its facilities are being utilized. Fort Bliss is the headquarters for air defense missile training for all the free world, and skilled missile men from more than 20 countries come to the base for their advanced training. This serves to make El Paso even more of a cosmopolitan city, and it has one of the finest councils for international visitors in the Nation.

El Paso has a first-class symphony orchestra. Its ballet and opera companies are presented cooperatively by the university and the community. It has an extensive program for the interchange of cultural events with its neighbor city, and a bilingual theater to present classic drama in both English and Spanish. It is the home of the Southwestern Sun Carnival and the annual Sun Bowl football game, now 35 years old.

Military men who have served all over the world choose to return to El Paso for their retirement years, and our retired military population now numbers at least 6,000. It might be pointed out that our football coach at the university was offered the position of head coach at West Point, and our basketball coach the position of head coach at the University of Detroit. Neither of them could bring themselves to leave El Paso. I believe that if my colleague were to pay our city an extensive visit, he might have similar feelings about its numerous attractions as a better place to live.

THE ISSUE OF VIETNAM

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, it is important for all of us to reflect on the positions we have taken on public issues and to refine and restate our views in the light of changing situations. Certainly, the President's recent speech on Vietnam should be an occasion for reflection on Vietnam. So also are the marches and demonstrations occasions for listening and reflecting. Generally, I have been disappointed in the kind of response to the President's address I have seen, particularly from those who feel that the President's only concern should be the immediate withdrawal of the United States from events in South Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

For myself, I support the President's policy with regard to Vietnam, and I agree with him and that full and immediate withdrawal from the war, however desirable that may be, is not a prudent policy for the United States to adopt. Some say, as the President did, that such a policy would lead to the slaughter of thousands of South Vietnamese, not only those close to the United States but also those who have opposed the Viet Cong in the hamlets and villages.

The late Senator Robert Kennedy of New York, one of the early and articulate critics of America's involvement in Vietnam, in his book "To Seek a Newer World," addressed himself to this problem:

> Withdrawal is now impossible. . . . Moreover, tens of thousands of individual Vietnamese have staked their lives and fortunes on our presence and protection: civil guards, teachers and doctors in the villages; mountain tribesmen in the high country; many who work for the present benefit of their people, who have not acceded to the Viet Cong even though they may not support the Saigon government. Many have once already fled the dictatorship of the North.

My purpose here is not to become involved in debating the question whether or not such a course of events would actually take place upon our withdrawal. However, the question is sufficiently weighty that it must not be ignored, because it poses a moral dilemma for the United States. In other words, our policy of disengagement must take this fact into consideration.

I think it is important to understand that the President is embarked on a course of action which will substantially reduce the American presence in South Vietnam. Underlying the President's policy is a clear realization that American military might alone, is not capable of settling the Vietnam problem. There was a time when many, including myself, thought that this was possible, but the events of the last 3 years, and particularly the 1968 Tet offensive, have shown that this is not the case. The President's policy, as I understand it, accepts this fact of life.

Even during the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson, we talked about how we were helping the South Vietnamese to help themselves, and I believe that this was our goal and it was an honorable one. Somewhere along the line, we passed beyond the point of helping them fight their own war and we assumed the leadership role, and with it the tremendous increase in the American presence in Vietnam. It has developed that the sheer weight of the American presence itself is a deterrent to self-determination. It follows then that real self-determination for the people of South Vietnam cannot be accomplished until American domination of so much of the life of the South Vietnamese people is substantially reduced.

The President's policy of disengagement, of reduction in the American presence, is designed precisely to permit the South Vietnamese people to take their destiny into their own hands. It should be clear to everyone that our policy has changed and we are on the road to withdrawal. Certainly, the leaders of South Vietnam, and those who aspire to that leadership, realize that the days of dependence on and subservience to the Americans are coming to an end.

Those Americans who participated in the events of the October and November protests and marches, and many others who were unable to participate, disagree

in varying measure with the present policy. In orderly and dramatic ways, that disagreement has been demonstrated. For myself, I cannot accept an immediate precipitate cessation of our presence in Vietnam, and for many of the same reasons outlined by the late Senator Kennedy and quoted above. I support the President's policy of gradual withdrawal.

Personally, I do not believe that it would be prudent to announce a timetable for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. While it is true that the negotiations at Paris have been unproductive, I do feel that an announced timetable would end all hope for any progress on a negotiated settlement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in looking toward the future and toward the kind of relationship we want with the other nations in the international community, I think it is important to reflect on the commitments contained in the many mutual security agreements we have with other nations. Our policy with regard to these commitments must be governed by a consideration of the impact of our actions on those nations' ability to achieve and maintain self-determination.

In short, while we have a moral and political obligation to honor our commitments, those obligations must be couched in a policy of prudence which provides the flexibility for collateral rather than completely dominant American participation.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON VIOLENT CRIME

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence has, through its Chairman, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, issued its report on violent crime: homocide, assault, rape, robbery, on November 23–24, 1969.

The able and distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS and I served as the Members of the House of Representatives on the Commission. We are of the opinion that the report merits the consideration of all our colleagues and insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reading in every part of our country.

The final paragraph of the report is taken from the monumental work of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, of February 1967.

That final paragraph on the report is as follows:

> Warring on poverty, inadequate housing and unemployment, is warring on crime. A civil rights law is a law against crime. Money for schools is money against crime. Medical, psychiatric, and family-counseling services are services against crime. More broadly and most importantly every effort to improve life in America's "inner cities" is an effort against crime.

Mr. Speaker, a list of the members of the Commission follows:

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman.
Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, Vice Chairman.
Congressman Hale Boggs.
Terence Cardinal Cooke.
Ambassador Patricia Roberts Harris.
Senator Philip A. Hart.
Eric Hoffer.
Senator Roman Hruska.
Leon Jaworski.
Albert E. Jenner, Jr.
Congressman William M. McCulloch.
Judge Ernest W. McFarland.
Dr. W. Walter Menninger.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission report follows:

COMMISSION STATEMENT ON VIOLENT CRIME: HOMICIDE, ASSAULT, RAPE, ROBBERY

(Submitted by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman)

When citizens express concern about high levels of violence in the United States, they have in mind a number of different types of events: homicides and assaults, rioting and looting, clashes between demonstrators and police, student seizures of university buildings, violence in the entertainment media, assassinations of national leaders. Foremost in their minds, no doubt, is what appears to be a rising tide of individual acts of violent crime, especially "crime in the streets."

Only a fraction of all crime is violent, of course. Major crimes of violence—homicide, rape, robbery, and assault—represent only 13 percent (or 588,000) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Index of reported serious crimes (about 4.5 million in 1968).[1] Moreover, deaths and personal injuries from violent crime cause only a small part of the pain and suffering which we experience: one is five times more likely to die in an auto accident than to be criminally slain, and one hundred times more likely to be injured in a home accident than in a serious assault.

But to suffer deliberate violence is different from experiencing an accident, illness or other misfortune. In violent crime man becomes a wolf to man, threatening or destroying the personal safety of his victim in a terrifying act. Violent crime (particularly street crime) engenders fear—the deep-seated fear of the hunted in the presence of the hunter. Today this fear is gnawing at the vitals of urban America.

In a recent national survey, half of the women and one-fifth of the men said they were afraid to walk outdoors at night, even near their homes. One-third of American householders keep guns in the hope that they will provide protection against intruders. In some urban neighborhoods, nearly one-third of the residents wish to move because of high rates of crime, and very large numbers have moved for that reason. In fear of crime, bus drivers in many cities do not carry change, cab drivers in some areas are in scarce supply, and some merchants are closing their businesses. Vigilante-like groups have sprung up in some areas.

Fear of crime is destroying some of the basic human freedoms which any society is supposed to safeguard—freedom of movement, freedom from harm, freedom from fear itself. Is there a basis for this fear? Is there an unprecedented increase in violent crime in this country? Who and where are most of the violent criminals and what makes them violent? What can we do to eliminate the causes of that violence?

I. PROFILE OF VIOLENT CRIME

Between 1960 and 1968, the national rate of criminal homicide per 100,000 population increased 36 percent, the rate of forcible rape 65 percent, of aggravated assault 67 percent, and of robbery 119 percent. These figures are from the *Uniform Crime Reports* published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These Reports are the only national indicators we have of crime in America. But, as the FBI recognizes, they must be used with caution.

There is a large gap between the reported rates and the true rates. In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice stated that the true rate of total major violent crime was roughly twice as high as the reported rate.[2] This ratio has probably been a changing one. Decreasing public tolerance of crime is seemingly causing more crimes to be reported. Changes in police practices, such as better recording procedures and more intensive patrolling, are causing police statistics to dip deeper into the large well of unreported crime. Hence, some part of the increase in reported rates of violent crime is no doubt due to a fuller disclosure of the violent crimes actually committed.

Moreover, while current rates compare unfavorably, even alarmingly, with those of the 1950's fragmentary information available indicates that at the beginning of this century there was an upsurge in violent crime which probably equaled today's levels. In 1916, the city of Memphis reported a homicide rate more than seven times its present rate. Studies in Boston, Chicago and New York during the years of the First World War and the 1920's showed violent crime rates considerably higher than those evident in the first published national crime statistics in 1933.

Despite all these factors, it is still clear that *significant and disturbing increases in the true rates of homicide and, especially, of assault and robbery have occurred over the last decade.*

While the reported incidence of forcible rape has also increased, reporting difficulties associated with this crime are too great to permit any firm conclusion on the true rate of increase.

Violent crimes are not evenly distributed throughout the nation. Using new data from a Victim-Offender Survey conducted by our staff Task Force on Individual Acts of Violence, standard data from the FBI, and facts from other recent studies, we can sketch a more accurate profile of violent crime in the United States than has hitherto been possible. We note, however, that our information about crime is still unsatisfactory and that many critical details in the profile of violent crime remain obscure. Moreover, we strongly urge all who study this profile to keep two facts constantly in mind. First, violent crime is to be found in all regions of the country, and among all groups of the population—not just in the areas and groups of greatest concentration to which we draw attention. Second, despite heavy concentrations of crime in certain groups, the overwhelming majority of individuals in these groups are law-abiding citizens.

(1) *Violent crime in the United States is primarily a phenomenon of large cities. This is a fact of central importance.*

The 26 cities with 500,000 or more residents and containing about 17 percent of our total population contribute about 45 percent of the total reported major violent crimes. Six cities with one million or more residents and having ten percent of our total population contribute 30 percent of the total reported major violent crimes.

Large cities uniformly have the highest reported violent crime levels per unit of population. Smaller cities, suburbs and rural areas have lower levels. The average rate of major violent offenses in cities of over 250,000 inhabitants is eleven times greater than in rural areas, eight times greater than in suburban areas, and five and one-half times greater than in cities with 50,000 to 100,000 inhabitants.[3]

For cities of all sizes, as well as for suburbs and rural areas, there has been a recent

Footnotes at end of article.

upward trend in violent crime; the increase in the city rate has been much more dramatic than that for the other areas and subdivisions.

The result in our larger cities is a growing risk of victimization: in Baltimore, the nation's leader in violent crime, the risk of being the victim of a reported violent crime is one in 49 per year. Thus, in the context of major violent crimes, the popular phrase "urban crisis" is pregnant with meaning.

(2) *Violent crime in the city is overwhelmingly committed by males.*

Judgments about overall trends and levels of violent crime, and about variations in violent crime according to city size, can be based upon reported offense data. But conclusions about the sex, age, race and socioeconomic status of violent offenders can be based only on *arrest* data. Besides the gap previously mentioned between true offense rates and reported offense rates, we must now deal also with the even larger gap between *offense reported* and *arrests made*. Accordingly conclusions in these areas must be drawn with extreme care, especially since arrests, as distinguished from convictions, are made by policemen whose decisions in apprehending suspects thus determine the nature of arrest statistics.[4]

In spite of the possibly wide margins of error, however, one fact is clearly indisputable: violent crimes in urban areas are disproportionately caused by male offenders. To the extent that females are involved, they are more likely to commit the more "intimate" violent crimes like homicide than the "street crimes" like robbery. Thus, the 1968 reported male homicide rate was five times higher than the female rate; the robbery rate twenty times higher.

(3) *Violent crime in the city is concentrated especially among youths between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four.*

Urban arrest rates for homicide are much higher among the 18–24 age group than among any other; for rape, robbery and aggravated assault, arrests in the 15–24 age group far outstrip those of any other group. Moreover, it is in these age groups that the greatest increases in all arrest rates have occurred. Surprisingly, however, there have also been dramatic and disturbing increases in arrest rates of the 10–14 age group for two categories—a 300 percent increase in assault between 1958 and 1967, and 200 percent in robbery in the same period.

(4) *Violent crime in the city is committed primarily by individuals at the lower end of the occupational scale.*

Although there are no regularly collected national data on the socioeconomic status of violent offenders, local studies indicate that poor and uneducated individuals with few employment skills are much more likely to commit serious violence than persons higher on the socioeconomic ladder. A forthcoming University of Pennsylvania study of youthful male offenders in Philadelphia, for example, will show that boys from lower income areas in the city have delinquency rates for assaultive crimes nearly five times the rates of boys from higher income areas; delinquency rates for robbery are six times higher.[5] Other studies have found higher involvement in violence by persons at the lower end of the occupational scale. A succession of studies at the University of Pennsylvania, using Philadelphia police data, show that persons ranging from skilled laborers to the unemployed constitute about 90–95 percent of the criminal homicide offenders, 90 percent of the rape offenders and 92–97 percent of the robbery offenders. A St. Louis study of aggravated assault found that blue collar workers predominate as offenders. The District of Columbia Crime Commission found more than 40 percent of the major violent crime offenders to be unemployed.

(5) *Violent crime in the cities stems disproportionately from the ghetto slum where most Negroes live.*

Reported national urban arrest rates are much higher for Negroes than for whites in all four major violent crime categories, ranging from ten or eleven times higher for assault and rape to sixteen or seventeen times higher for robbery and homicide.[6] As we shall show, these differences in urban violent crime rates are not, in fact, racial; they are primarily the result of conditions of life in the ghetto slum. The gap between Negro and white crime rates can be expected to close as the opportunity gap between Negro and white also closes—a development which has not yet occurred.

The large national urban arrest differentials between Negroes and whites are also found in the more intensive Philadelphia study previously cited. Of 10,000 boys born in 1945, some 50 percent of the three thousand non-whites had at least one police contact by age 18, compared with 20 percent of the seven thousand whites. (A police contact means that the subject was taken into custody for an offense other than a traffic violation and a report recording his alleged offense was prepared and retained in police files.) The differences were most pronounced for the major violent offenses: of fourteen juveniles who had police contacts for homicide, all were non-whites; of 44 who had police contacts for rape, 86 percent were non-whites and fourteen percent whites; of 193 who had police contacts for robbery, 90 percent were non-whites and ten percent whites; and of 220 who had police contacts for aggravated assault, 82 percent were non-whites and eighteen percent whites. When the three sets of figures for rape, robbery and assault are related to the number of non-whites and whites, respectively, in the total group studied (3,000 vs. 7,000), the differences between the resulting ratios closely reflect the differentials in the national urban arrest rates of non-whites and whites in the 10–17 age group.

(6) *The victims of assaultive violence in the cities generally have the same characteristics as the offenders: victimization rates are generally highest for males, youths, poor persons, and blacks. Robbery victims, however, are very often older whites.*

There is a widespread public misconception that most violent crime is committed by black offenders against white victims. This is not true. Our Task Force Victim-Offender Survey covering seventeen cities has confirmed other evidence that serious assaultive violence in the city—homicide, aggravated assault and rape—is predominantly between white offenders and white victims and black offenders and black victims. The majority of these crimes involves blacks attacking blacks, while most of the remainder involve whites victimizing whites. Indeed, our Survey found that 90 percent of urban homicide, aggravated assaults and rapes involve victims and offenders of the same race.

In two-thirds of homicides and aggravated assaults in the city, and in three-fifths of the rapes, the victim is a Negro. Rape victims tend strongly to be younger women; the victims of homicide and aggravated assault are usually young males but include a higher proportion of older persons. Nearly four-fifths of homicide victims and two-thirds of the assault victims are male. Generalizing from these data, we may say that the typical victim of a violent assaultive crime is a young Negro male, or in the case of rape, a young Negro woman.

Robbery, on the other hand, is the one major violent crime in the city with a high inter-racial component: although about 38 percent of robberies in the Survey involve Negro offenders and victims, 45 percent involve Negroes robbing whites—very often young black males robbing somewhat older white males. In three-fifths of all robberies the victim is white and nearly two-thirds of the time he or she is age 26 or over. Four-fifths of the time the victim is a man.

Data collected by the Crime Commission indicate that victimization rates for violent crimes are much higher in the lower-income groups. This is clearly true for robbery and rape, where persons with incomes under $6,000 were found to be victimized three to five times more often than persons with incomes over $6,000. The same relation held, but less strongly, for aggravated assault, while homicide victimization rates by income could not be computed under the investigative techniques used.

(7) *Unlike robbery, the other violent crimes of homicide, assault and rape tend to be acts of passion among intimates and acquaintances.*

The Victim-Offender Survey shows that homicide and assault usually occur between relatives, friends or acquaintances (about two-thirds to three-fourths of the cases in which the relationship is known). They occur in the home or other indoor locations about 50–60 percent of the time. Rape is more likely to be perpetrated by a stranger (slightly over half of the cases), usually in the home or other indoor location (about two-thirds of the time). By contrast, robbery is usually committed outside (two-thirds of the cases) by a stranger (more than 80 percent of the cases).

The victim, the offender, or both are likely to have been drinking prior to homicide, assault, and rape, and the victim often provokes or otherwise helps precipitate the crime. The ostensible motives in homicide and assault are often relatively trivial, usually involving spontaneous altercations, family quarrels, jealous rages, and the like. The two crimes are similar; there is often no reason to believe that the person guilty of homicide sets out with any more intention to harm than the one who commits an aggravated assault. Except for the seriousness of the final outcomes, the major distinction is that homicides most often involve handguns while knives are most common in assault.[7]

(8) *By far the greatest proportion of all serious violence is committed by repeaters.*

While the number of hard-core repeaters is small compared to the number of one-time offenders, the former group has a much higher rate of violence and inflicts considerably more serious injury. In the Philadelphia study, 627 of the 10,000 boys were chronic offenders, having five or more police contacts. Though they represented only six percent of the boys in the study, they accounted for 53 percent of the police contacts for personal attacks—homicide, rape and assault—and 71 percent of the contacts for robberies.

Offenders arrested for major criminal violence generally have long criminal histories, but these careers are mainly filled with offenses other than the final serious acts. Generally, though there are many exceptions, the more serious the crime committed, the less chance it will be repeated.

(9) *Americans generally are no strangers to violent crime.*

Although it is impossible to determine accurately how many Americans commit violent crimes each year, the data that are available suggest that the number is substantial, ranging from perhaps 600,000 to 1,200,000—or somewhere between one in every 300 and one in every 150 persons.[8] Undoubtedly, a far greater number commit a serious violent crime at some time in their lives. The Philadelphia study found that of about 10,000 boys 35 percent (3475) were taken into police custody for delinquency, and of the delinquents ten percent (363) were apprehended once or more for a major crime of violence before age eighteen.

A comparison of reported violent crime rates in this country with those in other modern, stable nations shows the United States to be the clear leader. Our homicide

Footnotes at end of article.

rate is more than twice that of our closest competitor, Finland, and from four to twelve times higher than the rates in a dozen other advanced countries including Japan, Canada, England and Norway. Similar patterns are found in the rates of other violent crime: averages computed for the years 1963–1967 show the United States rape rate to be twelve times that of England and Wales and three times that of Canada; our robbery rate is nine times that of England and Wales and double that of Canada; our aggravated assault rate is double that of England and Wales and eighteen times that of Canada.

II. CAUSES OF VIOLENT CRIME

Violent crime occurs in many places and among all races but we have just shown that it is heavily concentrated in large cities and especially among poor black young men in the ghettos. We must therefore focus on the conditions of life for the youth of the inner-city to find the root causes of a high percentage of violent crime.

Much has been written about inner-city slums where crime and delinquency are bred. Social scientists have analyzed slum conditions and their causal link to crime and violence, writers and artists have dramatized the sordidness and the frustrations of life in the inner-cities, and a number of Commissions prior to this one have produced comprehensive reports on this subject.[9] In its 1967 Report the Crime Commission described the linkage between violent crime and slum conditions in large cities as "one of the most fully documented facts about crime." Referring to numerous studies conducted over a period of years, the Commission found that violent crime, its offenders and its victims are found most often in urban areas characterized by:

Low income;
Physical deterioration;
Dependency;
Racial and ethnic concentrations;
Broken homes;
Working mothers;
Low levels of education and vocational skills;
High unemployment;
High proportions of single males;
Overcrowded and substandard housing;
High rates of tuberculosis and infant mortality;
Low rates of home ownership or single family dwellings;
Mixed land use; and
High population density.[10]

A series of studies by Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay remain the classic investigation of these ecological patterns.[11] Extensive data on the distribution of delinquency among neighborhoods were collected in a number of large American cities, and the results for Chicago have recently been updated to cover the period from 1900 through 1965. Finding uniformly high correlations between delinquency and areas having the characteristics listed above, Shaw and McKay focused on the process of change in the communities studied.

Neighborhoods disrupted by population movements and social change contained high proportions of delinquents. Although the same central core areas tended to experience social change and high delinquent rates over time, high or low delinquent rates were not permanently associated with any particular ethnic or racial group. The newest immigrant or migrant groups tended to settle initially in the core areas and be responsible for the highest delinquency rates in each city; yet the rates for these groups went down as the groups either moved outward to better areas or achieved a more stable community structure. In Chicago, first the Germans and Irish, then the Poles and Italians, and finally Southern Negroes and Spanish-speaking peoples replaced one another as the newest groups settling in the inner-city and producing the highest delinquency rates. Consistent with these findings has been a regular decline in delinquency rates from the innermost to the outermost areas around the centers of each city examined.[12] Crime and delinquency are thus seen as associated with the disorganization and deprivation experienced by new immigrant or migrant groups as they strive to gain a foothold in the economic and social life of the city.

Negroes, however, have not been able, even when they have improved their economic condition, to move freely from the central cities. Therefore, movement of Negroes with higher income has tended merely to extend the ghetto periphery. The Southern Negro migrants who have now been concentrated in the cities for two generations—as well as Negroes who have been living under conditions of urban segregation even longer—have experienced the same disorganizing forces as the earlier European settlers, but there are a number of reasons why the impact of these forces has been more destructive in the case of the Negro. Discrimination by race in housing, employment and education has been harder to overcome than discrimination based on language or ethnic background. With changes in the economy, there has been less demand for the Negro's unskilled labor than for that of the earlier immigrants. The urban political machines which furthered the political and economic interests of earlier immigrants had declined in power by the time the Negroes arrived in large numbers. The cultural experience which Negroes brought with them from the segregation and discrimination of the rural South was of less utility in the process of adaptation to urban life than was the cultural experience of many of the European immigrants. The net effect of these differences is that urban slums have tended to become *ghetto* slums from which escape has been increasingly difficult.

The National Commission on Urban Problems observed in its Report last year that "one has to see and touch and smell a slum before one appreciates the real urgency of the problem". Some of the urgency comes through, however, even in a simple verbal description of the facts and figures of slum life. Before presenting this description (much of which is drawn from the Reports of the Crime Commission and the Kerner Commission), we emphasize again that many slum residents manage to live peaceful and decent lives despite the conditions that surround them, and that the characterizations which follow are typical only of the ghetto core and those who fall into delinquency. They do not describe all neighborhoods or all residents of the inner city.

The Home. If the slums in the United States were defined strictly on the basis of dilapidated housing, inadequate sanitary facilities, and overcrowding, more than five million families, or one-sixth of the urban population, could be classified as slum inhabitants. To the inner-city child, home is often characterized by a set of rooms shared by a shifting group of relatives and acquaintances, furniture shabby and sparse, many children in one bed, plumbing in disrepair, plaster falling, roaches and sometimes rats, hallways dark or dimly lighted, stairways littered, air dank and foul.

In such circumstances, home has little holding power for a child, adolescent or young adult. Physically unpleasant and unattractive, it is not a place to bring friends; it is not even very much the reassuring gathering place of one's own family. Indeed, the absence of parental supervision early in the slum child's life is not unusual, a fact partly due to the condition of the home.

The Family. Inner-city families are often large. Many are fatherless, permanently or intermittently; others involve a conflict-ridden marital relationship; in either instance the parents may communicate to their offspring little sense of permanence and few precepts essential to an orderly, peaceful life.

Loosely organized, often with a female focus, many inner-city families bestow upon their children what has been termed "premature autonomy." Their children do not experience adults as being genuinely interested or caring persons. These children may, rather, experience adults as more interested in their own satisfactions than those of their children. Consequent resentment of authority figures, such as policemen and teachers, is not surprising. With a lack of consistent, genuine concern for children who are a burden to them, the parents may vacillate from being unduly permissive to being overly stern. Child rearing problems are exacerbated where the father is sometimes or frequently absent, intoxicated, or replaced by another man; where coping with everyday life with too little money for the size of the family leaves little time or energy for discipline; or where children have arrived so early and unbidden that parents are too immature to put their child's needs above their personal pleasure.

The seeds of delinquency in young boys are shown, studies suggest,[13] in families where there is an absence of consistent affection from both parents, and where there is lacking consistent parental direction. Identification of the boy with a stable positive male image is difficult when the father is frequently absent, erratic in his behavior, often unemployed, unfair in his discipline, or treated without respect by others. Conversely, studies indicate that a stable integrated family life can do much to counteract powerful external influences that pull young men toward delinquency.[14] If the inner-city family, particularly the ghetto black family, were stronger and more secure, with good family relationships, more of its offspring could avoid criminal behavior. However, even where there is a stable family which wishes to avoid the problems of slum-ghetto life, continuing racial discrimination makes it difficult for them to remove themselves and their children from the pernicious influences of the slums.

The Neighborhood. In many center city alleys are broken bottles and snoring "winos"—homeless, broken men, drunk constantly on cheap wine. Yards, if any, are littered and dirty. Fighting and drunkenness are everyday occurrences. Drug addiction and prostitution are rampant. Living is crowded, often anonymous. Predominantly white store ownership and white police patrols in predominantly black neighborhoods are frequently resented, reviled, and attacked, verbally and physically. Municipal services such as garbage collection, street repairs and utilities maintenance and the like are inadequate and, at times, all but nonexistent.

Many ghetto slum children spend much of their time—when they are not watching television—on the streets of this violent, poverty-stricken world. Frequently, their image of success is not the solid citizen, the responsible, hard-working husband and father. Rather, the "successful" man is the cynical hustler who promotes his own interests by exploiting others—through dope selling, numbers, robbery and other crimes. Exploitation and hustling become a way of life.

The School. The low-income ghetto child lives in a home in which books and other artifacts of intellectual interest are rare. His parents usually are themselves too poorly schooled to give him the help and encouragement he needs. They have not had the time—even had they the knowledge—to teach him basic skills that are routinely acquired by most middle-class youngsters: telling time, counting, learning the alphabet and colors, using crayons and paper and paint. He is unaccustomed to verbalizing concepts or ideas. Written communication is probably rare in his experience.

Footnotes at end of article.

The educational system in the slums is generally poorly equipped. Most schools in the slums have outdated and dilapidated buildings, few text and library books, the least qualified teachers and substitute teachers, the most overcrowded classrooms, and the least developed counseling and guidance services. These deficiencies are so acute that the school cannot hold the slum child's interests. To him it is boring, dull, and apparently useless, to be endured for awhile and then abandoned.

The school experience often represents the last opportunity to counteract the forces in a child's life that are influencing him toward crime and violence. The public school program has always been viewed as a major force for the transmission of legitimate values and goals, and some studies have identified a good school experience as a key factor in the development of "good boys out of bad environments." The link between school failure and delinquency is not completely known, but there is evidence that youth who fail in school contribute disproportionately to delinquency. One estimate is that the incidence of delinquency among drop-outs is ten times higher than among youths who stay in school.[15]

The Job. Getting a good job is harder than it used to be for those without preparation, for an increasing proportion of all positions require an even higher level of education and training. To be a Negro, an 18-year-old, a school dropout, a resident of the slums of a large city, is to have many times more chances of being unemployed than a white 18-year-old high school graduate living a few blocks away. Seventy-one percent of all Negro workers are concentrated in the lowest paying and lowest skilled occupations. They are the last to be hired. Union practices, particularly in the building trades, have always been unduly restrictive toward new apprentices (except those related to union members), and this exclusionary policy has a major impact on young blacks. The unemployment rate, generally down in the last few years, remains twice as high for non-whites; and for black teenagers in central cities in 1968 the unemployment rate was 30 percent, up a third over 1960.

Success in job hunting is dependent on information about available positions. Family and friends in middle-class communities are good sources for obtaining information about employment. In the ghetto, however, information about job openings is limited by restricted contact with the job market. The slum resident is largely confined to his own neighborhood, where there are few new plants and business offices, and unfortunately State Employment Services have been generally ineffective even when used.

Most undereducated youngsters do not choose a job. Rather, they drift into one. Since such jobs rarely meet applicants' aspirations, frustration typically results. Some find their way back to school or into a job training program. Some drift fortuitously among low paying jobs. Others try crime and, if successful, make it their regular livelihood; others lack aptitude and become failures in the illegal as well as the legal world—habitues of our jails and prisons. And there are those who give up, retreat from conventional society, and search for a better world in the private fantasies induced by drink and drugs.

The realities of the employment problem faced by ghetto Negroes are reflected in the data on family income. Negro family income in the cities is only sixty-eight percent of the median white family income. One-third of Negro families in cities live on $4,000 a year or less, while only sixteen percent of the whites do so.

When poverty, dilapidated housing, high unemployment, poor education, over-population, and broken homes are combined, an inter-related complex of powerful criminogenic forces is produced by the ghetto environment. These social forces for crime are intensified by the inferiority-inducing attitudes of the larger American society—attitudes that today view ghetto blacks as being suspended between slavery and the full rights and dignity of free men.

The competitive road to success is accorded great emphasis in American life. Achievement often tends to be measured largely in material terms. Our consumer-oriented culture pressures us to desire goods and services and to feel successful if one obtains them, unsuccessful if one does not. The network of mass communications spreads a culture of consumer desires over a vast audience. Happiness, we are endlessly reminded, is obtaining and having things. Most Americans operate on the premise that in the race to material success all men have an equal chance at the starting line, and that anyone who falls behind has only himself to blame. Yet not all can be at the front of the pack, especially not those who started far behind in the first place. And the race has different rules for different participants.

There are many ways of coping with the frustration of failure. Some take solace in the fact that others are even further behind. Some withdraw entirely from the race: alcohol, drugs, mental illness and even suicide are avenues of escape. Others, especially college youth whose parents have succeeded in the race, experiment with "alternative lifestyles" such as those associated with the hippie phenomenon. In the innter-city, where the chances of success are less, many adopt illegal means in the effort to achieve their goals of securing more money and higher status among their peers.

To be a young, poor male; to be undereducated and without means of escape from an oppressive urban environment; to want what the society claims is available (but mostly to others); to see around oneself illegitimate and often violent methods being used to achieve material success; and to observe others using these means with impunity—all this is to be burdened with an enormous set of influences that pull many toward crime and delinquency. To be also a Negro, Mexican or Puerto Rican American and subject to discrimination and segregation adds considerably to the pull of these other criminogenic forces.

Believing they have no stake in the system, the ghetto young men see little to gain by playing according to society's rules and little to lose by not. They believe the odds against their success by legitimate means are greater than the odds against success by crime. The step to violence is not great, for in an effort to obtain material goods and services beyond those available by legitimate means, lower-class persons without work skills and education resort to crimes for which force or threat of force has a functional utility, especially robbery, the principal street crime.

But the slum ghetto does more than generate frustration that expresses itself in violent acquisitive crime. It also produces a "subculture" within the dominant American middle-class culture in which aggressive violence tends to be accepted as normal in everyday life, not necessarily illicit. In the contemporary American city we find the necessary conditions not only for the birth but also for the accelerated development of violent subcultures, and it is in these settings that most violent aggressive crimes in fact occur.[16]

From the perspective of dominant middle-class standards, the motives in most criminal homicides and other assaults—altercations, family quarrels, jealousy—are cheap issues for which people give their lives or suffer serious injury. Similarly, the transient gratifications to be obtained from the rape or the robbery do not seem to warrant the risk of punishment or the burden of guilt that is presumably involved. Yet these events are much more reasonable to those in the ghetto slum subculture of violence, where a wide range of situations is perceived as justifying violent responses.[17] An altercation with overtones threatening a young man's masculinity, a misunderstanding between husband and wife, competition for a sexual partner, the need to get hold of a few dollars—these "trivial" events can readily elicit a violent response in an environment that accepts violence as a norm, allows easy access to weapons, is physically and culturally isolated from the rest of the wider American community, and has limited social controls—including inadequate law enforcement.

Violence is actually often used to enable a young man to become a successful member of ghetto society. In the subculture of violence, proving masculinity may require frequent rehearsal of the toughness, the exploitation of women, and the quick aggressive responses that are characteristic of the lower-class adult male. Those who engage in subcultural violence are often not burdened by conscious guilt, because their victims are likely to belong to the same subculture or to a group they believe has exploited them. Thus, when victims see their assaulters as agents of the same kind of aggressions they themselves represent, violent retaliation is readily legitimized.

Moreover, if the poor, young, black male is conditioned in the ways of violence by his immediate subculture, he is also under the influence of many forces from the general, dominant culture. As we have said in another statement, violence is a pervasive theme in the mass media. The frequency of violent themes in myriad forms in the media tends to foster permissive attitudes toward violence. Much the same can be said about guns in American society. The highest gun-to-population ratio in the world, the glorification of guns in our culture, and the television and movie displays of guns by heroes surely contribute to the scope and extent of urban violence.

Taking all the foregoing facts and circumstances into account, perhaps we should marvel that there is not more violent crime in the cities of our nation.

III. THE RISE IN VIOLENT CRIME

If, as we believe, the conditions of life for inner-city populations are responsible for the sharp difference in violent crime rates between these populations and other groups in our society, there remains a puzzling paradox to be considered: Why, we must ask, have urban violent crime rates increased substantially during the past decade when the conditions that are supposed to cause violent crime have not worsened—have, indeed, generally improved?

The Bureau of the Census, in its latest report on trends in social and economic conditions in metropolitan areas, states that most "indicators of well-being point toward progress in the cities since 1960."[18] Thus, for example, the proportion of blacks in cities who completed high school rose from 43 percent in 1960 to 61 percent in 1968; unemployment rates dropped significantly between 1960 and 1968; the median income of families living in cities rose by 16 percent between 1959 and 1967 (from $6,720 to $7,813), and the median family income of blacks in cities increased from 61 percent to 68 percent of the median white family income during the same period. Also during the same period the number of persons living below the legally-defined poverty level in cities declined from 11.3 million to 8.3 million.

There are some important counter-trends. The unemployment rate for blacks, through lower, continued to be about twice that for whites; and, as previously noted, unemployment among black teenagers in cities increased by a third between 1960 and 1968

Footnotes at end of article.

(to 30 percent, two and one-half times the urban white teenager rate). Moreover, figures indicating a closing of the family income gap between blacks and whites in the 1960's do not reflect a number of critical details, such as the fact that in cities black men who worked the year round in 1967 earned about seven-tenths as much as white workers and that this fraction was unchanged since 1959, or the fact that the "dependency ratio"—the number of children per thousand adult males—for blacks is nearly twice that for whites, and the gap widened sharply in the 1960's.[19] The degree of poverty among the Negro poor in metropolitan areas remained severe, half the families reporting incomes $1,000 or more below the Social Security Administration's poverty budget of $3,335 for a family of four. We also find a significant increase in the number of children growing up in broken homes, especially among Negroes and lower income families in the cities. Among Negroes in the cities in 1968 with incomes below $4,000, only one-fourth of all children were living with both parents, as compared to one-half for white families of the same income level. Significantly, for families with incomes of $10,000 per year, this difference between white and black families disappears.

Whatever may be the correct over-all judgment on the change in inner-city living conditions over the past ten years, it is clear, however, that the change has been less dramatic than the change in violent crime rates during this period. How is this discrepancy to be explained?

In seeking an acceptable answer, we must keep in mind two qualifications which to a degree mitigate the seriousness of the discrepancy: First, while, as we have said, serious increases have occurred in major crimes involving violence, these increases are not so dramatic as FBI data suggest. Undoubtedly our crime reporting system is gradually dipping deeper into the well of previously unreported crime. Second, substantial portions of such increases as have occurred are to some extent attributable to demographic shifts in the population, particularly increases in the young population and increasing urbanization of the population.[20]

Even with these two factors taken into account, however, an important part of the original question remains. Why, if a high percentage of the crime in our cities is caused by factors such as poverty and racial discrimination, has it increased in a period of unprecedented prosperity for most Americans and in a time of painfully slow and uneven but genuine progress toward racial equality? These questions are not susceptible to precise scientific answers, but it is possible to offer informed judgments about them. In our considered opinion, the following factors have been significantly operative in the increasing levels of violent crime in the inner cities:

(1) The United States has been changing with bewildering rapidity—scientifically, technologically, socially, and politically. Americans literally are changing how we work, how we live, how we think, how we manage our vast enterprise. Other rapidly changing nations—Israel, Japan, Western European countries—also have experienced rapid rises in crime rates, though at a much lower level than ours. Sociologists and anthropologists have long observed that rapid social change leads to a breakdown of traditional social roles and institutional controls over the behavior of young and old alike—but particularly the young, who, because of the social change, are less likely to be socialized into traditional ways of doing things (and not doing them) and, hence, ineffectively constrained by these traditional ways. This process includes the breakdown in traditional notions of civility, respect for elders and the institutions and patterns of conduct they represent, property rights, ways of settling disputes, relations between the sexes and many other matters.

With economic and technical progress in the United States has come increased affluence for most—but not all—of the members of our society. This combination of rapid social change and unevenly distributed affluence is devastating. At a time when established ways of doing things, traditions of morality, and attitudes about personal and property rights are changing, rising levels of affluence, interacting with public promises of a better life and television displays of still more affluence, have created expectations that have outstripped reality, particularly among the poor and especially the poor black. Rising income statistics look reassuring until one focuses on the continuing gap between black and white incomes.

We have in this country what has been referred to as a "revolution of rising expectations" born of unprecedented prosperity, changes in the law, wars on poverty, space spectaculars, and a host of other features of contemporary life. But, as one of the research contributions in this Commission's Task Force on Historical and Comparative Perspectives points out,[21] a rapid increase in human expectations followed by obvious failure to meet those expectations has been and continues to be a prescription for violence. Disappointment has manifested itself not only in riots and violent demonstrations—but may also be reflected in the increasing levels of violent crime.

(2) Our agencies of law enforcement have not been strengthened sufficiently to contain the violence that normally accompanies rapid social change and the failure to fulfill human expectations. The criminal justice process, suffering from an insufficiency of resources and a lack of management, has become less effective as a deterrent to crime and as an instrument for rehabilitating those who are apprehended and convicted.

As we analyze in other parts of our reports, we are allowing law enforcement to falter, the handgun census to approach 25 million, and an increasing number of crimes to go unpunished. Every successful crime is an inducement to further crime: it advertises society's inability to enforce generally accepted rules of conduct. Weaknesses of our criminal justice system have had a multiplier effect upon the rise of violent crime.

(3) Public order in a free society does not and cannot rest solely on applications or threats of force by the authorities. It must also rest on the people's acceptance of the legitimacy of the rule-making institutions of the political and social order and of the rules these institutions make. Persons obey the rules of society when the groups with which they identify approve those who abide by the rules and disapprove those who violate them. Such expressions of approval and disapproval are forthcoming only if the group believes that the rule-making institutions are in fact entitled to rule—that is, are "legitimate." What weakens the legitimacy of social and political institutions contributes to law-breaking, including violent crime.

In recent years a number of forces have converged to weaken the legitimacy of our institutions. We repeat what we have said elsewhere: the spectacle of governors defying court orders, police unlawfully beating demonstrators, looters and rioters going unapprehended and unpunished, and college youth attacking society's rules and values, makes it easier, even more "logical," for disadvantaged young people, whose attachment to law-abiding behavior already is tenuous, to slip into law-breaking behavior when the opportunity presents itself. Too, the pervasive suspicion that personal greed and corruption are prevalent among even the highest public officials has fed the idea among the poor that nearly everyone is "on the take," and that the real crime is in getting caught.

The beliefs that some claim to be widely held among poor young ghetto males—that the "system" in the United States is collectively guilty of "white racism" and of prosecuting an "immoral" war in Vietnam—have also tended to impair the moral impact upon them of our nation's institutions and laws and weakened the sense of guilt that otherwise would have restrained the commission of violent crimes against society.

These three factors—disappointments of minorities in the revolution of rising expectations, the weakening of law enforcement, and the loss of institutional legitimacy in the view of many—have had their effects on crime rates throughout our society. It is not surprising, however, that their greatest impact has been in the inner-cities among the young, the poor, the male, the black. It is there that reality most frustrates expectations, that law enforcement provides the least protection, and that the social and political institutions of society serve the needs of the individual least effectively. It is in the inner-city that a subculture of violence, already flourishing, is further strengthened by the blockage of aspirations whose fulfillment would lead out of the subculture, by the failure of a criminal justice system that would deter adherence to undesirable subcultural values, and by the weakness of institutions which would inculcate a competing set of values and attitudes.

IV. THE PREVENTION OF VIOLENT CRIME

For the past three decades, the primary concerns of our nation have been (a) the national defense, mutual security, and world peace (b) the growth of the economy, and (c) more recently, the conquest of space. These challenges have devoured more than two-thirds of all federal expenditures, approximately one-half of federal, state and local expenditures. We have staked out vast projects to promote the general domestic welfare and to overcome some of the problems we have here analyzed—but in view of dangerous inflationary trends and an already unprecedented level of federal, state and local taxation, we have not been able to obtain funds to support such projects in a volume and manner consistent with their lofty aims. The contemporary consequence of this pattern of resource allocation is an enormous deficit of unsatisfied needs and aspirations. Nowhere is this deficit more clearly apparent than in our crime-plagued metropolitan areas, where 65 percent of our people are now living.

In the absence of the massive action that seems to be needed to overcome this deficit, our cities are being mis-shaped in other ways by actions of more affluent citizens who desire safety for themselves, their families, and their investments. The safety they are getting is not the safety without fear that comes from ameliorating the causes of violent crime; rather it is the precarious safety obtained through individual efforts at self-defense. Thus the way in which we have so far chosen to deal with the deepening problem of violent crime begins to revise the future shape of our cities. In a few more years, lacking effective public action, this is how these cities will likely look:

Central business districts in the heart of the city, surrounded by mixed areas of accelerating deterioration, will be partially protected by large numbers of people shopping or working in commercial buildings during daytime hours, plus a substantial police presence, and will be largely deserted except for police patrols during nighttime hours.

High-rise apartment buildings and residential compounds protected by private guards and security devices will be fortified cells for upper-middle and high-income populations living at prime locations in the city.

Suburban neighborhoods, geographically

Footnotes at end of article.

far removed from the central city, will be protected mainly by economc hemogeneity and by distance from population groups with the highest propensities to commit crimes.

Lacking a sharp change in federal and state policies, ownership of guns will be almost universal in the suburbs, homes will be fortified by an array of devices from window grills to electronic surveillance equipment, armed citizen volunteers in cars will supplement inadequate police patrols in neighborhoods closer to the central city, and extreme left-wing and right-wing groups will have tremendous armories of weapons which could be brought into play with or without any provocation.

High-speed, patrolled expressways will be sanitized corridors connecting safe areas, and private automobiles, taxicabs, and commercial vehicles will be routinely equipped with unbreakable glass, light armor, and other security features. Inside garages or valet parking will be available at safe buildings in or near the central city. Armed guards will "ride shotgun" on all forms of public transportation.

Streets and residential neighborhoods in the central city will be unsafe in differing degrees, and the ghetto slum neighborhoods will be places of terror with widespread crime, perhaps entirely out of police control during night-time hours. Armed guards will protect all public facilities such as schools, libraries and playgrounds in these areas.

Between the unsafe, deteriorating central city on the one hand and the network of safe, prosperous areas and sanitized corridors on the other, there will be, not unnaturally, intensifying hatred and deepening division. Violence will increase further, and the defensive response of the affluent will become still more elaborate.

Individually and to a considerable extent unintentionally, we are closing ourselves into fortresses when collectively we should be building the great, open, humane city-societies of which we are capable. Public and private action must guarantee safety, security, and justice for every citizen in our metropolitan areas without sacrificing the quality of life and the other values of a free society. If the nation is not in a position to launch a full-scale war on domestic ills, especially urban ills, at this moment, because of the difficulty in freeing ourselves quickly from other obligations, we should now legally make the essential commitments and then carry them out as quickly as funds can be obtained.

What do our cities require in order to become safe from violent crime?

They surely require a modern, effective system of criminal justice of the kind we recommended in our statement on "Violence and Law Enforcement." All levels of our criminal justice process are underfunded and most are uncoordinated. Police protection and community relations are poorest in the high crime slum neighborhoods where they should be the best. Lower courts are impossibly overburdened and badly managed, while juvenile courts have failed to live up to their original rehabilitative ideal. Correctional institutions are generally the most neglected part of the criminal justice process. *We reiterate our previous recommendations that we double our national investment in the criminal justice process, that central offices of criminal justice be created at the metropolitan level, and that complementary private citizen groups be formed.*

In addition to other long-run solutions that we suggest, other immediate steps must be taken to reduce the opportunity and incentive to commit crimes of violence. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice made many suggestions which we endorse. In particular, we emphasize the need for actions such as the following (some of which are new):

Increased day and night foot-patrols of slum ghetto areas by interracial police teams, in order to discourage street crime against both blacks and whites; improved street lighting to deprive criminals of hiding places from which to ambush victims; increase in numbers and use of community neighborhood centers that provide activity so that city streets are not deserted in early evening hours.

Increased police-community relations activity in slum ghetto areas in order to secure greater understanding of ghetto residents by police, and of police by ghetto residents. Police should be encouraged to establish their residences in the cities in order to be a part of the community which they serve.

Further experimentation with carefully controlled programs that provide low cost drugs such as methadone to addicts who register, so that addicts are not compelled to resort to robbery and burglary in order to meet the needs of their addiction; increased education about the dangers of addictives and other drugs in order to reduce their use.

Identification of specific violence-prone individuals for analysis and treatment in order to reduce the likelihood of repetition; provision of special schools for education of young people with violence-prone histories, special psychiatric services and employment programs for parolees and released offenders with a history of violent criminal acts.[22]

Concealable hand-guns, a common weapon used in violent crimes, must be brought under a system of restrictive licensing as we have recommended in our earlier statement on firearms.

But safety without fear cannot be secured alone by well-trained police, efficient courts, modern correctional practices, and hand-gun licensing. True security will come only when the vast majority of our citizens voluntarily accept society's rules of conduct as binding on them. Such acceptance will prevail widely among those who enjoy by legitimate means the benefits and pleasures of life to which they believe they are entitled—who have, in short, a satisfactory stake in the system. Today the stake of our impatient urban poor is more substantial than it used to be, but unrealized expectations and needs are massive. To ensure safety in our cities, we must take effective steps toward improving the conditions of life for all the people who live there.

Safety in our cities requires nothing less than progress in reconstructing urban life.

It is not within the purpose or the competence of this Commission to detail specific programs that will contribute to this fundamentally important national goal—the goal of reconstruction of urban life. Such programs must be worked out in the normal functioning of our political processes. Many important ideas have been put forth in the reports of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the Urban Problems Commission, the Urban Housing Committee [23] and other groups which have made the city the focal point of their studies. Indeed, as the Urban Problems Commission observed, we already have on the national agenda much of the legislation and the programs needed to do the job. Examples are the Housing Act of 1968, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, the Civil Rights laws of recent years, the President's welfare reform proposal, and many other existing and proposed enactments.

What we urge, from the standpoint of our concern, is that early and accelerated progress toward the reconstruction of urban life be made if there is to be a remission in the cancerous growth of violent crime. The programs and the proposals must be backed by a commitment of resources commensurate with the magnitude and the importance of the goal and with the expectations which have been irreversibly raised by the small start already made.

Dr. Daniel P. Moynihan has recently outlined a ten-point national urban policy that embraces many of the recommendations of earlier Commissions and which this Commission, while not in a position to endorse in detail, believes to merit careful consideration.[24] The essentials of the ten points, together with some enlargements of our own, are as follows:

(1) *The poverty and social isolation of minority groups in central cities is the single most serious problem of the American city today.* In the words of the Kerner Commission, this problem must be attacked by national action that is "compassionate, massive, and sustained, backed by the resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on this earth." We must meet the 1968 Housing Act's goal of a decent home for every American within a decade; we must take more effective steps to realize the goal, first set in the Employment Act of 1946, of a useful job at a reasonable wage for all who are able to work; and we must act on current proposals that the federal government pay a basic income to those American families who cannot care for themselves.[25]

(2) *Economic and social forces in urban areas are not self-balancing.* There is evidence that some federal programs, such as the highway program, have produced sharp imbalances in the "ecology" of cities, and that others, such as urban renewal, have sometimes accomplished the opposite of what was intended.[26] A more sophisticated understanding and appreciation of the complexity of the urban social system is required—and this will in turn require the development of new, dependable and lasting partnerships between government, private industry, social and cultural associations and organized groups of affected citizens. Without such partnerships even the best-intentioned programs will fail or produce unforeseen disruptive effects.

(3) *At least part of the relative ineffectiveness of the efforts of urban government to respond to urban problems derives from the fragmented and obsolescent structure of urban government itself.* At the present time most of our metropolitan areas are misgoverned by a vast number of smaller, independent local governmental units—yet effective action on certain critical problems such as law enforcement, housing and zoning and revenue-raising requires governmental units coterminous with metropolitan areas. At the same time, however, many city governments suffer from being too large to be responsive to citizens, especially disadvantaged groups with special needs for public services and for increased political participation.

A dual strategy for restructuring local governments is thus required. On the one hand, steps must be taken to vest certain functions, such as the power to tax and to zone, in a higher tier of true metropolitan governments, each exercising jurisdiction over an entire metropolitan area. On the other hand, our cities must also develop a lower tier of modular neighborhood political units, operating under the direction of representatives elected by residents of the neighborhood and with the authority to determine some of the policies and to operate at the neighborhood center some of the services presently performed by city-wide agencies.[27] To provide new insights and new momentum for urban government restructuring, we suggest that the President might profitably convene an Urban Convention of delegates from all the states and major cities, as well as the national government, to advise the nation on the steps that should be taken to increase urban efficiency and accountability through structural changes in local government.

(4) *A primary object of federal urban policy must be to restore the fiscal vitality of*

Footnotes at end of article.

urban government, with the particular object of ensuring that local governments normally have enough resources on hand or available to make local initiative in public affairs a reality. Local governments that try to meet their responsibilities lurch from one fiscal crisis to another. Each one percent rise in the gross national product increases the income of the federal government by one and one-half percent, while the normal income of city governments increases only one-half to three-quarters percent at most. Yet federal aid to state and local governments is only 17 percent of state-local revenue, a figure which should be substantially increased as soon as possible. We also believe it is essential to insure that the cities that are most in need of federal funding will obtain their fair share from the states which receive the federal payments.

The President's revenue sharing proposal is one way to increase state and local revenues. However, it is limited both in the amounts envisioned and in the way they are proposed to be channeled. As an alternate to federal sharing of its tax revenue, consideration might be given to a plan by which a full credit against federal income taxes would be given for all state and municipal taxes up to some maximum percentage of a taxpayer's income. To prevent encroachment by state governments upon the municipal tax base, separate ceilings could be fixed for state tax credits and for municipal tax credits. Such a tax-credit plan for revenue-sharing would be simple to execute, would channel more funds directly to cities, and would eliminate competition among neighboring states and communities to lower tax rates as a means of attracting businesses and upper income residents.

(5) *Federal urban policy should seek to equalize the provision of public services as among different jurisdictions in metropolitan areas.* This includes, at the top of the list, public education and public safety. Not only are both of these vital parts of the public sector severly underfunded, but the available resources are not equitably distributed between, for example, the inner city and suburban areas. What constitutes an equitable distribution may not be an easy question to answer, but it is at least clear that the kinds of inner city-suburban disparities in educational expenditures and police protection reported by the Kerner Commission are *not* equitable.[28] Federal aid programs should include standards to insure that equitable allocation policies are maintained.

(6) *The federal government must assert a specific interest in the movement of people, displaced by technology or driven by poverty, from rural to urban areas, and also in the movement from densely populated central cities to suburban areas.* Much of the present urban crisis derives from the almost total absence of positive policies to cope with the large-scale migration of southern Negroes into northern and western cities over the past half century, when the number of Negroes living in cities rose from 2.7 to 14.8 million. In the next 30 years our metropolitan areas will grow both absolutely and in proportion to the total population as this nation of 200 million persons becomes a nation of 300 million persons. We must do the planning and take the actions—*e.g.*, maintenance of a flexible and open housing market, creation of "new towns"—that are necessary if future urban growth is to be less productive of social and human problems than has been true of past urban growth.

(7) *State government has an indispensable role in the management of urban affairs, and must be supported and encouraged by the federal government in the performance of this role.* City boundaries, jurisdictions and powers are subject to the control of state governments, and the federal government must work with state governments to encourage a more progressive, responsible exercise of the state role in this process.

(8) *The federal government must develop and put into practice far more effective incentive systems than now exist whereby state and local governments, and private interests too, can be led to achieve the goals of federal programs.* In recent years Congress has enacted legislation under which the federal government has funded an increasing number of venturesome programs aimed at broadening the scope of individual opportunity for educational and economic achievements. Under many of these new enactments, grants-in-aid to implement the federal policies in health, education, employment and other areas of human welfare have been given not only to state and local authorities, but also to universities, private industries and a host of specially created non-profit corporations. Although these grants have been made pursuant to specified standards of performance, the results have often been disappointing, in part because there have been inadequate incentives for successful performance and inadequate evaluative mechanisms for determining which specific programs are most efficiently and effectively achieving the federal goals.

It is thus increasingly agreed that the federal government should sponsor and subsequently evaluate alternative—in a sense "competing"—approaches to problems whose methods of solution are imperfectly understood, as is increasingly being done in the areas of medical and legal services for the poor and educational assistance for disadvantaged children. Other methods of spurring improvement in the delivery of federally-supported services include the provision of incentives to deliver the services at the lowest possible cost (as in current efforts with regard to Medicare), and the granting of the federal assistance directly to the consumers of the programs concerned, thus enabling them to choose among competing suppliers of the goods or services that the program is designed to provide (as in the GI Bill and other federal scholarship programs).

(9) *The federal government must provide more and better information concerning urban affairs, and should sponsor extensive and sustained research into urban problems.* Social science research is increasingly able to supply policy-makers and the public with empirical indicators of the nature of social problems and the success or failure of efforts to solve these problems. The time is at hand when these indicators should be systematically collected and disseminated in aid of public policy at all levels.

(10) *The federal government, by its own example, and by incentives, should seek the development of a far heightened sense of the finite resources of the natural environment, and the fundamental importance of aesthetics in successful urban growth.* Many American cities have grown to be ugly and inhumane largely because of an unrestrained technological exploitation of the resources of land, air and water by the economically most efficient means. That there has been too little restraint is not surprising in view of the over-all American cultural context in which the natural environment was perceived as an inexhaustible frontier impervious to human harm. Today, however, the critical cultural context seems to be changing, and the "frontier spirit" is giving way to a new conservation ethic more appropriate to a crowded urban society. Government should take the lead in encouraging, and in acting consistently with, the development of this new ethic.

V. CONCLUSION

To summarize our basic findings:

Violent crimes are chiefly a problem of the cities of the nation, and there violent crimes are committed mainly by the young, poor, male inhabitants of the ghetto slum.

In the slums increasingly powerful social forces are generating rising levels of violent crime which, unless checked, threaten to turn our cities into defensive, fearful societies.

An improved criminal justice system is required to contain the growth of violent crime, but only progress toward urban reconstruction can reduce the strength of the crime-causing forces in the inner city and thus reverse the direction of present crime trends.

Our confidence in the correctness of these findings is strengthened by the support of the findings of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and by subsequent events. At the end of its monumental work, in February of 1967, that Commission not only called for scores of improvements in the effectiveness and fairness of the law enforcement process, it also identified the same basic causes of violent crime and said this about their cure.

"Warring on poverty, inadequate housing and unemployment, is warring on crime. A civil rights law is a law against crime. Money for schools is money against crime. Medical, psychiatric, and family-counseling services are services against crime. More broadly and most importantly every effort to improve life in America's 'inner cities' is an effort against crime."

FOOTNOTES

[1] The FBI Index of Reported Crime classifies seven offenses as "serious crimes"—homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny of more than $50 and auto theft. It classifies the first four—homicide, rape, robbery and assault—as "violent crimes" because they involve the doing or threatening of bodily injury.

[2] Reasons for the gap include failure of citizens to report crimes because they believe police cannot be effective in solving them; others do not want to take the time to report, some do not know how to report, and others fear reprisals.

[3] The direct correlation between city size and violent crime rates may not be as uniform in the south as in other regions. Available data indicate higher suburban violent crime rates relative to center city rates in the south, suggesting the possibility that smaller city rates may also be higher relative to larger city rates in the south (although direct evidence on this point is not presently available).

Also, it should be kept in mind that the relationships noted in the text are for cities within certain population ranges (*e.g.*, more than 250,000, 100,000–250,000, etc.), not for individual cities. Thus the five cities with the highest metropolitan violent crime rates in 1968—Baltimore, Newark, Washington, San Francisco and Detroit—had smaller populations than some very large cities with somewhat lower rates of violent crime.

[4] According to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, about half of all arrests for serious crimes result in pleas of guilty or convictions: in only 88 percent of all arrests does the prosecutor decide he has sufficient evidence to try the case, and of those cases that are prosecuted, only 62 percent result in a plea of guilty or a conviction, often for a lesser offense than the one originally charged. A wide margin of error thus exists between the making of an arrest and proof that the person arrested has committed an offense.

[5] This is a study of 9945 males born in 1945 and who lived in Philadelpha at least from age 10 to 18. Of this group, 3475, or 35 percent, were taken into custody by the police for delinquent offenses other than traffic violations. Race, socio-economic status and many other variables are analyzed in this study, supported by NIMH, to be published shortly by Thorsten Sellin and Marvin E. Wolfgang under the title, *Delinquent in a Birth Cohort.*

[6] Because some police commonly associate violence with Negroes more than with whites, Negroes may be disproportionately arrested on suspicion, thus producing a higher reported Negro involvement in crime than is the true situation.

[7] In another report, this Commission has indicated that gun attacks are fatal in one out of five cases, on the average; knife attacks are fatal in one out of twenty.

[8] The FBI has reported that in 1968 588,000 violent crimes occurred. This is about 300 crimes of major violence per each 100,000 Americans. It is generally estimated that only about half of all violent crimes are reported; if this is true, the total number of violent crimes per year is in the range of 1,200,000 or 600 per 100,000 people. These are *offenses*, not *offenders*. Since violent crimes often involve several offenders committing a single crime—particularly among the large number of juvenile offenders—a fair guess might be that twice as many offenders (2,400,000) were involved. But some offenders account for more than one crime per year. If we assume the commission of two crimes per year per offender, the total number of offenders drops back to 1,200,000; if we assume the commission of four crimes per year per offender, the total number of offenders is 600,000. Thus the number of Americans who commit violent crimes each year appears to be somewhere between these figures—between one in every 150 and one in every 300 Americans. Since children under twelve and adults over 45 commit relatively few crimes, the rate for persons between 12 and 45 is even higher.

[9] President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967); *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968); National Commission on Urban Problems, *Building the American City* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968).

[10] *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, op. cit.*, p. 35.

[11] Shaw & McKay, *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*, Chicago, 1969.

[12] One expert testifying before this Commission reported his finding in Chicago: a person living in the inner-city faced a risk each year of 1 in 77 of being assaulted; a risk of only 1 in 2,000 in the better areas of the city, and 1 in 10,000 in the rich suburbs.

[13] See studies cited in "The Family and Violence," Chapter 9 of *Law and Order Reconsidered*, the Report of this Commission's staff Task Force on Law and Law Enforcement (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969) and in "Juvenile Delinquency and the Family," Appendix L of the Crime Commission's *Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

[14] *E.g.*, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Office of Policy Planning and Research, *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965), pp. 38–40.

[15] See "Violence and Youth," Chapter 14 of the Report of our staff Task Force on Individual Acts of Violence. Thirty-nine percent of Negroes and 23 percent of whites in cities fail to complete four years of high school.

[16] The subculture of violence is not the product of our cities alone: the Thugs of India, the *vedetta barbaricina* in Sardinia, the *mafioso* in Sicily and the Ku Klux Klan, for example, have existed for many years. Nor is violence absent from the established middle-class culture of the majority in our society. It is simply the greater frequency and approval of illegitimate violence that distinguishes the subculture of violence from the dominant cultural pattern.

[17] We are here drawing upon Marvin E. Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti, *The Subculture of Violence*, London: Tavistock Publications; New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.

[18] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P–23, Special Studies (formerly Technical Studies), No. 27, "Trends in Social and Economic Conditions in Metropolitan Areas," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969.

[19] Also, such closing of the family income gap as has occurred all took place after 1965; for the previous 15 years there was no change. See *Law and Order Reconsidered, op. cit.* at 103.

[20] Computations set forth in the Report of our Task Force on Individual Acts of Violence suggest that 18% of the increase in the volume of violent crime between 1950 and 1965 is attributed solely to urbanization, and 12% to age redistribution alone.

[21] See Davies, "The J–Curve of Rising and Declining Satisfactions as a Cause of Some Great Revolutions and a Contained Rebellion," in *Violence in America*, the Report of our staff Task Force on Historical and Comparative Perspectives (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969).

[22] The Philadelphia cohort study cited above shows that out of the entire Philadelphia population of boys born in 1945 (about 10,000), less than six percent had five or more police contacts. Even though the age group from 15 to 24 includes ten such cohorts, the number of identifiable violence-prone youths in a major city such as Philadelphia is still small enough to be manageable.

[23] These reports are available for purchase from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

[24] Daniel P. Moynihan, "Toward a National Urban Policy," *The Public Interest*, No. 17, Fall 1969, p. 15. Dr. Moynihan has been Executive Director of the President's Urban Affairs Council and is now Counselor to the President.

[25] The President has recently made such a proposal including a work incentive formula. A somewhat different proposal has been put forward in a recent report of the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs.

[26] "Is the only answer to traffic congestion more and wider roads? Clearly in many localities, it is not. The dislocation of people and businesses, the distortion of land use, the erosion of the real property tax base, and the dollars and cents cost, make this an increasingly unacceptable solution." *Tomorrow's Transportation: New Systems for the Urban Future*. U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 18. See also *Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth*, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 59–60.

[27] From the standpoint of reducing violence, needed services which might be provided at the neighborhood level include job counseling and training; family counseling and planning advice; medical and psychiatric care; counseling on alcohol and drugs; citizen's grievance agencies; adult education; preschool training and child care for working mothers; psychological counseling for parents during the formative child rearing years; domestic quarrel teams; suicide prevention units; youth bureaus, including counseling of youth referred for non-police action by local Juvenile Squads and Gang Control Units; and legal advice.

[28] See *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, op. cit.*, pp. 161–62, 241.

ALLEGED ATROCITIES IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in this 1 minute I want to make an announcement to the House. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, for that subcommittee and with the approval of the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), we have requested of the Army that they send to the investigating committee all the information they have on the alleged atrocities at Pinkville which is up in the Song My Province of Vietnam.

We do not know what there is to this or what the Army has in their files in Washington. If, the investigating committee, and we will be sitting as a kind of quasi-grand jury—if we see that this warrants further inquiry and should be brought out into a larger investigation, the subcommittee will do this.

But for the moment, exercising our jurisdiction over the Army and as a subcommittee created for this purpose, we are making this first move. I think the House ought to know it, because I am sure you are getting a lot of inquiries on just exactly what we are going to do in the House of Representatives on this matter which seems to be catching the headlines at this time.

ELECTION OF CONGRESSMAN WAYNE L. HAYS, OF OHIO, PRESIDENT OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on or about the 17th of October, in Brussels, one of the most distinguished Members ever to serve in this body was duly elected President of the next session of the North Atlantic Assembly. After many years of dedicated service as chairman of the House delegation to the former NATO Parliamentarians Meeting, now the North Atlantic Assembly, the Honorable WAYNE HAYS of Ohio, one of the most dedicated, one of the most influential, and one of the most qualified members of that large group was elected unanimously to be the next President of this 15-nation assembly.

Mr. HAYS comes to this justified recognition after many, many years of extraordinary service as a member of this group. We know the reason for the creation of NATO, and whether or not NATO did it, Europe has had peace since the shield of NATO was raised above the torn fields and battle fragments, shortly after World War II, of what was left of that great civilization.

Out of NATO came prosperity, and out of NATO came what is known and as has come now to be known as the North Atlantic Assembly, of which our distinguished colleague and veteran in this group was duly elected to this very important position.

Europe is basking in one of the most unusual prosperities it has known in its long, tedious, and troublesome history of

periodic war, and periodic peace. Now, with this prosperity, its faces one of the most dangerous things ever to befall a nation. It has been said that when a nation becomes prosperous, it is likely to forget the lessons of the past and it may lower the shield which has defended it during days of adversity.

Mr. HAYS in a great speech, which he did not even write, but which came out of his bounteous knowledge, his brilliance and his great mind, reminded us that we have stuck together in time of war. We have marshaled our forces to protect ourselves in time of battle. The problem which now confronts us is, Can Europe and the North Atlantic nations live in peace and prosperity and survive? The same vision that has been the hallmark of WAYNE HAYS was characteristic of that fine speech which he delivered as he peered into the future, a speech that got such wide acclaim at the NATO meeting.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, one of the most brilliant and knowledgeable men in the area of which he is speaking, in taking this time to compliment WAYNE HAYS. Every Member of the House joins the gentleman, I am sure, in the tribute he is paying to a man whose reputation has gone over the years across all the NATO countries and among the parliamentary bodies of the NATO countries as one of the real leaders in this field.

This is a well-deserved honor and we are all very happy it is coming to our distinguished and able colleague.

I congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina for taking this time to speak on this subject.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, our majority leader, for the comments he has made.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, our distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from South Carolina and the distingushed majority leader in complimenting our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, on his election as President of the North Atlantic Assembly. I think it is a great honor for the gentleman from Ohio, and it also a great honor for the House of Representatives and the Congress as well. It is my understanding this is the second time for the gentleman from Ohio, the first American, to be accorded this honor. This, I think, is a tribute to him and to the diligent and constructive efforts he has made in this great responsibility.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader for his statement.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina in congratulating the Honorable WAYNE HAYS on his election as President of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

For the last 3 years, I have had the honor of representing this body at the NATO Parliamentarians Conferences. As a member of this delegation, so ably led by the gentleman from Ohio, I had occasion to witness his success in dealing with our counterparts in the various nations. WAYNE HAYS has the respect, admiration and genuine affection of all the NATO representatives. This, combined with his parliamentary dexterity and vast understanding of international problems, has enabled the U.S. delegation to maintain the position of leadership which the international situation requires.

Those of us who have seen him perform so capably as chairman of our delegation were pleased at his election as President of the assembly for 1969 and 1970, a position he held previously in 1956 and 1957.

We were also gratified that our country and our delegation were so honored. I, therefore, join my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Ohio on his election.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois, who is a member of our NATO group.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina for calling this matter to the attention of the House at this particular time, because it is very noteworthy that we have in our midst one who has been elected President of the North Atlantic Assembly for this coming year.

It has been my privilege to have served on this assignment for at least eight times, where I worked with and in cooperation with the gentleman from Ohio, both in subcommittees and in the full committees in trying to further the cause of NATO.

NATO, incidentally, just this year celebrated its 20th anniversary. It has proved over that period of time to be the great deterrent we hoped it might be. While some of us may have at times wondered as to its effectiveness, I feel now more strongly than ever that it will continue to maintain the peace in that part of the world as long as the 15-member nations adhere to the principles of that fine organization.

I know the gentleman from Ohio (WAYNE HAYS) will be an outstanding President of the group through his acquaintanceship over the years with the members of the many different parliamentary bodies and because of the respect they have for him, and I am sure in a cooperative spirit with those of us who worked with him from the United States in this group we will see even better results with this assembly as time goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio as an individual and on behalf of the Members of this House for the fine work that the gentleman has done and which I know he will continue to do in the future.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to pay a most deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague, WAYNE HAYS, who was elected President of the North Atlantic Assembly at its last meeting in October.

The Assembly was first established in 1955 as the NATO Parliamentarians Conference and WAYNE HAYS has been chairman of the House delegation since that time. In 1956, he was elected President of the Assembly and it is a very signal honor that he has again been chosen by the representatives of the legislative bodies of the 15 NATO countries to head the Assembly.

Although it is an unofficial organization with no statutory powers, the North Atlantic Assembly has served as an important platform for discussions between parliamentary delegates from all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries. It can be considered, in fact, as a pilot organization on the Atlantic level and as the nucleus of a future Atlantic assembly.

WAYNE HAYS has ably and effectively served the people of Ohio's 18th District since 1949, when we both came to the House of Representatives. As a member of the North Atlantic Assembly myself since 1962, I know that he has also served the Nation with great distinction and skill as head of the House delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly. As the Assembly's President, his outstanding qualities of wisdom and statesmanship will further strengthen the role of the Atlantic alliance in working toward our common goals of bringing world peace, security, and prosperity.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

I now yield to our distinguished and beloved Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friend from South Carolina and my other colleagues in expressing pleasure on the signal honor which has been conferred upon our valued friend from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) by his being elected President of the North Atlantic Assembly. He richly earned the action taken by such rich dedication.

We in the House know of the seriousness with which he has taken throughout the years his duties and responsibilities as a member of the North Atlantic Assembly, which for years was known as the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. He has always reflected credit not only upon the Congress of the United States but particularly upon the House of Representatives.

I know of the sacrifices he has made in assuming and performing these du-

ties. I know of the wonderful results that have flowed from the communications he has had with parliamentarians in the countries that constitute the North Atlantic Pact.

His leadership has been outstanding. His leadership has been firm. His leadership has been consistent.

I know of no one who has a more profound appreciation of the challenges which confront the world of today than our distinguished friend from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Not only personally as a Member of the House but also as one who has a profound feeling of respect and friendship for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) and as Speaker of the House, I am highly honored in having him occupy the responsible position that he will for the next two years, to carry on the responsible work he has been doing with such great success for a number of years.

So I congratulate my friend and convey to him the honor that he has conferred upon the House of Representatives.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank our distinguished Speaker.

Before I yield to any other Member—and we have sufficient time—this is very significant for America and for the world. The President of the United States, President Nixon, has told the world—and this means our potential enemies behind the Iron Curtain—that NATO is there to stay. He is making plans to make our NATO alliance a stronger one than it is, and for the committing of sufficient military strength to carry out our commitments to this organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is highly important and highly imperative that a man of the stature, of the knowledge, of the decisiveness, of the dedication of WAYNE HAYS, who is always unequivocal in his stand, lead us at this time. The applause by which his election was received was one of the most gratifying things I have ever seen. This is an important group. It has been institutionalized, so far as we are concerned, because our group NATO is sanctioned by legislation passed by this House.

Before I finish, I want to read something of the biography of this distinguished American. A lot is not known about WAYNE HAYS, who is a kindly, considerate, careful, and patient person. This side of him is seldom told, but it is known everywhere else. I do not know whether it is known in America even now. WAYNE HAYS said this, among other things, and he did not know that he was going to be called upon at this time. It was a remarkable thing that he was, because normally the succeeding President is not called on as a speaker. He said that he would "like to dedicate my tenure as President to insuring that the NATO notions are brought closer together and that with some degree of unanimity we at least attempt, although there will be certainly differences of opinion and divergences, to look at and advance some solutions to the problems of mankind as seen from our vantage point in Europe and North America." "The problems of mankind." Behind that military shield which protects us, we must take care of the problems, the economic problems, the environmental problems, and the pollution problems. This he sees from his clairvoyant position with which he is hallmarked as a great leader in this Congress and in the world.

The full speech made by Mr. HAYS is as follows:

The PRESIDENT (Mr. WAYNE L. HAYS). In the names of all of you I express thanks to the retiring President, Dr. Gulek, for the extremely able job he has done as President of this organization, for the time he has devoted to it and for the efforts he has made towards the institutionalization of this organization. I consider that the fact that the organization exists is important and although I should like to see it institutionalized the fact that it meets annually, that it is financed by governments, and that every government contributes toward its upkeep and maintenance is some indication that they consider it worth while. We in the United States have legalized it by passing a law. The law was passed in both Houses and signed by the President. As Dr. Gulek did, I urge other legislatures to do whatever is proper to afford recognition to the organization in their legislative Assemblies.

I should like to reminisce about NATO, about some of its successes and problems. I recall a trip I made to Europe in 1948 as a candidate for Congress. I was concerned with one of the problems which had been debated rather strenuously in the American Congress—that of what we should do about assisting Western Europe to regain its proper posture in the World. I recall that the then Congressman from my constituency, who is now deceased who was a friend of mine for many years, had opposed the Marshall Plan and participation of the United States in helping Western Europe to get back on its feet. This was an issue on which America was divided and I did not know where I stood on it. At the primary election I promised that if I were nominated as a candidate I would go to Europe and try to decide for myself what ought to be done and what ought to be the position of the United States. I remember some of the sights I saw there. I remember that Belgium and Switzerland were the only countries I visited which did not have food rationing. I remember my first view of Frankfurt, it was practically flat on the ground, and of Berlin, which was a shambles. I remember the hunger of the Netherlands and people eating out of garbage cans in Italy. I saw this in 1948 and went back to the United States convinced that I should support the Marshall Plan. Subsequently, I was elected and when NATO was formed in 1949, I was convinced that I should support it.

I do not say that NATO should take credit for all the things which have happened in Europe since 1948–49, but I think if it had not been for NATO and, more importantly, for the cooperation of the free nations of the North Atlantic, Europe certainly would not be in the prosperous condition it is in today. People in Western Europe would not be free to be the masters of their destinies. We have accomplished a great deal. Without going into detail over the past twenty years, I think the problems which face us are as grave as those which we have surmounted. We have heard many addresses here which I shall not attempt to recapitulate. We heard one this morning on the problems of our environment. We have had a Resolution on that and Resolutions on the population explosion.

As I came through the Lobby this morning and saw the stacks of paper there I said, "I do not think we need to worry about the population explosion." I said this jokingly because my view is that the population will be drowned some day in a mountain of paper. One of our problems is the proliferation of people and the problems which that causes. I consider NATO a very proper forum for the attempted solution of some of these great problems now facing us.

A newspaper reporter said to me this morning, "How do you consider NATO as a proper forum for environmental problems?" I suspect that the nations comprising NATO contribute more than all the rest of the world put together to air and water pollution and other environmental problems, so I think this is exactly a forum which should be expanded to talk about and work on these problems.

I said before this Assembly 14 years ago—at the risk of being repetitious and boring I point it out again—that the free nations of the world have been able and have been proved to be able—history bears testimony to the fact that they have been able—to work together in times of military stress. We have always, under the gun, been able to do what is necessary to preserve our freedom, but we have yet to prove that we can work together in times of economic stress and now in times of environmental stress.

I recall the great depression of 1929 which in my view was largely accelerated, if not brought about, by the fact that the free nations of the world did not work together but when economic chaos began to descend upon them fell apart and passed restrictive tariff laws against each other and blamed each other for their difficulties. So I should like to see NATO broadened not only as a military structure but as an economic structure, a cultural structure and a structure which addresses itself to the multiplicity of problems which mankind faces in this great North Atlantic Community. I should like to dedicate my tenure as President to ensuring that the NATO nations are brought closer together and that with some degree of unanimity we at least attempt—although there will certainly be differences of opinion and divergencies—to look at and advance some solutions to the problems of mankind as seen from our vantage point in Europe and North America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

It has been my privilege to be a member of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentarian Conference now known as the North American Assembly, for 5 years, all of which have seen the continued leadership of our colleague WAYNE HAYS as chairman of the U.S. delegation, and occupying a very prominent, important, and influential role in all of the councils of the Assembly. To me the fact that he has been elected twice to be President, the only person in the world so honored, is of lesser importance to the role that he has played in the institutional development of NATO. This began as a peacetime alliance bringing the now 15 nations together for peacetime security purposes. It is unique in that respect. It is the most successful alliance of all time. It has now stretched 20 years beyond the end of World War II. Of course, it is an association of sovereign independent nations brought together through the political institutions known as the NATO Council with a permanent representative of each of the 15 nations full time on that Council. However, thanks in great measure to the vision and leadership of WAYNE HAYS, there is now an auxiliary to the executive authority known as the NATO Council, that auxiliary being the North Atlantic Assembly.

True, it is not so provided in the North

Atlantic Treaty but it has become recognized as a part of the ongoing institution known as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. At a very recent date the NATO council has recognized the existence, the official existence, of the North Atlantic Assembly and has been receiving communications from the North Atlantic Assembly and responding to those communications. These may seem, perhaps, as minor steps, but to me they are giant steps in the institutional development of this great peacetime alliance, one that holds the highest hopes for mankind and for the preservation of freedom and the containment of aggressive expansion, especially in the European area.

We must in all honesty give highest tribute to WAYNE HAYS because he not only helped to initiate the legislation in this Chamber that led to the establishment of the NATO Parliamentary Conference in the days when it was truly independent from the NATO Council, but later on through his persistent, effective prodding, not only here in this Capital but in the capitals of other NATO countries, we now have the North Atlantic Assembly which is a major step in the institutional development of this grand alliance.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) just a few moments ago was called away from the floor, but he did ask me to express as well his appreciation for the great contributions of our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add on a more personal note, it is refreshing to be under the leadership of a man who is so punctual. Whenever the departure day and hour for the North Atlantic delegation is set, we all know exactly when the plane is to leave and if the plane is to take off at 8 o'clock, the plane takes off at 8 o'clock.

I have been equally impressed with the punctuality of all the events that are scheduled throughout the Conference each year. Whenever a briefing is scheduled, say, with the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, as it was this past year, Mr. HAYS is there in person well in advance of the appointed hour. It is my opinion that his diligence in seeing to all the details is one of the reasons he has been so effective as the leader of the U.S. delegation. His ability is recognized by the entire North Atlantic Assembly as evidenced by the fact that he has been elected to this position on two occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership in making it possible for all of us to pay this tribute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

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

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high honor to join my distinguished friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), our beloved Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, and others who have preceded me in paying a much deserved accolade to that great American, WAYNE HAYS.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that a politician or a public servant makes three kinds of speeches during his career. One is the speech which he mulls over in his mind on the way to a meeting; the other is the one he delivers at the meeting, but the best one is the one he makes on his way home figuring what he should have said at the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, WAYNE HAYS is a rare individual who possesses many rare and diverse qualities. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) brought out the fact that Mr. HAYS is very vocal, but that he has another side, a very broadminded kind man. During my 15 years in which I have been associated with him I have found him to be that kind of man, willing to go out of his way to say a kind word on behalf of someone. I am delighted to have this time during which to pay honor and tribute to the very outstanding and distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) and I want to commend all of you for the kind words which you have expressed on behalf of my distinguished friend.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. HAYS is the author of the so-called Fulbright-Hays Act, and this fact should be remembered. It principally provides for educational and cultural exchange as a means of furthering mutual understanding between people of the United States and all other countries.

Mr. HAYS authored a resolution which expressed the sense of this House, or of this Congress, that Spain should be admitted into NATO, and I am sure you will agree with me that if NATO is to endure then Spain had better be admitted. We need Spain in NATO—we need Spain in NATO. We need the character of the Spanish people as well as the physical makeup and the logistical position of the Iberian Peninsula as part of the protective shield of NATO.

These are the kinds of things which Mr. HAYS perceived years ago, before it was so dramatically brought about by the walkout of France from NATO, leaving our southern flank exposed, and leaving us in a position to be cut down without any logistical security.

Mr. HAYS has seen these things. This is why it is so easy, so very easy, for me to get up here, even though I stumble, yet it is stumbling with ease in trying to say some of the many things to which this man is entitled.

Congressman HAYS was elected to the 81st Congress. I am going to ask permission to insert this in full in the RECORD, but I would just like to cite a few more items. He sponsored the things the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) has referred to, and the so-called Fulbright-Hays Exchange Act. He has been accorded many honorary degrees from the great universities in Ohio and other places. I have spoken in his district. He represents a farming district. You can look at the faces of the people in his district, and you can see that they are great Americans, really the hard-working group of people such as I see in my native South Carolina.

Congressman HAYS is a farmer—of course, he is a banker, too—but he owns a very fine farm known far and wide as the Red Gate Farms in Belmont, Ohio. He is a breeder, breeding Angus cattle, and Tennessee walking horses. He has many sides. The more one looks at this man the more one finds the reasons—and the attractive reasons—to admire this great American. I wanted to say these few things just in case time should expire before I could do so. I will submit the biographical material at this point:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CONGRESSMAN WAYNE L. HAYS

Congressman Wayne L. Hays, Democrat, of Flushing, Ohio, was born May 13, 1911, at Bannock, Ohio.

Received primary education in local schools, attended Ohio State University, graduating in 1933, and pursued further studies at Duke University. Between 1935 and 1939, taught history and public speaking.

Served as Mayor of Flushing, Ohio, for three terms (1939–45); Ohio State Senator for one term (1941–42); and Commissioner of Belmont County (1945–49). Member of the Officer's Reserve Corps, United States Army (1933–42); volunteered for active duty in World War II; honourably discharged in August 1942.

Elected to the Eighty-first Congress on November 2, 1948; reelected to the succeeding Congresses to present.

Presently the second ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Chairman of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations. Has traveled widely as Chairman of this Committee. Made a complete study at the direction of the Foreign Affairs Committee of State Department problems in Africa late in 1957, visiting twelve countries and colonies in Africa.

Also the ranking member of the House Administration Committee.

Chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts, which handles the finances of all other committees in the House of Representatives, and Subcommittee on Ethics and Contracts.

In 1955 sponsored enactment of legislation to authorize participation in NATO Parliamentarians Conferences (now the North Atlantic Assembly) and has served as Chairman of each House of Representatives delegation to the Conferences since that time. President of this Conference 1956 and 1957, and permanent representative of the United States to the North Atlantic Assembly Standing Committee.

Co-author of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961, which provides for educational and cultural exchange as a means of furthering mutual understanding between the people of the United States and other countries.

Received Honorary Doctor of Laws Degrees from Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, on December 2, 1966, and from the College of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio, on May 26, 1968.

Presented Caritas Medal by the Most Reverend John King Mussio, the Bishop of Steubenville, Ohio, on March 9, 1969.

Elected President of the North Atlantic Assembly for 1969–70.

Owner of Red Gate Farms, Belmont, Ohio. Breeder of Angus Cattle and Tennessee Walking Horses.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for taking this time to pay a very justifiable tribute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Certainly his election in the first place, and his unprecedented reelection, reflects great honor not only upon himself,

but upon this House of Representatives and upon the United States itself.

I would like to state parenthetically that this country has also been honored with the appointment as vice chairman of the Military Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly, of the gentleman now in the well of the House, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS). This, too, is a recognition of the great military expertise held by this gentleman, and is also a tribute to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I was not privileged to be a member of the delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly, but earlier in the year I did have the distinct advantage and honor of attending the biennial North Atlantic Assembly military tour in Europe.

There for a period of ten days we exhaustively studied in the field of defense bureau, in company with many parliamentarians who are members of the North Atlantic Assembly.

Aside from the information we gained on that trip, and aside from the friendships cultivated with my counterparts in other countries, two things stuck out in my mind. First, the outstanding caliber of the representatives from other nations to the North Atlantic Assembly. The second thing I was most impressed with was the very, very great prestige in which the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) is held by these outstanding legislators.

I gathered the impression that when WAYNE HAYS spoke, the rest of the NATO nations listened respectfully. I gathered the impression that here was a one-man State Department who is doing a great deal of good for the United States of America in creating good will among the islators.

So I would like to add my personal thanks to Mr. HAYS for what he has done and I would simply say I know the North Atlantic Assembly is an outstanding organization, but now thank heavens for the second term in a row it has an outstanding President.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I also have in this biography of Mr. HAYS a record of the fact that he has been elected over and over again by our group which is composed of House Members and Senate Members as the representative of the standing committee, which is the representative of the heirarchy of the NATO assembly which plans and sets the course of this organization. Mr. HAYS is our voice—and a good one it is. We are proud that he was elected unanimously by a joint meeting of our group and where he is elected each year unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, this man is respected and admired and recognized for his great abilities. This is why we are at this time doing this very little thing for this very great man.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, and compliment him for performing an exceptionally fine service here today with respect to one of our Members.

Because there are other Members here who wish to speak, I am going to ask permission to revise and extend by remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with WAYNE HAYS for some 11 years where he has made, as he has in so many areas, made an outstanding contribution to our national interest unheralded and unsung. So I am delighted to see the House bestow this honor upon him. The honor we pay him today is perhaps in a broader sense an honor to ourselves because by his worthiness and by his dedication and by his knowledge and by the kind of confidence he has inspired in the NATO parliamentarians in terms of what brings honor to us by his worthiness to assume the high honor that he now has.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I too want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from South Carolina for making possible this period of time this evening.

As the gentleman from New Jersey who just spoke pointed out, those of us who served with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) on the Committee on Foreign Affairs are aware of the great knowledge and expertise that he has in that difficult area—not only the knowledge that he has but the dedication, study and effort that he brings to the solution of the problems which are presented to us.

It has been my happy privilege on more than one occasion to have traveled on official missions with the gentleman from Ohio, and as others have previously pointed out, on those missions he works hard. He is dedicated to finding answers to problems and solutions to difficulties and in proper cases getting information and data which will be of use to the committee and to this Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I also want to join those who have previously spoken in expressing gratification at the high honor which has been again bestowed on Mr. HAYS, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) for his contributions. I know Mr. HAYS appreciates them.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to pay tribute to the achievement of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS on his being elected President of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Our colleague has brought great honor to the Nation, to this Congress, and the State of Ohio which sent him to this body.

I have known WAYNE HAYS perhaps longer than any Member of this body. We served as members of the Ohio Senate in 1941 and 1942 until we resigned that Ohio Senate for service in the military services of the country.

When I came to this body—in 1954, he was one of the first Members of this body to offer help and assistance—and I will be forever grateful.

We in the Ohio delegation are proud of what WAYNE HAYS has done in NATO but we are more proud of what he has done—day in and day out in this body in calling things as they are and what they are with parliamentary ease and with legislative truth.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. You have said a great deal. I think the country is so fortunate to have this man. He never elects or selects the easy course. I would rather follow the one which he considers right and, as the gentleman has said, he calls them as they are.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for yielding to me. I join in commending the gentleman for bringing to us the information concerning Mr. HAYS. I would like to add my commendation to all of those which have preceded me. I am reminded of a saying we have in south Texas, which I think would be appropriate at this time. I join in the commendations, and each one who spoke before me spoke his feelings. Whatever those feelings might have been, they were commendable of the gentleman from Ohio. I incorporate all of those and add my own with this one special note: I commend him as all the others have, but I commend him further on my own because I consider him my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I am known around these parts as having a wee bit of Irish wit, and I say sincerely I at any moment will happily yield to the gentleman from Ohio. I would also like to state to the gentleman from South Carolina that when he said that the gentleman from Ohio is 56, 57, or somewhere around there, I imagine it is "as the crow flies." I am sure the meetings of NATO will no longer be dull with the gentleman from Ohio presiding, because, as the other gentleman from Ohio who preceded me said. He tells it like it is. But sometimes in the dullest moment he tells it in the most pleasant manner that even the most intricate part of parliamentary procedure can be made easier, and even the most delicate subjects can be treated in a light manner, keeping the Assembly in good spirit and preventing the meeting, as many parliamentarian meetings do, from getting dull from time to time. So I am glad for all the reasons stated that Mr. HAYS will direct the Assembly. I know he will direct it with sternness, with fairness, and with a wee bit of wit.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I would like to close on this note, but before doing so, does the gentleman from Ohio desire me to yield?

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

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman for Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, naturally I am very deeply touched and very appreciative of all the nice things that have been said here this afternoon. I hope that I can justify the things that have been said in my conduct of this office in the next year and a half.

As I said to the Parliamentarians Assembly when I was elected, I would like to dedicate my tenure to bring even closer together the nations of the North Atlantic Assembly.

I am forever grateful to my colleagues for this special order and for all the things they have said. I want to repeat it over and over: I am very touched by it.

I do think we have many problems facing us as an organization, problems that are not military, and as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina said, behind that military shield we have many problems to solve.

I was glad to have mentioned, among other things, the speech I made on the environmental problems which face us as human beings in this world. I think I would like to have many share an observation I made to the distinguished Ambassador of the Soviet Union in a meeting I had with him last week.

As the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina knows, there is some movement underfoot for our organization to have at least one meeting with the similar people from the East bloc. The Ambassador was interested in what things might be discussed at such a meeting. I said that environmntal problems might be one, and I said: "Mr. Ambassador, with all the air pollution we have today, can you imagine what it is going to be like after 25 years when every traveler from Russia has an automobile to add to all those now in Europe and in the United States?"

This was a facetious thing to say, but it will probably happen. I remember my first trip 25 years ago, when one could drive all over Europe and if one saw one other car in 25 minutes, that was a great deal. Over that period of 25 years the hope of the average person in Europe that he could someday ride in an automobile—which was the hope—is now true, and he is now not only riding in it, but it probably is his automobile—or at least he has made a down payment on it, as his American counterpart has.

So the more of these industrial benefits we bring to people, the more problems we create. With the confidence that has been evinced by my colleagues who were here this afternoon to back me up, I hope to do something to get started—just started—on solving some of these problems.

Again, I thank all.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I think it is so fitting that on the 20th anniversary of NATO the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) has lived to see the fulfillment of his dream of, first, a strong and enduring military shield, with long and successful planning behind it, and now capable of meeting these other problems, and also that great problem of indifference due to prosperity. The gentleman is there to meet this with his leadership and experience. The least we can do is take a minute out to pay the gentleman this tribute.

Mr. Speaker, so frequently we wait until our friends depart, like a poem I learned years ago.

AROUND THE CORNER

Around the corner I have a friend
In this great city that has no end.
Yet weeks pass by and months rush on,
And before I know it, a year is gone
And I never see my old friend's face
But he knows I love him just as well
As in the days when I rang his bell and
He rang mine.

We were younger then, but now we are busy,
Tired men, tired of trying to make a name
And tired of trying to play life's game,
But tomorrow I say I will call on old Jim
Just to show him I am thinking of him.
But tomorrow comes and tomorrow goes
And the distance between us grows and grows.
Around the corner, yet miles away
By telegram—Jim died today.
Now this is what we get and deserve in the end:
Around the corner, a departed friend.

I know the gentleman will live many years, but while I am living and while the Members here are living, and while the gentleman is living, let us give him some encomiums. He has earned them.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add three items.

First I wish to state my personal appreciation to the gentleman in the well. I know and have some appreciation of the many demands on his time as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Yet, despite these demands he finds time to give for NATO. The fact is that year after year he sets aside at least that 1 week to attend to his responsibilities as a member of the U.S. delegation, and this adds greatly to the value of the work of the delegation.

Second, I want to mention the nonpartisan character of the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) as chairman of the U.S. delegation. This year, for the first time in the 5 years of my legislative experience, we went there while a Republican occupied the White House, a Republican who had made some far-reaching proposals about the environmental quality of life in the North Atlantic community. I was pleased, indeed, that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) saw fit to make that the central theme of his great address which the gentleman from South Carolina has placed in the RECORD today.

It was very gratifying to me as a Republican to hear the words of high praise the gentleman from Ohio spoke about the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Mr. Robert Ellsworth, who once served on my side of the aisle here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RIVERS. I was going to mention that. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), has not been enamored of some of the Ambassadors we had there, but when this young man was selected he went to him and told him of his gratification over his having been selected to represent us, and how he felt certain this would improve our stature in NATO. He does the unusual and the right thing.

This was like a shot in the arm to this young man. He had seen the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) in debate. He wanted his approval, and he got it. This young man was a new man, and the gentleman from Ohio did this voluntarily.

This is the kind of man about whom we speak today.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to add one final item, and that is to take note of the remarkable vision and I would say the courage of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), because he is not afraid to tackle challenging new ideas.

He was one of the forces that brought about the enactment of the Atlantic Resolution in 1960, which was followed by the Paris Convention of 1962. To be sure, the Paris Convention did not yield the fruit all hoped it would, but nevertheless the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) was willing in those earlier years to give his backing to this far-reaching proposal.

Just a little more than a year ago, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where I serve as his colleague, it was the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), who moved the previous question which brought to a vote an affirmative vote in the committee on the most far-reaching proposal dealing with the future formation of the North Atlantic community, a proposal that contemplates eventually a Federal structure. Even this did not cause the gentleman to shy away. It was his voice that moved the previous question and brought the question to an affirmative vote.

I am sure I speak for all on my side of the aisle who have served on this delegation—the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE), and, certainly, myself—in wishing the very best to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) as he serves his second term as President of the North Atlantic Assembly.

Mr. RIVERS. On that I must say "Amen" and I want to pledge to him my full cooperation and continued support of his leadership.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman in the well (Mr. RIVERS) and my other colleagues in paying tribute to and congratulating the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WAYNE HAYS, upon his election as President of the North Atlantic Assembly.

The honor which has been conferred upon Mr. HAYS, is not his alone, for it is as great an honor for this House, for this Congress, and for this Nation.

That WAYNE HAYS will perform most effectively as president of this important world assembly, we who know him entertain no doubts. He will take to the assembly his characteristic frankness and courage to speak the truth as he

sees it, and a sense of conscientious responsibility and leadership, so much needed in this era of international tensions.

He will no doubt make all Americans proud that he is an American, by continuing to gain honor and respect, not only for himself but more so for this great country of ours that he represents.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our esteemed and beloved colleague, MENDEL RIVERS, in the expressions of congratulations to the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, on the occasion of his election as President of the North Atlantic Assembly for 1969–70.

Having worked closely with Congressman HAYS through the years as fellow members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am not surprised that he has been chosen—and for the second time—to lead the North Atlantic Assembly.

No Member of Congress has devoted more assiduously to help resolve the problems of American-European relations than the gentleman from Ohio.

Not only did he spearhead legislation through the Congress in 1955, authorizing American participation in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—now called the North Atlantic Assembly—but he has served as chairman of each House delegation to the Conferences since that time and has been permanent U.S. representative to the North Atlantic Assembly Standing Committee.

In those positions, he has given our Nation able representation and has furthered the goals of American-European cooperation and amity.

For his efforts in this area, Congressman HAYS deserves our thanks and commendations. We wish him well as he takes up the responsibilities and obligations of a very important position, that of President of the North Atlantic Assembly.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS) for arranging this time to felicitate and congratulate our friend and colleague, WAYNE L. HAYS, upon his election as President of the North Atlantic Assembly. This is an honor which was also bestowed upon him back in 1956, the second year of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conferences, which are now known as the North Atlantic Assembly.

As one who had the privilege of attending one of these conferences, I have had the opportunity of observing firsthand the skill and knowledge which characterize his service as head of the House of Representatives delegations to the Assembly. He has been a member of the influential Standing Committee since 1955 and has served as a member of the Political Committee during most of the annual Conferences.

I think I can speak for every Member of the House of Representatives who has served on one of these delegations, that WAYNE has been a great credit to our country, to the Congress, and to himself, in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities as our chief representative at these Conferences.

His debating skill has evoked the admiration of his many friends in the European parliaments, just as it has here in this House. He has a profound knowledge of our mutual foreign policy problems and has made great contributions toward better United States-Europe understanding and cooperation.

WAYNE made an outstanding President of the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference. His recent election to this top post in the renamed organization is a double honor, doubly deserved for his dedication and tireless efforts. I am glad to see this proof of the esteem in which he is held by our European colleagues, and feel that we have every reason to be proud of his continued statesmanlike service as our chief delegate.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, once again an American of great ability and distinguished attainment has been selected to hold one of the international responsibilities which help preserve the uneasy balance of world peace. I am privileged to join with those who today pay tribute to our colleague who has often brought the force of reality to debate, Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio.

As President of the North Atlantic Assembly he will be called upon many times to exercise the firm hand and the sure touch for which he is already renowned. There will be need for an unswerving commitment to the principles on which the Western nations have built their societies. And here, indeed, they have chosen the right man.

Long experienced in European affairs, familiar with NATO since its beginning, seasoned by the combat of a lifetime of public service, none could be more eminently well fitted for the position. We are fortunate to have his experience and abilities at our service at a seat of decision where the cold war waits offstage. My congratulations and best wishes go with him, along with my complete confidence that he will enjoy great success in his endeavors.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in honoring a distinguished Member of this body who has just achieved one of the most prestigious positions of honor to which a legislator in the free world can aspire.

Our friend and colleague, WAYNE HAYS, from the 18th District of Ohio, has been elected President of the North Atlantic Assembly at the recent meeting of that interparliamentary body in Brussels.

This election is a special tribute to the ability and reputation of Mr. HAYS because this is the second time that his international colleagues have named him to this position of trust. In 1956 and 1957 Mr. HAYS served as President of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Parliamentarians' Conference, predecessor to the North Atlantic Assembly. He also has served as Vice President of the Assembly in 1968.

In his 11 terms in the House of Representatives Mr. HAYS has commanded the admiration of us all. He is a natural and gifted parliamentarian, a tough-minded legislator who responds to the legislative challenge with all the fervor of the true zealot. Because of his energetic criticism of the imperfect, there are those who are at times intimidated. But behind that tough exterior there is a deeply sensitive individual; one who openly weeps at the loss of a dear friend; one who speaks with unabashed pride of his daughter; one who feels, quite personally, the sorrows of others. His presence here in the House has caused us all to share in the deeper sensitivity which marks the extraordinary man.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with others today in recognizing the achievements of the gentleman from Ohio, and particularly his election as President of the NATO Conference is a tribute to his many years of effort in international affairs.

The fact that he has been so honored not only is a recognition of his knowledge in the critical area of foreign affairs that has been the principal field of his interest, but even more so, it reflects his skill in a parliamentary sense which has been evidenced many times here on the floor of the House in a host of other matters of national concern.

I believe that the gentleman's work in the field of scholarships abroad has often gone unnoticed, but I believe the record will show that he was a coauthor of that landmark legislation which established what is ofttimes referred to as the Fulbright Scholarships. More precisely, the program is the Fulbright-Hays Scholarships, and I think it is appropriate at this time to recall this to the attention of the Members. In the years past, many scholars have benefited from this program, and the Nation will undoubtedly gain rich dividends from this scholarship effort; therefore, I did want to mention this as one of the many achievements of the gentleman that we pay tribute to today.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me. It is rendering highly commendable service by making possible this deserved tribute to our colleague, WAYNE HAYES.

I have had the pleasure of serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee with WAYNE HAYES for over 11 years. During that time I got to know him as one of the most effective Members of the Congress, much of the work he does is unheralded and unsung, but few do more to make the Congress function and I know of no one in the Congress who makes greater contribution to our national interest and to our security.

So I am happy that our colleague has been elected to this high honor in the North Atlantic Assembly, for he is a parliamentarian and diplomat of the first rank. And while we honor him today, in a broader sense, he does us honor by having been elected as President of the North Atlantic Assembly. It is a recognition of ability, dedication, and cour-

age to fight for his beliefs. Beliefs which serve this body and our Nation. Under his leadership the North Atlantic Assembly will be able to make an even more meaningful contribution to the cause of peace. And, finally, I join with my colleagues in saluting an able, conscientious, and effective American, our colleague, WAYNE HAYES, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

DES MOINES SPEECH OF VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days several Members of Congress and former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey have made some rather absurd public statements with regard to the Des Moines speech of Vice President AGNEW. More recently there have been attacks upon other members of the Nixon administration who have defended the Vice President or expressed their criticism of the news media.

Just as these members of the Nixon administration have the right to criticize any public institution, so do Mr. Humphrey and Members of Congress have the right to criticize them. But the method of their criticism has bordered on sheer asininity in terms of their interpretations. Recognizing that the situation in general, and particularly the Des Moines speech of Vice President AGNEW provides an opportunity to do some real political apple polishing with the TV networks, many of these statements are nonetheless ridiculous.

Such charges as intimidation, assaults upon the constitutional guarantee of a free press, and coercive tactics are the figments of political bias that are obvious to the intelligent people of this country.

My colleague from Michigan, Representative O'HARA, went so far as to call for the dismissal of two administration officials, Herb Klein and Dean Burch. While I realize that the President of the United States is obviously too intelligent a man to even dignify such partisan hogwash, I would be remiss if I did not set the record straight on both scores.

In the first place, Dean Burch merely requested transcripts of public statements made by TV commentators. I have had occasion to do this many times, and I am sure most of my colleagues have done likewise. There is certainly nothing in the world wrong with making such a request. To even suggest that Mr. Burch's request was a direct assault upon the constitutional guarantee of a free press is beyond comprehension. To further charge that Herb Klein was likewise guilty of the same assault is equally as insidious.

It seems to me that these statements question the constitutional right of Mr. Klein, Mr. Burch, and others, to express their opinions.

The liberals in this country who are the self-appointed bearers of the torch of individual freedoms, it would seem, have a double standard when it comes to freedom of expression. Regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with these criticisms of the news media, I deeply resent the implication of the public statement that administration officials "are making it perfectly plain that their only beef with the press is that it does not give the Nixon administration the objective coverage that Kosygin can expect from Pravda, and so forth."

I want to make it very clear that I personally do not question the right of my colleagues or anyone else to express these or other opinions, and I would be obliged to fight for their right to do so even though it is partisan political drivel and unadulterated hogwash.

Instead of quibbling for political advantage should not we be taking a good hard look at the reaction of the American public which can provide the vehicle by which the institutions of this country can be improved?

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I testified last week before the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Reorganization. While I want to praise the committee for its commendable efforts to get a congressional reform bill before the House this session, I feel there are serious gaps in the bill drafted by the committee. I went into some detail in this respect in the statement I submitted to the committee. For that reason, I would like to insert a copy of my testimony in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Subcommittee, it is with a deep sense of urgency that I testify on the subject of congressional reorganization. Improving the effectiveness of Congress has been a goal of mine for many years now. It predated even the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I have been a persistent advocate and one with conclusions based on both experience and study. You will expect certain things of me today and I can assure you that you will not be disappointed.

So, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this welcome opportunity.

May I also say that I am appreciative of the yeoman efforts of the Subcommittee which, since May of this year, has devoted considerable time and energy to drafting a proposed reform act. To the Chairman, Bernie Sisk, and to the other Member of the Subcommittee, I extend my thanks for your diligent efforts and for your expeditious draft of a proposed bill.

The preponderance of what you propose will find no argument from this quarter. There is no reason for me to drone on extensively about our areas of agreement. I think the proposed procedures to guarantee adequate time for filing of supplementary and minority opinions in committee reports is a plus, as is the provision to ensure the availability of reports themselves to Members prior to the consideration of legislation on the floor. It is to be hoped that such provisions will be followed to the letter so that debate and consideration of legislation will proceed at a more knowledgeable pace.

I note that tucked into the Subcommittee's draft is a provision for updating the Precedents of the House of Representatives and for providing Members with a handy compilation of the more important and contemporary precedents at the beginning of each Congress. Not many *Congressional observers* will fall over themselves with glee at this prospect but it is certain that Members of the House will find this a real dividend. This is particularly true of freshmen Representatives who are not aware of nor accustomed to the mysteries of House parliamentary procedure.

The elimination of obsolete Joint Committees is an intelligent and constructive idea. Also I am in accord with the idea of revising and strengthening the Joint Committee which has jurisdiction over the Library of Congress, including, of course, the Legislative Reference Service. I am greatly encouraged, by the way, with those provisions of the reorganization act which will expand the services provided by the Legislative Reference Service.

On February 28, 1968 I spoke directly to the issue of the Service and its relationship with Congress in remarks printed in the *Record* of that day. We are all aware that the Service is a basic research and reference arm for the legislative branch. Through the supply of nonpartisan analysis and unbiased information it assists Members in fulfilling their legislative and constituent tasks. Anything done to augment the assistance L.R.S. can provide to Members is progressive and in the public interest. I am particularly intrigued by the idea of a pool of analysis being available through the Service to aid in the oversight activities of congressional committees. I approve further the authorization in the Subcommittee's draft bill which encourages the Legislative Reference Service to explore ways in which computer technology can be put to use in assisting Congress with the tasks which confront it. On this I shall have some more to say at a later time.

Though I am to some degree dismayed by the failure to include provisions strengthening the lobbying section of the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act, there is some consolation in the suggestion of the Subcommittee that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to examine the various suggestions for improving regulation of lobbying on Capitol Hill. Particularly important is the stipulation that this Select Committee report its recommendations to the House prior to the final adjournment of the 91st Congress. We can agree, certainly, that the present Lobbying Act is insufficient in terms of its coverage and reporting requirements. While proper and intelligent lobbying is an accepted and acceptable practice in legislative politics, its very nature requires the light of disclosure to preclude from the public's mind the suspicion of underhanded tactics and purposes.

I understand that removal of lobbying provisions from the present bill will expedite its passage in the House and probably, for that matter, the Senate. Still, the Subcommittee has faced up to the pressing need to focus attention on the Lobbying Act and to do something to correct its inadequacies.

We are in a period of history which finds our political institutions and policies in disfavor with far too many of our people. It is unquestionably true that you cannot satisfy all of the people any of the time *but the situation which prevails in our time is not one to bring comfort to those who believe in our republican institutions*. Certainly the displeasure abroad in the land is not without some foundation. Accordingly, it is incumbent upon those of us who have been elected to man our political institutions to take the necessary action to dispel popular doubts as to the integrity and the viability of those institutions. That, along with the real need for congressional reform, is a compelling argument favoring action in this Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I turn to three areas of particular concern to me.

I would be less than honest were I not to express my disappointment at the failure of the Subcommittee to include in its proposed bill an alternative to the seniority system for the selection of committee chairmen. A former Representative in this House has said that "there are three things you can do about the seniority system in Congress: you can attack it directly, you can gnaw at its edges, or you can leave it alone." I believe in attacking it directly.

The Subcommittee has apparently concluded that the best thing to do is to leave it alone. I cannot agree. Seniority as the method for determining committee chairmen is a perfect example of the principle that in a difficult situation "take the path of least resistance." In some situations that may also be the best course of action but not in the selection of committee chairmen. The only telling argument offered in defense of selection by seniority is that it expedites the organization of committees. That is not good enough for me.

Seniority, as you all know, is not a Rule of the House but a custom. Rule 10 of the House provides that the "House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof" at the commencement of each Congress. Admittedly, the remaining language of that Rule, in its provision for chairing of the committee by the ranking member in the absence of the chairman, implies seniority. Nevetheless, in the election of the chairman the Rule permits the choosing of any Member of the committee.

For almost six decades now longevity has been the criterion for their selection. It has been said before, and I now say it again, that this use of seniority is, apparently, peculiar to the U.S. Congress. It is not the method employed in our State legislatures or in foreign legislative bodies for the selection of committee chairman. I would say that this is a singularly interesting fact.

In both the 90th and in this Congress I have introduced resolutions which would revise the method for selection of committee chairmen. For those who may not know the language of my proposal, it is contained in House Resolution 81 of this Congress.

My alternative is quite simple. It provides that the members of the committee shall convene as soon as possible following the opening of Congress and by secret ballot the majority party members shall elect the chairman from among the three senior majority members on the committee. In like fashion the minority party members shall elect the minority leader for the committee.

This alternative to the present method has the virtue of permitting the members of a committee a choice in the selection of the chairman and ranking minority members. Thus, if there are valid or seemingly valid reasons in their minds for not awarding the chairmanship to the senior majority member, they can withhold it from him and elect someone in whom they have greater confidence. I would expect that if such a system of election were instituted, it would be a rare occasion for the senior member to be denied the chairmanship. But, I think that option should remain open to the members of the committee if they desire to exercise it. Moreover, the very possibility of not maintaining or attaining the chairmanship by seniority alone could act to curb any abuse of authority by a chairman or prospective chairman.

To buttress my alternative permit me to quote from a former colleague. In *We Propose: A Modern Congress*, John Lindsay has written:

"I am . . . inclined to favor selection of committee chairmen by secret ballot of the members of each committee. Each of the standing committees of the House is a semi-autonomous body with its own unique problems and special norms. Committee members, by observing each other at close range in the daily operations of the committee, would seem to me to be in the best position to judge the qualifications necessary for their chairman, and they certainly are aware of intelligence or personality traits which are often important to a smooth-working relationship. Committees are the workshops of Congress; their members should determine who should be seated at the head of the worktable."

I might add that Mr. Lindsay's article effectively devastates arguments offered in defense of selection by seniority by pointing out that the senior members of the majority and minority parties are not alone in having valuable experience on the committee and are not alone in having expertise in the committee's jurisdictional areas. Countering the argument that the seniority principle avoids internecine struggles and their bitter residue is the historically dismaying fact that longevity has too often put into the chairs of the House committees men unresponsive to the platforms and policies of their own party. Finally, the notion that men from safe districts who live long enough to become chairman are somehow more attentive than other Representatives to the "national interest" is dubious at best because it presupposes that such men operate from a rational basis in their consideration of legislation and their estimation of the role of a chairman. There is little, if any, empirical evidence to support that claim.

In matters of courtesy such as the assignment of room space, I think that reliance on seniority is probably as equitable and practical a system as could be devised. But on the question of choosing who shall be the chairman of each of the important standing and special committees of the House, it seems to me that we ought to be governed by a higher law of logic than that which says that the fellow who has been around the longest shall therefore exercise the greatest authority. This is not the way in which we choose the Speaker, or the party leaders on each side of the aisle. Why then should it be the way in which we select committee chairman who exercise equally enormous powers?

I would respectfully request, therefore, that you give some additional thought to eliminating the seniority principle and I offer House Resolution 81 as a possible alternative.

The second matter upon which I elaborate concerns the improvement of resources for supplying Members of Congress with information to assist them in their work. I have previously mentioned my favorable reaction to those parts of the reorganization bill which will improve the services provided by the Legislative Reference Service. In addition, the proposed Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing is a clear recognition by the Subcommittee that the Congress can and should avail itself of the fantastic benefits which can accrue through use of the computer.

As you are no doubt aware I have been serving this session on the Subcommittee on Mechanical and Electrical Equipment of the Committee on House Administration. My experience with that subcommittee has reinforced my previous conviction that Congress must expand and improve information resources available to it if it is to fulfill its proper role in the National Government.

For the past several years I have been greatly occupied with the study of ways and means by which Congress could accomplish just that and I contributed a chapter on the subject to *We Propose: A Modern Congress*.

For various reasons that we all know, the boundaries separating legislative from executive have blurred since the adoption of the Constitution. Richard Neustadt has suggested that, "the separations between President and Congressmen are partly constitutional, partly political, partly attitudinal, and in no small degree a matter of semantics." Increasingly, Congress has come to rely upon the President for a legislative agenda, though it would be erroneous to conclude that Congress has completely abdicated an initiative role in the passage of public policy.

Despite this reliance upon the President, the Congress is constitutionally charged with the responsibility to set public purpose, to allocate resources, and to test the validity of proposals from the President against the wishes and mood of the people. In carrying out its legislative, oversight, and representative functions, Congress must have not only full and free access to information within the executive branch but the analytical capability to separate the "signals from the noise." Moreover, if Congress is to retain any degree of autonomy, it must equip itself with the necessary machinery and avail itself of adequate manpower for *independent* intelligence gathering, sorting, and analysis.

May I emphasize in this regard that Congress is too dependent upon executive agencies. We authorize programs and then rely upon the implementing agencies to supply us with information necessary to overseeing their performance. To a degree this is unavoidable but certainly Congress should also have independent sources of information and independent means of analysis. One takes encouragement, therefore, from the provision in the draft bill which would authorize congressional committees to employ the services of analysts located within the Legislative Reference Service. With diligent use, these analysts could vastly improve oversight activities by the Congress.

Along with the professional staffs of the committees, the Legislative Reference Service is the agency which can supply Members with accurate and objective information, research, analysis, and evaluation of legislative matters. It is the agency which can and should put Congress on parity with the executive branch in access to information and expertise. Unfortunately, such a heavy demand is placed upon the Service that at present it only partially fulfills these goals.

As I have elsewhere said, the Service must have additional personnel to meet its growing responsibilities. It must be encouraged to adopt new techniques. Automated information retrieval is a must for the Service. The functions of the Legislative Reference Service present a tantalizing number of opportunities for utilizing such devices. The facilities of the Service ought to be improved and its equipment should be of adequate calibre.

It is apparent that the Subcommittee has given a good deal of thought to this matter and I hope the Congress will carry through with its recommendations. Beefing up the services provided by L.R.S. cannot be accomplished if the Congress is niggard in authorizing personnel and appropriating funds.

It is to be hoped that the proposed Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing will move expeditiously to augment the use of the computer in such ways as may prove practical for the Congress. Already the Clerk of the House employs a computer for personnel and housekeeping chores. The Legislative Reference Service uses the Library's computer for, among other things, production of the *Digest of Public General Bills* and the *Legislative Status Report*. It is exploring additional ways in which to make ways of information storage and retrieval systems. Certain committees, including the House Committee on Banking and Currency, have tapped into the Library's computer in order to expedite production of their calendars.

Wise use of automatic information systems can go far in assisting Congress with its heavy workload, a burden so imposing that it is routine for Congress to sit in session for most of a calendar year, which situation has led the Subcommittee to recommend a

regular August recess and aligning the fiscal year with the calendar year.

I commend the Subcommittee for its efforts to improve the flow of information to the Congress.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I turn to the provisions in the Subcommittee's draft bill for minority staffing on committees. As former Chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing of the Republican Conference and as a long-standing member of the minority party in the House—a situation, I can assure you, which I would like to see changed—I have been much intrigued by this whole problem.

I have been convinced for some time that a minority party is hampered in functioning as the loyal opposition by the failure to provide it with adequate staff representation on the committees of both the House and Senate. It is true that a number of committees do permit the minority to have members on the permanent staff but this is not a uniform practice.

A group of distinguished political scientists has said:

"To deny the Minority in Congress access to adequate representation on Committee staffs eliminates the opportunity for a minority to act responsibly after a careful examination of the problems under consideration. Congressmen, in this difficult and complex period of our history, require access to date and evaluation in those subject areas to which they are given responsibility as Committee members. It is obvious that this work cannot be placed regularly with their own office staffs, which have functions very different from those of a Committee. It is obvious, in light of policy formulation patterns at all levels of government, that the adversarial technique of law and politics in this country requires a personal relationship in which a congressman can develop confidence with the professional staff members. This is why, of course, the President has a high degree of control over his White House Staff, as well as at many policy-making levels in the Executive Departments.

"Some have argued that an increase in minority staffing of congressional committees would jeopardize the recent "professionalization" of these staffs. We do not believe that this is true. There is no reason why such "professionalization" cannot take place in a bipartisan framework. What is needed are professional staff members separately responsible to the majority and the minority. The demand that a substantially larger portion of the professional staff be responsible to the minority members is wholly reasonable and within the best democratic traditions."

Their statement puts the case well.

Furthermore, as my colleague and fellow Republican, James C. Cleveland, has said: "Even in the cases of committees which do list staff members as assigned specifically to assist the minority, those employees are ultimately responsible to the committee chairman, who is always a member of the majority party. By that I mean that they cannot be hired without the chairman's approval; their salaries are subject to the approval of the majority, and often their physical location is determined by the majority. Thus, nowhere in the House does the minority party have guaranteed to it an unobstructed conduit to information vital to the success of its adversary role under our two-party system."

As I have said on many occasions the minority on a committee ought to have exclusive right to hire and fire. As a matter of right, not privilege, it should have allotted to it probably in the neighborhood of 40% of both permanent and temporary staff. With such a staff it could offer constructive alternatives to the proposals of the majority party. With that staff assistance it could submit far more detailed and far better minority and supplementary opinions in committee reports. No matter of what party, the minority must be granted staff on committees which will enable it to be a more adequate and constructive loyal opposition.

Regrettably, this has not been true in the past. Unfortunately, we Republicans have had to suffer from it for most of the past 35 years. I think that this situation has been more detrimental to the Nation and the Congress than it has to us House Republicans.

The Subcommittee has seen fit to include provisions for minority staffing in its proposed bill. In all candor I must take exception to the language as presently written. It is true that the language of the bill provides the minority with a maximum two of the six permanent, professional staff members and one of the six permanent, clerical staff. The language further provides for equitable treatment for the minority staff in terms of pay, work facilities, and accessibility to committee records. It is also true that language in the bill stipulates in a general way that the minority be given fair consideration in the appointment of temporary committee employees.

In the latter regard, however, there are no guarantees that the majority on the committee, specifically the chairman, has to allot any of the temporary staff to the minority. There is no specific formula and no enforcement clause. In other words, the prescription in the bill can be ignored and minority members could be denied a fair share of temporary staff.

Even less palatable is the entire setup for the hiring of minority staff. Sole right of hiring is not vested in the minority. Instead it may only recommend a person whose appointment is subject to ratification by the full committee. The whole purpose of minority staffing is subverted by this method of appointing. Who knows what tests might be applied by the majority party before it will agree to the recommendations of the minority? Why should the majority be given a veto power over the employment of minority staff? That, of course, is the precise effect of the present language. I submit that the majority would never tolerate the minority having such a veto power. This distresses me and I beseech you to alter the language of the bill to permit the minority sole hiring and firing power over minority staff.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

Mr. Chairman, Part 5, Title IV of the Committee Print deals with a matter in which I have a deep, personal interest, the Capitol Guide Service. It is the object of this part of the bill to replace the existing system, beneficial to a few, with a superior system, beneficial to many, and to erase forever the commercial stigma of collecting a fee from patriotic Americans interested in visiting the Capitol Building.

Mr. Chairman, there is less reason to charge for guide service in the Capitol than there is to charge for guide service in the White House, Ford Theatre or the hundreds of other places where the Park Service has free guide service. When you consider the millions of dollars we spend at the Smithsonian and millions of dollars we have spent building monuments like the Lincoln Memorial, Jefferson Memorial, the Kennedy Memorial and a host of other similar places where we make no charge for visitors, it makes us foolish and inconsistent to charge people for guide service in the Capitol, the most important memorial of them all. I have said hundreds of times to students, groups and friends that more has happened in the shadow of the dome of our Capitol to bring about the Biblical promise of an abundant life than anywhere else in all of time. I believe any study by a competent historian will agree with my conclusions in this respect. There is no place that students can visit where they can more easily catch some of the fire that burned in the hearts of those early patriots who gave us this inheritance and magnificent system and so we should encourage visitors and especially students to come here and make free guide service available to them.

Under the terms of the Committee print, a Capitol Guide Board shall be established, consisting of the Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, an employee under the Senate appointed by the minority leader of the Senate and an employee under the House of Representatives appointed by the minority leader of the House.

The Capitol Guide Service would be authorized and directed to provide guided tours of the interior of the Capitol Building for the education and enlightenment of the general public. A major feature of the tour will be the fact that there will be *no fee*.

Under the existing arrangement, there is a fee, which seems to me astonishing. In the first place, it does not accord with the dignity of the Capitol Building for persons familiar with its history to be selling their services, like dance-hall girls, at twenty-five cents a head. Nor does it seem to me decorous, from the point of view of Congressmen concerned for the sensitivities of their constituents.

As it now stands, a family from Iowa or North Dakota or California or New Hampshire will come to Washington, where they will immediately develop that same lost feeling experienced by any traveller visiting any big city. Unfamiliarity with places and with prices is apt to make the visitors confused and suspicious and they may get the feeling that the hotel keepers, the waiters, the taxi drivers and half the people they meet on the sidewalk are either out to misinform them as to where things are located or out to sell them something for more than they had expected to pay. It is probably no worse here than it is in other big cities, so far as this feeling is concerned, but still is bad enough. The weary visitors are far from home and are very likely to go looking for a friendly, familiar face, which feeling can lead them to the Capitol Building for a chat with their Congressman. And, while they're at the Capitol, they just might want to look around and take in the sights on the Capitol grounds. They *are* taxpayers, after all, and it *is* their Capitol. But when they meet the guide, who is knowledgeable about the Capitol and capable of showing them around, they find they are expected to pay out twenty-five cents a person for the privilege of visiting *their own* Capitol Building.

The whole idea is outrageous.

Under the terms of the Committee Print, such visitors would be able to draw upon the knowledge and assistance of the Capitol Guide Service, without cost, and their visit to the Capitol would be free of commercialism and its inevitable irritations.

The expenses of the Capitol Guide Service shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, from funds appropriated for the Service, upon vouchers approved by the Capitol Guide Board. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall pay the salaries of employees of the Capitol Guide Service from the contingent fund of the House.

In order to work no hardship upon the staff members of the United States Capitol Guides, currently involved in the act of serving visitors at cost, initial appointments, under authority of the Capitol Guides Act shall be made available to members of the U.S. Capitol Guides, without reduction of level in rank or seniority.

The purpose here is clear enough, I believe. The Capitol Dome symbolizes to most Americans a free Government, with authority extending from sea-to-sea, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, with a National history in which the struggle for survival has not required the abduration of democratic representation.

Our Capitol, symbolic of the freedom we

enjoy, is sacred to the democratic principle. Can we afford to cheapen such a symbol with guides-for-hire infesting the Capitol? I think not. There is an appalling lack of dignity in such an arrangement. We have here the temple of freedom. Can we tolerate the existence of money-changers in the temple? We have for many years, I realize. But that was wrong. We should stand for it no longer. We should end that precedent at once, in favor of another providing the people with a service they deserve without cost, as Americans, as taxpayers and as believers in our National integrity.

I therefore highly recommend that portion of the Committee Print which establishes the Capitol Guide Service.

Let me turn briefly now to several areas of the Committee print which I feel are inadequate and need strengthening or addition of new sections.

Mr. Chairman, I am especially concerned about the omission of provisions for a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. Even if significant reforms are enacted this year, they can be rendered obsolete or ineffective in short order unless there is created a continuing review process. A bill which I co-sponsored earlier this year, contained a provision establishing such a review process and a permanent committee to accomplish it. The committee would have been directed to "make a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States. . . . "The Committee would also have been directed to study automatic data processing and information retrieval systems, together with reviewing legal proceedings which might be of interest to the Congress. The Committee would have been completely bipartisan in makeup under the provisions of our bill. The omission of these provisions constitutes a very serious deficiency in the bill developed by your Committee.

Another area about which I am very much concerned is that of the announcing of votes of Members on action taken by the various committees. I think the strongest provision in this regard is that contained in Section 102B of H.R. 11475. That section would require a *public* announcement of each roll call vote at the conclusion of every meeting, including the votes of individual Members and those who voted by proxy.

With respect to proxy voting, Mr. Chairman, I am completely opposed to any form of proxy voting in committees. It seems to me that the most important votes cast by Members of the Congress, are those cast in committee. It is only reasonable to require that they be physically present to participate in this important phase of our legislative process. If necessary, committee assignments and scheduling of hearings could be reorganized to avoid conflicts.

With respect to the Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing established by your committee print, the major reservation which I have in this respect, is a fear that it might in any way impede the efforts of the Legislative Reference Service to update the equipment needed in their programs.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is high time that we finally "solve the Page problem" once and for all. I think that could be rather easily accomplished by establishing the requirement that no one will be allowed to serve as a Page who has not completed his high school education. I think this a far sounder answer than building dormitories and extending even further our involvement in the supervision and education of Pages. In this vein, I would call your attention to Section 423 of H.R. 6278.

Another important area deleted from the Committee print, is that providing for the Office of Placement and Office Management. I refer here to language similar to that contained in Section 407 of H.R. 6278. This section would have provided an office which would assist in the placement of employees here on the Hill. It is generally agreed that the existing operation of the U.S. Employment Service is unsatisfactory, and is doubtful if it could be revitalized to the point it would be successful. The provision would also establish a division which would provide consultation on office management practices to Members, particularly new Members of Congress. I think this would be most helpful, not only to our new Members but to many of our long-time Members.

It is unclear to me from my study of the Committee print, as to whether or not, individual Members would have access to the Information Specialists created in the Congressional Research Service. It would be my position that the facilities of this service should certainly be available to all Members, and not just to the committees.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. On the whole I want to congratulate the Subcommittee for its work and to thank you for your attention to my thoughts on this important matter.

MR. JUSTICE CLARK AND THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Judicial Center was created by Public Law 90–219 which was signed by the President on December 20, 1967. The idea for the Center grew out of the administrative problems caused by the size and complexity of the operations of the Federal courts.

As our Nation has increased in population over the years, the business of the courts has increased apace. The need for studying and streamlining the operations of the courts, while at the same time preserving a full and fair system of justice for all, has grown increasingly more serious but until 1967 no effective steps had been taken to solve any of the problems. In that year it was clear to the Congress that the situation had become critical and that something had to be done. Many of the Federal courts had become nearly paralyzed as a result of administrative inefficiency due to the use of outmoded methods not suited to modern caseloads. Backlogs of cases in many districts were large, and it often took months to get a case to trial. Many court staff personnel were relatively untrained in their duties, and time, money, and resources were being wasted. In the face of this critical need Congress acted, and the Federal Judicial Center came into being, charged with the task of initiating a massive attack on the many administrative problems faced by the courts.

The role envisioned for the Center was threefold: education and training of all court personnel, including judges; research in specific problem areas; and innovation, which would involve the study of modern data processing and computer procedures and their application to the administration of the Federal courts.

Management of the Center was placed in the hands of a seven-member Board of Directors, to include two appellate court judges, three district court judges, and ex-officio the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Chief Justice of the United States. The Board then created four advisory committees—operations, research, continuing education, and innovation and development—to oversee the general functions and the many projects to be undertaken by the Center.

The choice of a Director for the Center was a matter of great importance. It was clear that the Center's operations would be widespread and their effects would be felt throughout the entire Federal court system. A man of superior intelligence, proven leadership ability, and considerable knowledge in the field of judicial administration was needed. It was so important that the Director be a man of stature in the legal profession, known by and capable of working effectively with judges throughout the federal system. Mr. Justice Tom C. Clark was the obvious choice.

The Justice had retired from the Supreme Court in June of 1967 when his son became Attorney General of the United States. His 18 years on the Court had given him a breadth and depth of understanding of the Federal judicial system exceeded by no other person. He was known and respected by judges and lawyers throughout the legal profession. His intelligence, compassion, and appreciation of the concepts of justice embodied in our system were reflected in many judicial opinions. Finally his consuming interest in improving the administration of justice was evidenced by his active participation in the work of the American Bar Association Section of Judicial Administration, of which he was the chairman in 1957–58. It was true that Mr. Justice Clark was approaching the age of compulsory retirement from Federal service. It was felt, however, that it was of the greatest importance to have the best possible man as the Center's first Director, since the first year or two of its operation would be crucial. Mr. Justice Clark was that man.

After Mr. Justice Clark's appointment became effective on March 22, 1968, he immediately asked Federal judges throughout the Nation for their suggestions concerning projects the Center could undertake. He personally reviewed all of the many replies received during the next few months, and, together with his staff, established a list of priorities. Several projects were then initiated.

Having passed through the initial stages of creation, staffing, and organizing, let us see what the Center under Mr. Justice Clark's leadership has accomplished to date.

In the area of education and training, three seminars for newly appointed judges have been held under the auspices of the Center. The courses were taught by experienced judges, and dealt with jurisdictional problems, trial practice and effective disposition procedures, discovery, pretrial settlements, selection of juries and their instruction, criminal litigation—including arraignment—omni-

bus hearings, expediting cases, jury management, sentences, postconviction remedies, et cetera. These seminars were attended by 89 newly appointed judges, and 18 judges of longer tenure served as faculty. Questionnaires were sent following these seminars to the judges who attended, and the answers indicated that a multitude of changes has been instituted throughout the districts as a result of the seminar experience. A fourth seminar is to be held in the near future, and two seminars for appellate judges will be held next year.

A metropolitan court conference of 24 judges from eight heavily populated districts was held in January of this year. Many topics of common interest were discussed, including comparison of filings and depositions, backlogs, State prisoner applications, counsel for indigents, central versus individual calendaring of cases, data processing in judicial administration, and many other subjects. Useful information was developed relating to problems peculiar to districts with high concentrations of people and hence heavy caseloads.

In March, a conference was held for district courts having jurisdiction along the Mexican border. The conference was attended by judges, U.S. attorneys, and probation officers. Problems peculiar to this area were discussed, such as narcotic prosecutions and wetback and immigration problems, as well as State prisoner applications and omnibus hearing techniques.

Criminal cases were also discussed at a conference in Washington in April attended by judges from the five districts having the heaviest criminal caseloads. Problems of expedition of criminal cases, use of the omnibus hearing, bail matters, parole and probation surveillance, and other topics were considered.

A conference of district court clerks was held in April which was attended by 33 clerks and deputy clerks from 19 metropolitan districts having a high percentage of civil backlog and serious criminal cases. Methods of improving office efficiency were discussed, along with docket control, efficient selection and use of jurors and automation, with the hope of evolving techniques for streamlining the operations of clerks' offices.

The chief judge of the courts of appeals met in official conference for the first time in September 1968. This meeting was followed by subsequent meetings in March and October of this year. The crucial problem is to devise ways of handling more efficiently the increasing caseload and expediting the writing of opinions. It developed that there were many different methods used through the circuits for dealing with these problems. As a result, the Center proposed that the circuits adopt a method for screening appellate petitions. This was tried experimentally in the fifth circuit, and it became apparent that over 30 percent of the cases could be resolved fairly on the briefs alone. This finding resulted in a reduction of 10 weeks in the number of formal court sessions for fiscal year 1969, and a reduction of 23 to 25 weeks in fiscal 1970, and with summary dispositions totaling approximately 500 cases. As to the delayed submission of opinions, the Center proposed that a system be instituted whereby if a judge has not filed an opinion within 3 months after a case has been assigned to him for writing, he must abstain from all other duties and devote all his time to the preparation of the opinion. A 30-day rule would apply to dissenting opinions. This procedure has been adopted in most of the circuits, and, when combined with a more effective utilization of law clerks, has had tremendous success. In the fifth circuit, for example, one judge was 46 opinions in arrears; this has been reduced to four.

The clerks of the courts of appeals met in Washington this year for the first time since 1961. There have been, of course, many significant procedural changes since then. Problems of office management, counsel relationship, habeas corpus and pro se applications, and other matters were considered. Replies to questionnaires sent out following the conference indicate a considerable number of changes have come about as a result of the conference.

This past spring and summer the Center sponsored panel discussions at all circuit conferences to better acquaint judges, lawyers, and commissioners with the operation of the Federal Magistrates Act.

The Center has helped coordinate and has participated in a number of probation officer inservice training conferences at Nags Head, N.C., and Custer, S. Dak. Other conferences are being held this fall. The Center has also participated in program formulation at the Federal Probation Training Center in Chicago. A number of courses will be conducted there in fiscal year 1970. The Center is working with outside contractors to develop an introductory magistrates program, to be conducted in the spring. Short orientation courses for part-time magistrates will also be developed.

Seven regional seminars for referees were held in fiscal year 1969, and four more are planned for 1970. A national seminar was held in Washington in September. The Center has also assisted with various courses and meetings for probation officers throughout the United States.

Through the use of modern computer techniques and analysis the Center has assisted both the courts of appeals and the district courts. With regard to the courts of appeals, the development of proposals for screening of appeal petitions, and instituting compulsory time limitations for filing opinions have already been mentioned. More effective use of law clerks throughout the system was the result of a pilot project undertaken in the fifth circuit. In addition, various studies on the operation of the courts of appeals clerks' offices have been undertaken, and the results should be available in 2 or 3 months. It is anticipated that these studies will result in recommendations as to mechanization, improved management techniques, and job descriptions which will enable these offices to operate more efficiently.

In the district courts, computer analysis of administrative procedures has had startling results. In the Eastern District of New York, the delay in the criminal calendar was the longest in the country, over 20 months from indictment to trial. Following analysis of the caseload, a preferred disposition program was instituted. This resulted in a decrease in backlog from 614 cases on March 31, 1968, to 232 cases by January 31, 1969. It is anticipated that by next April 1, the delay will be less than 6 months, the shortest of any metropolitan court.

An analysis of the caseload in the southern district of New York was equally revealing. The breakdown showed that a high percentage of the calendar was personal injury litigation and was controlled by a few law firms. The study also showed that less than 20 percent of the total caseload was carried on the active calendar, indicating that there was a serious time lag in many cases and that this was, in fact, the chief cause of docket congestion. The study also revealed that some 90 percent of the cases were settled without trial, and that if discovery were expedited further processing could be eliminated in all but 10 percent of the cases. The immediate result was the institution of a civil jury pool in October of 1968. Pool judges screen all cases for settlements, and so forth. In the 3 months of October, November, and December of 1968, 546 cases were disposed of against only 284 being terminated during the same year in 1967. Use of this technique alone doubled the disposition rate. In fact, it proved so successful that it was subsequently applied to the admiralty calendar, resulting again in a doubling of the disposition rate. As a result of this experiment, the eastern district of Louisiana is now computerizing its docket, and it is expected that a 20-percent reduction in the docket should be realized.

Computer analysis of dockets has also led to experiments in individual calendaring of cases versus master calendaring. In the eastern district of Pennsylvania, following an analysis of the dockets in November 1968, 248 cases were selected at random and assigned to two judges for individual calendaring. Another 248 cases were earmarked on the central calendar. As of February 14, 1969, a total of 177 of the 248 cases assigned for individual calendaring had been disposed of. Among the cases on the central calendar, only 29 had been terminated. As a result of this and other experiments, five metropolitan district courts have gone over to individual calendars, and the southern district of New York is trying it on an experimental basis.

Finally, surveys of the clerks' offices in the eastern district of Louisiana and in Los Angeles have resulted in the institution of modern business techniques. Also, the eastern district of Louisiana has installed a data processing program to fulfill the information requirements and recordkeeping needs of the judges, the clerk, and the U.S. attorney's and marshal's offices, and if this proves successful, the idea will be adopted elsewhere.

In the area of general research, the Center has been involved in many activities. A study is being conducted concerning the impact of automobile accident claims upon Federal and State courts. Extensive work is being done in the area

of habeas corpus applications in Federal courts by State prisoners under title 28, United States Code, section 2254. These cases seriously clog the civil dockets of the courts and also strain relations between State and Federal agencies. A committee has undertaken a survey of State postconviction remedies, with the aim of making recommendations to the States for more effective procedures. Another problem under study is the efficient utilization of jurors. Much of a juror's time after being called is unproductive, boring, and costs the Government considerable money. The aim of the study is to develop ways to use a juror's time more efficiently. As a result of findings already made, the central district of California has instituted changes which are expected to save the Government $100,000 a year in jury costs.

Studies have also been undertaken concerning psychiatric facilities for Federal prisoners, use of parole and probation rather than incarceration, Federal jurisdiction in civil disorder emergencies, and a number of other important areas.

The Center has also been responsible for a number of publications. "The Manual on Complex and Multidistrict Litigation" and the "Judges' Bench Book," a compilation of forms, have been issued to District court judges and are widely used. "The Third Branch" is a six-page bimonthly bulletin devoted to informing the judicial system of current judicial activities. "The Federal Judicial Center Report" is a serial publication through which the Center releases findings on research projects, learned articles and material developed in seminars and other programs. The Center is building a library of materials on judicial administration which it plans to make the most complete in existence.

It is quite clear that the Federal Judicial Center is off to a flying start. In a little more than a year and a half it has already made significant contributions in improving the administration of justice in the federal system. The Congress has been well rewarded for the modest financial investment that has been made in this endeavor.

There can be no doubt that institutions and organizations reflect the character of their leaders. The Federal Judicial Center would not have been the obvious success that it is today had it not been for the inspired leadership of Mr. Justice Clark. There was a critical need to reform and remold the operations of the judicial system. The task required the guidance of a truly outstanding and gifted administrator. Mr. Justice Clark was admirably suited for the task, and he can be more than proud of the results he has achieved.

A CENTURY OF THE SUEZ CANAL: LESSONS FOR THE PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 13, 1969, I quoted an illuminating article by John Brinton on the early history of the Suez Canal. Another informative article on Suez Canal history by Hon. Julian Amery, Member of Parliament, in the November 15, 1969, issue of the Daily Telegraph, evaluates the strategic significance of the closure of the canal and expresses an informed opinion concerning free world interest. This is of value as lessons in connection with the U.S.-owned and operated Panama Canal.

In order that this perceptive story by Mr. Amery may be more readily available, I include its full text as part of my remarks:

A CENTURY OF THE SUEZ CANAL

(By Julian Amery, Member of Parliament)

"East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet." In fact they have met from time immemorial at the Isthmus of Suez.

Here is the ground where the Mediterranean and Atlantic world comes together with the world of the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. It was this fact of geography which led Napoleon to call Egypt "the most important country in the world." For whoever controls Egypt controls the main gateway between West and East.

Under the Pharaohs, the Ptolemies, the Caesars and the Caliphs, Egypt enjoyed a long era of prosperity as the commercial junction between Europe and Asia. For much of the time, indeed, the Red Sea was linked by canal with the Nile and through the Nile to the Mediterranean. This canal, according to Herodotus, was wide enough to allow the passage of "two triremes abreast." One of the Caliphs closed the canal in the course of an inter-Arab quarrel. His Turkish successors charged excessive dues. Piracy and brigandage also made it unsafe.

In the 15th Century the Venetians tried, in vain, to persuade the Marmalukes to reopen the Nile-Red Sea canal. But by this time the Portuguese, advised by the Knights Templar—the CIA of the Crusades—had discovered that it was cheaper and safer to trade with Asia around the Cape than through Egypt.

Portugal and the maritime States of Western Europe rose to become the commercial leaders of the world. Venice and Genoa declined. Egypt was ruined.

FRENCH INFLUENCE

The revival of Egypt dates from the Napoleonic conquest in 1798. Napoleon judged that, if France could establish herself in Egypt, she would be in a position to threaten Britain's Indian Empire. The building of a Suez Canal had a high priority among his plans. This would have given France interior lines of naval communication between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean as compared with Britain's dependence on the Cape route.

It is questionable whether the building of a Suez Canal would in fact have altered the balance of naval power in Napoleon's time. The big sailing ships of those days were carried round the Cape by the trade winds at considerable speed. They might well have been becalmed in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Red Sea.

But with the advent of the steamship all was changed.

Despite the failure of Napoleon's expedition, French influence remained strong at the court of the Khedive. A M. de Lesseps had been French Agent-General in Egypt under Napoleon. His son, Ferdinand, had been brought up in Egypt and was a childhood friend of Said Pasha. When Said became Khedive in 1854, de Lesseps persuaded him to back the idea of a Suez Canal. He also enlisted powerful support in the Paris of Napoleon III.

The British Government resisted the project strenuously. They regard it—not without reason—as a Bonapartist plot designed to undermine Britain's position in Asia. But the technical and commercial arguments in favour of the Canal proved irresistible.

Once the Canal was opened, British policy toward it was reversed. Since we could not stop it, we must control it. Disraeli seized the chance of the Khedive's bankruptcy to buy his shares in the Suez Canal Company. Gladstone was drawn reluctantly into an occupation of Egypt. It was planned to last six months. It continued for 70 years.

The truth is that from the moment the waters of the Red Sea and the Mediterranean met, Britain could not afford to see control of the Canal pass into other hands. Despite an impressive network of international conventions designed to safeguard the rights of the Powers, the only real security for Britain's interest in Asia lay in establishing a British presence.

The occupation of Egypt had momentous consequences for Britain. It involved us in the re-conquest of the Sudan and the annexation of Uganda. It led us, in the First World War, to build a British Empire in the Middle East; and, after the Second World War, to extend it to Libya.

During the Second World War the Suez Zone became a major staging post for British aircraft bound for the East, and all the more valuable because its use saved the RAF from overflying other countries. Above all, it became the base from which Britain waged war in the Middle East and North Africa.

As long as we had control of it, our armed forces could be moved easily from Europe to the Middle East, Asia or East Africa. By the same token, Commonwealth forces could be brought there from Australia or South Africa.

After the independence of India, indeed, the Suez Zone became the fulcrum of British power in Asia.

In 1953, however, the British Government succumbed to ruthless American pressures and decided to withdraw from the Suez Canal Zone. This decision called in question the strategic unity of the Commonwealth. Suez in our hands was the gateway to Asia. In hostile hands, it could become a barrier cutting the Commonwealth in two.

It was this prospect that led to the formation of the so-called "Suez Group" in the Conservative party.

The "Suez Group" was widely regarded at the time as a body of reactionary diehards. With the advantage of hindsight, historians are likely to conclude that it was not so much Right-wing as right.

Its main argument was simple—if Britain withdrew from the Canal Zone, a power vacuum would be created which the Egyptians could not fill by themselves; the Americans might in theory take Britain's place, but from what we knew of them and of Nasser's international affiliations, the Soviets seemed more likely to inherit the prize.

The fears of the "Suez Group" were to be dramatically fulfilled. The last British soldier had scarcely left Port Said when Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal Company.

The British reacted strongly. So did the French, infuriated by Nasser's support of the Algerian rebellion. The R.A.F. destroyed the Egyptian Air Force. British and French troops landed at Port Said.

But the Americans broke the nerve of the British Cabinet by ordering their banks to sell sterling on a scale which would have broken the pound. The British and French forces ceased fire and then were pressured by the Americans into an ignominious withdrawal. Perhaps the best verdict on the expedition is one attributed to Sir Winston Churchill: "I do not know if I would have dared to start. I would never have dared to stop."

The Americans destroyed Britain's influence in Egypt, but, despite high-sounding declarations like the Eisenhower doctrine, predictably failed to take our place.

Now, as every armchair strategist knows, Egypt has become the base from which Soviet naval power extends into the Mediterranean as far as Algeria. It is from Egypt that Soviet reconnaissance aircraft shadow the American Sixth Fleet and other NATO forces. Egypt provides the bases from which Soviet support is given to the Yemen Republic and the pro-Communist clique controlling Aden.

BY THE CAPE

But in one respect the Soviets have not yet secured our full inheritance.

The Canal is blocked; and until it is reopened the Soviets cannot exploit their position in Egypt to send naval units from the Mediterranean into the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Nor can they send supplies through the Mediterranean to Vietnam.

The Western countries have largely adjusted themselves to the closing of the Canal, albeit at considerable expense. Giant tankers bring Europe's oil round the Cape at much the same price as before, and would continue to do so even if the Canal were reopened. Once again, as in the 15th century, our commerce with Asia goes via South Africa.

What is the Canal's future? The closing of this famous waterway is an undoubted inconvenience to the Mediterranean world and to the countries of the Red Sea. It is a crippling blow to the Egyptian economy.

It is difficult, however, to see how the Canal can be reopened, except in the context of a settlement between Israel and Egypt. Everyone wants a settlement in principle. But the Western Powers have little interest in encouraging the Israelis to withdraw from the Canal so long as Egypt remains a Soviet satellite.

If the Soviets withdrew from Egypt, a new situation would arise. Until then the interests of the free world are, on balance, best served by letting the Canal remain closed. Meanwhile, Egypt's loss is South Africa's gain.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, last week, my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) was kind enough to write me, advising me of his intention to chastise me this evening for my temerity in requesting the firing of Herb Klein and Dean Burch. I told him then, and I reiterate to the House now, that I appreciated his courtesy in forewarning me, and I felt that Klein and Burch had, in the gentleman from Illinois, an abler defender than they either needed or deserved.

But, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to the able gentleman, let me say that I fear he misses my point. I do not question the right of the President, the Vice President, the Director of Communications, the Chairman of the FCC, or any other person in public life to feel and to say that the press has been unfair to him. I imagine everyone in public life has felt that way, with good reason, from time to time.

What I do question, Mr. Speaker, and what gives me great cause for concern is when such a person, using the prestige and the power of his office, seeks to frighten the communications media into silence by the threat of Government regulation. Both the Vice President and the Director of Communications did precisely that, and the Chairman of the FCC, both by his words endorsing the Vice President's speech, and by his actions in summoning the nets to send him transcripts, underscored the threat.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that both the Klein television interview and the Vice President's Des Moines speech contained disclaimers of censorship. But the latter said it was time that the media were "made to be" more responsive, and the former was very specific about the possibility of government moving in. These words sounded much louder in my ears than the formal disclaimers of censorship with which they were punctuated. When, Mr. Speaker, a man holds a gun in my ribs, asks for my wallet, but denounces the use of violence, I find the gun more convincing than the denunciation.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution does not require the press to be fair. It does require it to be free. And that freedom first of all and essentially means freedom from the hand of Government regulation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Illinois. His right to denounce me stems from precisely the same constitutional concept as does the right of the press to annoy Vice Presidents. I shall continue, Mr. Speaker, to defend that freedom, and, in so doing, to defend the freedom of the former editor of the Berwyn Beacon, the gentleman from Illinois.

THE AMAZING GROWTH OF THE JAPANESE ECONOMY

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the Task Force on International Trade has been reviewing U.S. trade policy and prospects for future trade development. Throughout our discussions, the subject of Japanese competition and Japanese market potential has often been considered. The problem of Japanese protectionism has been discussed in relation to many U.S. agricultural commodities.

For those who do not fully appreciate the incredible strength of the Japanese economy, I insert in the RECORD an article carried by the Associated Press and reproduced in the Leavenworth Times of November 17, as follows:

ECONOMY GROWING AT AN AMAZING RATE: JAPAN SUPERPOWER OF THE 1980'S

NEW YORK.—One hundred and one years ago the Japanese emperor issued an advisory to his people to "discard misguided practices of the past." He encouraged them to "seek new knowledge from the rest of the world."

Thus ended three centuries of isolation. And thus also were laid the beginnings of an economic story that some observers feel is as significant to world affairs as was the growth to world leadership of the U.S. economy.

The Japanese economy is growing at an amazing rate, somewhere around 13 or 14 percent in real dollars. And the way Japanese manufacturers are plowing money back into expanded facilities, that rate may continue for years.

Match this against a rate of 5 or 6 per cent which most nations would be happy to achieve but seldom do. Japan's rate is twice that of its competitors.

Rising from economic devastation following World War II, this island nation that is physically smaller than California achieved by 1955 a production rate equal to that of its immediate pre-war years. But even faster growth was ahead, and Japan is now the third largest industrial power behind the United States and the Soviet Union.

It leads the world in shipbuilding, production of cotton yarn, motorcycles, cameras, sewing machines, watches and radios. It is the second largest producer of automobiles, turbine generators, artificial fiber and television sets. And it is third in steel, paper, cement and oil refinery products.

With such an abundant output, Japanese businessmen are scurring about the world selling their products and, in many instances scaring the daylights out of domestic companies.

There is a reason for the zeal with which Japanese businessmen approach foreign sales. Japan must export or perish. If its goods are not bought abroad, the nation could not afford to import its basic foods and raw materials.

This situation makes the Japanese story all the more amazing. Barren of raw materials, Japan depends on imports for her oil, iron, wheat, cotton, coal, timber and a long list of other products that Americans take for granted.

One of its most important imports has been technology. Starting from scratch in many areas of production, the Japanese swiftly built up their capabilities by using ideas and methods developed in other countries, adding improvements of their own.

One result is that now the Japanese production plant is more modern than that of the United States. More than 60 per cent of its machine tools are less than 10 years old, for example, compared with 39 per cent in the United States.

Whether or not Japan can continue to capitalize on the implementation of technology is a cause for concern in that nation. Japanese economists feel that their country now must invest its own research and depend less on that of others.

If it fails to produce the scientists and engineers, and if its companies do not put more money into research and development, there is some danger that the tremendous economic expansion will lose energy.

At the moment, the evidence hasn't appeared. In fact, a new book by a Swedish author, called "The Japanese Challenge," states that Japan's per capital income will exceed that of the United States in 15 years.

Haakan Hedberg, whose book is now being translated into English, will be challenged by critics and analysts. They can point out, for example, that per capita income of Japan's 100 million people will have to be tripled to equal that of the United States.

The Japanese nation has other problems also. The number of paved roads is insufficient for a nation so advanced. And highways, airports, ports and other public facilities are badly needed and will have to be built.

Despite these and other problems, the pace of the Japanese economy is so swift right now that many people are bound to accept the subtitle of Hedberg's book as an accurate forecast. It's called "Japan—The Economic Superpower of the 1980's."

THE CHALLENGE OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, we often become preoccupied with the awesome and tragic difficulties of our great cities. This

concern is a proper one and cannot be diminished by other considerations. But rural America, too, has problems. Under the leadership of Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin, the Nixon administration has forcefully called attention to the plight of our rural communities. The Secretary observes:

While rural America is the home for around a third of our people, it contains approximately 60% of the sub-standard housing and nearly half of the Nation's poor people. These facts, and the conditions associated with them, have accounted for a significant part of the large-scale rural-urban migration that has occurred during the past two decades.

The American population will increase some 100 million during the next three decades. The achievement of an economically healthy and livable rural America will surely make conditions of life more tolerable everywhere, for if the population is substantially forced into crowded center cities and suburban areas, those areas will become totally unlivable while rural America slips into a chronic condition of unrelenting recession.

I have been concerned lest the future economic vitality of rural America be ignored for other, more vocally presented needs. Accordingly, I have been principal sponsor of the Rural Job Development Act in the 90th and 91st Congresses. Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, of Kansas, the author of this important legislation, has served as principal cosponsor along with Senator FRED HARRIS, of Oklahoma, in the other body. As the Congress considers remedies to generate prosperity throughout the country, I hope the Rural Job Development Act will receive very serious consideration.

Secretary Hardin eloquently spoke of the hope and potential of rural America at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges at Chicago on November 10.

Because his remarks are of importance to every Member and directly relate to the security, prosperity, and dignity of all Americans in the very near future, I include them in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLIFFORD M. HARDIN AT THE 83D ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 10, 1969

For several reasons I welcome this opportunity to meet with old friends and colleagues in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. I continue to view my own involvement in the affairs of the Association with pride and a touch of nostalgia.

Today I will touch principally on a topic which is not new, but which is becoming urgent. I am referring to the development of rural America—that part of our great nation that lies outside of the metropolitan areas—that part which encompasses most of our geography and around a third of our people.

The further development of rural America must proceed with speed and dispatch because of the people and the problems that exist there, *and* also, because of the utter necessity of relieving the population pressures that are growing daily in our large cities.

While rural America is the home for around a third of our people, it contains approximately 60 percent of the sub-standard housing and nearly half of the nation's poor people. These facts, and the conditions associated with them, have accounted for a significant part of the large scale rural-urban migration that has occurred during the past two decades.

It is not enough that we think in terms of improving conditions and opportunity for the people living today in rural America, and thereby stemming the flow of people to the cities. We must do much more. We must make it a matter of urgent national policy that we create in, and around, the smaller cities and towns sufficiently good employment opportunities and living environments that large numbers of families will choose to rear their children there.

We are not talking about making the huge cities smaller, but in establishing conditions that will make it unnecessary for the great urban centers to have to somehow absorb most of the 100 million or so new Americans who will arrive during the next 30 years. And that most certainly will happen unless strong positive steps are taken to prevent it.

During the past 20 years the total population has grown by 54 million, and all of the growth has taken place in the metropolitan centers. Think of the prblems and the expenses involved if that pattern should continue and an additional 100 million persons were crowded into the existing urban centers in the short span of 30 years.

These are some of the things President Nixon had in mind several weeks ago when he appointed a Task Force for Rural America and requested them to "review the effectiveness of present rural assistance programs, and make recommendations as to what might be done in the private and public sectors to stimulate development."

It was recognition of this same set of conditions that prompted the President to announce just four days ago the creation of a Rural Affairs Council within the Cabinet.

In making these moves, the President hopes to establish a national rural policy that will be coordinated with the drive for a new national urban policy that has been underway for several months.

The options are as varied as the face of America. But development of the magnitude that is necessary can come about only with the most energetic and innovative efforts on the part of State and local governments working in close cooperation with persons and corporations in the private sector. The Federal departments and agencies can provide assistance, and hopefully more in the future, but initiative must invariably come from the communities themselves.

And this is where the State universities and especially the Cooperative Extension Service comes in. These institutions played a vital role in an earlier movement, from East to West as Americans tamed the frontier and built a thriving nation. The acceptance of the mandate to educate the sons and daughters of the working classes may have been the most important component in our country's development and leadership.

In any event, the institutions represented here have long experience in working effectively with people in the private sector and with people in government at all levels. You have great competence in many areas and you enjoy the well-earned confidence of the public. And this is why we call on you now to accept a position of leadership and to lend your efforts and know-how toward a mobilization of the people and the resources of rural America.

Development can occur in many directions. For example, the National Committee on Urban Growth policy—a non-government group—recommends Federal assistance in the creation of 100 new cities of 100,000 each and 10 new cities of a million each. That's a large vision! Yet even an effort as enormous as this would provide for only 20 percent of the additional people we expect in the next 30 years.

Perhaps community development can and should be based principally around existing towns and cities, thus gaining the economic advantages of existing institutions and services, existing history, culture, identity, character, and continuity.

In any case, the decisions must be made by people living within the communities and within the States. State and local policies for urban, suburban and rural growth must be decided and promoted at the State and local level.

Communities which have already exhibited strong growth potential should be helped to develop. When local community leadership and private enterprise have shown the initiative necessary for sound development, government at all levels should be willing to help.

This is in line with a philosophy expressed by President Nixon. He has stated many times his desire for the enhancement of the role and influence of State and local government and he has urged the Federal departments to cooperate fully toward this end. Additionally he has recommended to the Congress the sharing of Federal funds with State and local government.

While the initiatives are expected to come from the State and communities, it is important that the resources and services of the Federal establishment be properly ordered and directed. The role of the Rural Affairs Council is to provide this sense of direction and to bring with it the dedicated support of the President.

In announcing the Rural Affairs Council, President Nixon said:

"It is a fact of our national life that the concerns of rural America also deserve more careful consideration and more effective coordination at the highest levels of government.

"We are a nation of cities, to be sure, but we are also a nation of small towns and villages, farms and forests, mines and ranches, mountains and rivers and lakes. The people who live in rural America have urgent problems which deserve our attention. More importantly, they represent a great resource upon which all of us can draw.

"After an era in which people have moved steadily from the countryside to large and crowded cities, we must now do what we can to encourage a more even distribution of our population throughout our country. The Rural Affairs Council can help our nation to meet this challenge."

Those words reflect the President's personal support of a program that goes beyond the idea of "making rural America a better place to live"—and looks toward major changes in the distribution of population in America—toward giving Americans *a real choice* as to where they want to live.

The Rural Affairs Council includes those officers of Cabinet level whose agencies can make a significant contribution to community development. The Council includes:

The President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Budget and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

The Rural Affairs Council will ensure that the government is a full partner, that all the programs that have application to rural America will be brought to bear—HUD's housing and planning money, Labor Department's training programs, HEW's educational and assistance programs, Commerce Department's economic development projects, the Small Business Administration's funds and guidance, these and many others.

The Council will carry on the closest co-

operation with the Urban Affairs Council, and other Federal agencies.

Specifically, the Rural Affairs Council will seek to:

Achieve coordination between Federal departments in all matters that may affect rural Americans.

Encourage decentralization of government and coordination of programs between the Federal and State and local governments.

Encourage the effective utilization of voluntary organizations.

Secure up-to-date comprehensive information on the problems that confront rural America. Then identify the causes of those problems and develop solutions, either through existing programs or by initiating new programs.

Encourage action on a regional, State and local basis.

We will seek to improve the effectiveness and timeliness of delivery of public services to rural America. Still, program responsibilities must remain vested to the greatest possible extent in State and local government.

The recommendations of the President's Task Force on Rural Development should provide guidelines for this work.

Immediately, we will get to work on such problems as:

The best means of creating new jobs and new economic opportunity to rural America.

How best to adapt extensive manpower training programs to small towns and rural areas.

How best to ensure decent housing for more rural people.

Within the Department of Agriculture, we are moving in several ways to meet the challenge that the President has put before us.

We are asking the Federal Extension Service to work closely with the State Extension directors. In turn we are hoping that the Cooperative Extension Services will assume a leadership role in organizing and promoting community interest.

In urging this role for Extension, we are in no way reducing the responsibility of the other agencies of the Department.

Every agency in the Department with a contribution to make to rural development has been directed to provide aggressive leadership in its area, assigning appropriate resources and personnel to the effort.

We plan to choose a few special project areas in which to concentrate all Federal activities—areas that represent specific problems in rural America. We expect to learn a lot in those areas that will be useful in the rest of America, both urban and rural.

You know the programs of the Department that are especially important in rural development: the housing, water and sewer loans of the Farmers Home Administration; the small watersheds and resource conservation and development programs of the Soil Conservation Service; the credit potentials of REA and the resource surveys and development programs of the Forest Service. They are most effective when employed in coordination with all other available resources.

The administrators of these agencies, the FHA, SCS, REA, Forest Service, along with the Federal Extension Service, are meeting now as the Departmental Rural Development Committee. As a group, their assignment is to develop the vital policies, programs and priorities necessary for the Department to carry out its rural development mandate.

Dr. Tom Cowden, Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation, is chairman of this group. He will have a special rural development staff to assist him in program coordination and leadership.

Each member of this committee will be assigned specific liaison responsibilities with other departments of the Federal government, on a similarity-of-service basis. For example, the Farmers Home Administration will assign key men to coordinate with Housing and Urban Development.

Each agency also will be maintaining liaison with national organizations to help make their programs and services more available to rural people and their communities.

One of the key elements of USDA's rural development organization will be the committees set up in each State by the Director of that State's Cooperative Extension Service. These committees will maintain liaison with State governments, other agencies and whatever organizations are involved in the development of our countryside.

Department members on these committees in each State will be representatives of the Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration and Rural Electrification Administration. They will provide whatever staff services are needed to support activities of the committee.

These committees will decide what kind of USDA rural development organization should be established on a local basis.

Rural development begins at home. It is the responsibility of State and local organizations, groups and leaders. They will provide the channel through which the people may improve their situations: analyzing their local needs, assessing their local potentialities, matching their community's potential with private and public programs at all levels of government.

The work of the Cooperative Extension Service in these basic activities is obviously essential.

The effective development of America depends upon the Cooperative Extension Service working with public and private agencies at the State, regional and local levels. The Service is invaluable in developing an understanding of the nature of development, and in helping Federal agencies to assist in State and local development activities.

To quote from "A People and a Spirit," our joint report:

"Extension can bring cohesiveness into many community development programs through its role in educational leadership. It can help people obtain the right kind of planning, financing and technical aid from other agencies."

The role of Extension, which is significant now, will become more so as it trains new personnel to meet modern demands; as it reorganizes to provide a wider variety of experts to serve more people; as the great State Colleges and Land-Grant Universities become even more active in community development.

Again, from "A People and a Spirit":

"Extension's ability to extend the modern land-grant university to the people is limited only by the breadth of the university and Extension's willingness to function universitywide."

Each American has a role to play in determining the destiny of his country—in creating a fuller more attractive life for everyone—in both rural and urban America.

Beyond the boundaries of metropolitan America lies a fertile land of beautiful landscape, open space, rich resources and an energetic, proud people.

This rural and small town America offers opportunity and hope for a better life for all of us and our children's children, for those who prefer to live in the country and for those who prefer the city.

We can achieve this better life by joining together in common effort to reach our common and realistic goals.

THE WORLD'S MOST AMAZING BOOK

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a sermon.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the White House Sunday services on November 16. The Reverend Harold Hollings, assistant pastor of Landmark Baptist Temple, Cincinnati, Ohio, delivered a sermon that should be made available to all members.

I insert the sermon in the RECORD at this point:

THE WORLD'S MOST AMAZING BOOK

God has two textbooks, one the textbook of nature and the other the textbook of revelation. The laws of God revealed in the textbook of nature have never changed; they are what they were since the beginning. They tell us of God's mighty power and majesty.

In the textbook of revelation, the Bible, God has spoken verbally; and this spoken word has survived every scratch of human pen. It has withstood the assaults of skeptics and tyrants. Quentin Reynolds once said, "If I were a dictator, the first book I would burn would be the Bible." Greater efforts have been made to destroy the Bible than any other book. Yet despite the attacks of men, through many centuries, it remains the world's most amazing book.

It has often been reiled but it has never been refuted. It has never bowed its head before the discoveries of science. The more the archaeologist digs and the more the scientist discovers, the greater the confirmation of the truth of the Bible.

The Bible has a great tradition and a significant heritage. W. E. Gladstone said, "The Bible is stamped with a speciality of origin, and an immeasurable distance separates it from all competitors."

It was written over a period of 1600 years by men of various backgrounds—law-givers, kings, artisans, farmers, fishermen and scholars. It was written in different countries, under different social and political conditions; yet in its harmony, it is historically, doctrinally and scientifically correct.

One peculiarity of the Bible is its claim to come from God. The writers claim repeatedly that God gave them their material. Two thousand times in the Old Testament they said that God spoke. To tell more than two thousand lies on one subject seems incredible. Either He did just that, or they lied!

Jesus Christ quoted frequently from the Old Testament. He never once indicated that He doubted the Scriptures. The Apostle Paul said, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." The Apostle Peter added these words, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The Bible claims to be without a rival. It is not only a word from God, it is the Word of God.

The Bible is also permanent. Christ said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Helen Frazee-Bower expressed this truth well when she wrote:

"The books men write are but a fragrance blown
From transient blossoms crushed by human hands;
But, high above them, splendid and alone,
Staunch as a tree, there is a Book that stands
Unmoved by storms, unchallenged by decay:
The winds of criticism would profane
Its sacred pages, but the Truth, the Way,
The Life are in it—and they beat in vain."

Apart from its divine authority, there is more glowing eloquence, more noble sentiments, more melting pathos, more beautiful poetry between its covers than anywhere else. Macaulay said, "If everything else in our language should perish, the English Bible alone would suffice to show the whole extent of its beauty and power."

The Bible has done more to bless society, to promote brotherhood, commerce, happiness, peace, and liberty in the world, than any other book, and all other books together.

It humbles the lofty, and exalts the lowliest. It condemns the best, yet saves the worst. It engages the study of angels, and is not above the understanding of a little child. It shows us man raised to the position of a son of God, and the Son of God stooping to the condition of a man.

The Bible is not any heavier than a knife, but it is sharper than any two-edged sword. It is no larger than a compact in a woman's purse, but it produces more beauty than all the compacts put together. It is no thicker than a man's wallet but it contains more riches than all the banks in the world.

Our beloved country owes more than we could ever know to the teachings of Scripture. At the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, representatives from thirteen colonies came together, each with his own opinion and each so dogmatic that he would not budge an inch. They had almost decided to go back to their homes and form thirteen separate nations, when Benjamin Franklin stood and said: "I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more convincing proof I see that God governs in the affairs of man, and if a sparrow cannot fall without His notice, is it probable that a nation can rise without His aid? 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' Without His concurring aid we shall proceed no better than the builders of Babel." A prayer meeting followed and out of that prayer meeting came the Constitution of the United States, whose laws and policies are based largely upon the Word of God.

Daniel Webster said, "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible our country will go on prospering and to prosper, but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury our glory in profound obscurity."

God speaks to man through the Scriptures. This is why it is so important to read the Bible for ourselves. Most of the time we are very grateful about what we eat and how often we eat, but what about food for the inner man? How easy it is to feed the body and starve the soul. Jesus said. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The ancient patriarch Job said, "I have esteemed the words of His mouth more than my necessary food."

If men and women would only spend more time in the serious study of the Word of God, earth's questions would seem far less significant and heaven's answers far more real.

It is sometimes objected that the Bible is hard to understand. It is not hard to understand but it is hard to believe! Mark Twain once said: "Most people are bothered by those passages of Scripture which they cannot understand; but as for me, I have always noticed that the passages of Scripture which trouble me most are those which I do understand."

Bibles are to be more than depositories of memorabilia. A little boy told his Sunday school teacher that he finally had learned everything that was in the Bible. He said, "Sister's boy friend's picture is in it, so is Mom's recipe for vanishing cream, and a lock of Grandma's hair."

The blessings of God can be claimed only where the will of God is known, trusted and acted upon. If we wish to know what is in a will, we must read the will. If we want to know God's will on any subject, we must read His will. The word "Testament", legally speaking, means a person's will. The Bible contains God's last Will and Testament, in which He bequeaths to us the blessings of redemption. To know God's will we must study His Word.

Dwight D. Eisenhower said, "Like stored wisdom, the lessons of the Bible are useless unless they are lifted out and employed. A faithful reading of Scripture provides the courage and strength required for the living of our time."

God calls a man blessed who meditates in His law day and night. He goes on to say, "And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

The Bible is not only good for the soul, but also for the body. U.S. Army Private Roger Boe of Ellow Lake, Minnesota, is a First Infantry Division trooper in Viet Nam. A few weeks ago he was on patrol near Lai Khe when North Vietnamese soldiers ambushed his unit. When the firefight ended, Boe noticed smoke curling from his pocket. An enemy rifle bullet had gone through his wallet and lodged in his Bible, just short of a loaded ammunition clip.

I believe the Bible to be the Word of God because it alone has the ability to satisfy the human heart. One of the great differences between man and animal is that man has the capacity to know and worship God. Every human being has an inherent cry after God. This longing for God cannot be satisfied by science or technology.

To love God and to worship Him, you must know Him in a personal relationship. For this reason the Bible was written. The Bible teaches that the only way that man can bridge the gap between man and God is through Jesus Christ. Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

The Bible is God's "love letter" to us—telling us that His love sent His only Son, Jesus, who gave His life on Calvary for our sins. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The Word of God is the bread of life without which our spirits weaken and die, just as our bodies do if we do not eat. The Apostle Paul said, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

When Sir Walter Scott, the famous author lay on his death-bed, shattered in fortune and health, he said to his son-in-law, "Bring me the Book." "What book?" asked Mr. Lockhart. "There is but one Book," was the answer.

David said, "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." May it also be settled in our hearts and in our nation.

In a very moving tribute to the Bible, Billy Sunday takes a word-picture journey through the Scriptures. He describes it this way:

"I entered through the portico of Genesis and walked down through the Old Testament art gallery where the pictures of Abraham, Moses, Joseph, Isaiah, David, and Solomon hung on the walls.

"I passed into the music room of the Psalms and every reed of God's great organ responded to the tuneful harp of David.

"I entered the chamber of Ecclesiastes where the voice of the preacher was heard, and into the conservatory of Sharon and the lily of the valley's spices filled and perfumed my life.

"I entered the business office of the Proverbs, then into the observation room of the prophets where I saw telescopes of various sizes, some pointing to far-off events but all concentrated upon the bright star which was to rise above the moonlit hills of Judea for our salvation.

"I entered the audience room of the King of Kings and passed into the correspondence rooms where sat Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, and James penning their epistles.

"I stepped then into the throne room of Revelation and caught a vision of the King sitting on His throne in all His glory and I cried:

" 'All hail the power of Jesus' name,
Let angels prostrate fall,
Bring forth the royal diadem.
And crown him Lord of all.' "

COMPLACENCY, CANCER, AND THE FRC RADIATION GUIDELINES

(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 disease of cancer is unpleasant enough without elaborating but my concern for the population of the United States dictates that I comment on recent testimony of Messrs. Gofman and Tamplin of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory before the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. With the presentation of a paper entitled, "Federal Radiation Council Guidelines for Radiation Exposure of the Population-at-Large—Protection or Disaster," these two emminently qualified scientists have shattered the myth that the public is fully protected from the effects of atomic radiation merely because the Radiation Council exists.

The authors warn us that complacency over the FRC guidelines has created a grave situation for public safety. They presented the committee with evidence that current radiation exposure guidelines are dangerously high and suggested that the Council and the Atomic Energy Commission seek an early downward revision of the guidelines. The issue is summed up in one sentence:

> The case against perpetuation of the existing F.R.C. guidelines is overwhelmingly strong just on the basis of the cancer-leukemia risk, without even considering the potentially much larger problem of effects upon future generations.

Drs. Gofman and Tamplin explain that at one time there was a very great paucity of data concerning the dose versus effect relationship between radiation and cancer or leukemia induction in man. This lack of data contributed to the public's unawareness of the dangers of radiation. But over the past 20 years, the studies of the survivors of the Hiroshima-Nagasaki bombings, study of patients treated with radiation for nonmalignant diseases, study of the occurrence of lung cancer in uranium miners in the United States, and study of cancer and leukemia in children whose mothers had received irradiation during pregnancy, has led to the development of a body of scientific and medical knowledge about irradiation effects which should not be ignored by the public or the Federal Radiation Council.

In the interests of furthering public understanding of the potential health hazards resulting from a continuation of the present FRC guidelines, I submit for close examination by our colleagues, the paper of Messrs. Gofman and Tamplin, and call attention specifically to the addendum to their paper which lists a host of studies which have been done on this subject.

I further ask unanimous consent to put

in the RECORD the background of Dr. Gofman, as set forth in "Who's Who," because this is one scientist who cannot be sneered at for lack of scientific background in this field.

(The paper follows:)

FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL GUIDELINES FOR RADIATION EXPOSURE OF THE POPULATION-AT-LARGE—PROTECTION OR DISASTER?

(By John W. Gofman and Arthur R. Tamplin, Division of Medical Physics (Berkeley) and Bio-Medical Research Division, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory (Livermore), University of California)

(NOTE.—Excerpt from Who's Who: Gofman, John William, research biophysicist, physician; b. Cleveland, Sept. 21, 1918; s. David and Sarah (Kaplan) G.; A. B., Oberlin Coll., 1939; Ph. D., U. Calif., 1943, M.D., 1946; m. Helen Fahl, Aug. 10, 1940; 1 son, John David. Nuclear chemistry research Manhattan Project, Berkeley, 1940–44, research large molecular physical chemistry, especially ultracentrifugation of lipoproteins, Donner Lab., U. Calif., since 1947; intern Calif. U. Hosp., San Francisco, 1946–47; became asso. prof. med. physics U. Cal., 1947, now professor medical physics; dir. biomedical research division, associate director U. Calif. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore. A discoverer (with Glenn Seaborg) of Uranium 233, 1941, also discovered presence of certain blood lipoproteins associated with that form of arteriosclerosis known as atherosclerosis which is major factor in coronary artery disease. Mem. Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi. Author: (with A. V. Nichols and V. Dobbin) Dietary Prevention and Treatment of Heart Disease; What We Do Know About Heart Attacks; Coronary Heart Disease. Home: 1045 Clayton St., San Francisco 17.)

(Testimony presented before the subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, 91st Congress, Nov. 18, 1969)

We wish to apprise you that, in our opinion, the most crucial pressing problem facing everyone concerned with any and all burgeoning atomic energy activities is to secure the earliest possible *revision downward, by at least a factor of tenfold,* of the allowable radiation dosage to the population from peaceful atomic energy activities. The Federal Radiation Council allowable dose of whole body ionizing radiation is 0.17 Rads per year. We shall present to you hard evidence that leads us to recommend that this be reduced *now* to 0.017 Rads or even less. And we shall present to you the estimated disastrous consequences to the health of the public if this recommendation receives less than immediate, serious attention.

THE FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL GUIDELINES

There has been ample reason for skepticism concerning the FRC guides for many years.[1] In essence, this is the case because a valid scientific justification for the allowable dose of 0.17 Rads of total body exposure to ionizing radiation has never been presented. The general vague statement is usually repeated that the risk to the population so exposed is *believed* to be small compared with the benefits to be derived from the orderly development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Dr. Brian MacMahon, Professor of Epidemiology at Harvard, writing as recently as early 1969, stated,

"While a great deal more is known now than was known 20 years ago, it must be admitted that we still do not have most of the data that would be required for an informed judgment on the maximum limits of exposure advisable for individuals or populations".[2]

This is vastly different from the bland reassurances of The Federal Radiation Council Guidelines. We find ourselves in general agreement with Professor MacMahon, except that we go further and feel the already-documented evidence amply justifies a drastic revision *downwards*—and now.[3 4]

There is an even more hazardous situation associated with the vagueness of the justification for FRC Guidelines. This hazard has become apparent to us through extensive contact with people in radiation surveillance work, in the atomic energy industry, and in atomic energy laboratories. Widely prevalent is the notion that the existing standards have a wide margin of safety built in. Many such individuals refuse to believe that any responsible body would ever set a guideline dosage into the Federal Statutes without a wide margin of safety.

How is it possible that our current Federal Radiation Council Guidelines may have falsely lulled us into complacency? Let us trace the evidence, and restrict our considerations to two major effects of radiation upon humans, namely, cancer and leukemia—in this generation—that is effects upon those humans actually receiving the radiation. *Any conclusion* we draw concerning the hazard of the current radiation guidelines can only be amplified and buttressed by consideration of the additional burden of human misery associated with genetic defects, fetal deaths, and neo-natal deaths.[3] The case against perpetuation of the existing FRC Guidelines is overwhelmingly strong just on the basis of the cancer-leukemia risk, without even considering the potentially much larger problem of effects upon future generations.

HOW DID THE COMPLACENCY ARISE?

First of all, there once existed a very great paucity of data concerning the dose versus effect relationship between radiation and cancer or leukemia induction in man. Steadily, however, during these past 20 years, parts of the story have come to light from a combination of several extremely important sources:

(a) Study of survivors of Hiroshima-Nagasaki by the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission.

(b) Study of patients *treated* with radiation for non-malignant diseases earlier in life and then developing cancer or leukemia.

(c) Study of children who commonly received irradiation to the neck area in one unfortunate era of American Medicine.

(d) Study of the occurrence of lung cancer in uranium miners in the USA.

(e) Study of cancer and leukemia in children whose mothers had received irradiation (diagnostic) during the pregnancy.

As the early results started to come forth from the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission, it was noted that *leukemia* might be appearing more frequently in those persons irradiated in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Attention became centered upon leukemia as a sort of "special" response to ionizing radiation and not much thought was given to other forms of cancer. From the ABCC[5] studies and from wholly independent observations,[2] it is now clear, and we believe no one disputes the estimate that, at least for total doses of 100 Rads or more, the leukemia risk may be expressed as follows:

One to two cases of leukemia per 10^6 exposed persons, where each of them has received 1 Rad of total body exposure. This does not require 1 Rad per year; rather, we are talking about the above rate of disease occurrence with a total integrated exposure of 1 Rad. Furthermore, this incidence of 1 to 2 cases per 10^6 people per year persists for many years, once the latency period* is over, ultimately declining somewhat, at least for chronic leukemia[5].

An incidence rate of 1 or 2 cases per million people per year *sounds* like a small number, especially when this number is viewed in isolation. Indeed, many have hastened to add that spontaneously, without any man-made radiation, leukemia occurs with a frequency of 60 cases per million per year, which makes it a relatively rare disease. So, 1 or 2 cases per year sounds small by itself, and sounds even smaller viewed against a spontaneous rate of 60 per million persons per year. And, as a result, with the *early* atomic bomb survivor data *only* showing leukemia, a widespread complacency set in concerning long-term effects of ionizing radiation, a complacency extending to high circles.

For two very major reasons, this error in thinking has *turned out to be a mistake of the first order of magnitude.*

(1) Leukemia happens to show a shorter latency period than most other forms of cancer. Therefore, the reason it appeared *early* to be the *only* malignancy in the Hiroshima-Nagasaki survivors was simply that not enough time had elapsed for the other forms of cancer to manifest themselves.

(2) The *proper* way to look at the incidence rate of 1–2 per 10^6 persons per year from radiation and the 60 10^6 persons per year spontaneously is *not* in isolation from each other, *but in relation* to each other. Thus, viewed in this light, 1 Rad of ionizing radiation *increases* the leukemia incidence between 1.6 and 3.3%. Or, we can state that the doubling dose for leukemia (namely, that amount of radiation which will double the spontaneous rate) is between 30 and 60 Rads. (Doubling a spontaneous rate of 60 cases per million each year means producing an additional 60 cases per million per year).

WHAT ABOUT OTHER FORMS OF CANCER?

It now becomes an issue of paramount importance to know whether other forms of cancer behave similarly in response to ionizing radiation. *Are* other forms of cancer describable by a fractional increase in occurrence rate per Rad, and if so, how do the fractions compare with those for leukemia? We need no longer speculate about such matters because *hard, incontrovertible data* are available for human cancers induced by radiation. These data represent *facts, not opinion.* Estimates are available for several forms of cancer from worldwide data, US data, and from the studies by the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission of survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Let us consider a variety of forms of human cancers.

(a) Thyroid cancer: The Japanese data, primarily based upon adults, show an approximate doubling dose of 100 Rads for development of thyroid cancer, or approximately a 1% increase in incidence rate of thyroid cancer in the population per Rad of exposure of the population.[5]

We can arrive at the risk for younger people in the USA from two items of data.

(a) Pochin gives the figure of 1 case of thyroid cancer 10^6 persons per Rad.[6]

(b) Carroll et al reported that the spontaneous incidence rate for thyroid cancer is difference 5–10 cases per 10^6 persons per year in the age range of 10–20 years.[7]

Combining these two items of information, it is estimated that between 5 and 10 Rads is the doubling dose for thyroid cancer in young people in the US. This means a 10 to 20% increase in risk of thyroid cancer in the youthful population per year per Rad of exposure. Thus, considering the youthful group (USA) and the adults (Japan), the range is be-

Footnotes at end of article.

*It is a known fact, from many observations, that leukemia or cancer is *not* an immediate response to radiation. There is a period of years (different for different forms of cancer) *before* the clinical disease is manifest. This period is called the latency period.

tween 1% and 20% increase in thyroid cancer per year per Rad of exposure.

(b) Lung cancer: Estimates are available from several sources for radiation-induction of lung cancer. The ABCC studies in Japan indicate an approximate doubling of lung cancer incidence rate for 100 Rads of exposure, or a 1% increase in risk of lung cancer in the population for an exposure of 1 Rad.[5] The experiences of the uranium miners in the USA are complicated by two factors: (a) the dosimetry is poorly known, and (b) many of the workers are still in the latency period.[8] What estimates have been made for the uranium miners suggest the doubling dose for lung cancer to be between 250 and 500 Rads. If the correction for latency is estimated as two-fold, the final estimate would be 125–250 Rads as the doubling dose.[8]

Miller has questioned the Japanese data because of non-specificity of the histology of the cancer cells.[9] On the other hand, the similarity of the ratio of lung cancer to leukemia in the Japanese as compared to the British patients studied by Court-Brown and Doll suggests the Japanese data to be quite reasonable.[10] As a compromise estimate, we shall average the Japanese and USA data, to obtain 175 Rads as the estimate for the doubling dose for lung cancer, or a 0.6% increase in the annual incidence rate of lung cancer in the population per Rad of exposure.

(c) Breast cancer: Breast cancer has been found to be radiation-induced in the Japanese studies.[5] The estimated doubling dose is approximately 100 Rads for breast cancer, or, again, a 1% increase in incidence rate per year of breast cancer in the population per Rad of exposure.

(d) Other forms of cancer: From some important studies on humans receiving therapeutic radiation for the arthritis-like disorder known as rheumatoid spondylitis, Court-Brown and Doll[10] have studied the subsequent occurrence of many forms of cancer in organs heavily exposed, *incidental* to irradiation of the primary disease in the spine. We don't know that all the heavily exposed regions received equivalent doses, but it appears reasonable to estimate that the *various* heavily exposed regions were within a factor of 2 on either side of the median value for the group. If we use Court-Brown and Doll's value for bronchiogenic cancer of the lung as a reference value, and for this form of cancer we have used 175 Rads above as an estimated doubling dose, we can then estimate the doubling dose for radiation for several additional cancers. Uncertainty of precise dose comparisons make these numbers uncertain by a factor of two or thereabouts either on the low or high side. We shall, therefore, not only show the estimated doubling doses for all these additional cancers, but also a range to take this dose uncertainty into consideration. Thus, we have for the following additional cancers:

Site of cancer	Doubling dose (rads)		Percent increase in incidence rate per rad	
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Pharynx	40	(20–80)	2.5	(1.2–5.0)
Stomach	230	(115–460)	.4	(.2–0.8)
Pancreas	125	(60–250)	.8	(.4–1.6)
Bone*	40	(20–80)	2.5	(1.2–5.0)
Lymphatic plus other hematopoetic organs	70	(35–140)	1.4	(.7–2.8)
Carcinomatosis of miscellaneous origin	60	(30–120)	1.7	(.9–3.4)

(* Bone may possibly have received higher irradiation dose than other sites. If this were true, the estimated doubling dose is too low for bone.)

Note: Now we are in a position to summarize the radiation-induced cancers for all sites, utilizing all the data available.

Footnotes at end of article.

BEST ESTIMATES OF DOUBLING DOSE OF RADIATION FOR HUMAN CANCERS AND THE INCREASE IN INCIDENCE RATE PER RAD OF EXPOSURE

Organ site	Doubling dose (rads)	Percent increase in incidence rate per rad
Leukemia	30–60	1.6–3.3
Thyroid Cancer:		
Adults	100	1.0
Young persons	(5-10)	(10.0–20.0)
Lung cancer	~175	.6
Breast cancer	~100	1.0
Stomach cancer	~230	.7
Pancreas cancer	~125	.8
Bone cancer	~40	2.5
Lymphatic plus other hematopoietic organs	~70	1.4
Carcinomatosis of miscellaneous origin	~60	1.7

For such an array of widely divergent organ systems, *already including* hard data for nearly all the major forms of human cancers, it is amazing indeed that there is such a small range for the estimated doubling dose. Correspondingly, there is a very small range in the estimated increase in incidence rate per Rad for these widely differing organ sites in which cancers arise.

The only number that is different, and *that one* indicates an *even higher* susceptibility to radiation-induction of cancer, is for thyroid cancer induction in youthful persons (under 20 years of age). As we shall see below, this is *not* at all surprising or inconsistent, for the data presented below suggest a very high sensitivity of embryos in-utero to irradiation, causing subsequent leukemia and cancer during early childhood.

Furthermore, in some of these studies, aside from leukemia, the persons at risk were most probably still in the latency period when studied, so that full expression of the disease has not yet been reached. This would mean than an *even* smaller radiation dose is required to double the incidence rate, or expressed otherwise, the percent increase in incidence rate per Rad of exposure is even higher than that tabulated above. We know, from extensive other data, that bone cancer and skin cancer have definitely been produced by radiation. With further observation and study, the ABCC data will provide firm estimates of the doubling dose for the induction of cancer by radiation at the *few* remaining other major organ sites. At present the *only* malignant disease reputedly *not* induced by radiation is chronic lymphatic leukemia. And even this may be in doubt, since malignant lymphoma, a highly related cancerous disorder, is radiation-induced, both from the data of Court-Brown and Doll[10] and from Japanses data.[11]

IN UTERO-RADIATION AND SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDHOOD LEUKEMIA AND CANCER

Stewart and co-workers originally[12] and MacMahon[13 14] and Stewart and Kneale[15] recently have presented evidence that implicates in-utero radiation of embryos (carried out for *diagnostic* purposes in the mother) with the development of subsequent leukemia plus other cancers in the first ten years of life of the child. The general estimate of the amount of radiation delivered in such diagnostic procedures is 2 to 3 Rads to the developing fetus. From the Stewart and Kneale data, we have, for the following forms of cancer, the estimates of the increase in numbers of cancers for several organ sites:

[Increase over spontaneous incidence in percent]

Type of cancer	Radiation induced increase
Leukemia	50
Lymphosarcoma	50
Cerebral tumors	50
Neuroblastoma	50
Wilms' tumor	60
Other cancers	50
Leukemia [1]	50
Central nervous system tumors [1]	[1] 60
Other cancers [1]	40

[1] Similar estimates from the MacMahon data.

If we now take the central values from both the MacMahon evidence and the Stewart-Kneale evidence, we have as a best estimate, 50% increase in incidence rate for all forms of cancer plus leukemia, associated with diagnostic irradiation of the infant in-utero, and the numbers are closely similar for US practise and British practise. So, for 2–3 Reds to the infant in utero, a 50% increase in incidence rate of various cancers leads to an estimate of 4 to 6 Rads as the doubling dose for childhood leukemia plus cancer due to diagnostic irradiation in-utero. Let us underestimate the risk, and use the higher number, 6 Rads as the doubling dose for in-utero induction of subsequent leukemia plus other childhood cancers. This means a 17% increase in the incidence rate of such leukemias plus cancers per Rad of in-utero explosure of the infant.

It is not at all surprising that infants in-utero should appear *most* sensitive to irradiation, children *next* in sensitivity, and adults *third* (but *by no means* low). This is precisely the order in which these groups stand in terms of the fraction of their cells undergoing cell division at any time—and much evidence suggests these are the cells most susceptible to cancer induction.[16]

GENERAL LAWS OF CANCER INDUCTION BY RADIATION

In view of the widely diverse forms of human cancers plus leukemias showing such striking similarity in their risk of radiation induction, it does not appear at all rash to propose some fundamental laws of cancer induction by radiation in humans:

Law I: "All forms of cancer, in all probability, can be increased by ionizing radiation, and the *correct* way to describe the phenomenon is either in terms of the dose required to double the spontaneous incidence rate of each cancer or, alternatively, as the increase in incidence rate of such cancers per Rad of exposure."

Law II: "All forms of cancer show closely similar doubling doses and closely similar increases in incidence rate per Rad."

Law III: "Youthful subjects require less radiation to increase the incidence rate by a specified fraction than do adults."

Based upon these laws and the extensive data already in hand and described above, the following assignments appear reasonable for all forms of cancer.

For adults	~100 rads as the doubling dose. ~1 percent increase in incidence rate per year per rad of exposure.
For youthful subjects (<20 years of age)	Between 5 and 100 rads as the doubling dose. Between 1 and 20 percent increase in incidence rate per year per rad of exposure.
For infants in-utero	~6 rads as the doubling dose. ~17 percent increase in incidence rate per year per rad of exposure

For the radiation of infants in utero, Stewart and Kneale[15] clearly stated the outlines of these general laws. For adults, Court-Brown and Doll[10] clearly stated the outlines of these general laws.

With all the additional data available plus the data of Stewart and Kneale, MacMahon, and Court-Brown and Doll, we consider the enunciation of these general fundamental laws as having a better experimental base than many laws of physics, chemistry, or

biology had when first proposed. Furthermore, we would estimate that the absolute numbers, if anything, probably underestimate the risk. For purposes of setting radiation tolerance guidelines, one might even be advised to use lower doubling doses than those estimated above.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE LAWS FOR THE POPULATION EXPOSURE ASSOCIATED WITH ATOMS-FOR-PEACE PROGRAMS

The *statutory allowable dose* to the population-at-large in the USA is 0.17 Rads per year from peaceful uses of atomic energy in all forms. If everyone in the population were to receive 0.17 Rads per year from birth to age 30 years, the integrated exposure (above background) would be 5 Rads per person. If the risk for all forms of cancer plus leukemia is an increase of 1% in incidence rate per Rad, we have $5 \times 1 = 5\%$ increase in incidence rate for all forms of cancer plus leukemia per year.

For a popuulation of 2×10^8 persons in the USA ½ can roughly be estimated to be over 30 years of age. In this group, irradiated from birth, the latency period might, on the average, be expected to be over by $\sim$ 35 years of age.

The *spontaneous* cancer incidence is $\sim 280/10^5$ persons per year $5\% \times 280 = 14.0$. Therefore, 14 additional cancer cases per 10^5 persons per year due to irradiation.

Thus, *14,000 additional cancer cases per year* in the USA, considering *only* those over 30 years of age.

If we estimate that latency plus lower accumulated dosage provides a smaller number of additional cases in the under 30-year age group, it would by no means be an overestimate to add 2,000 additional cases for the under 30-year age group. (Especially is this true when we see the data above concerning the greater sensitivity of this group to radiation-induced cancer).

There should be added some contribution of additional cases each year to take into account the fact that 0.13 Rads will have been received by each infant in-utero. (0.17 Rads/year $\times$ 40/52 years). It is hard to know whether this in-utero radiation carries an increased cancer risk for the whole lifetime or not. The additional contribution for the in-utero radiation (at a period when the effectiveness per Rad is very high) could be between a few hundred and several thousand additional cancer cases per year. We shall not attempt to guess the additional contribution due to in-utero irradiation.

Therefore, $14{,}000 + 2{,}000 =$ *16,000 additional cancer plus leukemia cases* per year in the USA if everyone received the Federal Radiation Council statutory allowable doses of radiation. This would, for the several reasons outlined, appear to be a *minimum* value. 16,000 cases is equivalent to the mortality rate from one recent high year of the Vietnam war! It would appear that this is rather a high price to consider as being compatible with the benefits to be derived from the orderly development of atomic energy.

And we must add to these estimates the comment that we have used only the *hard data* in hand based upon cancer and leukemia induced in humans by radiation. We have said *nothing* of the additional possible burden of loss of life and misery from genetic disorders in future generations, fatal deaths, and neo-natal deaths.[3] Furthermore, we have not used the vast array of experimental animal data which indicate that not only does cancer mortality increase from irradiation, but that many, if not all, causes of death increase—and in about the same proportion as does cancer mortality.

WHAT MUST BE DONE

In the *absence of any direct evidence* in man that factors will operate to reduce these estimated cases of cancer plus leukemia, it would appear that the only sensible thing to do right now is to reduce *drastically* the Federal Radiation Council dose allowable to the population-at-large—by at *least* a factor of 10. The new figure should be below 0.017 Rads for peaceful uses of atomic energy. We are well aware that this suggestion recommends that man-made radiation exposure be limited to a *small* fraction (0.1 or less) of natural background sources.

ARE THERE ANY COUNTER-ARGUMENTS?

A *number* of counter-arguments may be raised against this proposal by some advocates of the peaceful uses of the atom. Before demonstrating to you the lack of validity of every one of these arguments in turn, we must emphasize that this is *not* a proposal against peaceful uses of the atom. Rather, it is a proposal for the use of common sense discretion in atomic energy development, weighed always in favor of the health and welfare of the people of the USA.

Argument 1: "Atomic energy projects thus far have *not* delivered 0.17 Rads to everyone in the population."

That is perfectly true! But the nuclear power industry is only now getting going, and 0.17 Rads per year *is* on the Federal Statute Books as allowable. Additionally, Plowshare proposals and industrial uses of radiation sources will surely add some increment to the population dosage.

Argument 2: *"We don't plan* to deliver the allowable 0.17 Rads per year to everyone in the population-at-large from peaceful uses of atomic energy".

We should certainly hope not! But, if it be true that such doses are unnecessary in the peaceful development of atomic energy, and if it be true that we can develop atomic energy for electric power and other uses with a much lower delivery of radiation to humans, that is indeed excellent news. Surely there can be no objection to immediate codification of this welcome news into *law* so that no one can possibly be confused by a *high* allowable standard and the concomitant promise that we will stay *well below* that figure.

We have alluded previously to our experience indicating that misinformation concerning potential hazard is widespread, with numerous responsible people in atomic energy development laboring under the impression that the *current* standards have a wide margin of safety built in. Just recently an eminent authority in nuclear safety, Professor Merrill Eisenbud, expressed his *opinion* that, "The standards contain enormous built-in conservatism" and "that 50–100 millirads per year (⅓ to ½ FRC Guideline values) will produce no harm".[17] We would indeed be relieved of our concern if Professor Eisenbud would replace his *opinion* with some hard *evidence* to refute the facts presented here today.

Industry *urgently* needs a real standard that can be expected to hold up over time, since a *later* revision downward can lead to excruciatingly costly retrofits in a developed industrial application of nuclear energy. It is *far* better to lower the guidelines for radiation exposure now and do our engineering accordingly. We believe engineering talent can direct its effort to essentially absolute containment of radioactivity *at every step* in any useful atomic energy development.

If we are fortunate enough later to find that some unknown effect operates to protect against the hazards we have demonstrated here, it will be easy enough to raise the guidelines for radiation exposure *then*. In this way we can avoid irreversible injury to our environment and to a whole generation of humans *while* we find out the true facts.

Argument 3: "We live in *'a sea of radioactivity'* and man has for time immemorial been exposed to ionizing radiation. Why worry about adding a little?"

This argument presumes that natural radiation does no harm! As we can demonstrate readily by elementary arithmetic, natural radiation, in all likelihood, does just about as much harm as we would expect from all the evidence we have laid before you.

Let us apply our factor of a 1% increase in cancer incidence rate per Rad. A reasonable value for average radiation due to natural causes is approximately 0.1 Rad per year. At 30 years of age, the average man has received $30 \times 0.1 = 3.0$ Rads of radiation from natural sources. (It is higher in some locations, and we shall consider that in a few moments).

Now $3 \times 0.1 = 3$, so we expect a 3% increase in the spontaneous cancer rate due to natural radiation. We doubt very, very much that may persons informed in this field would be prepared to argue that 3% of "spontaneous" cancer plus leukemia is *not* due to natural radiation. So, this argument concerning the sea of radioactivity falls of its own weight.

Argument 4: "But possibly there is a 'threshold' dose of radiation below which no harm accrues to man. Aren't you, therefore, unduly pessimistic about our standards?"

There are two crucial answers to this question:

1. Before the work of Stewart, Kneale, and MacMahon all the data concerning cancer plus leukemia induction in man was for total doses of 100 Rads or more. But their data for irradiation of infants in-utero are for *2 or 3 Rads*. And, even more importantly, their data indicate that each Rad may be even 10 times *more effective* in inducing cancer at these *extremely low total doses* than is each Rad at the high doses. So the threshhold concept has suffered some rather severe reverses!

2. We and others are doing experiments on human cells actively to determine the effect per Rad at various *total* doses to see if threshold type effects *ever* exist for man. But to use a *hope* that such thresholds may exist in setting guidelines for the exposure of our population *now* would seem like absolute folly.

Argument 5: "But isn't it true that delivering radiation slowly over a period of years, as would be the case for peaceful applications of atomic energy, may be less harmful with respect to cancer induction than the same dose delivered rapidly?"

It is perfectly true that, for *some* biological effects, the ability of the body to repair damage from previous radiation makes the effect of slow, protracted radiation less than for the same dose delivered rapidly. *No* evidence exists for such an effort on cancer or leukemia induction by radiation in man. Furthermore, the uranium miners received *their* irradiaton slowly over a period of years, and it appears that any protection this provides, if there *is any*, is not enough to appreciably alter any of our major conclusions.

Further, it may take 10 or 20 years to ascertain whether such protraction of radiation lessens cancer induction in man. This only militates in *favor* of redcuing the allowable dosage standards rather than against reducing them. Why, during such an interval of 10–20 years, should we take the high risk, *at the expense of the people of the USA*, of producing extensive irreversible injury?

Argument 6: "But isn't it true that some children have received large dosage of radiation to their thyroid glad from radio-iodine from fallout, as in St. George, Utah, and have failed to show a high incident of thyroid cancer?"

Let us look very closely at this issue. Tamplin has presented evidence, never refuted, that high levels of radio-iodine were indeed deposited in the St. George area during the Nevada tests *above ground* during 1952–55.[18] If children in that area consumed 1 liter of milk each day from cows grazing upon contaminated pastureland, he calculated that the radio-iodine dosage to their thyroid glands would have been approxi-

Footnotes at end of article.

mately 120 Rads. Now there are several points to consider:

(a) There are some 2,000 children in St. George, Utah.

(b) When thesee children were examined, years after the possible exposure, some of the children in St. George were those who had moved there *since* the exposure, so the true number who might have been exposed is less than 2,000.

(c) Some of the children probably didn't drink 1 liter of milk per day.

(d) Some of the cows were *not* grazing on contaminated pastureland. They were eating uncontaminated stored feed.

But, for the sake of argument, let us *assume* all 2,000 children *were* in St. George, and *did* drink 1 liter per day of radio-iodine-contaminated milk, and *did* receive 120 Rads to their thyroid glands. How much cancer should have been expected?

Again, by simple arithmetic, we can use the mid-figure for increased incidence of thyroid cancer in children per Rad as 15% of the spontaneous rate. If the spontaneous rate is the difference of 10 cases per million per year, our expectation would be, for St. George.

$$\left(\frac{2{,}000}{10^6}\right)\times\left(\frac{15}{100}\right)\times(10)\times(120)=0.36 \text{ cases per year.}$$

Thus, every three years, 1 case of thyroid cancer would be *expected*. With this expectation, one could go for 10 years and not see that one case. Further, the points mentioned above in (b) through (d) would have reduced even this small expectation! So the data from St. George, Utah don't prove at all that radio-iodine exposure *doesn't* produce cancer in children. The St. George Studies just prove if an inadequate study is done, an inadequate result is obtained.

Argument 7: "But isn't it true that living in Denver at high altitude exposes people to more cosmic radiation and that as a result their annual "natural" radiation dose is 1.5 to 2.0 times what it is at sea-level?"

The answer is, "Yes".

"Then why don't they have a higher cancer incidence than people at sea-level?"

This particular argument is brought out and burnished brightly at regular intervals.

The answer is that the excessive radiation due to cosmic rays probably produced precisely as much extra cancer in Denver as our calculations would indicate. Let us make those extremely simple calculations.

First, to compare Denver with a sea-level region, we would have to know that the medical reporting of disease categories were just as good both in Denver and the sea-level community.

Second, we would want to be sure that the people at risk in Denver had lived there all their lives, and the people at sea-level had lived *there* all their lives.

Third, we would want to be sure that all other factors, aside from radiation, were identical in Denver and the sea-level community.

We don't know all these points, but let us suppose we were satisfied on all three. Let us say, to exaggerate the case, that Denver residents get 0.2 Rads per year versus 0.1 Rads per year at sea-level. In 30 years, the average Denver resident would accumulate 6 Rads; the average sea-level resident would accumulate 3 Rads.

Using our increase in cancer incidence rate of 1% per Rad, we would estimate, for Denver, a 6% increase in the cancer incidence rate; for Sea-Level, a 3% increase in the cancer incidence rate.

So, if we set all other "spontaneous" causes of cancer at 100%, we would say, Denver residents should experience 100+6=106.

Sea-Level residents should experience 100+3=103.

No expert in the field of Vital Statistics would be prepared to contest that Denver residents might be experiencing a 3% increase in cancer incidence rate due to cosmic radiation compared with otherwise equivalent people at sea-level.

Argument 8: "But aren't medical x-rays also capable of producing cancer along the lines of your argument?"

Absolutely! There is no justification whatever for *non-essential* x-ray in the course of medical practise. Every physician should acquaint himself with the facts described above and he should be convinced that the risk to his patient is greater by *not* having a particular x-ray taken than by having it taken. There is ample evidence of a concerted campaign within the medical profession to reduce the radiation exposure through diagnostic x-rays.

Argument 9: "Why do you criticize the guidelines for radiation exposure from the development of nuclear energy for electricity generation and say nothing of the hazard to the public from fossil-fuel electricity generating plants?"

Our answer is that we don't condone homicide with knives any more than homicide with guns.

We are in the field of atomic energy and we believe our knowledge enables us to speak to the issue of atomic energy. Therefore, we are presenting the evidence upon which a reasonable set of guidelines for radiation exposure from the peaceful atom can be based. We are *not* against nuclear generation of electricity. We have great confidence that our engineers have the talent to design reactors, reprocessing plants for spent nuclear fuel, transport systems, and waste storage facilities in such a manner that any release of radioactivity that might conceivably expose humans be kept so low as to preclude harm.

If fossil-fuel plants are causing disease in our population, this issue should be evaluated as soon as possible, and the fossil-fuel generating plants should be redesigned to remove effluents that are producing harm.

The general argument that making either nuclear plants or fossil-fuel plants safe will increase the cost of electricity does not impress us. Probably a dollar per month added to electricity cost per family would allow super-clean plants either of fossil-fuel or atomic variety. We submit it is much better to pay a little more for electricity than to die prematurely of cancer or leukemia.

Argument 10: "Experts have estimated that the dosage levels we are discussing in the existing Federal Radiation Council Guidelines might only shorten the average lifespan of humans some weeks or months. Isn't this worthwhile compared to the benefits?"

Absolutely not! First, even the *average* life-shortening may be greater than estimated. Let us assume, however, that the experts are right. The real answer is that this argument is totally immoral. Let us *assume* it is true that the average life expectancy is reduced only by several weeks. But how, we must ask, does this average reduction come about? It arises because many of the victims of premature cancer (those 16,000+ cases per year we referred to previously) lose 10, 20, 30, 40, or 50 years of their potential life span. While 16,000 cases is a large number, when it is diluted into the couple of hundred million people in the country, the resulting *average* reduction of life span due to radiation-induced cancer comes out only several weeks. This monstrous hoax should stop recurring.

SOME CLOSING REMARKS TO SENATORS MUSKIE, GRAVEL, RANDOLPH, AND THEIR COMMITTEE COLLEAGUES

We believe the real area where the problem of safeguarding the public health rests is in the primary biological standards of allowable radiation exposure. We do not think the current standards are at all acceptable.

With respect to calculating how much radiation the public might receive from nuclear power reactors, underground Plowshare events, we have, in our own laboratory, (supported by the Atomic Energy Commission) developed, under Dr. Tamplin's and Dr. Ng's guidance, a handbook, "Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices", which enables anyone to calculate the radiation dose possible to any organ of the body from each and every radionuclide producible.[19] Wherever the data are inadequate, the worst possible case is assumed, in order to err always on the side of public protection. We constantly are updating this Handbook and are providing it to workers in the atomic energy field nationally and, where requested, worldwide. We welcome anyone concerned to visit our laboratory to learn, in detail, how to use this Handbook for their needs in public protection work in the radiation field. Thus, in the area of estimating possible *dosage* to humans, there exists, sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission and required for its work, a highly advanced ability for anyone who wishes to avail himself of it.*

At the same time we, both members of an Atomic Energy Commission supported laboratory, should like to speak out on two issues of major importance.

First, any release of radioactivity associated with Plowshare or other programs to regions where humans or other members of our ecosystem can possibly be exposed should be documented by a truly independent agency and made immediately available to public sources for independent review. It may well turn out that attention to injury to other members of the ecosystem may be of greater long-range relevance to man than the immediate attention to man with extensive neglect of the ecosystem which supports his life.

The U.S. Public Health Service is, in principle, such an independent agency, but in practice the overly long delay in release of their measurements for public review is unacceptable. Furthermore, in the vicinity of the Nevada Test Site the AEC can exercise control over their reporting practices. This is also unacceptable. All measurements of radioactivity releases, radionuclide by radionuclide, to any unrestricted area must be made available for public scrutiny on an immediate and, therefore, timely basis. It is doubtful that public credibility can be maintained under existing circumstances.

It is difficult to believe such requirements can really in any way compromise the National Security. If *measurements* of radioactivity releases to unrestricted areas can possibly benefit an unfriendly power, it would indeed be a paradox that such measurements are possible for a hypothetical unfriendly power while being withheld where they may impinge upon the public health and safety of citizens of the USA.

Second, we are speaking out in the strongest terms against the current guidelines for radiation exposure to the population-at-large. We are urging the Atomic Energy Commission itself to join us in seeking early downward revision of the Federal Radiation Council Guidelines.

When the AEC in 1963 requested our laboratory to undertake long range, systematic studies of the effects of Man-Made Radiation upon man, we told AEC Chairman Seaborg and (then) Commissioner Haworth that the results of our studies could very well suggest restrictions upon on-going or proposed AEC projects. We said further that we intended fully to disclose publicly any evidence

Footnotes at end of article.

*Additionally, in the Supplementary Section of this testimony is an extensive recent bibliography of contributions from our Laboratory bearing directly upon *documentation* related to possible dose from underground nuclear explosives of the Plowshare Program. We believe this Committee will find that a large body of evidence is being developed already on this subject.

developed, favorable or unfavorable to the AEC. Both commissioners assured us they were perfectly happy about this prospect—all they wanted was for us to be sure to provide the truth.

Today, we have presented your Committee with much evidence indicating that current radiation exposure guidelines are indeed dangerous—much too high. It would indeed be naive for us to believe that our recommendations will be received with enthusiasm in all quarters. To the best of our ability we have endeavored to present the truth. Our calculations, our evidence may, upon critical examination by others, prove wrong in minor respects. We doubt they will prove wrong in any major respect. The sharp cutting edge of scientific criticism, with all the evidence placed squarely in the open forum, will demonstrate any fallacies, will show where additional evidence is needed, and where errors have been made.

We intend to continue to provide critical appraisal of questions of atomic energy safety in such a manner that the evidence can be examined by the scientific and public community at large. We do not subscribe to the concern that the public might, thereby, become unduly or prematurely alarmed. If a real controversy concerning the evidence exists, the public very well ought to be alarmed, and ought to demand that we pace our technical progress in such a way always that unanswered questions are decided in favor of the health and welfare of the public.

REFERENCES

(1) Gofman, J. W. "The Hazards to Man from Radioactivity" in *Proceedings of the 3rd Plowshare Symposium, "Engineering with Nuclear Explosives"* April 21–23, 1964, Davis, California, TID–7695 (Reprinted in "Scientist and Citizen" 5–10, Aug. 1964.

(2) MacMahon, B. "Epidemiologic Aspects of Cancer", *"Ca-a Cancer Journal* for Clinicians" 19, 1, 27–35, 1969.

(3) Tamplin, A. R. "Fetal and Infant Mortality and the Environment", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist 25*, No. 10, December, 1969 (in press).

(4) Gofman, J. W. and Tamplin, A. R. "Low Dose Radiation, Chromosomes, and Cancer" Presented at "1969 Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers Symposium: Nuclear Science", Oct. 29, 1969, San Francisco, California (To be published in IEEE Proceedings, Feburary, 1970).

(5) Maki, H., Ishimaru, T., Kate, H., Wakabayashi, T. "Carcinogenesis in Atomic Bomb Survivors. *Technical Report 24–68*, Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission, November 14, 1968.

(6) Pochin, E. E. "Somatic Risks-Thyroid Carinoma", (The Evaluation of Risks from Radiation), *International Commission on Radiation Protection, Publication 8*, p. 9, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1966.

(7) Carroll, R. E., Haddon, W., Jr., Handy V. H., and Weeben, E. E., Sr., "Thyroid Cancer: Cohort Analyses of Increasing Incidence in New York State, 1941–1962". *J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 33*, 277–283, 1964.

(8) *Hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy*, "Radiation Exposure of Uranium miners". Part 2, p. 1047, 90th Congress, 1967.

(9) Miller, Robert W. "Delayed Radiation Effects in Atomic Bomb Survivors", *Science 166*, 569–574, 1969.

(10) Court-Brown, W. M. and Doll, R. "Mortality from cancer and other causes after radiotherapy for ankylosing spondylitis", *Brit. Med. J. 2*, 1327–1332, 1965.

(11) Anderson, R. E. and Ishida, K. "Malignant Lymphoma in Survivors of the Atomic Bomb in Hiroshima", *Ann. Intern. Med. 61*, 853–862, 1964.

(12) Stewart, A., Webb, J., and Hewitt, D. "A survey of childhood malignancies", *Brit-Med. J. 1*, 1495–1508, 1958.

(13) MacMahon, B. "Pre-Natal x-ray exposure and childhood cancer", *J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 28*, 1173–1191, 1962.

(14) MacMahon, B. and Hutchinson, H. *Rev. Acta Un. Int. Cancer 20*, 1172, 1964.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS OF THE BIO-MEDICAL DIVISION CONCERNED WITH THE DOCUMENTATION OF RADIOACTIVITY RELEASED IN PLOWSHARE EVENTS

[1] Anspaugh, Lynn R. Special Problems of Thyroid Dosimetry: Considerations of I^{131} Dose as a Function of Gross Size and Inhomogeneous Distribution, UCRL–12492, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (March 25, 1965).

[2] Anspaugh, Lynn R. and William L. Robison, Quantitative Evaluation of the Biological Hazards of Radiation Associated with Project Ketch, UCID–15325, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (May 8, 1968).

[3] Anspaugh, L. R., R. J. Chertok, B. R. Clegg, J. J. Cohen, R. J. Grabske, F. L. Harrison, R. E. Heft, G. Holladay, J. J. Koranda, Y. C. Ng, P. L. Phelps, and G. D. Potter, Bio-Medical Division Preliminary Report for Project Schooner, UCRL–50718, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (July 22, 1969).

[4] Anspaugh, Lynn R. and William L. Robison, "An Estimate for the Increased Risk of Thyroid Cancer as a Result of Chronic ^{131}I Exposure." (In preparation.)

[5] Anspaugh, Lynn R., P. L. Phelps, G. D. Holladay and R. E. Heft, Distribution and Redistribution of Airborne Activity Following the Schooner Event. (In preparation.)

[6] Anspaugh, L. R., J. J. Koranda, R. C. Pendleton, P. L. Phelps, W. Wagoner, Post Schooner: Radioactivity in Soil and Vegetation in Utah and Nevada. (In preparation.)

[7] Bishop, S. R., Power Sources for Extended Field Uses on Plowshare Counting. (In preparation.)

[8] Bishop, S. R., A Simple Battern Operated Open Field Gamma Recorder. (In preparation.)

[9] Burton, C. Ann and Michael W. Pratt, Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices. III. Biological Guidelines for Device Design, UCRL–50163 (Pt. III Rev. I), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1968).

[10] Chapman, William H., H. Leonard Fisher and Michael W. Pratt, Concentration Factors of Chemical Elements in Edible Aquatic Organisms, UCRL–50564, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1968).

[11] Chertok, Robert J. and Suzanne Lake, The Distribution in the Domestic Lactating Goat of Radionuclides in Inhaled Nuclear Debris from the Plowshare Excavation, Buggy (U), UCRL–50725 (SRD) Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore. (In press.)

[12] Chertok, Robert J. and Suzanne Lake, Availability in the Dog of Radionuclides in Nuclear Debris from the Plowshare Excavation Cabriolet, UCRL–71900, submitted to Health Physics.

[13] Chertok, Robert J. and Suzanne Lake, Availability in the Peccary Pig of Radionuclides in Nuclear Debris from the Plowshare Excavation Buggy, UCRL–71904, submitted to Health Physics.

[14] Chertok, Robert J. and Suzanne Lake, Biological Availability of Radionuclides Produced by the Plowshare Event Schooner. 1. Body Distribution in Domestic Pigs Exposed in the Field. (In preparation.)

[15] Chertok, Robert J. and Suzanne Lake, Biological Availability of Radionuclides Produced by the Plowshare Event Schooner. 2. Retention and Excretion Rate in Peccary Pigs after Acute Ingestion of Debris. (In preparation.)

[16] Chertok, Robert J. and Suzanne Lake, Biological Availability of Radionuclides Produced by the Plowshare Event Schooner. 3. Accumulation, Excretion Rates, and Body Distribution in Peccary Pigs after Daily Ingestion of Debris. (In preparation.)

[17] Fisher, H. Leonard, Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices. VI. Transport of Nuclear Debris by Surface and Groundwater, UCRL–50163 (Part VI), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore. (In preparation.)

[18] Gofman, John W., The Hazards to Man from Radioactivity. In Engineering with Nuclear Explosives (Proceedings of the Third Plowshare Symposium, University of California, Davis, April 21, 1964). TID–7695 (1964).

[19] Gofman, John W. and Arthur Tamplin, Low Dose Radiation, Chromosomes, and Cancer, presented at the 1969 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium, San Francisco, Calif., October 29, 1969.

[20] Grabske, Robert J., Radioecological Studies along a Fifty Mile Arc from the Project Schooner Detonation. (In preparation.)

[21] Harrison, Florence L., Radioactive Debris from Underground Nuclear Explosions: 1. Physical and Chemical Characteristics. 2. Biological Availability of the Radionuclides to Aquatic Animals. UCRL–50596, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (February 7, 1969).

[22] Harrison, Florence L. and Dorothy J. Quinn, Accumulation and Distribution of Radionuclides in Freshwater Clams, UCRL–71607 submitted to Health Physics.

[23] Harrison, Florence L., Radioactive Debris from the Nuclear Cratering Event Cabriolet. Part I. Some Physical and Chemical Characteristics, UCRL–50773 (SRD). (In press.)

[24] Harrison, Florence L., Radioactive Debris from the Nuclear Cratering Event Cabriolet. Part II. Biological Availability of the Debris Radionuclides to Representative Freshwater and Marine Organisms. (In preparation.)

[25] Harrison, Florence L., Biological Availability of the Debris Radionuclides from a recent Nuclear Cratering Event to Representative Freshwater and Marine Organisms. (In preparation.)

[26] Hatch, F. T., J. A. Mazrimas, G. G. Greenway, J. J. Koranda and J. L. Moore, Studies on Liver DNA in Tritiated Kangaroo Rats Living at Sedan Crater, UCRL–50461, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1968)

[27] Hatch, F. T., J. A. Mazrimas, J. J. Koranda, and J. R. Martin, Studies on Kangaroo Rats Living in a Tritiated Environment I. Ecology and Radiation Exposure of the Animals. (In preparation.)

[28] Heft, Robert E. and William A. Steele, Procedures for the Systematic Separation and Analysis of Radioactive Particles from Nuclear Detonations, UCRL–50428, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, (May 17, 1968).

[29] Heft, Robert E., The Characterization of Radioactive Particles from Nuclear Weapons Tests. Advances in Chemistry. (In press.)

[30] Heft, Robert E., William Phillips and William Steele, The Particle Analysis Program in the Schooner Event. (In preparation.)

[31] Holladay, Gale, Stanley R. Bishop, Paul L. Phelps and Lynn R. Anspaugh, A System for Measurement of Deposition and Resuspension of Radioactive Particulate Released from Plowshare Cratering Events. Proc. 1969 IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium, San Francisco, Calif., October 29–31, 1969. (In press.)

[32] Koranda, John J., Preliminary Studies of the Persistence of Tritium and Carbon-14 in the Pacific Proving Ground. Health Physics *11*, 1445 (1965).

[33] Koranda, John J., Agricultural Factors Affecting the Daily Intake of Fresh Fallout of Dairy Cows, UCRL–12479, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (March 19, 1965).

[34] Koranda, John J., Residual Tritium at Sedan Crater. Proc. 2nd Natl. Symp. on Radioecology, Ann Arbor, Mich., May 15–17, 1967 CONF–670503, p. 696 (March 1969).

[35] Koranda, John J., J. R. Martin and R. W. Wikkerink, Residual Tritium at Sedan Crater. Part II. Soil and Ejecta Studies. UCRL–

50360, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (Dec. 7, 1967).

[36] Koranda, John J., J. R. Martin and R. W. Wikkerink, Leaching of Radionuclides at Sedan Crater. Advances in Chemistry (in press).

[37] Koranda, J. J., J. R. Martin, R. W. Wikkerink and M. L. Stuart, Radioecological Studies on Amchitka Island, Aleutian Islands, Alaska. II. Gamma Emitting Radionuclides in the Terrestrial Environment. (In preparation.)

[38] Koranda, J. J., J. R. Martin, R. W. Wikkerink and M. L. Stuart, Tungsten 181 in Small Mammals at Schooner Crater. (In preparation.)

[39] Koranda, J. J., J. R. Martin, R. W. Wikkerink and M. L. Stuart, Specific Activity and Mass Distribution of Schooner Crater Ejecta and Debris (in preparation).

[40] Koranda, J. J., J. R. Martin, R. W. Wikkerink and M. L. Stuart, Postshot Distribution and Movement of Radionuclides in Nuclear Crater Ejecta. (In preparation.)

[41] Koranda, J. J., J. R. Martin, R. W. Wikkerink and M. L. Stuart, The Distribution of Radionuclides in Schooner Crater Ejecta. (In preparation.)

[42] Ng, Yook C., C. Ann Burton and Stanley E. Thompson, Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices. IV. Handbook for Estimating the Maximum Internal Dose from the Deposition of Radionuclides Released to the Biosphere. UCRL–50163 (Pt. IV), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1968).

[43] Ng, Yook C., C. Ann Burton and Stanley E. Thompson, Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices. IV. Handbook for Estimating the Maximum Internal Dose from Radionuclides Released to the Biosphere, UCRL–50163 (Pt. IV ADD. I), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1968).

[44] Ng, Yook C., Critical Unknowns Required for Predicting Organ and Body Burdens from the Radionuclides Produced in the Schooner Event (U), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, UCRL–50678 (SRD) (1969).

[45] Ng, Y. C., L. R. Anspaugh, C. A. Burton, and O. F. deLalla, Preshot Evaluation of the Source Terms for the Schooner Event (U), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, UCRL–50677 (SRD) (1969).

[46] Ng, Y. C. and S. E. Thompson, Prediction of the Maximum Concentrations in Milk and Maximum Dosage to Man from the Radionuclides Released in the Sturtevant Event. (In preparation.)

[47] Ng, Y. C., C. A. Burton and S. E. Thompson, Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices. IV. Handbook for Estimating the Maximum Internal Dose from Radionuclides Released to the Biosphere, UCRL–50163 (Pt. IV Revision). (In preparation.)

[48] Phelps, Paul L., Keith O. Hamby, Bernard Shore and Gilbert D. Potter, Ge(Li) Gamma-Ray Spectrometers of High Sensitivity and Resolution for Biological and Environmental Counting, UCRL–50437, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (May 24, 1968).

[49] Phelps, Paul L., Gale Holladay, Lynn R. Anspaugh, A Documentation Program for a Plowshare Nuclear Excavation Event. (In preparation.)

[50] Potter, G. D., David R. McIntyre and Deborah Pomeroy, Transport of Fallout Radionuclides in the Grass to Milk Food Chain Studied with a Germanium Lithium-Drifted Detector. Health Physics *16*, 297 (1969).

[51] Potter, Gilbert D., Deborah Pomeroy and David R. McIntyre, Residual Gamma-Emitting Radionuclides in Nevada Range Cattle as Observed with a Lithium-Drifted Germanium Detector, UCRL–70812 (1967).

[52] Potter, Gilbert D., David R. McIntyre and Gerald M. Vattuone, Biological Availability of Radionuclides from an Accidental Nuclear Venting in the Dairy Cow. (In preparation.)

[53] Potter, Gilbert D., David R. McIntyre and Gerald M. Vattuone, Biological Availability of Radionuclides in the Dairy Cow from Cabriolet (a Plowshare nuclear cratering event). (In preparation.)

[54] Potter, Gilbert D., Gerald M. Vattuone and David R. McIntyre, Maternal-Fetal Transfer of Orally Administered Radionuclides from Buggy (a Plowshare nuclear cratering event). (In preparation.)

[55] Potter, Gilbert D., Gerald M. Vattuone and David R. McIntyre, Biological Availability of Radionuclides from Schooner in the Dairy Cow. (In preparation.)

[56] Potter, Gilbert D., Gilbert M. Vattuone and David R. McIntyre, Biological Availability of Carrier-free Radionuclides in the Dairy Cow. (In preparation.)

[57] Potter, Gilbert D., Gilbert M. Vattuone and David R. McIntyre, Biological Availability of Carrier-free Radionuclides in Calf Tissues. (In preparation.)

[58] Saunders, E. W. and C. J. Maxwell, Paralleling Planar Ge(Li) Detectors for Counting Large Volume Biological Samples, IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science *NS–15* No. 1, 423 (1968).

[59] Shore, B., L. Anspaugh, R. Chertok, J. Gofman F. Harrison, R. Heft, J. Koranda, Y. Ng, P. Phelps, G. Potter and A. Tamplin, The Fate and Importance of Radionuclides Produced in Plowshare Events. Proc. U.S. Public Health Symposium, Las Vegas, Nevada, April 7–11, 1969.

[60] Tamplin, Arthur R., I–131, I–133 and Cow Milk, UCRL–14146, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1965).

[61] Tamplin, Arthur R., Discussion on "Thyroid Irradiation in Utah Infants Exposed to Iodine 131." Scientist and Citizen *8* (9), 3 (1966).

[62] Tamplin, Arthur R., Estimation of Dosage to Thyroids of Children in the U.S. from Nuclear Tests Conducted in Nevada During 1952 and 1955, UCRL–70787 (November 1967).

[63] Tamplin, Arthur R., Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices. I. Estimation of the Maximum Contamination of Agricultural Land. UCRL–50163 (Part I), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1967).

[64] Tamplin, Arthur R., H. Leonard Fisher and William H. Chapman, Prediction of the Maximum Dosage to Man from the Fallout of Nuclear Devices. V. Estimation of the Maximum Dose from Internal Emitters in Aquatic Food Supply. UCRL–50163 (Pt. V), Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore (1968).

[65] Tamplin, Arthur R., Fetal and Infant Mortality and the Environment, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Dec. 1969. (In press.)

BEAUTIFYING POWER TRANSMISSION LINES

(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, in the September issue of Transmission and Distribution, Mr. J. B. Middleton of the Pennsylvania Electric Co. outlines the program his environment improvement conscious company is undertaking to beautify power transmission lines. The program is worthy of emulation by other power companies. I know there are many conservationists and environmentalists who blithely call for the "improvement of the environment" without considering the practical and/or economic problems involved. Trying to beautify transmission lines is a case in point. When one considers that transmission lines must clear most of any surrounding structures or growth, beautification is nearly impossible. Nevertheless, the Pennsylvania Electric Co. has tackled the impossible and is succeeding. The method of success is explained in the accompanying article:

IMPROVING APPEARANCE OF TRANSMISSION R/W

(By J. B. Middleton)

Fostered mainly by the opinions and demands of the public, transmission right-of-way clearing and maintenance has recently taken on the complexion of a beauty program. Current beautification activities were unheard of ten years ago. In helping develop healthy communities in which to flourish, electric power companies are finding it desirable and necessary to enter into this beautification activity. In an effort to remove the so-called "ugliness" from all of their facilities, two of General Public Utilities Corp. subsidiaries, Pennsylvania Electric Co. and Metropolitan Edison Co., have undertaken a seven-step major beautification effort.

SELECTIVE CUTTING DURING INITIAL CLEARING

In areas were transmission line rights-of-way will be under the surveillance of the public, selective cutting is used to screen and obscure the towers and other items of construction that are necessary for a major power transmission line. At some locations where the topography is favorable, it is possible to leave all of the trees and vegetation. Taller structures and towers make it possible to span the conductors above the ultimate mature height of the trees that are growing on the right-of-way. In some locations where it is possible to leave all the trees, shrubs and other growth, the right-of-way is then barely discernible to the most observant individual.

At the most important highway crossings, both the timber type trees and the trees normally preserved in a pure selective cutting are left on the right-of-way. The tallest trees allowed to remain provide for some height growth. The preserving of the timber type trees is a temporary measure. These will be removed when they threaten the operation of the line. All of the chosen trees for the selective cutting will be preserved as a future vegetative material to reduce the observability of the line.

At highway crossings where limited public scrutiny is anticipated, available vegetation from the selective cutting list (Table 1) is left to reduce the prominence of the transmission line.

The length of the areas designated for selective cutting varies with the topography and the availability of species included in the selective cutting list. Prior to inviting line clearing contractors to bid on any transmission line, a field inspection is made to determine the location, type, and size of selective cutting areas on the line. The construction engineering sections provide allowable vegetation heights for each highway and road crossing on the proposed transmission line. This allowable vegetation height information is used to determine what kind of vegetation and how high it may be left on the right-of-way.

By working with selected line clearance contractors, it has been possible to instruct and control them so that they perform an acceptable selective cutting operation. Traditionally, transmission line construction contractors are primarily concerned with building the line efficiently. We need to work closely with contractors to avoid damage to vegetation that is left for beautification purposes.

USE OF HERBICIDES

In each of the three categories of selective cutting used to shield off the observation of transmission line rights-of-way, herbicides are used selectively to eliminate timber type trees that would re-establish themselves on the right-of-way. Either selective basal or stump treatment is employed to accomplish the elimination of these unwanted species. We use two formulas—16

lb of half and half D and T to 100 gal of solution in fuel oil or diesel oil, or 12 lb. of straight 2,4,5-T in the same amount of solution. The esters that are used in these selective treatments are limited to butoxy ethanol or propylene glycol, but they are not effective on root suckering species. Much promise, on a very limited basis, is showing up for trichloropicolinic acid, which gives hope that root suckering species will be eliminated when this herbicide is applied as a winter dormant application.

In carrying out the routine brush control management, consideration is given to the beauty of the area following the treatment. One of the requirements is that all applications within 100 ft of any highway or road shall be selective basal. In the selective basal treatment we use 16 lb of T in 100 gal of oil. Here again, if trichloropicolinic acid has the ability to kill root suckering species, much can be accomplished in the way of retaining material beauty. The two utility companies are working toward a 12-month chemical treatment program.

Much of the undesirable results can be avoided by treating timber type species during the dormant season. This dormant season in the respective service areas extends from November 1 to May 1. The routine right-of-way management program utilizes all of the available tools to assist nature. These tools are: selective basal treatment; water-borne stem-foliage treatment; preclearing selective basal; stump treatment; mist blower application; and helicopter application. With water-borne, stem-foliage applications, the advantages of each of the chemical solutions is utilized. We use 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T as esters or amines. Areas that contain no timber type trees will not be treated at all. An effort is made to isolate and treat timber type species as selectively as possible when applying the water-borne, stem-foliage treatment.

PLANTING OF VEGETATIVE SCREENS

At all newly cleared transmission rights-of-way as well as all older existing transmission rights-of-way where exposure to public viewing is great, screens of vegetation are planted to provide a shield between the observer on the highway and the power transmission facilities. The planting consists of evergreen trees, shrubs, and low growing broad leaf evergreens.

Selective cutting is more effective than transmission screen planting. However, it must be recognized that some locations are void of the chosen species covered in the selective cutting list. Here, planting may be the best solution.

IMPROVEMENT OF ROUTINE CLEARING TECHNIQUES

Where the topography permits the elevation of the conductors to give safe and reliable operation above the ultimate mature height of forest type trees, the right-of-way is left uncut or narrowed as much as construction practices can accommodate. Burning of waste materials from the clearing operation is accomplished in a manner to avoid scorching or damaging the trees adjacent to the right-of-way. Stump treatment to all stumps one inch and greater in diameter is applied where any clearing is needed. This one-inch diameter breaking point allows for timber type tree stumps to be treated and shrub species to be left untreated to later sprout and provide right-of-way cover. In special cases, where requested, selective clearing is done for the individual property owner. It is very possible that before too long, selective clearing will cover the entire length of the rights-of-way.

With the higher voltages that are now being used to transport electric power, rights-of-way are wider than before. To remove the heavy tree stems from the right-of-way, heavy equipment is mandatory. This heavy equipment rips up the right-of-way and makes it difficult to locate stumps for follow-up stump treating. Pre-treating of the trees to kill them before the right-of-way is cleared has been tried using selective basal with 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T as well as straight 2,4,5-T ester in fuel oil or diesel oil. Concentrated solutions of these materials and trichloropicolonic acid as mist blower applications are being tried.

POLE AND STRUCTURE LOCATIONS AND SIZES

Special attention is given to major highway crossings and areas of heavy public observation. To accommodate the requirements of beautification, modifications have been made in structure location and structure size. Poles have been moved to get them away from the immediate area of observation. Taller structures have been used to accommodate taller growing plant material under the conductors.

HERBICIDES VS. FOOD AND COVER VALUES OF GAME LANDS

In January 1965, the Pennsylvania Game Commission prohibited the use of any herbicides on Pennsylvania State Game Lands. They said that much game food and cover were lost due to the use of chemicals. In the spring of 1967, the Game Commissioners agreed to permit the utilities to demonstrate that application could be controlled and that the wanton destruction of food and cover would not occur. During 1967, four game land areas were treated as a part of this demonstration. The work on these four demonstration areas was accomplished by the dormant selective basal only. Judicious right-of-way management is imperative, especially where herbicides are used.

INSTALLING OF FOOD PLOTS

Two agencies in Pennsylvania, the Departmnt of Forests and Water and the Game Commission, require that designated areas be established as food plots for game on new transmission rights-of-way. Food plot preparation is the conversion of forest land to a high grade of cultivated agricultural land. This practice is expensive.

A CONSERVATIONIST VIEWS THE TIMBER SUPPLY BILL

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, working on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has taught me how complex Federal land management can be, and has given me a splendid opportunity to push hard for conservation measures.

I cosponsored the North Cascades National Park bill and was instrumental in guiding it through the House. The 1967 plan to blast an open pit copper mine in the heart of the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area drew my vehement opposition and led me to ready a bill to block the mine. In committee and on the floor of the House, the long-sought Redwoods National Park, wild rivers legislation, scenic trails bill, national seashore measures, and additions for wilderness areas had my enthusastic support.

In 1960 we had no wilderness preservation system. Today more than 14,300,000 acres are being administered under the Wilderness Act of 1964. One of the latest additions is the 520,000-acre Pasayten Wilderness in the North Cascades.

Why, you might ask, is a life-long conservationist supporting this timber supply bill (H.R. 12025) about which so many bad things have been said?

Like so many natural resources measures, the timber supply legislation might be called "the Halloween bill." Somehow these issues get the full treatment of speculation and exaggeration.

When Congress was working on the North Cascades bill, a highly respected business leader in Bellingham, Wash., said flatly that the local Georgia Pacific plant would shut down within 5 years if the bill were passed. Sportsmen's groups protested the legislation as threatening their activity. In fact, little of the timber cut in the Mount Baker National Forest was involved, and less than 1 percent of the State's deer kill was affected.

This same litany of impending doom pursued us on the Redwoods bill, the Wilderness Act, and other measures. Can it be that well-meaning persons opposed to H.R. 12025 have overlooked the complexities and purposes of national forest management?

TREES AND HOUSES

The Kerner Commission cited deplorable housing as a key factor behind violence and unrest in the Nation's inner cities. Dwelling units in the ghettos are islands of neglect. Overcrowded, poorly insulated, hospitable to rats—these are the facts of life that make slum housing like a medieval prison.

In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, a goal of 2.6 million housing starts was set for the next decade to meet the needs of our people. In addition to the urgent demand for better housing in the core cities, the children of the "baby boom" of 1943–50 are beginning to raise families of their own.

But because of tight money conditions, high interest rates, a severe shortage of commercial sawtimber, and other factors, the total number of new housing starts for 1969 is expected to be only 1 million.

Wood is used in 80 percent of American homes. It is the prime element for rehabilitating ghetto housing. Projected to 1985, our housing needs will demand an increase of about 50 percent in lumber consumption. And 100 percent by 2000. At the present time, the development of wood substitutes is moving forward but is also hindered by cost and other factors.

Trees are essential for the conservation of America, her cities, and her people.

TIMBER, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

Almost 13 billion board feet of timber was removed last year from the national forests. Roughly 3 billion board feet came from the public lands in Washington and Oregon lying west of the Cascades. Total lumber consumption in the United States amounted to 44 billion board feet, and lands owned by the timber industry itself produced about 36 percent of the harvest.

The forest products industry in the West is characterized by the large firms such as Weyerhaeuser who own vast tracts of timber and small companies that are wholly dependent on national forest timber. The latter include such local concerns as Everett Plywood, Peninsula Plywood, and Anacortes Veneer.

In the face of skyrocketing log exports to Japan and the accompanying rise in timber stumpage prices, Congress in 1968

passed a law requiring that no more than 350 million board feet of national forest timber can be sold into export each year. I worked hard for this conservation measure.

Edward P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, estimates that 10 billion board feet of public timber is lost each year owing to fire, insects and disease. He states further that there is a current backlog of 4.8 million acres needing reforestation and 13 million acres requiring thinning and other improvement work. To take care of the latter two problems, he told Congress, would cost about $900 million.

The Forest Service and other experts all agree that U.S. housing needs cannot be met unless additional funds are found to increase timber yields through modern forest management practices.

The public lands must respond to the public's needs, be they for recreation, housing, or wilderness. Because they are public lands, they belong to the hiker, to the camper, to the young married couple, and to the ghetto child now suffering and imprisoned in shameful housing.

THE PENDING BILL

In its statement of purpose, H.R. 12025 says that "increased annual harvests from national forest commercial forest land may be permitted under sound conservation principles on the basis of short-range accomplishments so long as long-range goals are assured. * * *

H.R. 12025 establishes a high-yield timber fund in the U.S. Treasury. The fund will be supplied by 65 percent of the receipts from the sale of Federal timber—existing law requires that 25 percent go to the States for schools and roads and that 10 percent be used to finance access road construction.

The funds, estimated to be some $230 million in the first year, would be deployed for reforestation, precommercial thinning, semicommercial thinning, fertilization, salvage sales, and other aspects of timber technology.

How different these sound conservation practices are from the "cut and get out" methods of the last century. Through industry and through the great forestry schools such as the University of Washington we have transformed mistakes into accomplishments. Forest ravaging has yielded to forest reclamation.

Indeed, today's professional forester is equally at home in a laboratory as in a stand of Douglas-fir. He is an ecologist who seeks to put back more than he removes. Often overlooked is his role as a star player in the growing drama of American conservation.

Estimating the precise effects of H.R. 12025 is somewhat difficult, but many persons predict that the output of timber could be increased by 60 percent. Keep in mind, too, that this is a long-range measure. No one in his right mind would sanction a "mow 'em down" logging policy.

MULTIPLE USE AND OTHER AMENDMENTS

The timber supply and conservation bill has gone through four stages as of November 1969. There was the original bill introduced in April, the substitute introduced in June, the amendments of September, and the amendments of November.

These changes should remove legitimate fears about the bill.

By far the most critical change made by the House Agriculture Committee was to require that the timber supply bill conform directly to the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960. I recommend this improvement in my testimony on the bill on May 21.

This act clarifies the organic act on national forests. The 1897 statute says that national forests are established to improve the forests, to secure favorable water flows, and to "furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States."

The 1969 act says:

> The national forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes.

In section 2 it specifies:

> The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to develop and administer the renewable surface resources of the national forests for the multiple use and sustained yield of the several products and services obtained therefrom. In the administration of the national forests due consideration shall be given to the relative values of the various resources in particular areas. *The establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this Act.*

The official Agriculture Committee report on the bill, dated November 18, carries this principle even further: "It is the understanding and expectation of the committee that H.R. 12025 shall not interfere with existing procedures for the designation of wilderness prescribed by the Wilderness Act, or with present practices for multiple-use management of the national forests under the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act."

Thus, the H.R. 12025 retains the power of the Forest Service to ban logging even on lands classified as "commercial." This power is already used frequently by the Forest Service. Not only does it ban cutting, but the Service also limits cutting as well.

In fact, H.R. 12025 applies only to commercial forest lands. Of the 186 million acres now administered by the U.S. Forest Service, only 96 million acres are classified as commercial timberlands.

Another important amendment met the objections of conservation groups by eliminating the authority for advance road building. Conservationists feared that this would be used to construct extensive new roads into areas presently roadless.

Yet another change was that which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to the Congress within 1 year first, a plan for the development and management of national forest resources, and second, a similar plan for all commercial forest lands, public and private.

This latter amendment answers the charge that the bill did not call for better timber supply and conservation practices on lands owned by the forest products industry.

LOOKING AHEAD

That H.R. 12025 serves the cause of conservation can be illustrated by a hard, political fact. Simply this: unless we take sound and practical measures to increase the timber supply, it will be much more difficult for Congress to pass wilderness, national park, and recreation bills.

The lobbying on the Redwoods measure offered a good example of this reality. Then, too, we have the 1966 plan to remove 59,000 acres from the Olympic National Park.

There are many areas in the West that deserve inclusion under the Wilderness Act. Among them in my own State are the Alpine Lakes region in the Snoqualmie National Forest and the Mount Aix and Enchantment areas in the Wenatchee National Forest. Translating these wishes into acts of Congress, however, may depend on our ability to assure larger and sustained yields of timber in the areas suitable for cutting.

OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, if eviction is a person's only experience with the law and the process server a person's only encounter with legal personnel, it is pretty difficult to have an unbiased view of our legal process. And this is doubly true if that legal process has been abused.

One of the major problems of a poor person is to obtain decent housing. Although housing and sanitary codes are in existence to insure that landlords fulfill their duty to maintain decent and safe housing conditions, they have been generally ineffective in protecting an individual tenant's rights.

The OEO legal services program has been helping to make these rights secure. In two District of Columbia landmark decisions, left standing by the U.S. Supreme Court, statutory housing provisions were "given teeth" for the protection of ghetto dwellers.

In the first case, eviction proceedings were brought against a tenant after she fell behind in her rent. Her lodgings were riddled with housing code violations at the time she made the lease. The U.S. court of appeals held that no rent was due under the lease because it was an illegal contract. The court said, "To uphold the validity of this lease agreement, in light of the defects known to be existing on the leasehold prior to the agreement, would be to flout the evident purposes" of the code.

In the second case, the client was threatened with an eviction after she complained to the city about more than 40 code violations which existed in her rented house. When inspectors ordered repair of the violations, she was sent an eviction notice. The court ruled that a landlord had no right to evict a tenant in retaliation for complaints about code violations, a customary way in which unscruplous landlords intimidate tenants from exercising their right to file such complaints. The court noted that the

housing and sanitary codes reflected a strong congressional interest in securing safe housing for slum dwellers, and that the codes depended in part for enforcement on the reporting of violations by private individuals.

Were it not for legal services, recourse to rights would be sought on the streets rather than in the courts. Legal services is doing its job.

HON. WAYNE HAYS, PRESIDENT OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor to attend the 15th session of the North Atlantic Assembly, formerly the NATO Parliamentarians Conference. I observed with considerable pride the high esteem in which our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) is held by the several representatives from the parliaments of the NATO nations. They made their respect a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, by electing him President of the North Atlantic Assembly.

It is the purpose of the Assembly to seek to strengthen political understanding and cooperation among the member countries. The parliamentarians seek to give active proof of their interest in the problems and development of the Alliance in their respective legislative assemblies. No man has demonstrated his interest more actively than has WAYNE HAYS.

It was WAYNE HAYS himself who, in 1955, sponsored legislation to authorize participation by the United States in the NATO Parliamentarians Conferences. He has served as the chairman of every delegation the House of Representatives has sent to the Assembly since that time. He also served as President of the Conference in 1956–57.

I know that WAYNE HAYS will continue to do the outstanding job he has always done in this new expanded responsibility and I want to extend my warmest congratulations on this international acknowledgment of the outstanding qualities of our distinguished colleague.

U.S. BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT OF BETTER HOUSING OVERSEAS

(Mr. MORSE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today, with my colleague from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), introducing a bill for the purpose of study and review by the Congress and the Department of State in connection with our efforts to stimulate private U.S. business participation in the development of better housing overseas.

Let me reiterate that I introduce the bill at this time, not in the expectation that the Congress will be able to act on it now, especially in view of the fact that we enacted the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 only last week, but rather in the hope that the Congress will take this opportunity to study and consider the proposal for the future. I put this before the House so that the Peterson Commission, too, can consider it as an effective device to promote housing in the developing countries.

The priority to be given to housing in our foreign assistance program is of great concern to me and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am not yet satisfied that proposals which have been brought before the committee satisfactorily encompass the importance of our housing efforts abroad, particularly as these involve the participation of private businessmen and investments of private funds from the United States. Thus, I introduce this bill in the hope that during the next session perhaps, the Congress will be able to proceed with a full exploration of the housing matter. I am hopeful, too, that this bill may contribute to that effort and form a basis for future legislative action.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, which passed the House last week, included a provision to establish an Overseas Private Investment Corporation which is intended to further increase the participation of U.S. businessmen in the total overseas development process. There is, however, a significant omission in the structure of the corporation: it does not provide for the participation of U.S. businessmen involved in homebuilding and financing activities which, in the opinion of many Members of the Congress, constitute a significant part of our foreign aid effort.

Since 1961, the housing guaranty program, particularly in Latin America, has been operating with some measure of success within the Agency of International Development—AID. It is a program which does far more than simply transfer U.S. dollars overseas and provide a supply of houses for the developing countries. This program stimulates and creates private homeownership in those countries and it introduces North American skills in producing better homes at less cost.

The Congress has continually supported this worthwhile program and has reiterated the principle that decent housing and homeownership should be a major foreign assistance objective. The housing guaranty program provides middle-income individuals the opportunity to purchase a home. This group—caught between the wealthy who need no assistance and the impoverished who receive direct Government assistance—contains a most vital segment of society: professional people, skilled workers, teachers, and civil servants.

The bill Mr. FASCELL and I are introducing today proposes that a special corporation be created for our foreign housing and home finance activities. Such a corporation, an Overseas Private Housing Corporation, would carry on the present AID housing guaranty activities in the same manner that the proposed OPIC will operate with regard to other private enterprise activities.

The housing corporation proposed in this bill would be financially self-sufficient—operating with the fees it receives and with the proceeds of the sale of shares to the private U.S. business community. Such a corporation would be capitalized initially by a transfer of the fees and reserves presently available for the AID housing guaranty programs. No appropriations would be required.

The Board of Directors would consist of nine individuals—three appointed from private life by the President, three selected by the stockholders, and three from those Government agencies most involved in housing, home finance, and the foreign aid program. The Board would be directly responsible for appointing officers and staff and for the operations of the corporation.

The purpose of the corporation proposed in this bill is similar to the purpose of OPIC. More effective and efficient operations are sought. In the housing guaranty program, for example, delays in processing applications and in approving projects have kept the present housing program from achieving its full potential. In some cases projects have been delayed for such a long period of time that the original approved sales prices are no longer realistic, other circumstances have changed, and the projects are no longer feasible.

I believe that U.S. businessmen require and should be given prompt decisions when investing their money in foreign countries. This is particularly important for housing guaranty activities because of the long development time necessary in order to produce housing.

The corporation proposed in this bill would operate independently of the State Department but would coordinate its activities with the Department. It would provide a means for carrying out, on a businesslike basis, an excellent private enterprise program. A private corporation would operate more efficiently than the present program and its independence and efficiency should encourage the participation of more United States businessmen.

I am pleased to point out that this bill has the wholehearted support of two organizations with unparalleled experience and expertise in this area: The United States Savings and Loan League and the National Association of Home Builders.

I believe that careful study by the Congress of the concept embodied in this bill, may reveal a more effective way to marshal private participation in the foreign assistance program which might hopefully lead to the more efficient operation of that program toward our stated goals.

UNITED STATES TODAY LIKE CUBA WHEN CASTRO WAS STARTING

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues and fellow countrymen the able and eloquent speech delivered by Dr. Manolo Reyes at the graduation exercises of the Cuban teacher retraining program at the University of Miami on October 23, 1969; as well as the very timely and interesting article "United States Like Cuba Was, Fidel's Ex-friend Says'" by Dr. Reyes appearing in the Coral Gables Times of November 10, 1969.

Dr. Reyes is Latin American Affairs

editor of television station WTVJ in my district and is one of our greatest advocates of friendship between the American and Cuban peoples. His voice continues to be a testament to the cause of freedom and his sentiments should be an inspiration to all of us.

His speech and article appear immediately following my remarks:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MANOLO REYES AT THE GRADUATION EXERCISES OF THE CUBAN TEACHER RETRAINING PROGRAM, UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI, CORAL GABLES, FLA., OCTOBER 23, 1969

This happy occasion reminds me of the boy that was walking on the snow and taking big steps. He was very short but nevertheless he was trying to take almost giant steps. Somebody asked him: "What are you doing?" And he answered: "I am following the footprints of my teacher."

This is to tell you, now more than ever, on your graduation day, how important your daily dealing with children and youngsters really is. You will be the mirror in which they will learn the basic matters of the subjects that you will teach them. But also the manners and reactions that you will use with them.

As time goes by, the child converted into a man will not remember the color of the jacket, or shirt, or the pants, or the suits he used to wear to school. He won't even remember the color of the necktie he liked the most during his school years. But he will always remember his best teacher. I believe that the most precious reward for a teacher is to be remembered, with affection, with gratefulness, by his pupils.

Tonight we are gathered here together for a graduation. After many months and some years, of hard work, a group of Cubans are finishing their studies to become teachers in the United States of America. I want to thank you, the faculty of the Cuban Teacher Program of the University of Miami, for giving me the privilege and the honor of addressing this meeting. As a Cuban I feel very proud of my compatriots, especially tonight.

But, also, as a Cuban, interpreting the feelings of all of you, I want to express your gratitude to the United States of America, to its people, to its government and particularly, to these wonderful teachers of the Cuban Program for their help in providing this unique opportunity to all of you. An opportunity to put you on the road to success and self pride, because the teacher is not only father and mother at school, but also a builder, a constructor of nations.

Tomorrow, when you go out to teach, I know that your teaching will have a different flavor, the expensive flavor of experience. Because, we, the Cubans, are the only ones in the Western Hemisphere that have tasted the evil of communism. We are the only ones that have lost, not permanently, but nevertheless lost, our country due to communism. And I am sure, that you, the new teachers of tomorrow, will be the best speakers for freedom. And always remember . . . that . . . Education Is Freedom. Maybe some of you will go to other latitudes of the United States, where I am sure that democracy will have in you a symbol. We the Cubans will have not only an outstanding spokesman for our oppressed people . . . but also a Cuban Ambassador in exile. His behavior will honor not only the United States, but also our beloved Cuba.

Some of you will stay in this area and will go to teach in schools with Cuban students. I don't want to sound selfish in my expressions, but remember, if the American students need your help, the Cuban youngsters may need it more than any one. He is not in his country. Outside the door of his home he is an American. Inside his home he is a Cuban.

If parents and teachers, especially you the new Cuban teachers, don't work together for his benefit, he can be lost. He is standing between two nations, but don't let him know this problem. Let him be just one of the class. Let him have the same teachings as the others. Don't make special treatment for him. Sponsor and help him to have all the class students as their friends, whether they are Americans, French, Cubans, Europeans, etc. But, bear in mind, that the Cuban youngster has to be saved for the future, because they are the leaders of tomorrow in a free Cuba. And you have to help them to maintain their heritage, their history, their language, so they will not be foreigners when they go back to their native land. And never force them to decide between their native and adopted countries. Remember, the Cubans are fighting for freedom, and in freedom they have to make their own choice. We have to respect it.

To finish these words I want to praise all of you for your efforts that culminated tonight in your graduation. In the midst of our ordeal you have increased your knowledge by hard work, and now you are full accredited teachers in this country. I repeat, I am very proud of all of you, not only because you have shown not only to the University of Miami and your teachers, but to the world, that you have been capable to have been born twice in your life also, because you were born in Cuba, and when you came to a new environment, to a different country, you stood up, and through study, you have been born again.

You have been born for the second time in your life. And I'm sure that when the time comes . . . and it will come, be sure of that . . . you will be born for the third time in your natural life. And that time will be when you will go back to the land in which you opened your eyes for the first time in this world. . . . That time will come when you will be teaching in a Free Cuba.

UNITED STATES LIKE CUBA WAS, FIDEL'S EX-FRIEND SAYS

(By Dr. Manolo Reyes)

Sometimes we take many things for granted. We believe that they are with us and will be forever.

And that is not true.

In 1956, we, the Cubans, felt very sorry about the Hungarian people crushed by the Soviet tanks when they tried to get freedom.

But we never thought that only three years later communism was going to be imposed in our country and the Cuban people would be facing the same situation of the Hungarian people.

And one of the things that brought down the nation was the student disorders!

I believe in student disagreements, and I believe in student controversy . . . but I don't believe in student anarchy just to break respect. Once respect is out, there is no authority. And without respect and authority there are no moral or spiritual values.

Furthermore, the student of today will be the husband, the wife, the father, the mother, the leader of tomorrow. And if he does not learn respect today, he will never be respected tomorrow.

I believe in the peaceful demonstrations authorized by the laws. But I don't believe in demonstrations aimed to wind up in rioting, burning, looting and sniping, because these demonstrations take advantage of the guarantees given by freedom to destroy the same freedom.

I can talk from experience. I saw many student demonstrations in Cuba.

Some of them were peaceful.

Others were done to finish in rioting. And particularly in those, a handful of professional agitators were enough to launch larger groups of innocent students to fight with the police.

And after the fight was over in many streets of Havana, and in many cities of the island, there was a charge made:

"Police brutality."

Because the students are always seen as the sons and daughters of the people, the word student always conveys the picture of a young kid, the one who is growing up.

The word "police" implies a grown up person—strong, equipped with the proper arms to defend himself. And in this mental struggle the student always won the battle in Cuba.

And how did we finish?

With communism in Cuba.

With a massive exodus.

Without a country.

I'll never forget one day that I was going out near the Alma Mater at the University of Havana.

I was studying at the Law School. That day I was going down the big staircase toward Saint Lazaro Plaza.

It was 1947. The Government of President Grau San Martin said it was planning to increase the public bus toll from five to ten cents.

All of a sudden I saw a group of about 50 students screaming and running down the big staircase of the University of Havana.

As soon as they reached the bottom, at gunpoint, they stopped a public bus that was coming and ordered all the passengers to get out.

The leader of the group screaming the most, ordered cables and ropes around the bus. And other students came to pull up the bus.

They did through the big staircase, until the bus was put side by side to the Alma Mater.

Then the ringleader got two gas cans, spread gasoline throughout the bus and set it on fire.

The leader's name was Fidel Castro.

I knew Castro because we were studying the same profession at the Law School. He was two years behind me. He is 43 and I am 45.

Castro as other so-called student leaders at the University of Havana, had long hair, mustaches and always had a gun in his belt.

His clothes were always dirty.

Of course Castro was not seen very often in classes and people speculated that the grades were made by Castro through intimidation or threats.

It can be said that the students at the University of Havana in the years I was there were divided—those who went to the University to study and those who went there to produce unrest.

The first group was the largest by a vast majority.

The second group was a very small minority, but a noisy minority that agitated and destroyed.

In the first group have to be included those honest student leaders that wanted better things for the student body.

In the second group were those who did not reject any means if with them they could get their goals, including sniping and injuring one of their own, so the police can be blamed for it.

Castro himself had been accused many times of the killing of one of the most outstanding student leaders of the University of Havana, Manolo Castro. No relation to Fidel.

And it has been said that Castro shot him in the back.

I'll never forget the day I was going to examinations for the last subject to become a lawyer.

I remembered that we were called at the Aula Magna of the Law School by the student delegate in an urgent meeting.

Hundreds of students gathered together there to listen to what he had to say. And

he explained that he was going to call for a strike against the school.

The strike would begin right there and would spread throughout the entire school.

After he made a speech full of fire, I stood up and asked his explanation of why the strike was going to be called.

The explanation was—more participation of the students in the direction of the Law School . . . and the University.

That was enough for me. I stood up again and told him that I was completely sure that he was calling that strike because he did not know the subject he had to be tested on that afternoon.

Since I had never seen him regularly in classes, I invited him to a public debate about the content of the subject.

He refused.

Then I told him in front of all the student body that if I believed his reasons were valid, I would go on the strike.

But since the whole thing was another personal matter, for his own sake, I was not in a position to accept the strike.

So, I was going to the exams.

The rest of the students stood up and voted with me and we would go on with our studies.

This is what happens in many instances. These so-called student leaders work for themselves, for their own benefit, with no regard for the sake of the others.

I saw many times the students pushed into a confrontation with the police.

The so-called leaders, meanwhile, were not with them or ran away seconds before the police arrived.

So, that's why I repeat.

We, the Cubans, know many things about student demonstrations and student riots.

We know how innocent people can be pushed into riots.

We know how the professional agitators work to create or develop these situations.

And we don't want other people to suffer what we had to face in our country.

So, that's why I believe in student rights to disagree, in student controversy to make better and healthy the road of the future . . .

But I don't believe in student anarchy to destroy respect, obedience, authority and the intangible values that makes democracy strong.

RESOLUTION OF THE DADE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION OPPOSING THE MURPHY AMENDMENT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you and Members of the House will be interested, I believe, in the resolution of the Dade County Bar Association of November 5 opposing the so-called Murphy amendment to S. 3016 in the Senate. I share the views of the Dade County Bar Association about this matter. The resolution of the Dade County Bar Association appears in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Dade County Bar Association has been advised that the United States Senate through the "Murphy Amendment" has modified Senate Bill 3016 so as to permit the governor of each state to exercise an absolute and final veto over the grant of funds to any legal services program in the state, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity legislation embodying the Murphy Amendment will now be considered by the House of Representatives,

Be it resolved, that the Dade County Bar Association considers the Murphy Amendment to be unwise, and opposes its enactment.

Dated this 5th day of November, 1969, at Miami, Florida.

FRANK A. HOWARD,
President.

Attest:

LYLE D. HOLCOMB, Jr.,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE DADE COUNTY FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS ON THE DISSEMINATION OF OBSCENE AND PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you know that our citizens are deeply concerned about the dissemination of vast quantities of obscene and pornographic material through the mails and over the country. Many of my colleagues and all of the Florida delegation have introduced legislation to curb this evil. We were very much gratified that the distinguished Dade County Federation of Women's Clubs on October 22 adopted a resolution supporting our H.R. 12627 and similar Senate bill.

A copy of this resolution appears in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The dissemination of obscene and pornographic material presents a serious threat to the morals and welfare of citizens generally and especially to the youth of our country; and

Whereas, On February 19, 1969, the late Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen introduced Senate Bill No. 1077 in the Senate of the United States to amend Title 18 and Title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; and

Whereas, On July 8, 1969, the Honorable Charles E. Bennett, the Honorable Dante B. Fascell, the Honorable Claude D. Pepper, the Honorable Bill Chappell, the Honorable Don Fuqua, the Honorable Sam M. Gibbons, the Honorable James A. Haley, the Honorable Paul G. Rogers, and the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida Members of the United States House of Representatives, introduced House of Representatives Bill No. 12627 to amend Title 18 of the United States Code by adding a section to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of eighteen years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; and

Whereas, After consideration of Senate Bill No. 1077 and House of Representatives Bill No. 12627, the members of the Dade County Federation of Women's Clubs believe it would be for the best interest of the public that such legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States,

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

1. That the Dade County Federation of Women's Clubs, of Dade County, Florida, approves and endorses, in principle, Senate Bill No. 1077 to amend Title 18 and Title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes, and House of Representatives Bill No. 12627 introduced by the aforenamed Florida Members of the United States House of Representatives to amend Title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the dissemination of materials harmful to persons under the age of eighteen years and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons, and urges the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to enact said bills into law.

2. That copies of this resolution be furnished to all Florida Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

3. That the Florida Federation of Women's Clubs be requested to adopt this resolution at its next regular meeting.

Adopted by the Dade County Federation of Women's Clubs at a regular meeting held in Miami, Florida, on October 22, 1969.

MRS. WYATT O. CRANE,
President.

MRS. JAMES W. BEVILLE, Jr.,
Secretary.

DO WE REALLY WANT AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY?

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include pertinent material.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a favorite ploy of those individuals—some well intentioned—who would reduce this Nation's defense capability, is to constantly call for an all-volunteer army. I might add, that these same individuals would also do away with the ROTC program as well as the Selective Service System. They continually refuse to face the fact, that release of induction pressure on the Army, would decimate the vaunted "volunteer" ranks of the other three services.

To those who would like to better inform themselves to the risks presented by this idea, I offer for their enlightenment, an article written by a highly qualified and distinguished American, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, U.S. Army, retired.

General Clarke, takes his expertise from many years in the military, service in three wars, and a long history of positions of command. I certainly recommend its reading.

The article follows:

DO WE REALLY WANT AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY?

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke)

Today there is much discussion about whether our country would be better served by an all-volunteer Army than by one which includes volunteers and inductees. Many of the viewpoints advanced are solidly based, while others give the appearance of being catchy slogans backed by little more than good intentions.

At first glance, the all-volunteer Army concept appears to be an attractive alternative. By permitting the elimination of Selective Service, it would do away with a target of criticism by some Americans. It is asserted that an all-volunteer Army would retain its members for longer careers thus becoming more "professional" and proficient while at the same time reducing high training costs occasioned by rapid turnover.

There are, of course, other favorable arguments for an all-volunteer military force.

My purpose here is not to attempt to destroy these arguments nor to intimate that the entire proposition does not deserve consideration. On the contrary, it seems appropriate now to introduce some further points for consideration by thoughtful military men and by American citizens generally.

At the risk of sounding less than becomingly modest, I believe that some 40 years of military service including three wars and command at nearly all levels might persuade some that what follows has a basis on fact and hard-earned experience.

If the United States adopts a policy of an

all-volunteer Army in the face of present world conditions, we may well be in for some real problems.

First off, we want a democratic Army of, and close to, our people. We want an Army that is representative of the best of all those diverse nationalities, races, creeds and conditions which make good our motto "E Pluribus Unum" (out of many—one).

A purely professional force tends to isolate itself, and to be isolated, from the mainstream of national life. It has very little positive impact on our American society and tends to be neglected by the people and their elected representatives. When this happens, adverse effects on morale rapidly reduce the effectiveness of the Nation's defense.

We want and need an Army of men meeting the required high moral, mental and physical standards. When undue enlistment and reenlistment pressures are brought about, standards tend to be lowered in order to fill quotas. For example, during one year while I was in command in Europe, 91% of the soldiers we eliminated from the Army as unsuitable were Regular Army, and most of these were on their first enlistment.

Furthermore, there is no place today in these times of rapidly evolving military technology for an army having any aging professional privates.

Today, the draft encourages many to voluntarily enlist, enroll in the ROTC, join the National Guard and the Reserve and to consider attending one of the service academies. This results from focusing national attention on service needs for quality manpower as well as from the threat of the draft.

And now comes the very practical matter of maintaining the combat elements of the Army and the Marine Corps without Selective Service. Simply stated, the problem essentially is to get officers and men whose job it is to close with the enemy and defeat him on the ground.

The hardships and hazards of duty are not equal among the Armed Services, nor are they equal among the various branches of the Army. The Infantry of the Army and the Marines incur, by far, the greatest risk. Overall casualties of the Korean War are illustrative. For the Army these were 27,604 (of which 84% were Infantry), for the Marines 4267, for the Air Force 1200 and for the Navy 458. During World War II, 89% of the Army people killed were Infantrymen and during the Korean War 92%. While these figures are not in the minds of Americans in general, their overall import is commonly understood.

Between World War II and Korea, we tried to maintain the Army without Selective Service. And, we made an all-out effort to do this. This resulted in so much stress on enlistments in the administrative and technical elements of the Army in order to learn a trade that enlistments in the combat arms were inadequate to maintain them at authorized strength.

While an important incentive, pay alone is not the answer. In this respect, one has only to look at the recruiting picture in some of those countries which pay well considering their economies and go begging for military manpower. Or, closer to home, consider the police recruiting problems of some of our leading, modern police forces where salaries and other benefits appear to be most attractive.

Now, even assuming that we could somehow build and maintain a large all-volunteer force (an assumption which I consider to be of the type that might properly earn a "U" on a staff study at one of our service schools), what happens if a crisis demands expansion? One can but imagine that the Selective Service system would have deteriorated so far that rapid response to vital national need would be impossible. This must not be permitted to happen. This system must be maintained fully and effectively even on a standby basis.

Having said all of this, it is important not to forget that we very much need to maintain a sizable and high quality volunteer career group in our Army.

And this seems a good place to point out that there are a number of things designed to increase career attractiveness which can and should be looked into:

Pay inequities.

Increase of war risk insurance (the present $10,000 figure was evolved in World War I).

More benefits to surviving wives and minor children.

More realistic educational benefits for veterans.

Retirement benefits for those completing 10 years service.

Recomputation of retired pay, on a current pay basis, to insure that inflation does not reduce to penury those retired for long honorable service.

A discharge bonus of about $1000 per year paid after completion of three years enlisted service. This might well be paid in U.S. Savings Bonds.

Other service benefits should be examined in the light of present-day economics as well as the current practices of business and industry. Those things which might be increased or improved include:

On-post housing
Medical and dental care
Post exchange goods and services
Commissary services
Rental and ration allowances

And, we would be well advised to put more thought and effort into how we handle our officers and soldiers so that when they leave the services, they will be "alumni boosters." The veteran with a favorable impression is our best recruiter.

Morale is that great intangible which separates effective armies from the poor ones. The officer-enlisted man relationship in the Army is most important. Over the past years, when we have had a proper balance of professional and citizen officers, non-commissioned officers and men, we have had a fine Army. Both volunteers and selectees have made this true.

It hardly seems the time to break up a winning combination. Rather, it seems wise to reinforce success.

CYCLAMATES BANNED—FLUORIDES SANCTIFIED

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when the first hint of danger from the use of cyclamates was noticed, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare promptly banned their use.

Then it develops that the hint came from massive doses given to rats—doses so huge that a user of soft drinks containing the substance would need to consume several hundred bottles daily for life to match the amounts. And it also develops that the removal of the products from the general market will price the remaining products, vitally necessary to persons on medically controlled restricted diets, entirely out of sight.

So Mr. Finch has protected rats by endangering diabetics.

The use of the pesticide DDT is to be severely curtailed over the next 2 years—with about the same application of balance between the potential harm and the demonstrated good. No one has shown that the product is harmful to man, but it just might be, so it is banned.

Tobacco has been condemned as harmful to health, while supposedly sophisticated social scientists beat the drums to encourage the smoking of marihuana.

An accelerated program of attacks on the effectiveness of safety of other food additives, flavorings, or preservatives can certainly be anticipated by the bureaucrats who are convinced that they alone can save the ignorant masses from themselves.

But amid all of the noise, there is a deafening silence where the fluoridation of public water supplies is concerned. People must be prevented from ingesting the food products which they are free to buy or to leave alone, but they are not to be protected from the pollution of the water which they must drink.

The double standard is very interesting. Insofar as a commercial additive is concerned, it is condemned at the slightest suggestion that it may, in a lifetime, prove to be deleterious. But with fluorine, a known poison which has been demonstrated to accumulate in the tissues, those who do not wish to receive it as medication through their public water supply must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it is harmful.

Like the question of racial equality, the value of fluoridation has been pronounced. It is a taboo—not to be questioned.

I include a column by James J. Kilpatrick and the text of H.R. 10900 which I introduced to control the use of public funds in such mass medication:

FLUORIDATED WATER ENJOYS SANCTIFIED STATUS

Recent actions by the government in regard to cyclamates and DDT remind me, somehow, of recent nonactions by the government in regard to fluoridation of public water supplies. My train of thought also passes by a junction known as genetics. Stay aboard for a moment.

On Oct. 16, Robert Finch, secretary of health, education and welfare, cracked down upon products containing cyclamates. He ordered all such diet drinks and packaged soft-drink mixes off the market by the end of the year. It was a bold and decisive step toward protection of the public health.

Why was this action taken? It appeared from certain research conducted by Abbott Laboratories that rats subjected to massive daily doses of cyclamates eventually produced a high incidence of urinary bladder tumors. Both Finch and Dr. Herbert Ley, commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, went to great lengths to stress that no evidence indicates that cyclamates in normal amounts will cause tumors in man. A soft-drink fan would have to drink 350 bottles a day for life to match the rats' exposure. Nevertheless, a remote possibility of harm existed; so out with cyclamates.

On Nov. 12, Finch made another dramatic announcement: The pesticide DDT will be forbidden for most domestic uses over the next two years. A study commission said this:

"While there is no evidence to indicate that pesticides presently in use actually cause carcinogenic (cancer) or teratogenic (birth deformities) effects in man, nevertheless, the fact that some pesticides cause these effects in experimental mammals indicates cause for concern and careful evaluation."

So out with DDT. And another billion-dollar business down the drain.

Now, it is a curious thing about the fluoridation of public water supplies. Over the last 20 years, 4,400 American communities with a population of 78 million have added a fluoride to their drinking water to reduce decay in children's teeth. Most dentists be-

lieve the additive is safe and effective. But this view is not universally held.

In March, John Lear, science editor of Saturday Review, reported upon published papers by scientists of impecable reputation, warning that fluoridation may have dangers after all. One paper came from Dr. Gerald Posen of Canada, citing the grave damage that results when fluoridated water is used in the dialysis baths of artificial kidneys.

Relatively speaking, the fluoride that flows through a dialysis bath is like the cyclamate fed to laboratory rats; it is a massive proposition. But the reaction of U.S. health officials to Lear's article and Posen's paper was pooh-pooh. The American Dental Association will not even listen to such evidence.

This transpired last month, when Dr. A. Allen London of Boonton, N.J., an expert in the field, sought a chance to speak at an ADA-sponsored symposium on fluoridation. There is mounting evidence, he said showing the possibility of side effects from lifetime ingestion of fluoride-treated drinking water. He proposed to present a scholarly summary of these findings.

On Oct. 3, he received this reply from Mary Bernhardt, secretary of the Council on Dental Health of the ADA: "The type of presentation which you are suggesting might have been appropriate a generation ago when the early scientific studies on fluoridation were being carried out. The theme of the Symposium is not controversy, but additional documentation of the universality of experience of the safety and effectiveness of fluoridation, world over. Presentation of the type of paper you propose would be an insult to the scientific community today."

In brief, fluoridation of water must be accepted, like the intellectual equality of races, as absolute dogma, not ever to be examined by anyone. Cyclamates and DDT have no such privileged standing. Away with them! But fluoridation—a compulsory process of mass medication—has become an article of faith. What price consistency in the domain of Robert Finch?

H.R. 10900

A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to promote the fluoridation of public water supplies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no part of any funds appropriated for research, or otherwise available, for expenditure by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be expended to promote, subsidize, or propagandize for fluoridation of public water supplies. Nor shall any such funds be expended to ridicule, dissuade, or disparage the opponents of fluoridation of public water supplies.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. PATMAN, on Friday, November 21, 1969, pursuant to the order of Thursday, November 20, 1969, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4293), the Export Administration Act:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-681)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Export Administration Act of 1969".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the availability of certain materials at home and abroad varies so that the quantity and composition of United States exports and their distribution among importing countries may affect the welfare of the domestic economy and may have an important bearing upon fulfillment of the foreign policy of the United States;

(2) the unrestricted export of materials, information, and technology without regard to whether they make a significant contribution to the military potential of any other nation or nations may adversely affect the national security of the United States;

(3) the unwarranted restriction of exports from the United States has a serious adverse effect on our balance of payments; and

(4) the uncertainty of policy toward certain categories of exports has curtailed the efforts of American business in those categories to the detriment of the overall attempt to improve the trade balance of the United States.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. The Congress makes the following declarations:

(1) It is the policy of the United States both (A) to encourage trade with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except those countries with which such trade has been determined by the President to be against the national interest, and (B) to restrict the export of goods and technology which would make a significant contribution to the military potential of any other nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States.

(2) It is the policy of the United States to use export controls (A) to the extent necessary to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand, (B) to the extent necessary to further significantly the foreign policy of the United States and to fulfill its international responsibilities, and (C) to the extent necessary to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security of the United States.

(3) It is the policy of the United States (A) to formulate, reformulate, and apply any necessary controls to the maximum extent possible in cooperation with all nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, and (B) to formulate a unified trade control policy to be observed by all such nations.

(4) It is the policy of the United States to use its economic resources and trade potential to further the sound growth and stability of its economy as well as to further its national security and foreign policy objectives.

(5) It is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States, and (B) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, which has the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

AUTHORITY

SEC. 4. (a)(1) The Secretary of Commerce shall institute such organizational and procedural changes in any office or division of the Department of Commerce which has heretofore exercised functions relating to the control of exports and continues to exercise such controls under this Act as he determines are necessary to facilitate and effectuate the fullest implementation of the policy set forth in this Act with a view to promoting trade with all nations with which the United States is engaged in trade, including trade with (A) those countries or groups of countries with which other countries or groups of countries having defense treaty commitments with the United States have a significantly larger percentage of volume of trade than does the United States, and (B) other countries eligible for trade with the United States but not significantly engaged in trade with the United States. In addition, the Secretary shall review any list of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, the exportation of which from the United States, its territories and possessions, was heretofore prohibited or curtailed with a view to making promptly such changes and revisions in such list as may be necessary or desirable in furtherance of the policy, purposes, and provisions of this Act. The Secretary shall include a detailed statement with respect to actions taken in compliance with the provisions of this paragraph in the second quarterly report (and in any subsequent report with respect to actions taken during the preceding quarter) made by him to the Congress after the date of enactment of this Act pursuant to section 10.

(2) The Secretary of Commerce shall use all practicable means available to him to keep the business sector of the Nation fully apprised of changes in export control policy and procedures instituted in conformity with this Act with a view to encouraging the widest possible trade.

(b) To effectuate the policies set forth in section 3, the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its territories and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this Act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person. Rules and regulations prescribed in the interest of the national security shall provide that express permission and authority must be sought and obtained to export articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information, from the United States, its territories and possessions, to any nation or combination of nations, if the President determines that (1) such articles, materials, supplies, data, or information would make a significant contribution to the military potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States, and (2) articles, materials, supplies, data, or information of comparable quality and technology to that sought to be exported are not readily available to such nation or nations from other sources: *Provided,* That express permission and authority shall be required to be sought and obtained, in accordance with such rules and regulations, in order to export to any nation or nations articles, materials, supplies, data, or information with respect to which the President has not made the determination referred to in clause (2), if the President (A) determines such action to be necessary in the interest of national security, and (B) includes in the first quarterly report submitted, pursuant to section 10, after taking such action a full and detailed statement with respect to such action setting forth the pertinent articles, materials, supplies, data, or information; the nation or nations affected thereby; and the reasons therefor. Rules and regulations prescribed under this subsection shall implement the provisions of section 3(5) of this Act and shall require

that all domestic concern receiving requests for the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements as specified in such section must report this fact to the Secretary of Commerce for such action as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of such section.

(c) Nothing in this Act, or in the rules and regulations authorized by it, shall in any way be construed to require authority and permission to export articles, materials, supplies, data, or information except where the national security, the foreign policy of the United States, or the need to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials makes such requirement necessary.

(d) The President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this Act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

(e) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) of section 3 of this Act.

CONSULTATION AND STANDARDS

SEC. 5. (a) In determining what shall be controlled hereunder, and in determining the extent to which exports shall be limited, any department, agency, or official making these determinations shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports. Consistent with considerations of national security, the President shall from time to time seek information and advice from various segments of private industry in connection with the making of these determinations.

(b) In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters, and provision shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end. In addition, there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department, or agency, or official to carry out the policies of this Act.

VIOLATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, whoever knowingly violates any provision of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. For a second or subsequent offense, the offender shall be fined not more than three times the value of the exports involved or $20,000, whichever is greater, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever willfully exports anything contrary to any provision of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder, with knowledge that such exports will be used for the benefit of any Communist-dominated nation, shall be fined not more than five times the value of the exports involved or $20,000, whichever is greater, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) The head of any department or agency exercising any functions under this Act, or any officer or employee of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof, may impose a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000 for each violation of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act, either in addition to or in lieu of any other liability or penalty which may be imposed.

(d) The payment of any penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c) may be made a condition, for a period not exceeding one year after the imposition of such penalty, to the granting, restoration, or continuing validity of any export license, permission, or privilege granted or to be granted to the person upon whom such penalty is imposed.

(e) Any amount paid in satisfaction of any penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c) shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt. The head of the department or agency concerned may, in his discretion, refund any such penalty, within two years after payment, on the ground of a material error of fact or law in the imposition. Notwithstanding section 1346(a) of title 28 of the United States Code, no action for the refund of any such penalty may be maintained in any court.

(f) In the event of the failure of any person to pay a penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c), a civil action for the recovery thereof may, in the discretion of the head of the department or agency concerned, be brought in the name of the United States. In any such action, the court shall determine de novo all issues necessary to the establishment of liability. Except as provided in this subsection and in subsection (d), no such liability shall be asserted, claimed, or recovered upon by the United States in any way unless it has previously been reduced to judgment.

(g) Nothing in subsection (c), (d), or (f) limits

(1) the availability of other administrative or judicial remedies with respect to violations of this Act, or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act;

(2) the authority to compromise and settle administrative proceedings brought with respect to violations of this Act, or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act; or

(3) the authority to compromise, remit, or mitigate seizures and forfeitures pursuant to section 1(b) of title VI of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 401(b)).

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 7. (a) To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this Act or to the imposition of any penalty, forfeiture, or liability arising under the Export Control Act of 1949, the head of any department or agency exercising any function thereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person. In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in the case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any such person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application, and after notice to any such person and hearing, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443; 49 U.S.C. 46) shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(c) No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this Act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a rquest for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information, unless, the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

(d) In the administration of this Act, reporting requirements shall be so designed as to reduce the cost of reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation required under this Act to the extent feasible consistent with effective enforcement and compilation of useful trade statistics. Reporting, recordkeeping, and export documentation requirements shall be periodically reviewed and revised in the light of developments in the field of information technology. A detailed statement with respect to any action taken in compliance with this subsection shall be included in the first quarterly report made pursuant to section 10 after such action is taken.

EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. The functions exercised under this Act are excluded from the operation of sections 551, 553–559, and 701–706, of title 5 United States Code.

INFORMATION TO EXPORTERS

SEC. 9. In order to enable United States exporters to coordinate their business activities with the export control policies of the United States Government, the agencies, departments, and officials responsible for implementing the rules and regulations authorized under this Act shall, if requested, and insofar as it is consistent with the national security, the foreign policy of the United States, the effective administration of this Act, and requirements of confidentiality contained in this Act—

(1) inform each exporter of the considerations which may cause his export license request to be denied or to be the subject of lengthy examination;

(2) in the event of undue delay, inform each exporter of the circumstances arising during the Government's consideration of his export license application which are cause for denial or for further examination;

(3) give each exporter the opportunity to present evidence and information which he believes will help the agencies, departments, and officials concerned to resolve any problems or questions which are, or may be, connected with his request for a license; and

(4) inform each exporter of the reasons for a denial of an export license request.

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 10. The head of any department or agency, or other official exercising any functions under this Act, shall make a quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter, to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder.

DEFINITION

SEC. 11. The term "person" as used in this Act includes the singular and the plural and any individual, partnership, corporation, or other form of association, including any government or agency thereof.

EFFECTS ON OTHER ACTS

SEC. 12. (a) The Act of February 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1140), relating to the licensing of exports of tinplate scrap, is hereby superseded; but nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of any other laws authorizing control over exports of any commodity.

(b) The authority granted to the President

under this Act shall be exercised in such manner as to achieve effective coordination with the authority exercised under section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1934).

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. (a) This Act takes effect upon the expiration of the Export Control Act of 1949.

(b) All outstanding delegations, rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under the Export Control Act of 1949 or section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), shall, until amended or revoked, remain in full force and effect, the same as if promulgated under this Act.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 14. The authority granted by this Act terminates on June 30, 1971, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

And the Senate agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
WALTER F. MONDALE,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
JOHN G. TOWER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4293) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate-passed bill proposed to let the existing Export Control Act expire on its termination date and proposed to regulate and promote the expansion of exports thereafter under authority of a new act. The House, on the other hand, had passed a bill to extend for 2 years the existing Export Control Act of 1949 with one amendment to the findings, one to the grant of authority and one to the section on enforcement.

The Senate had struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and had inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference agreed to a substitute for both the Senate amendment and the House bill. With respect to the form of the conference substitute, the managers on the part of the House agreed to the appropriateness of enacting a new law to take effect on the expiration of the existing act. However, a great many of the provisions of the existing law would be, in effect, reenacted under the conference substitute. Under it, the President retains plenary power to control exports.

Except for technical, clarifying and conforming changes, the section-by-section summary which follows explains the differences between the Senate amendment, the House bill and the conference substitute.

Full presidential regulatory authority preserved

The managers on the part of the House insisted upon and prevailed in their position that the legislation in conference was for purposes of regulation and control, not for the purpose of trade expansion, and that the President continue to possess full authority to control exports for reasons of national security, foreign policy and short supply.

Export expansion commission rejected

The Senate-passed amendment called for the establishment of an Export Expansion Commission composed of 15 members to be appointed by the President to study ways to promote, with special emphasis, trade with countries with which our allies have a significantly larger percentage of trade than does the United States. The managers on the part of the House, while recognizing the need and benefits of a continuing and expanded foreign trade, objected and prevailed, pointing out that the purpose of the legislation is regulation and control. In five other instances, Senate language with respect to expansion or promotion was rejected by the House managers.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

Short title

The Senate amendment describes the title of the bill as "Export Expansion and Regulation Act of 1969." The conference substitute cites the proposed act as the "Export Administration Act of 1969".

Findings

National Security

Section 2(2) of the Senate amendment found that "the unrestricted export of materials without regard to whether they make a significant contribution to the military potential of any other nation or nations may adversely affect the national security of the United States." The House bill made no mention of "significant contributions to the military potential" but included "information" and "technology" in addition to "materials." The conference substitute, with the addition of the House language "information" and "technology," contains the Senate provision.

Balance of Payments and Trade

The Senate amendment contained, in sections 2(3) and 2(4), two additional findings which take into account changes in the international economy which have taken place over the last 20 years. Section 2(3), as modified and accepted by the House managers, finds that unwarranted restrictions have a serious adverse effect on our balance of payments. Section 2(4), also modified and accepted by the House managers, finds that uncertainty of policy has curtailed the efforts of American business to the detriment of our balance of trade.

Declaration of policy

Trade Policy Broadly Defined

The Senate amendment included a declaration which indicates that it is the policy of the United States both to encourage the expansion of trade with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except those countries with which such trade has been determined by the President to be against the national interest, and to restrict exports which would make a significant contribution to the military potential of any other nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States. At the insistence of the House managers, the language referring to "expansion" was stricken.

Objectives of Export Controls

The Senate amendment more specifically defined the same export control objectives found in existing law: only to the extent necessary to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the previous inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; only to the extent necessary to further significantly the foreign policy of the United States and to fulfill its international responsibilities; and to the extent necessary to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of national security. With the word "only" stricken in two instances, the conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Uniform Application of Controls

The Senate amendment contained a policy provision that, with certain exceptions, export controls should be applied uniformly to all nations with which the United States engages in trade. It was stricken at the insistence of the House.

Multilateral Trade Control Policy

The Senate amendment called for the reformulation and application of controls to the maximum extent possible in cooperation with all nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, and for the formulation of a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by all such nations. The conference substitute clarifies the policy requirement to be a unified trade control policy.

Use of Economic Resources and Trade Potential

The Senate amendment stated an additional objective in the use of our economic resources and trade potential; namely, to further the sound growth and stability of our economy. Existing law calls for the use of these capacities to further our national security and foreign policy objectives, but only in trade with Communist-dominated nations. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

Authority

Organizational and Procedural Changes

Section 4(a)(1) of the Senate amendment provided that the Secretary of Commerce shall institute changes he determines are necessary to effectuate the fullest implementation of the policy set forth with a view to promoting the expansion of trade with all nations with which the United States is engaged in trade, with special emphasis on promoting such trade with those countries or groups of countries with which our allies have a larger percentage of trade than does the United States and with other eligible countries not significantly engaged in trade with us.

The section further provided that the Secretary shall review any list of articles and information the export of which was until now prohibited or curtailed with a view to promptly making changes in such list as may be necessary or desirable in furtherance of the policy, purposes, and provisions of the proposed act. Finally, the Secretary was directed to include a detailed statement about actions taken in compliance with these expansion, promotion, and review provisions in the second quarterly report (and in any subsequent report about actions taken during the preceding quarter) made by the Secretary to the Congress after the date of enactment.

The House contended that all eligible countries should be included in our trade promotion and expansion efforts, but that no specific country or group of countries should be singled out by law for special emphasis in such efforts. Language calling for special emphasis on promoting trade with a particular country or group of countries was stricken from the Senate provision.

Informing American Business

The Senate amendment contained a provision which would direct the Secretary of Commerce to keep the business sector fully apprised of changes in export control policy and procedures with a view to encouraging the widest possible trade. The Senate provision is contained in the conference substitute.

Regulatory Powers of the President

The Senate amendment would enable the President to prohibit or curtail the export from the United States, its territories and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data or other information. The House bill would require the President in prescribing rules and regulations providing for denial of requests to export specified articles, materials, or supplies, to take into consideration their avail-

ability from other nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, in determining that such exports would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States. The House provision, like the Senate amendment, was designed to remove the handicap with which American business has been burdened in international competition on one hand, and on the other hand to prompt efforts by our Government to achieve an effective, multilateral control mechanism with our allies.

The Senate amendment provides that rules and regulations prescribed in the interest of national security shall provide that express permission to export to any nation or combination of nations be sought if the President determines that such export would make a significant contribution to the military potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States, and if the President determines that exports of comparable quality and technology to that sought to be exported are not readily available to such nation or nations from other sources. However, if the President has not determined that exports of comparable quality and technology are not readily available from other sources, he may still require express permission to export if he determines it to be necessary in the interest of national security and if he includes in the first quarterly report subsequent to the action a full and detailed statement setting forth the exports for which express permission is required together with the nation or nations affected and the reasons for requiring express permission. The Senate language is contained in the conference substitute.

Specific Purposes of Export Regulation Reaffirmed

The Senate amendment contained a provision which would make clear that nothing in the proposed act or in regulations stemming from it shall require permission to export except where national security, foreign policy, or domestic short supply make such a requirement necessary. The Senate language is contained in the conference substitute.

Consultation and standards

Control Agency Consultation

Existing law requires that any department, agency or official administering the control program seek advice from the other Federal departments and agencies whose policies and operation have an important bearing on exports. The Senate amendment broadened this requirement to embrace expansion as well as regulation, and to include Presidential consultation with industry from time to time. Language with respect to "expansion" was stricken at the insistence of the House managers.

Full Use of Private Trade Channels

Existing law, not contained in the Senate amendment, provides for representative trade consultation to encourage full use of private competitive trade channels, giving consideration to the interest of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters. The conference substitute would continue this provision of existing law.

Information to exporters

The Senate amendment contained a provision which, consistent with national security, foreign policy, and effective administration, would require the departments, agencies, and officials implementing the regulations to inform each exporter about considerations which may cause his export license request to be denied or to be the subject of lengthy examination, about the circumstances arising during consideration of his license application which are cause for denial or for further examination, and about reasons for denial of a license request; and to give each exporter the opportunity to present evidence and information which he believes will help resolve any problems or questions which are, or may be connected with his license request. At the insistence of the managers on the part of the House, the requirements were modified so as to be operative only at the specific request of an exporter and, in the case of circumstances arising during the Government's consideration, to be operative only in the event of undue delay.

Export Expansion Commission

The Senate amendment contained a provision which would have provided for the establishment of an Export Expansion Commission to be composed of 15 members to be appointed by the President to study practicable ways to expand exports, with special emphasis on promoting trade with countries with which our allies have a significantly larger percentage of trade than does the United States, and with other eligible countries with which our trade is not significant. At the insistence of the House managers, the Senate amendment was stricken.

Definitions

Existing law contains a definition of "person." This provision, not in the Senate amendment, is contained in the conference substitute.

Effects on other acts

The Senate amendment contained a provision directing that the authority granted to the President shall be used to achieve effective coordination with the authority exercised under section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The conference report contains the Senate language.

Termination date

The Senate amendment provided for termination of authority on June 30, 1973, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate. The otherwise identical language of the House bill provided for a termination date of June 30, 1971. The conference substitute conforms to the House bill.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. CORMAN, for Monday and Tuesday, November 24 and 25, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today and the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. GUDE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

Mr. ASPINALL, from end of business on November 25 to start of business on December 1, 1969, on account of personal pleasure by having Thanksgiving dinner "with my children."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. POFF, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROE) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. OTTINGER, for 60 minutes, on November 25.

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. ROE), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KEE.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK to revise and extend remarks made in connection with H.R. 11193.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZION.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. PELLY.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.

Mr. HICKS in three instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. HAYS.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1170. An act to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1421. An act to amend the District of Columbia Legal Aid Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2602. An act, the District of Columbia Public Defender Act of 1969; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of manuscript entitled "Separation of Powers and the Independent Agencies: Cases and Selected Readings", as a Senate document; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a report entitled "Handbook for Small Business" as a Senate document; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3666. An act to amend section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

H.R. 4284. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act;

H.R. 11363. An act to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes;

H.R. 13018. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13949. An act to provide certain equipment for use in the offices of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14195. An act to revise the law governing contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on November 21, 1969 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11612. An act to make appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12829. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 25, 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:

1358. A Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other provisions for the executive branch for the fiscal year 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91–199); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1359. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 through June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1360. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the concentrated employment program under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, St. Louis, Mo., Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1361. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a coordinated national boating safety program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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:

(Pursuant to the order of the House on November 20, 1969, the following conference report was filed on November 21, 1969)

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 4293 (Rept. No. 91–681). Ordered to be printed.

(Pursuant to the order of the House the following bills were reported November 21, 1969)

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 944. A bill to amend section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, by increasing the maximum rates of per diem allowance and reimbursement authorized, under certain circumstances, to meet the actual expenses of travel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9528. A bill to require students and teachers in the District of Columbia public schools to wear protective devices for their eyes while engaged in certain activities in those schools; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–683. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

(Pursuant to the order of the House on November 20, 1969, the following report was filed on November 22, 1969)

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12321. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Submitted November 24, 1969]

Mr. DENT. Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 345. Concurrent resolution providing for printing as a House document "A Guide to Student Assistance"; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–685). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENT. Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 407. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag"; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–686). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 554. Resolution providing funds for the operation of the Select Committee on Small Business; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91–687). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 644. Resolution providing for the adjustment of salaries of certain employees of the House Press Gallery; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–688). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 710. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–689). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 2276 (Rept. No. 91–690). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 14925. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91–691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14939. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe standards governing the design of plastic bags and other commercial articles utilizing plastic sheeting with dangerous adhesive characteristics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14940. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 14941. A bill to provide for the imposition of a duty on excessive imports of potassium chloride or muriate of potash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 14942. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to give any State an additional year to develop and enforce an effective inspection program for meat and meat food products that are distributed wholly within such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 14943. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GROVER, Mr. STEED, and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 14944. A bill to authorize an adequate force for the protection of the Executive Mansion and foreign embassies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 14945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the spouse of an individual who derives unreported income from criminal activities, if such spouse had no knowledge of such activities or such income, shall not be liable for tax with respect to such income even though a joint return is filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 14946. A bill to give Congress the sole authority to set the prime interest rate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14947. A bill to stabilize the prime interest rate at 7½%; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 14948. A bill to amend section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to equalize the retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with retirement benefits provided for other officers in the uniformed services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14949. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next of kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. WYATT):

H.R. 14950. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies on Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H.R. 14951. A bill to establish a National Commission on Financial Institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 14952. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional exemption from coverage for individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14953. A bill to provide long-term financing for expanded urban public transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 14954. A bill to authorize standby credit controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 14955. A bill to prohibit the use of the name of any of certain deceased servicemen unless consent to so use the name is given by the next of kin of the serviceman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 14956. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930—to extend the duty-free treatment of certain dyes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. FASCELL):

H.R. 14957. A bill to promote the mobilization and participation of U.S. private capital and skills to assist the peoples in the developing countries of the world to achieve the goal of decent housing and homeownership; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 14958. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 14959. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive and judicial branches of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 14960. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize appropriations to carry out such act through fiscal year 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 14961. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.J. Res. 998. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 999. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 1000. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 1002. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.J. Res. 1003. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.J. Res. 1004. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.J. Res. 1005. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.J. Res. 1006. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 1007. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI (for himself, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, and Mr. FRASER):

H.J. Res. 1008. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 1009. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.J. Res. 1010. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 1011. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 1012. Joint resolution to give immediate effect to the provisions of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 1013. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually a "National Manufacturing Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. Con. Res. 456. Concurrent resolution urging the adoption of policies to offset the adverse effects of governmental monetary restrictions upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H. Res. 725. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduce and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 14962. A bill for the relief of Olav Olsen Mannes; to the Committee on the Juduciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14963. A bill for the relief of Franco Emilio Nardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

269. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to amending the Constitution of the United States to make provision for Federal-State revenue sharing, which was referred 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:

337. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John E. Butler, Fort Pierce, Fla., relative to humane treatment of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

338. Also, petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y., relative to immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

339. Also, petition of the Legion of Estonian Liberation, Inc., New York, N.Y., relative to establishment of a permanent Special Committee on East European Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

340. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to creation of a special committee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.