

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

342. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas G. Staley, Eagle Point, Oreg., relative to preservation of the Rogue River in Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

343. Also, petition of Louis Teplitzky, Bronx, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: A BACKGROUND SERIES—II, III, IV

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Congressional Reorganization of the Committee on Rules has now completed its draft bill on congressional reorganization. Because of many requests by Members interested in congressional reform, and in order to be of help to these Members, I am inserting into the RECORD three items of background information: First, the final report of the first Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, dated March 5, 1946, which accompanied S. 2177, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; second, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and third, a report by Dr. George B. Galloway during the 1951 hearings on the Evaluation of the Effects of Laws Enacted To Reorganize the Legislative Branch of the Government.

The special subcommittee headed by the Honorable B. F. SISK has held 5 days of public hearings on their preprint of the reform bill and has scheduled 3 more days of hearings for December 3, 4, and 5. In the near future this draft will be recommended to the full Rules Committee, which I hope will report it to the House for action in January of 1970. It is for this reason that I feel that the following information, along with other material to be inserted into the RECORD by my colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), will be especially useful to Members of the House:

CALENDAR NO. 1427: LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The most important amendment made by the special committee was to eliminate from the bill Title VII—Self-Government for the District of Columbia. The Committee on the Judiciary has favorably reported a bill, S. 1942, to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission. Title VII of S. 2177 and S. 1942 are similar measures, having the same objective of home rule for the District of Columbia. Attainment of this desirable objective will be expedited, we believe, by the enactment of S. 1942.

GENERAL STATEMENT

S. 2177 incorporates the recommendations contained in the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress Report No. 1011 of March 4, 1946. This report was based upon a year's full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States. Its almost unanimous findings and recommendations reflect

a consensus of opinion among Members of Congress, political scientists, efficiency engineers, and students of government concerning the conditions that handicap Congress in the performance of its proper functions and suitable remedies.

Since 1941 a series of independent surveys of the machinery and methods of our National Legislature have been made by public and private organizations. These surveys, including that by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, have reached substantially the same conclusions as to the defects in our legislative structure and operation and as to appropriate correctives. They are agreed that Congress today is neither organized nor equipped to perform adequately its main functions of determining policy, authorizing administrative organizations to carry out policy, and supervising execution of the resultant programs.

Devised to handle the simpler tasks of an earlier day, our legislative machinery and procedures are by common consent no longer competent to cope satisfactorily with the grave and complex problems of the post-war world. They must be modernized if we are to avoid an imminent break-down of the legislative branch of the National Government.

Determining policy

Cited as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, S. 2177 is designed to reconvert our inherited and outmoded congressional machinery to the needs of today. One group of provisions deals with strengthening the policy determining function of Congress. Because of the volume and specialized character of the legislative business, Congress has logically delegated the initial work of policy making to standing committees of its Members. These committees have had a long and useful history, some of them dating back to the early days of the Republic. There have been several major and minor reorganizations of the congressional committee system through the years, as new problems have arisen and old ones have disappeared. The system has not been revamped to meet mod-

ern needs and conditions, however, since 1921. It is now in need of a complete overhaul to enable Congress to handle efficiently the expanding problems of the postwar world.

Today there are more than twice as many standing committees in the Senate as there are principal provinces of public policy. Responsibility for legislative action is scattered among 33 little legislatures which go their own way at their own pace and cannot act in concert. Their jurisdictions are undefined in the Senate rules, and there are many committees functioning in the same problem areas. For example, three Senate committees deal with problems of commerce and industry, five deal with public land problems, and six with the rules and administration of the Senate. Furthermore, some committees are inactive and seldom or never meet.

To remedy this crazy-quilt pattern, S. 2177 would replace our jerry-built committee structure with a simplified system of standing committees corresponding with the major areas of public policy and administration and having authority to hold joint hearings with the parallel committees of the House of Representatives on matters of common interest. The correlation of the committee systems of the two Chambers with each other would facilitate joint action on specific measures by means of joint hearings.

It would also increase the efficiency of the committee structure, facilitate closer liaison between the two Houses, and economize the time of busy legislators and administrators alike. And the coordination of the congressional committee system with the pattern of the administrative branch of the National Government would improve the performance by Congress of its legislative and supervisory functions, provide direct channels of communication and cooperation between the two branches, promote more harmonious and unified action in the development of public policies, and go a long way to bridge the gap between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

CONSOLIDATION OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Existing committees	Reorganized committees
1. Agriculture and Forestry.....	1. Agriculture and Forestry.
2. Appropriations.....	2. Appropriations.
3. Military Affairs.....	3. Armed Services.
4. Naval Affairs.....	4. Banking and Currency.
5. Banking and Currency.....	5. Civil Service.
6. Civil Service.....	6. District of Columbia.
7. Post Offices and Post Roads.....	7. Expenditures in Executive Departments.
8. District of Columbia.....	8. Finance.
9. Expenditures in the Executive Departments.....	9. Foreign Relations.
10. Finance.....	10. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
11. Foreign Relations.....	11. Judiciary.
12. Interstate Commerce.....	12. Labor and Public Welfare.
13. Commerce.....	13. Public Lands.
14. Inter-oceanic Canals.....	14. Public Works.
15. Manufactures.....	15. Rules and Administration.
16. Judiciary.....	16. Veterans' Affairs.
17. Patents.....	(Abolished.)
18. Immigration.....	
19. Education and Labor.....	
20. Public Lands and Surveys.....	
21. Mines and Mining.....	
22. Territories and Insular Affairs.....	
23. Irrigation and Reclamation.....	
24. Indian Affairs.....	
25. Public Buildings and Grounds.....	
26. Rules.....	
27. Audit and Control.....	
28. Library.....	
29. Privileges and Elections.....	
30. Printing.....	
31. Enrolled Bills.....	
32. Pensions.....	
33. Claims.....	

Moreover, the burden of committee work is especially onerous in the Senate. At present the combined membership of all the standing committees in the upper House is 481 and of the 11 major committees is 220. In addition, there are 10 special committees of the Senate, with a total membership of 87. Altogether, the 96 Senators of the Seventy-ninth Congress occupy 568 seats on its standing and special committees, an average of 6 seats per Senator. Nor are there any exclusive committees in the Senate as there are in the House, the members of which serve on no other committees. Today no Senator serves on less than 3 committees; and one sits on 10 committees, not counting the service on subcommittees, of which there are 67 in the Senate. In short, the committee work load of United States Senators today is too heavy to bear. Many Senators have so many committee assignments that they find it impossible to attend their meetings because of conflicts and are present by proxy or not at all. Under S. 2177 Senators would serve on two standing committees each and no more, with the exception of the District and Expenditures Committees, whose members would serve on three committees each.

S. 2177 would also define the jurisdiction of each reorganized committee so as to avoid jurisdictional disputes between them. It would expand the present meager staff facilities of our standing committees, which are the real workshops of Congress; permit each committee to appoint four experts in its field; and strengthen the legislative reference and bill-drafting services which are our own unbiased research and legal arms. The bill would also authorize each senatorial and congressional office to employ a high-caliber administrative assistant to perform non-legislative duties and thus allow Members more time for the study and consideration of national legislation.

As further steps toward improving the policy-determining machinery of Congress, S. 2177 would regularize committee procedure as regards hearings, meetings, and records. It would expedite the reporting and clarify the understanding of bills. Committee powers are defined, and permission to sit while the Senate is in session is restricted. The bill would also confine conference committees to the consideration of matters in disagreement between the two Houses and outlaw legislative riders on appropriation bills.

With a view to crystallizing the determination of party policy on major issues, and to strengthen party government as an offset to organized group pressures, S. 2177 provides for the establishment of majority and minority policy committees in each House. Each of these four committees would be composed of seven members appointed in its entirety at the opening of each New Congress. The majority and minority policy committees in both Houses would be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences. There is no unity of command in Congress today. Responsibility for the development and coordination of legislative policy is scattered among the chairmen of 81 standing committees, who compete for jurisdiction and power. As a result, policy making is splintered and uncoordinated. The proposed policy committees would formulate over-all legislative policy of the respective parties and strengthen party leadership. They would also help to promote party responsibility and accountability for the performance of platform promises.

In order to facilitate the formulation and carrying out of national policy, and to promote better teamwork between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, the bill further provides for the creation of a Joint Legislative-Executive Council. This Council would be composed of the majority policy committees in Congress and of the President and his Cabinet. It would seek to bridge the gap between the two branches

created by our inherited system of separated powers and to avoid those periodic deadlocks between Congress and the President which have hitherto caused dangerous crises in the conduct of the Federal Government.

In the last analysis, Congress is the center of political gravity under our form of government because it reflects and expresses the popular will in the making of national policy. Too often, however, the true attitude of public opinion is distorted and obscured by the pressures of special-interest groups. Beset by swarms of lobbyists seeking to protect this or that small segment of the economy or to advance this or that narrow interest, legislators find it difficult to discover the real majority will and to legislate in the public interest. As Government control of economic life and its use as an instrument of popular welfare have increased, the activities of these powerful groups have multiplied. As the law-making, money-raising, and appropriating agency in the Federal Government, the acts of Congress affect the vital interests of these organized groups, many of which maintain legislative agents on or near Capitol Hill. These agents seek to transform the aims and programs of their groups into public policy by having them embodied in general legislation, by changing the tax laws to suit their own purposes, by using their influence to reduce or eliminate the appropriations for agencies they dislike and to increase the appropriations of agencies they favor, and by pressing for the ratification or rejection of treaties, Presidential nominations, and constitutional amendments. A pressure-group economy gives rise to government by whirlpools of special-interest groups in which the national welfare is often neglected. The pulling and hauling of powerful pressure groups create delays and distortions which imperil national safety in wartime and threaten paralysis and bankruptcy in time of peace. The public welfare suffers in the warfare of private groups and Congress becomes an arena for the rationalization of group and class interests.

Without impairing in any way the right of petition or freedom of expression, S. 2177 provides for the registration of organized groups and their agents who seek to influence legislation. It also requires them to file detailed quarterly accounts of their receipts and expenditures. Full information regarding the membership, source of contributions, and expenditures of organized groups would prove helpful to Congress in evaluating their representations and weighing their worth. Publicity is a mild step forward in protecting government under pressure and in promoting the democratization of pressure groups.

Improved fiscal procedures

A second set of provisions in S. 2177 is designed to strengthen Congress in the performance of its appropriating function for the administrative establishment. Hitherto the efforts of Congress to compel compliance with the laws making specific appropriations have been too often frustrated. Congress has permitted transfers between appropriations, authorized the unlimited use of departmental receipts, and set up credit corporations with separate budgets. The executive has mingled appropriations, brought forward and backward unexpended and anticipated balances, incurred coercive deficiencies, and otherwise escaped the rigors of congressional control.

To correct these conditions, at least in part, S. 2177 provides for several improvements in the legislative phase of the budget process. It would provide for open hearings on appropriation bills and require all such bills to be fully and carefully considered by the entire Appropriations Committees of both Houses. It would allow members time to study the committee hearings and reports on appropriation bills before their floor consideration. It would provide each appropri-

tion subcommittee with a staff of four qualified specialists in its particular expenditure province with a view to making a more thorough scrutiny of departmental estimates and to serve both the majority and minority members. The bill would also forbid the reappropriation of unobligated balances except for continuing public works, which were estimated at 12.3 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1946; prevent transfers between appropriations; and take steps toward limiting permanent appropriations which amounted to 5.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1946.

Although Congress is charged by the Constitution with the power of the purse, there now is no correlation between income and outgo. Control of the spending power is divided between the Senate and the House of Representatives, and within each House between its revenue and appropriating committees. Taxes are levied and appropriations made by many separate committees. The right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

To strengthen fiscal control, S. 2177 provides for the adoption of annual Federal budget totals by joint action of the revenue and appropriating committees of both Houses. If total expenditures recommended by the appropriating committees for the coming fiscal year exceed total Federal income as estimated by the revenue-raising committees, Congress would be required by record vote to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess. And if it appears midway through the fiscal year that total appropriations are going to exceed the total approved budget figure, the President shall by proclamation reduce them by a uniform percentage (except for certain fixed charges), so as to bring total expenditures within the limit previously set. These limitations would not apply, however, during a wartime emergency.

Oversight of administrative performance

A third group of provisions in the bill is designed to strengthen congressional surveillance of the execution of the laws by the executive branch. Congress has long lacked adequate facilities for the continuous inspection and review of administrative performance. We often delegate the rule-making power to administrative departments and commissions, without making any provision for follow-up to see if administrative rules and regulations are in accord with the intent of the law. Several of the postwar acts, for example, require certain agencies to submit quarterly reports to Congress, but assign the responsibility for scrutinizing these reports to no legislative committees.

To remedy this situation, S. 2177 would authorize the standing committees of both Houses to exercise continuous surveillance of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their jurisdiction. Armed with the power of subpoena and staffed with qualified specialists in their respective provinces of public affairs, these committees would conduct a continuous review of the activities of the agencies administering laws originally reported by the legislative committees. The reconstructed standing committees will, it is hoped, roughly parallel the reorganized administrative structure of the executive branch of the Government and will be utilized as vehicles of consultation and collaboration between Congress and the corresponding administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions.

Under this arrangement, it will no longer be necessary to create special committees of investigation from time to time. Sporadic investigations of the conduct of public affairs in the past have often served a salutary purpose by exposing administrative incompetence or corruption and by improving the execution of the laws. But they have lacked continuity and have not provided the members of standing committees with direct knowledge of the information they have

gathered. In cases where legislative action is indicated, standing committees find it necessary to do much of the work over again. S. 2177 proposes, therefore, to ban the use of special committees hereafter.

As a further check upon the financial operations of the Government and its care in handling public funds, the bill authorizes and directs the Comptroller General to make administrative management analyses of each agency in the executive branch, including Government corporations. Such analyses, with those made by the Bureau of the Budget, will furnish Congress a double check upon the economy and efficiency of administrative management. Reports on such analyses would be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Expenditures, Appropriations, and appropriate legislative committees, and to the majority and minority policy committees, of the two Houses.

Saving congressional time

Congress is overburdened by many local and private matters which divert its attention from national policy making and which it ought not to have to consider. It functions as a common council for the District of Columbia. It serves as a tribunal for the settlement of private claims. It spends much time on pension bills, the construction of bridges over navigable waters, and other private and local matters. S. 2177 bans the introduction in either House of private claims and pension bills, bridge bills, and other local and private legislation. Title IV provides for the administrative and judicial adjustment of tort claims against the United States which Congress is poorly equipped to settle. Title V grants the consent of Congress to the construction of bridges over navigable waters, subject to the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. Self-government for the District of Columbia—a reform long overdue and a step toward reducing the legislative work load—is separately provided for in legislation introduced by Senator McCarran and pending on the Senate Calendar.

Congressmen are also handicapped by a host of routine chores for constituents which they are glad to perform, but which leave them little time for the adequate study of national legislative problems. From one-half to three-fourths of the time of the average Member is consumed with running errands and knocking on departmental doors on behalf of constituents. S. 2177 authorizes each Senator and Representative to employ a well-qualified administrative assistant to aid in receiving callers and handling departmental business. The bill also provides for the creation of a stenographic pool to help congressional offices with their mail during busy seasons. These provisions will enable Members to make more efficient use of their time, making for a better balance between national and local, public and private business.

S. 2177 also proposes an experimental modification of the present meeting schedules by staggering committee meetings and Chamber sessions on alternate days. This arrangement will make for closer concentration on committee work, on the one hand, and for fuller attendance on the floor, on the other. Nor would Senate committees be permitted to meet during the sitting of the Senate, without special leave.

These time- and labor-saving devices will not only make for a more efficient use of congressional time. They will also enable the Congress, which has been in almost continuous session since 1940, to take a regular annual recess. S. 2177 provides that, except in time of war or national emergency, the two Houses shall stand adjourned during July, August, and September each year, reconvening on the second Tuesday in October. Such a regular recess at definite annual intervals will insure the return of Members to their constituencies for that refreshment of contact and exchange of opinion and experience so essential to responsive representative government.

Improving congressional services and facilities

Another group of provisions in S. 2177 is designed to improve the administrative services and facilities available within the legislative establishment. The internal administration of the Congress has long been characterized by duplicating housekeeping services and obsolete methods of personnel administration. Each House has its separate postal, document, folding, stationery, mailing, disbursing, doorkeeping, messenger, and other services. And most of these positions are subject to the hazards of the patronage system.

In order to modernize the internal housekeeping services of our National Legislature and install up-to-date methods of personnel administration, S. 2177 provides for the establishment of an Office of Congressional Personnel. The Director of this Office shall be appointed on merit by the majority and minority leaders of the two Houses and shall prepare plans for a modern personnel system for all congressional employees and for the efficient coordination of the existing housekeeping services within the legislative establishment.

The bill also provides for remodeling the Senate and House caucus rooms, for the more efficient assignment of available space within the Capitol, and more convenient dining facilities. The education and discipline of page boys would be improved by selecting pages from among boys who live at home or in orphanages in the District of Columbia and by arranging for their education in the public schools of the District.

The usefulness of the Congressional Record to all its readers would be increased under this bill by the printing in it of a daily calendar of legislative events, together with a résumé of congressional activities and an index of its contents.

Improving the composition of Congress

While the quality of the present personnel of our Federal Legislature is as high as it ever was in the good old days of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, the average level of ability and energy is still possible of improvement. In the last analysis, of course, the composition of Congress depends upon the alertness, public interest, and education of the electorate. Nevertheless, steps can be taken by Congress itself to attract even abler persons to the legislative service. One such step would be to pay higher salaries to Senators and Representatives. S. 2177 would increase the compensation of Members of Congress to \$15,000 a year, effective January 1, 1947. The present salary of \$10,000 a year has been in effect since 1925. Impartial studies of the cost of living show that, on the average, it costs more to be a Congressman than the position pays.

The bill would also encourage Members to retire by permitting them to join the Federal retirement system on a contributory basis. To be eligible for retirement pay, Members would be required to deposit 6 percent of their basic salary, to have served at least 6 years in Congress, and have attained the age of 62 years. Those with at least 5 years of service could be retired for disability and receive an annuity. The annuity would amount to 2½ percent of a Member's average annual basic salary multiplied by the number of his years of legislative service. But no annuity could exceed three-fourths of the salary received at the time of separation from the service. All other Federal employees may now participate in the Federal retirement system, but Congressmen are the forgotten men of social security.

This inducement to retirement for those of retiring age or with other infirmities is a recognition of the arduous labors now imposed upon all Members. The resulting sense of security would contribute to independence of thought and action on the part of Members. It would also tend to bring into the legisla-

tive service a larger number of younger members with fresh energy and new viewpoints concerning the economic, social, and political problems of the Nation.

What S. 2177 would cost

Enactment of the entire program embodied in S. 2177 would increase the cost of the legislative establishment only \$12,000,000—a negligible sum compared with the resultant gains. The following table itemizes the added cost:

Administrative assistant for each Member	\$4,272,000
Government share of retirement plan	3,000,000
Salary raise for Members	2,655,000
Staff experts for standing committees	952,000
Staff experts for Appropriations Committees	768,000
Expansion of Legislative Reference Service	300,000
Policy committee staffs	120,000
Stenographic pool	100,000
Expansion of office of legislative counsel	60,000
Increase in compensation of congressional officers	44,235
Salary of director of congressional personnel	10,000

Total estimated increase— 12,281,235

Surely this a modest price to pay for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government. Even with this modest increase, the total cost of the legislative branch would be \$6,000,000 less than the 1947 budget estimate for the office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics alone. It would be more than offset by the abolition of the patronage system, the reduced cost of shorter sessions, the reduction from 33 to 16 in the number of standing committees to be staffed and supported, and the great economies in public expenditures to be brought about by the fixing of Federal Budget totals.

The national interest involved in the development of a stronger, more efficient, and more representative Congress needs no emphasis here. Congress itself and the entire Nation will derive immeasurable benefit from the enactment of this bill.

These are critical days for the Government of the United States. Congress and the President are beset by a host of postwar problems at home and abroad. Our machinery of government, which was devised for the simpler tasks of the nineteenth century, is breaking down under its tremendous work load. Democracy itself is in grave danger of disintegrating from internal dissensions under the terrific pressures of the postwar world.

Congressional reform will not solve all the problems that beset us. That will require good men, good will, and good policies as well as good governmental machinery. But modernized machinery will greatly increase the efficiency of Congress. By revising our antiquated rules and improving our facilities, we can at once revitalize our National Legislature, expedite the adjustment of our postwar problems, and renew popular faith in American democracy. The time has come for Congress to reform itself. The time to act is now.

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTORY MATTER

The matter preceding title I of the bill provides a short title for the bill, namely the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946"; sets up a table of contents; and provides the usual separability clause.

TITLE I—CHANGES IN RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE

This title either specifically or by implication makes changes in the rules of the Senate and House. These changes are extensive, although in great measure they relate di-

rectly or indirectly to realignment, jurisdiction, and procedure of committees. This is one of the fundamental reforms proposed to be brought about by this bill. In that connection it will be noted that the bill as written contains no realignment of House committees or specification of their jurisdiction, although the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18 (Rept. No. 1011) made recommendations bearing thereon. Your committee felt that this matter was of such fundamental importance that it would be in the interest of comity and expedition to leave that subject to be handled by way of amendment in the House.

Section 101. Rule-making power of the Senate and House

Inasmuch as this title, as indicated, makes changes in the rules of the two Houses it is provided in this section that these provisions are enacted as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith. It is further provided that these provisions are enacted with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

This procedure will be recognized as that provided with regard to congressional action on resolutions under recent reorganization acts.

PART 1. STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Section 102. Standing committees of the Senate

This section amends rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees. In short it provides for 16 standing committees in lieu of 33 under existing rules, fixes the membership of each such standing committee at 13 Senators, in lieu of the varying memberships of existing committees, and specifies in considerable detail, by subject matter, the jurisdiction of

each such committee, a matter not provided for under existing rules except in isolated instances.

It is not the purpose of this report to present the considerations which moved the committee in each case in distributing the rather imposing list of subjects for legislative consideration among the various committees. It is sufficient to say that the assignments were made as nearly as may be on a functional basis, although the committee is frank to concede, and it is believed the Senate will appreciate, that such a rule could not be followed to the letter. However, the committee has made an earnest effort to set up a workable committee structure.

It will be noted that whereas the report made pursuant to House Concurrent Resolu-

tion 18 recommends a Committee on Interior, Natural Resources, and Public Works in which would be consolidated some eight Senate committees, your committee felt that this committee would be heavily overburdened and recommends instead the distribution of this jurisdiction to two committees, namely, a Committee on Public Lands and a Committee on Public Works.

Although, as has been indicated, the committee has deemed it wise not to explain in detail the assignment of the various subject matters, the following tables, first, will suggest in a general way the consolidation effected insofar as it affects the status of the existing standing committees of the Senate and, second, will show the jurisdiction by subject matter under present committee structure and under the proposed realignment.

TABLE I.—CONSOLIDATION OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Existing committees	Reorganized committees
1. Agriculture and Forestry.....	1. Agriculture and Forestry.
2. Appropriations.....	2. Appropriations.
3. Military Affairs.....	3. Armed Services.
4. Naval Affairs.....	4. Banking and Currency.
5. Banking and Currency.....	5. Civil Service.
6. Civil Service.....	6. District of Columbia.
7. Post Office and Post Roads.....	7. Expenditures in Executive Departments.
8. District of Columbia.....	8. Finance.
9. Expenditures in Executive Departments.....	9. Foreign Relations.
10. Finance.....	10. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
11. Foreign Relations.....	11. Judiciary.
12. Interstate Commerce.....	12. Labor and Public Welfare.
13. Commerce.....	13. Public Lands.
14. Inter-oceanic Canals.....	14. Public Works.
15. Manufactures.....	15. Rules and Administration.
16. Judiciary.....	16. Veterans' Affairs.
17. Patents.....	(Abolished.)
18. Immigration.....	
19. Education and Labor.....	
20. Public Lands and Surveys.....	
21. Mines and Mining.....	
22. Territories and Insular Affairs.....	
23. Irrigation and Reclamation.....	
24. Indian Affairs.....	
25. Public Buildings and Grounds.....	
26. Rules.....	
27. Audit and Control.....	
28. Library.....	
29. Privileges and Elections.....	
30. Printing.....	
31. Enrolled Bills.....	
32. Pensions.....	
33. Claims.....	

TABLE II.—JURISDICTION OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED COMMITTEES

Subject	Present committee	Proposed committee
(a) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Agriculture generally.....	Agriculture and Forestry.....	Agriculture and Forestry.
2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.....	do.....	Do.
3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.....	do.....	Do.
4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.....	do.....	Do.
5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.....	do.....	Do.
6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.....	do.....	Do.
7. Agricultural economics and research.....	do.....	Do.
8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.....	do.....	Do.
9. Dairy industry.....	do.....	Do.
10. Entomology and plant quarantine.....	do.....	Do.
11. Human nutrition and home economics.....	do.....	Do.
12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.....	do.....	Do.
13. Agricultural educational extension services.....	do.....	Do.
14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.....	(Agriculture and Forestry.....)	Do.
15. Rural electrification.....	(Banking and Currency.....)	Do.
16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.....	Agriculture and Forestry.....	Do.
17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.....	do.....	Do.
(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subject:		
1. Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.....	Appropriations.....	Appropriations.
(c) Committee on Armed Services, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Common defense generally.....	(Naval Affairs.....)	Armed Services.
2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.....	(Military Affairs.....)	Do.
3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.....	do.....	Do.
4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.....	Naval Affairs.....	Do.
5. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.....	Military and Naval Affairs.....	Do.
6. Selective service.....	do.....	Do.
7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.....	Military Affairs.....	Do.
8. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.....	Military and Naval Affairs.....	Do.
9. Ammunition depots.....	do.....	Do.
10. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.....	Military Affairs.....	Do.
11. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves.....	do.....	Do.
12. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.....	Naval Affairs.....	Do.
	Military Affairs.....	Do.

TABLE II.—JURISDICTION OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED COMMITTEES—Continued

Subject	Present committee	Proposed committee
(d) Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Banking and currency generally	Banking and Currency	Banking and Currency.
2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.	do.	Do.
3. Deposit insurance	do.	Do.
4. Public and private housing	do.	Do.
5. Federal Reserve System	Banking and Currency	Do.
6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof	Education and Labor	Do.
7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof	Banking and Currency	Do.
8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar	do.	Do.
9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services	do.	Do.
(e) Committee on Civil Service, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. The Federal civil service generally	Civil Service	Civil Service.
2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement	do.	Do.
3. The postal service generally, including the railway-mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.	Post Offices and Post Roads	Do.
4. Postal-savings banks	do.	Do.
5. Census and the collection of statistics generally	Commerce	Do.
6. The National Archives	Library	Do.
(f) Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor including—	District of Columbia	District of Columbia.
2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations	do.	Do.
3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors	do.	Do.
4. Adulteration of food and drugs	do.	Do.
5. Taxes and tax sales	do.	Do.
6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce	do.	Do.
7. Municipal and juvenile courts	do.	Do.
8. Incorporation and organization of societies	do.	Do.
9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws	do.	Do.
(g) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations	Expenditures in the Executive Departments	Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government	Judiciary	Do.
(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—		
(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;		Do.
(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;		Do.
(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;		Do.
(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.		Do.
(h) Committee on Finance, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Revenue measures generally	Finance	Finance.
2. The bonded debt of the United States	do.	Do.
3. The deposit of public moneys	do.	Do.
4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery	do.	Do.
5. Reciprocal trade agreements	do.	Do.
6. Transportation of dutiable goods	do.	Do.
7. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions	do.	Do.
(i) Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally	Foreign Relations	Foreign Relations.
2. Treaties	do.	Do.
3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations	do.	Do.
4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation	do.	Do.
5. Neutrality	do.	Do.
6. International conferences and congresses	do.	Do.
7. The American National Red Cross	Judiciary	Do.
8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war	Foreign Relations	Do.
9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service	do.	Do.
10. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries	do.	Do.
11. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.	do.	Do.
12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations	Foreign Relations	Do.
13. Foreign loans	Banking and Currency	Do.
(j) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Interstate commerce generally	Interstate Commerce	Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
2. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipe lines	do.	Do.
3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television	do.	Do.
4. Civil aeronautics	Commerce	Do.
5. Merchant marine generally	do.	Do.
6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats	do.	Do.
7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage	do.	Do.
8. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea	do.	Do.
9. Merchant marine officers and seamen	do.	Do.
10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.	do.	Do.
11. Coast and Geodetic Survey	do.	Do.
12. The Coast Guard, including life-saving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts	do.	Do.
13. The U.S. Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies	do.	Do.
14. Weather Bureau	do.	Do.
15. Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally	Interoceanic Canals	Do.
16. Inland waterways	Commerce	Do.
17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation	do.	Do.
18. Bureau of Standards, including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system	do.	Do.

TABLE II.—JURISDICTION OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED COMMITTEES—Continued

Subject	Present committee	Proposed committee
(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally	Judiciary	Judiciary
2. Constitutional amendments	do	Do.
3. Federal courts and judges	do	Do.
4. Local courts in the territories and possessions	do	Do.
5. Revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States	do	Do.
6. National penitentiaries	do	Do.
7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies	do	Do.
8. Holidays and celebrations	do	Do.
9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting	do	Do.
10. State and Territorial boundary lines	do	Do.
11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices	do	Do.
12. Civil liberties	do	Do.
13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks	Patents	Do.
14. Patent Office	do	Do.
15. Immigration and naturalization	Immigration	Do.
16. Apportionment of Representatives	Commerce	Do.
17. Measures relating to claims against the United States	Judiciary	Do.
18. Interstate compacts generally	do	Do.
(l) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally	Education and Labor	Labor and Public Welfare
2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes	do	Do.
3. Wages and hours of labor	do	Do.
4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce	Judiciary (Interstate Commerce	Do.
5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract	Immigration	Do.
6. Child labor	Education and Labor	Do.
7. Labor statistics	do	Do.
8. Labor standards	do	Do.
9. School-lunch program	Agriculture	Do.
10. Vocational rehabilitation	Education and Labor	Do.
11. National social security, except revenue measures relating thereto	Finance	Do.
12. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto	Interstate Commerce	Do.
13. United States Employees Compensation Commission	Education and Labor	Do.
14. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and St. Elizabeths Hospital	District of Columbia	Do.
15. Public health and quarantine	Education and Labor	Do.
16. Welfare of miners	Mines and Mining	Do.
(m) Committee on Public Lands, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon	Public Lands and Surveys	Public Lands
2. Mineral resources of the public lands	do	Do.
3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands	do	Do.
4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain	do	Do.
5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries	do	Do.
6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain	do	Do.
7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations	Territories and Insular Affairs	Do.
8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easement of public lands for irrigation projects	Irrigation and Reclamation	Do.
9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes	do	Do.
10. Mining interests generally	Mines and Mining	Do.
11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder	do	Do.
12. Geological survey	do	Do.
13. Mining schools and experimental stations	do	Do.
14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States	(Public Lands and Surveys Mines and Mining	Do.
15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes	Indian Affairs	Do.
16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds	do	Do.
(n) Committee on Public Works, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors	Commerce	Public Works
2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams)	do	Do.
3. Water power	do	Do.
4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters	do	Do.
5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally	Public Buildings and Grounds	Do.
6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia	do	Do.
7. Measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House Office Buildings	do	Do.
8. Measures relating to the maintenance and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution	do	Do.
9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park	do	Do.
10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads	Post Offices and Post Roads	Do.
Committee on Rules and Administration, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee	Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate	Rules and Administration
(B) Except as provided in par. (n) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statutory and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals	Library	Do.
(C) Except as provided in par. (n) 8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions	do	Do.
(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession	Privileges and Elections	Do.
(E) Matters relating to parliamentary rules; floor and gallery rules; Senate Restaurant; Senate Office Building; Senate wing of the Capitol; assignment of office space; and services to the Senate	Rules	Do.
(F) Matters relating to printing and correction of the Congressional Record	Printing	Do.
(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the Senate; and, in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled; and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate. Such committee shall also have the duty of assigning office space in the Senate wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building.	Enrolled Bills	Do.

TABLE II.—JURISDICTION OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED COMMITTEES—Continued

Subject	Present committee	Proposed committee
(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:		
1. Veterans' measures generally.....	Finance.....	Veterans' Affairs.
2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.....	Pensions.....	Do.
3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.....	Finance.....	Do.
4. Compensation, vocational rehabilitation, and education of veterans.....	do.....	Do.
5. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.....	do.....	Do.
6. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.....	Military Affairs.....	Do.
7. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.....	do.....	Do.

It is provided that each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more. Your committee will frankly explain the reason for this latter provision. It had been hoped that committee service of each Senator would be limited to two standing committees and in the light of generally increased jurisdiction of committees that would normally be sufficient. However, it was discovered that with a close alignment of the two major parties in the Senate that arrangement would leave many committees of the Senate in which the majority party did not have control, that is, the members would be evenly divided. The committee felt that that was not a satisfactory arrangement and hit upon the expedient of permitting Senators of the majority party who are members of the two committees named above (District of Columbia and Expenditures in the Executive Departments), whose jurisdiction was relatively light as compared with other committees, to serve on three standing committees.

Section 103. Appropriations

This section amends rule XVI dealing with amendments to appropriation bills and while rewritten in its entirety this was due in great measure to the change in the names of the committees under the revised committee structure. The only substantial change made in this section is the provision which prohibits the Committee on Appropriations from reporting an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing "any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law," and further provides that any such restriction shall not be received by way of an amendment to any general appropriation bill.

It is specifically provided that when a point of order is made against any limitation on expenditure of funds appropriated in a general appropriations bill on the ground that the limitation violates this rule (whether for violation of the limitation just discussed or any limitation now contained in rule XVI), the rule shall be construed strictly and, in case of doubt, in favor of the point of order.

Section 104 and section 105. Printing and rules

These sections made formal changes to conform to changes in the rules relative to committee structure, but in view of section 224 of the bill dealing with transfer of functions to the new committees, these sections are unnecessary and have been stricken from the bill.

PART 2. PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES

Section 121. Private bills banned

This section bans private bills, resolutions, and amendments authorizing or directing the payment of property damages for personal injuries or death or for pensions; the construction of bridges across navigable streams; or the correction of military or naval records. It is provided, however,

that the provisions of this section shall not apply to private bills or resolutions conferring jurisdiction on the Federal courts to hear, determine, and render judgment in connection with private claims otherwise cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act if the claim accrued between January 1, 1939, and December 31, 1944, the last day being the day before the effective date (for the purpose of accrual of claims) of the Federal Tort Claims Act. This will permit consideration of bills or resolutions covering claims going back for a period of 6 years and would seem to be ample to prevent any inequities.

Section 122. Joint hearings

This section authorizes the standing committees of the two Houses to hold joint hearings with respect to subject matter within their respective jurisdictions.

Section 123. Congressional recesses

This section fixes a definite adjournment period for the Congress for each year, from the last of June until the second Tuesday in October, except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President. It is provided, however, that the Members of the Congress may be called back by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House whenever in their opinion legislative expediency warrants it or whenever the majority leader or the minority leader of the Senate and the majority leader or the minority leader of the House, acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

Section 124. Committee procedure

Various provisions relating to committee procedure are set forth in this section. Some of these procedures are now in effect in the case of many committees of the Congress. This section will make specific provision therefor.

Each standing committee must set aside a regular period during each month to permit Members to appear before the committee on bills or resolutions which they have introduced; each such committee must fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business, and additional meetings may be called by the chairman; each such committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action, which shall include attendance and a record of votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded, which record vote shall be printed in the Congressional Record. It is made the duty of the chairman of each committee to report promptly to the Senate or House, as the case may be, any measure approved by his committee and to take necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote; but no measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present and voted in favor of the report.

Further, each committee report shall contain an outline of proposed legislation in nontechnical digest form, together with a supporting statement of reasons for its enactment and a statement of the national interest involved. This report shall also include estimates of cost. All such outlines, statements, and estimates shall be prepared by the committee staff.

Each standing committee shall, so far as practicable, require witnesses to file in advance written statements of their testimony and to limit oral presentations to brief summaries. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for use of committee members. All hearings are required to be open to the public except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders a secret executive session in the interest of national security.

Section 125. Committee powers

This section embodies the procedural powers normally given to Senate committees and extend it generally to standing committees of the House. Owing to the greater volume of work imposed on the smaller number of committees under the bill, it is recommended that expenditures for any Congress be fixed at not in excess of \$10,000 for each committee in lieu of \$5,000 now fixed for Senate committees.

It is further provided that no standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit without special leave while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session. This will extend to the Senate the rule now applicable to House committees except in the case of the Committee on Rules.

Section 126. Special committees banned

This section provides that no special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be established or continued by bill, resolution, or amendment.

Section 127. Conference rules on amendments in nature of substitute

This section in effect makes specific the application to amendments in the nature of a substitute of the conference rules now applicable to numbered amendments, and will outlaw the expedient resorted to in recent years of conferees bringing back legislation not passed by either House.

Section 128. Legislative oversight by standing committees

In effect, this section directs each standing committee of the Senate and the House to exercise continuous surveillance of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of laws within the jurisdiction of the respective committees.

Section 129. Decisions on questions of committee jurisdiction

This section provides that questions with respect to committee jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate or the House, as the case may be, without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates; but the decision is subject to an appeal.

Section 130. Estimates of receipts and expenditures

This section requires the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to meet jointly at the beginning of each session and after study and consultation to report to their respective Houses estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year. The report is to be made within 60 days after

the opening of the session or by April 15, whichever first occurs. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts the report must be accompanied by a concurrent resolution reciting that it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt should be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts. Until this resolution has been agreed to by both Houses no general appropriation bill appropriating money for the ensuing fiscal year shall be received or considered in either House. The section is not applicable in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

Section 131. Hearings and reports by Appropriations Committees

This section provides that general appropriation bills shall not be considered unless prior to the consideration printed committee hearings and reports have been available for at least three calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered. The Appropriations Committees are further authorized and directed, acting jointly, to develop standard appropriation classification schedules, and it is required that the part of the printed hearings containing any agency's request for appropriations shall be preceded by such a schedule.

The section further provides that no general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be in order if it contains any provision reappropriating unexpended balances; but this provision shall not apply to appropriations in continuation of appropriations for public works on which work has commenced.

The Appropriations Committees are also directed to make a study of permanent appropriations with a view to limiting their number, and also a study of the disposition of funds resulting from the sale of Government property or services with a view to recommending a uniform system of control with respect to such funds.

Section 132. Records of Congress

The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, acting jointly, are directed by this section to obtain at the close of each Congress all noncurrent records and transfer them to the National Archives; and the Clerk of the House is directed to collect the non-current records of the House of Representatives from the First to the Seventy-six Congress, inclusive, and transfer them to the National Archives.

Section 133. Preservation of committee hearings

This section requires the Librarian of Congress to have bound the printed hearings of testimony taken by each committee of the Congress.

Section 134. Effective date

This title takes effect on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes; except that the provisions relative to reports, just discussed, take effect on the date of enactment.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

This title contains miscellaneous provisions relating to congressional personnel, committees of Congress, the Capitol Building, and policy committees.

PART 1. STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Section 201. Office of Congressional Personnel

This section creates the Office of Congressional Personnel headed by a Director appointed by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives, acting jointly. The Director will receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 a year and is to be appointed without regard to political affiliations and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

One of the initial functions of the Director (others will be noted hereinafter) is to prepare a plan for a modern personnel system for all employees of the Senate and House (including employees under the Architect of the Capitol), to make a complete study of overlapping and duplicating services within the legislative establishment, and to prepare a plan for the establishment of efficient services and to report to Congress at the earliest practicable date. Any plan or schedule prepared by the Director must contain as an integral part provisions that appointments to any office or position under the Senate or the House shall be made only upon certification by the Director that the appointee is qualified, and in addition, in the case of committee staffs, upon recommendation of the Director; and that service employees of the Capitol shall be appointed on a merit basis established by the Director to the end that the so-called patronage system shall be discontinued and the fee system for guides abolished.

The provisions of this section do not apply and the authority of the Director does not extend to elected officers of the Senate or House or to personnel of Members' offices or to personnel of party policy committees provided for in the bill.

Section 202. Stenographic pool

Under this section the Director is required to establish a stenographic pool in each of the Senate and House Office Buildings for use of Members during peak periods.

Section 203. Increase in compensation for certain congressional officers

This section increases the basic compensation of elected officers of the Senate and House (not including the presiding officers) by 50 percent, effective January 1, 1947; and increases the appropriations for the Office of the Vice President and the Office of the Speaker by approximately 50 percent.

Section 204. Administrative assistant to Members

This section authorizes each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico to appoint an administrative assistant at a salary of \$8,000 a year.

Section 205. Committee staffs

This section authorizes each standing committee to appoint four professional staff members (in addition to the clerical staffs), who are to be appointed on a permanent basis upon the recommendation and certification of the Director, without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office. These staff members may not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

In the case of the Committees on Appropriations, each such committee and each subcommittee thereof is to be provided with a professional staff, two members of which shall be assigned to the chairman of the committee and each subcommittee thereof and two members to the ranking minority member of each such committee and subcommittee thereof.

The clerical staff of each standing committee will consist of six clerks, two to be attached to the office of the chairman, two to the ranking minority member, and two to the professional staff; and the office of committee janitor is abolished.

It is required that all committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman; and such records are declared to be the property of the Congress and all members of the committee and the respective Houses shall have access to such records.

Until the Director submits a plan for re-

vision of legislative pay schedules and such plan is accepted by the Congress, the professional staff members will receive annual compensation, to be fixed by the chairman, ranging from \$6,000 to \$8,000, and the clerical staff will receive annual compensation ranging from \$2,000 to \$6,000. When the Director has submitted a plan for revision of pay schedules and such plan is accepted by Congress, all provisions of law authorizing chairmen of standing committees to rearrange or change the salaries and number of committee employees are repealed, and the personnel of Members' offices shall not be assigned any committee work.

It is specifically provided that no committee shall appoint to its staff any experts or other personnel detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government except with the written permission of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

Section 206. Legislature Reference Service

This section gives specific statutory authority for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and prescribes detailed statutory functions for that Service. In addition to the other functions the Director of the Service is to assign competent persons to the press and radio galleries of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Director and Assistant Director of the Service are to be appointed by the Librarian upon recommendation and certification of the Director of Congressional Personnel. All personnel of the Service are to be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws and solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their offices. Specific provision is made for the appointment of senior specialists in certain broad fields and such specialists, together with such other members of the staff as may be necessary, are to be available for special work with the committees of Congress.

Increased appropriations for the work of the Legislative Reference Service are authorized as follows: (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, \$550,000; (2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, \$650,000; (3) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, \$750,000; and (4) for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Service.

Section 207. Office of the Legislative Counsel

This section authorizes appropriations for the Office of the Legislative Counsel as follows:

- (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, \$150,000.
- (2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, \$200,000.
- (3) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, \$250,000.
- (4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, \$250,000.
- (5) For each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Office.

These figures are increases over past appropriations for this office; for example, the appropriation contained in the pending legislative appropriation bill is \$105,000.

Section 208. Reductions in appropriations

This section provides that if on December 31 in any fiscal year, and after the budget resolution discussed above (sec. 130 (b) of title I) has been agreed to, the President is of opinion that the expenditures for that fiscal year will exceed receipts in an amount greater than the excess specified in the resolution the President shall so proclaim; and thereupon all appropriations (except permanent appropriations and appropriations for

servicing the public debt, for veterans' pensions and benefits, and to trust funds) shall be reduced by a uniform percentage which will reduce the aggregate amount of funds appropriated for that fiscal year in an amount equal to the difference between the excess proclaimed by the President and the excess specified in the resolution. The section is not to be applicable in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President.

Section 209. Transfer of appropriations

This section, effective July 1, 1947, prohibits the transfer of funds from one appropriation account to another or from one organization unit to another in the executive departments and other executive agencies.

Section 210. Studies by the Comptroller General

This section authorizes and directs the Comptroller General to make a study of restrictions in general appropriation accounts limiting expenditure of specified appropriations, with a view to determining the cost to the Government incident to comply with such restrictions and to report to the Congress with respect thereto.

Section 211. Administrative management analyses by Comptroller General

This section authorizes and directs the Comptroller General to make an administrative management analysis of each agency in the executive branch, to enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently administered and expended. Reports on such analyses are to be submitted to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Appropriations Committees, the legislative committees having jurisdiction over legislation relating to the operations of the respective agencies, and each of the majority and minority policy committees.

PART 2. STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Section 221. Improvement of Congressional Record

This section authorizes and directs the Joint Committee on Printing to make provision for printing in the daily Record the legislative program for the day, together with a list of congressional committee meetings and hearings; and to cause a brief résumé of congressional activities for the previous day to be incorporated in the Record, together with an index of its contents. The data will be prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, respectively.

Section 222. Joint Committee on Printing

This section provides that the Joint Committee on Printing shall consist of the chairman and two members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the chairman and two members of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives. This provision is made necessary by reason of the fact that the Committees on Printing of the respective Houses are abolished in the rearrangement of committees, heretofore discussed.

Section 223. Joint Committee on the Library

Similarly, under this section the Joint Committee on the Library will consist of the chairman and four members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the chairman and four members of the Committee on House Administration of the House.

Section 224. Transfer of functions

Owing to the rearrangement of committees this section transfers the function, powers, and duties imposed on a standing commit-

tee of the Senate or the House to the standing committee created by this act to which is transferred legislative jurisdiction over the subject matter to which such functions, powers, and duties relate; except that respective chairmen of the Civil Service Committees are to be members of the National Archives Council since under the bill the National Archives come under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Committees.

PART 3. PROVISIONS RELATING TO CAPITOL AND POLICY COMMITTEES

Section 241. Remodeling of caucus rooms and restaurants

This section authorizes and directs the Architect of the Capitol to prepare and submit to Congress plans for the remodeling of the caucus rooms in the Senate and House Office Buildings and the Senate and House restaurants. By a committee amendment the provision relating to the Chambers of the two Houses has been stricken out as this project has already been authorized by law.

Section 242. Assignment of Capitol space

Under this section the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House are to cause a survey to be made of available space which could be utilized for joint committee meetings, meetings of conference committees, and other meetings requiring attendance of both Senators and Members of the House, and to recommend the reassignment of such space to accommodate such meetings.

Section 243. Senate and House pages

This section provides that pages for the Senate and House shall be appointed by the Director of Congressional Personnel from among boys from the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House are directed to enter into an arrangement with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the education of these pages and pages of the Supreme Court in the public school system of the District, with provision for reimbursement to the District for any additional expenses incurred.

Section 244. Majority and minority policy committees

This section recommends the establishment of policy committees by the majority party and the principal minority party in each of the two Houses, for the formulation of over-all legislative policy, and authorizes an appropriation of \$30,000 annually for each policy committee for the maintenance of a staff. The members of each such staff are to be appointed and their compensation fixed by the policy committee concerned, but no such compensation shall be fixed at a rate in excess of \$8,000 per annum.

Section 245. Joint legislative-executive council

This section provides that when the majority policy committees are established they shall serve on a formal council to meet at regular intervals with the Executive and members of his Cabinet to consult and collaborate in the formulation and carrying out of national policy. It is further provided that from time to time the minority policy committees shall be included in such conferences on broad questions of foreign and domestic policy.

Section 246. Experimentation with meeting schedules

This section, in effect, recommends that there be experiments with schedules for meeting of the two Houses to determine whether business might not be more efficiently transacted by providing for alternate days for Chamber sessions and committee meetings, or by providing for three

full days for committee meetings and three full days for sessions in the Chamber, or by providing some other schedule, including night sessions.

Section 247. Effective date

This section fixes an effective date for this title. With the exception of sections 205 (a), (b), and (c), 222, 223, 224, and 243, the title is made effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

TITLE III—REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

This title deals with a subject that has frequently been before the Congress, in the form of bills to regulate lobbying activities. In order that there may be no misunderstanding of the purposes of this title the committee desires to make a statement as to what the title does and what it does not do. There follow some of the things that the title does not do:

First. It does not curtail the right of free speech or freedom of the press or the right of petition.

Second. It has no application to the publishers of newspapers, magazines, or other publications, acting in the regular course of business.

Third. It has no application to persons who appear openly and frankly before the committees of Congress and engage in no other activities to influence legislation.

Fourth. It does not require any reports of any persons or organizations now required to report under the provisions of the present Corrupt Practices Act.

Fifth. It does not apply in any manner to persons who appear voluntarily without compensation.

Sixth. It does not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed.

On the other hand the title applies chiefly to three distinct classes of so-called lobbyists:

First. Those who do not visit the Capitol but initiate propaganda from all over the country in the form of letters and telegrams, many of which have been based entirely upon misinformation as to facts. This class of persons and organizations will be required under the title, not to cease or curtail their activities in any respect, but merely to disclose the sources of their collections and the methods in which they are disbursed.

Second. The second class of lobbyists are those who are employed to come to the Capitol under the false impression that they exert some powerful influence over Members of Congress. These individuals spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence with respect to the legislation in which their employers are interested, but carefully conceal from Members of Congress whom they happen to contact the purpose of their presence. The title in no wise prohibits or curtails their activities. It merely requires that they shall register and disclose the sources and purposes of their employment and the amount of their compensation.

Third. There is a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views for or against legislation, many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose in expressing the views and interpretations of their employers with respect to legislation which concerns them. They will likewise be required to register and state their compensation and the sources of their employment.

Section 301. Short title

This section provides a short title, namely, the "Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act."

Section 302. Definitions

This section contains definitions and for convenience or reference the definitions of "contribution," "expenditure," and "legislation" are included herein as follows:

(a) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

(b) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

(c) The term "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

Section 303. Detailed accounts of contributions

This section makes it the duty of every person soliciting or receiving contributions (as defined above) to any organization or fund for the purposes defined in section 307 (post) to keep a detailed and exact account of all contributions; the name and address of every person making a contribution of \$500 or more and the date thereof; all expenditures made by or on behalf of the organization or fund; and the name and address of every person to whom any expenditure was made, and the date thereof. It is further made the duty of such person to keep receipted bills for expenditures in excess of \$10, and to preserve the receipted bills and accounts required to be kept for at least 2 years from the date of filing of the statement containing such items.

Section 304. Receipts for contributions

This section requires every individual who receives a contribution of \$500 or more for the purposes specified in section 307 (post), within 5 days after receipt, to render to the person or organization for which it was received a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making the contribution and the date on which received.

Section 305. Statements to be filed with Clerk of House

This section requires every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes specified in section 307 (post) to file with the Clerk of the House a statement showing the names and addresses of persons contributing \$500 or more; the total sum of the contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year and not stated under the foregoing requirement; the total sum of all contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year; the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure of \$10 or more has been made within the calendar year by or on behalf of such person and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure; the total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under the foregoing requirement, and the total expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year. Statements required to be filed hereunder shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate.

Section 306. Statement preserved for 2 years

Statements required to be filed with the Clerk must be preserved for a period of 2 years from the date of filing, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

Section 307. Persons to whom applicable

This section defines the application of the title and includes any person who by himself or through any agent or employee or other person in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any one of the following purposes:

(a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. It will be noted in this connection that under the definition set forth above "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

(b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress.

(c) To influence, directly or indirectly, the election or defeat of any candidate for any elective Federal office.

Section 308. Registration with Secretary of Senate and Clerk of House

This section requires any person who engages himself for pay or for any consideration, for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, to register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, giving full details of his employment, and to report each calendar quarter details concerning money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work. There are excepted from the provisions of this section persons who merely appear before committees in support of or in opposition to legislation but who engage in no further or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation; public officials acting in their official capacity; and newspapers and periodicals acting in the regular course of business. All information required to be filed with the Clerk and Secretary shall be compiled by them, acting jointly, and printed in the Congressional Record.

Section 309. Reports and statements to be made under oath

This section requires all reports and statements to be made under oath.

Section 310. Penalties

This section makes it a misdemeanor to violate any of the provisions of the title and provides punishment by fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both. In addition to these penalties any person convicted of the misdemeanor specified above is prohibited for a period of 3 years from attempting to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or in opposition to proposed legislation; and any person who violates this provision is guilty of a felony and subject to punishment by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Section 311. Exemption

This section provides that the title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act nor be construed as repealing any portion of said act.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

This title waives, with certain limitations, governmental immunity to suit in tort and permits suits on tort claims to be brought against the United States. It is complementary to the provision in title I banning private bills and resolutions in Congress, leaving claimants to their remedy under this title.

In addition, the title extends the existing

authority of heads of Government departments to adjust tort claims. Under existing law such authority is restricted to claims for property loss and damage not exceeding \$1,000. This title would extend it to cases of personal injury or death, but retains the maximum limitation of \$1,000.

The title applies to claims accruing on and after January 1, 1945, thus going back for one full session of Congress, and together with the provision in section 121 (ante) permitting bills and resolutions to be considered covering claims accruing between January 1, 1939, and December 31, 1944, will in effect permit an 8-year period for disposing of past claims.

Attention is called to the fact that there is now on the House Calendar a bill (H.R. 181, 79th Cong.) almost identical with this title. The essential difference is that the House bill puts a maximum limitation of \$10,000 on claims for which suit may be brought, whereas this title as reported by your committee contains no such limitation. The committee is of the opinion that in view of the banning of private claim bills in the Congress no such limitation should be imposed, and that with respect to this type of claim the Government should be put in the same position as any private party.

For the information of the Senate the following statement from the House Committee report on H.R. 181 (H. Rept. No. 1287, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), covering the history of this legislation and a summary of existing law is incorporated and made a part of this report:

"HISTORY OF LEGISLATION"

"Under existing law, while the Government may be sued in contract, it is not generally subject to suit in tort, except as to admiralty and maritime torts.

"Heads of departments are permitted to make administrative adjustments of certain types of tort claims for small amounts. Other claims, if adjusted at all, are handled individually by private bills, which either make a direct appropriation for the payment of the claim or else remit the claimant to suit either in the Court of Claims or in a United States district court.

"For many years the present system has been subjected to criticism, both as being unduly burdensome to the Congress and as being unjust to the claimants, in that it does not accord to injured parties a recovery as a matter of right but bases any award that may be made on considerations of grace. Moreover, it does not afford a well-defined continually operating machinery for the consideration of such claims. For many years bills on this subject have been introduced from time to time attempting to approach the matter in various ways. During the Seventieth Congress a bill, H.R. 9285, which endeavored to deal with this matter passed both Houses but encountered a pocket veto at the hands of President Coolidge, which it is understood was principally based on the fact that the function of acting as counsel for the Government in such cases was to be reposed by that bill in the Comptroller General instead of in the Attorney General.

"In the Seventy-sixth Congress H.R. 7236 passed the House on September 12, 1940, but the pressure of other urgent matters prevented its consideration in the Senate before the close of the session.

"In the Seventy-seventh Congress a similar bill, S. 2221, was passed by the Senate and was approved in substance by this committee. Previous to such action, hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 6463 and an earlier bill, H.R. 5373, both introduced by Representative Celler.

"The magnitude of the task of considering and disposing of private claims can be gathered from the following statistics:

"In the Sixty-eighth Congress about 2,200 private claim bills were introduced, of which 250 became law, then the largest number in the history of the Claims Committee.

"In the Seventieth Congress 2,268 private claim bills were introduced, asking more than \$100,000,000. Of these, 336 were enacted, appropriating about \$2,830,000, of which 144, in the amount of \$562,000, were for tort.

In each of the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses over 2,300 private claim bills were introduced, seeking more than \$100,000,000. In the Seventy-sixth Congress approximately 2,000 bills were introduced, of which 315 were approved, for a total of \$826,000.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress, of the 1,829 private claim bills introduced and referred to the Claims Committee, 593 were approved for a total of \$1,000,253.30. In the Seventy-eighth Congress 1,644 bills were introduced; 549 of these were approved for a total of \$1,355,767.12. So far during the present Congress about 1,279 private claim bills have been introduced. Of these, 225 have been enacted, appropriating about \$965,353.06.

"SUMMARY OF EXISTING LAW

"Since 1855 the Government has been subject to suit on contract in the Court of Claims (act of February 24, 1855; 10 Stat. 612, amended by act of March 3, 1863; 12 Stat. 765). By the act of March 3, 1887, known as the Tucker Act, concurrent jurisdiction was conferred on the United States district courts over such contract claims and other claims "not sounding in tort" against the Government as involve a sum not exceeding \$10,000. By the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 851; U.S.C., title 35, sec. 68), the United States submitted itself to suit for patent infringement. Such suits may be brought only in the Court of Claims.

"By the act of March 9, 1920 (41 Stat. 525; U.S.C., title 46, sec. 742), the Government was subjected to being sued in the district courts in respect to admiralty and maritime torts involving merchant vessels or tugboats owned or operated by the Government. By the act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1112; U.S.C., title 46, sec. 781), the right to sue the Government in respect to admiralty and maritime torts was extended so as to include damages caused by a public vessel of the United States. This authority was without limitation as to the amount of the claim.

"As a result of the statutes briefly summarized above, the Government is subject to suit in contract, on admiralty and maritime torts, and for patent infringement. On the other hand, no action may be maintained against the Government in respect to any common-law tort. The existing exemption in respect to common-law torts appears incongruous. Its only justification seems to be historical. With the expansion of governmental activities in recent years, it becomes especially important to grant to private individuals the right to sue the Government in respect to such torts as negligence in the operation of vehicles.

"In respect to certain classes of small claims the heads of departments are permitted by existing law to make administrative adjustment. However, in no case, is a court review now provided, if the claimant feels aggrieved at the disposition made of his claim by the head of the department. Thus by the act of December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066; U.S. Code, title 31, sec. 215), the head of each department or independent establishment was authorized to adjust any claim for property loss or damage caused by the negligence of an officer or employee of the Government acting within the scope of his employment if the amount of the claim does not exceed \$1,000. It will be observed that this authority does not extend to claims for personal injuries or death. There are special statutes in existence permitting the heads

of a few departments to adjust claims of a character defined in such statutes, generally not exceeding \$500 in amount. For example, the Postmaster General is vested with power to settle claims not exceeding \$500 involving either personal injuries or property damage caused by operations of the Post Office Department.

"The present bill would establish a uniform system authorizing the administrative settlement of small tort claims and permitting suit to be brought on any tort claim not exceeding \$10,000, with the exception of certain classes of torts expressly exempted from the operation of the act."

PART 1. SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

Section 401. Short title

This section provides a short title, namely, the "Federal Tort Claims Act."

Section 402. Definitions

This section defines the terms used in the title and makes it clear that its provisions cover all Federal agencies, including Government corporations, and all Federal officers and employees, including members of the military and naval forces (in the case of the latter it is noted that section 421(j) excludes from the application of the title claims arising out of the activities of the military and naval forces or the Coast Guard, during time of war).

PART 2. ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT OF TORT CLAIMS

Section 403. Claims of \$1,000 or less

This section authorizes the head of each Federal agency, or his designee, to adjust claims accruing on and after January 1, 1945, not exceeding \$1,000 on account of property loss or damage or personal injury or death caused by the negligence or wrongful act or omission of a Government employee of such agency while acting within the scope of his employment. In general, any award or determination is final and conclusive, except when procured by means of fraud. The acceptance of any award, compromise, or settlement releases both the Government and the employee from liability.

Section 404. Reports

Under this section the heads of Federal agencies are required to make an annual report to Congress of all claims paid under this part.

PART 3. SUITS ON TORT CLAIMS

Section 410. Jurisdiction

This section vests exclusive jurisdiction in the United States district courts over claims against the United States, accruing on and after January 1, 1945, on account of property loss or damage or personal injury or death caused by the negligence or wrongful act or omission of a Government employee while acting within the scope of his employment. The trial will be without a jury as is now the case in suits under the Tucker Act. The liability of the United States will be the same as that of a private person under like circumstance, in accordance with the local law, except that no punitive damages and no interest prior to judgment may be recovered.

Suit may not be instituted on a claim presented to a Federal agency under part 2 until it has been finally disposed of by the agency or withdrawn from consideration of the agency, and in any case suit shall not be brought for any sum in excess of the amount of the claim presented to the Federal agency except where based upon newly discovered evidence or evidence of intervening facts.

Section 411. Procedure

This section provides that the practice and procedure shall be in accordance with the Rules of Civil Procedure, and the same provision for counterclaim and set-off, for

interest upon judgments, and for payment of judgments are applicable as in cases brought in the district courts under the Tucker Act.

Section 412. Review

Final judgments in the district courts are made subject to review by appeal to the circuit court of appeals or, with the written consent of all appellees, to the Court of Claims. Judgment would then be subject to review by the Supreme Court to the same extent as in other cases in the circuit courts of appeal.

Section 413. Compromise

This section authorizes the Attorney General to arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim cognizable under this part, after the institution of suit thereon.

PART 4. PROVISIONS COMMON TO PART 2 AND PART 3

Section 420. Statute of limitations

This section prescribes a limitation period of 1 year for presentation of claims to Federal agencies or filing of suits in the district courts. If the claim is presented to a Federal agency an additional period of 6 months is provided from the time of disposition by the agency or withdrawal of the claim within which to file suit.

Section 421. Exceptions

This section specifies types of claim which would not be covered by the title. They include claims based upon the performance or nonperformance of discretionary functions or duties; claims based upon the act or omission of a Government employee exercising due care in the execution of a statute or regulation; claims based upon action of the Treasury Department under its blacklisting or freezing powers; claims seeking to test the constitutionality of legislation or the legality of a rule or regulation; claims arising from the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and claims which relate to certain governmental activities which should be free from the threat of damage suit, or for which adequate remedies are already available. These exemptions cover claims arising out of the loss or miscarriage of postal matter; the assessment or collection of taxes or assessments; the detention of goods by customs officers; admiralty and maritime torts; deliberate torts such as assault and battery; and others. There are also excluded claims arising out of the activities of the military and naval forces, or the Coast Guard, during time of war, and claims arising in a foreign country.

Section 422. Attorney's fees

This section authorizes the court or the administrative officer, as the case may be, to fix reasonable attorney's fees. If the recovery is \$500 or more, such fees may not exceed 10 percent of the administrative award or 20 percent of the judgment; but in any case the attorney's fees allowed must be paid out of, but not in addition to, the judgment or award. Criminal penalties are provided for charging or collecting fees in excess of the maximum.

Section 423. Exclusivity of remedy

This section provides that after the effective date of the title, the authority of any Federal agency to sue and be sued in its own name will no longer be applicable to torts cognizable under this title. This will place torts of "suable" agencies of the United States upon precisely the same footing as torts of "nonsuable" agencies. In both cases, the suits would be against the United States, subject to the limitations and safeguards of the bill; and in both cases the exceptions of the bill would apply either by way of preventing recovery at all or by way of leaving recovery to some other act, as, for example, the Suits in Admiralty Act. It is intended

that neither corporate status nor "sue and be sued" clauses shall, alone, be the basis for suits for money recovery sounding in tort.

Section 424. Certain statutes inapplicable

This section provides that as to claims cognizable under part 2 of the title existing provisions of law authorizing administrative adjustment of such claims are repealed. Provisions of law authorizing adjustment of claims not cognizable under part 2 would remain unaffected as to such claims.

TITLE V—GENERAL BRIDGE ACT

The object of the proposed title is to eliminate the necessity of a special act of Congress to authorize the construction of each individual bridge by giving general consent to all bridges the location, plans, and specifications of which are approved by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

The title does not apply to bridges over waters the navigable portion of which lies wholly within one State, and in such cases under the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; U.S. Code, title 33, sec. 401) authorization by the State legislature will still be necessary. The plans and specifications for these bridges will still need the approval of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

This title does not repeal the General Bridge Act of 1906 (34 Stat. 84; U.S.C., title 33, sec. 491), but supersedes such act with respect to bridges over navigable waters of the United States, the construction of which is hereafter approved, and it is contemplated that all such bridges will hereafter be constructed under the provisions of this title. However, it may be noted that even though section 121 of the bill prohibits the receipt or consideration in either House of Congress of a private bill or resolution authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream, the two Houses may suspend such rule and grant such consent by a special act in accordance with the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1906. In any case in which that event occurs, the provisions of the 1906 act will apply.

This title does not apply to the bridges specified in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 670; U.S.C., title 33, secs. 503-506). That act permits the Secretary of War to set reasonable tolls on bridges constructed under the authority of acts prior to the act of March 3, 1899, cited above; nor does it apply to the act of June 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 497; U.S.C., title 33, secs. 511-523), which is an act to provide for the alteration of railroad bridges and for the apportionment of the cost of such alterations between the United States and the owners of such bridges.

Section 501. Short title

This section provides a short title, namely, the "General Bridge Act of 1946."

Section 502. Consent of Congress

This section contains a general grant of the consent of Congress for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges over navigable waters in accordance with the provisions of this title. Location and plans are to be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War who may impose any specific conditions that they deem necessary in the interest of public navigation. In the case of privately owned highway toll bridges the location and plans must be approved by the highway departments of the State or States in which the bridge and its approaches are situated, and if in any such case the States are unable to agree or they, or either of them, fail or refuse to act upon the location and plans submitted, the location and plans will then be submitted to the Federal Public Roads Administration, and, if approved by the Public Roads Admin-

istration, approval by the State highway departments is not required.

Section 503. Tolls

This section provides for the regulation of tolls over interstate bridges and authorizes the Secretary of War from time to time to prescribe reasonable rates of toll.

Section 504. Acquisition by public agencies

This section authorizes acquisition by public agencies of any interstate toll bridge and limits the damages or compensation to be allowed, after 5 years after the completion of the bridge, to cost of construction, acquiring interests in real property, financing and promotion costs not to exceed 10 percent of the sum of the foregoing, and actual expenditures for necessary improvements. In such cases no allowances will be made for good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits.

Section 505. Statements of cost

Under this section the owner is required to file with the Secretary of War and the highway departments detailed statements of cost. Provision is made for investigation of such costs by the Secretary of War and his findings shall be conclusive for purposes of section 504, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

Section 506. Sinking fund

This section provides that in the case of interstate toll bridges constructed or taken over by a public agency, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of construction or acquisition. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization has been provided the bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls.

Section 507. Applicability of title

This title is to apply only to bridges over navigable waters of the United States the construction of which is hereafter approved under the provisions of this title.

Section 508. International bridges

This section specifically excepts from the application of the title bridges which will connect the United States or any Territory or possession of the United States with any foreign country.

Section 509. Eminent domain

This section grants the right of eminent domain to persons or public agencies authorized to build bridges between two or more States.

Section 510. Penalties

This section imposes criminal penalties for violation of orders of the Secretary of War or the Chief of Engineers, and for refusal to produce books, papers, or documents required under the title.

Section 511. Rights reserved

This section is the usual reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

This title accomplishes two purposes. First, it increases the compensation of Members of Congress to \$15,000 per annum, and the compensation of the Speaker and the Vice President to \$20,000 per annum. Second, it provides a system of retirement pay for Members of Congress similar to that accorded to Government officers and employees generally.

Section 601. Compensation of Members of Congress

This section increases the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico to \$15,000 per annum; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President to \$20,000 per annum. As an incident to these increases the section contains two additional provisions:

(1) It provides that for the purpose of section 23(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the deductibility of trade and business expenses), in the case of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners their home shall be considered to be their place of residence within the State, Territory, or possession from which they are such a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner. This will in effect permit these officials to deduct business expenses, including board and lodging in Washington, and other expenses incident to their absence from home on congressional service.

(2) The provision of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, providing for the \$2,500 expense allowance for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is repealed.

Section 602. Retirement pay of Members of Congress

Subsection (a) of this section amends section 3(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to remove the exclusion contained therein with respect to Members of Congress. Section 3(a), which relates to coverage under the act, reads in part as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) This Act shall apply to all officers and employees in or under the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the United States Government * * * except elective officers and heads of executive departments."

The amendment would insert after the words "elective officers" the words "in the executive branch of the Government", thus confining the exclusion of elective officers to the President and the Vice President.

Subsection (b) of the section would add a new section 3A to the Retirement Act. This new section would outline the respects in which the Retirement Act would operate differently in the case of a Member of Congress, and, except as provided in this section, the provisions of the Retirement Act would apply in the same manner to Members of Congress as to other persons covered by such act.

Paragraph (1) provides that no Member of Congress shall be subject to the provisions of the act unless he so elects. His election could be made at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment or at any time within 6 months after taking an oath of office as a Member of Congress. He would be required, however, to make his election while serving as a Member of Congress. Thus a Member could not wait until he is out of office and then elect to come under the act; nor would the amendment confer any rights upon former Members of Congress. Any such person who later becomes a Member of Congress would, of course, have a further opportunity at that time to elect to come within the purview of the act, and, if he so elected, he would get credit for his prior service as a Member of Congress.

Members of Congress electing to become subject to the provisions of the act would be required, from the date of such election, to contribute to the retirement fund at the rate of 6 percent of their pay rather than at 5 percent as in the case of other persons subject to the act. Deposits made for the purpose of purchasing credit for past service performed prior to the date of enactment, however, would be made at the same rates as in

the case of other persons, that is, 5 percent for service between July 1, 1942, and the date of enactment; 3½ percent for service between July 1, 1926, and July 1, 1942; and 2½ percent for service between July 31, 1920, and July 1, 1926. No deposit is required for service prior to July 31, 1920.

A Member of Congress would not be eligible for a superannuation annuity under these provisions unless he had served as a Member of Congress for at least 6 years, and unless he contributes or makes deposit for his last 5 years of congressional service. If his last 5 years of service are performed after the date of enactment, the contribution or deduction would be at the rate of 6 percent. However, if any portion of his last 5 years of service shall have been performed prior to the date of enactment, the deposit for that portion would be at the rates (set forth in the preceding paragraph) in effect at the time such service was performed, and would be based on the salary he received at such time. An exception to the rule that the last 5 years of congressional service must be contributed for is contained in paragraph 7 of the amendment and perhaps should be mentioned at this point. In a case in which a Member of Congress qualifies for and receives an annuity but thereafter is again elected to Congress, his annuity will be suspended during the period in which he holds office. Although this subsequent service will now form at least a part of his last 5 years of service, his annuity will be resumed when he relinquishes office even though he does not elect to have deductions made during this period. As hereafter explained, however, the annuity will not be recomputed to allow credit for the subsequent service unless such deductions are made.

If the Member of Congress is 62 or over when he leaves office his annuity would become payable on the first day of the month following the month in which he leaves office. If, however, he leaves office prior to attaining the age of 62, his annuity would not commence until the first day of the month following the month in which he reaches age 62.

As in the case of other persons subject to the Retirement Act, a Member of Congress could, irrespective of age, retire after 5 years' service if he were to become totally disabled for useful and efficient service, and be paid an annuity computed in the manner set forth in the following paragraph. In order to qualify for a disability annuity, the Member of Congress, however, must have contributed or made deposit for his last 5 years of service as required in the case of the annuity based on age and service.

The annuity of a Member of Congress under this section would, if he contributed or made deposit for all congressional service subsequent to July 31, 1920, be an amount equal to 2½ percent of the average annual pay he received as a Member of Congress

multiplied by his years of service as a Member of Congress, but no annuity would be permitted to exceed three-fourths of the annual rate of compensation received by such Member at the date of his separation from the service. For the purposes of computing average annual pay, only basic compensation would be considered. The compensation provided by law for the Speaker of the House and of the President pro tempore of the Senate when there is no Vice President would, of course, be considered pay for service as a Member of Congress for such purposes.

If the Member of Congress failed to contribute or make deposit for all his years of congressional service the years for which he did not contribute or make deposit would nevertheless be included in computing his annuity, but the annuity would be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of annuity which his contributions or deposit including interest thereon for such years would purchase if made. Since service other than as a Member of Congress cannot be used in computing the annuity under this provision, failure to make deposit for such service would not result in reduction of such annuity.

The amount of annuity payable to a Member of Congress would also be affected by any election which he might make under section 4 (c) or (d) of the Retirement Act. Ordinarily, any unexpended part of the principal of an annuity is returned, upon the annuitant's death, to his beneficiary. Under section 4(c), however, he may elect to receive an increased annuity with forfeiture at his death of any unexpended part of the principal. Also, under section 4(d), he may elect to receive a reduced annuity during his life, and an annuity after his death payable to his beneficiary.

A Member who becomes separated without having served at least 6 years as a Member of Congress will be entitled under paragraph 6 to a refund of all amounts deducted from his pay for retirement purposes, with interest at 4 percent to the date of separation, unless, of course, he is receiving a disability annuity. In any case in which a Member receives a refund under this paragraph, and later has additional service which qualifies him for an annuity, he must redeposit the amount refunded to him with interest, in order to receive such annuity.

No annuity will be payable to any person under the act during any period in which he holds office under, or is employed by, the United States. Paragraph 7 provides that if a person qualifies for and receives an annuity and later takes office as a Member of Congress, the payment of his annuity will be suspended so long as he holds such office. When he relinquishes office, however, his annuity will be resumed and, if he has elected to have deductions made from his salary for such period, his annuity will be recomputed to reflect credit for the additional service.

Under the Retirement Act at present service as a Member of Congress is creditable for annuity purposes in cases where the annuitant had other governmental service which was within the purview of the act. This would be changed under the amendment so that in any case in which a person can qualify for a congressional annuity (i.e., if he has 6 years of service as a Member of Congress any of which occurs after the date of enactment of the amendment) his service as a Member of Congress cannot be credited for the purposes of a regular annuity under the act, and any amounts which he may have contributed with respect to his other governmental service, if less than 5 years, would be refunded. If, however, he has less than 6 years of service as a Member of Congress, or if all of his congressional service was performed prior to the enactment of the amendment, such service can be credited for the purposes of a regular annuity provided he has other Government service bringing him under the act. In no case can service other than service as a Member of Congress be considered in computing a congressional annuity under the amendment. There may be instances, of course, where a person has six or more years of service as a Member of Congress thus qualifying him for an annuity under the amendment, and also has five or more years of other governmental service performed either prior to or after his congressional service, also qualifying him for an annuity under other provisions of the act. In such a case the annuity payable would be equal to the aggregate of the two annuities separately computed. It should be emphasized, however, that a period of service credited for the purposes of the one computation may in no event be credited for the purposes of the other computation.

Certain provisions of the Retirement Act are obviously incompatible with constitutional provisions relating to terms of office and removal of Members of Congress. Thus the provisions of the act relating to automatic separation from the service and to retirement at the request of the head of a department, branch, or agency of the Government, would not be applicable to Members of Congress who come within the provisions of the act.

The amendment would apply only to the Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

The following table indicates the amounts of annuity payable under S. 2177 to Members of Congress whose services are terminated January 2, 1947, according to indicated entry date into service and whether full contributions for all prior service or only contributions for the last 5 years of service have been made. In the latter case the annuity payable is shown for indicated select ages.

Date of entry into service	Annuity payable if full contributions for all prior service are made	Annuity payable at indicated ages if contributions are made only for the last 5 years of service ¹			
		62	65	70	75
Jan. 3, 1941.....	\$1,500	\$1,465	\$1,463	\$1,458	\$1,451
Jan. 3, 1939.....	2,000	1,892	1,884	1,868	1,816
Jan. 3, 1937.....	2,500	2,313	2,299	2,271	2,233
Jan. 3, 1935.....	3,000	2,727	2,707	2,666	2,611
Mar. 4, 1933.....	3,458	3,100	3,074	3,020	2,949
Mar. 4, 1931.....	3,958	3,500	3,467	3,398	3,307
Mar. 4, 1929.....	4,458	3,892	3,851	3,766	3,653
Mar. 4, 1927.....	4,958	4,275	4,226	4,123	3,987

Date of entry into service	Annuity payable if full contributions for all prior service are made	Annuity payable at indicated ages if contributions are made only for the last 5 years of service ¹			
		62	65	70	75
Mar. 4, 1925.....	\$5,458	\$4,673	\$4,616	\$4,498	\$4,341
Mar. 4, 1923.....	5,833	4,975	4,913	4,783	4,612
Mar. 4, 1921.....	6,208	5,271	5,203	5,061	4,875
Mar. 4, 1919.....	6,583	5,621	5,551	5,406	5,215
Mar. 4, 1917.....	6,958	5,996	5,926	5,781	5,590
Mar. 4, 1915.....	7,333	6,371	6,301	6,156	5,965
Mar. 4, 1913.....	7,708	6,738	6,668	6,523	6,332

¹ The paradoxical situation of persons receiving less at the older ages where full contributions have not been made for all service rendered after July 1920 is due to the fact that the full annuity is reduced by the actuarial equivalent of the amount of indebtedness to the fund. The actuarial equivalent therefore increases with age.

The above table is computed on the basis of compensation heretofore received and, of course, the amounts will be increased as time goes on if the provisions of section 601, providing for increased compensation for Members of Congress, are enacted.

TITLE VII—SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This title, which provided for the preparation of a charter designed to provide a form of municipal government for the District of Columbia, and a referendum thereon of District residents, was stricken from the bill by the committee, for the reasons given in the general statement above.

[Reproduced by the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, June 27, 1969]

S. 2177

An act to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government

Mr. La Follette; Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, 4881.—Reported with amendment (S. Rept. 1400), 5958.—Debated in Senate, 6344, 6365-6375, 6390-6398, 6439-6454, 6455-6466, 6466-6469, 6517-6521, 6522-6541, 6547-6575.—Amended and passed Senate, 6578.—Made special order (H. Res. 717), 10037.—Debated, amended, and passed House, 10039-10104.—Senate concurs in House amendment, 10139-10152.—Examined and signed, 10329, 10411.—Presented to the President, 10412.—Approved [Public, No. 601], 10740.

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

SHORT TITLE

That (a) this Act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946":

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE I—CHANGES IN RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE

Sec. 101. Rule-making power of the Senate and House.

PART I—STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 102. Standing committees of the Senate.
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
Committee on Appropriations.
Committee on Armed Services.
Committee on Banking and Currency.
Committee on Civil Service.
Committee on the District of Columbia.
Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
Committee on Finance.
Committee on Foreign Relations.
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Committee on the Judiciary.
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
Committee on Public Lands.
Committee on Public Works.
Committee on Rules and Administration.

Sec. 103. Appropriations.

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 121. Standing committees of the House of Representatives.
Committee on Agriculture.
Committee on Appropriations.
Committee on Armed Services.
Committee on Banking and Currency.
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
Committee on the District of Columbia.

Committee on Education and Labor.
Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
Committee on Foreign Affairs.
Committee on House Administration.
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Committee on the Judiciary.
Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
Committee on Public Lands.
Committee on Public Works.
Committee on Rules.
Committee on Un-American Activities.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
Committee on Ways and Means.

Sec. 122. Delegates and Resident Commissioner.

Sec. 123. Reference of Private Claims Bills.

PART 3—PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES

Sec. 131. Private bills banned.
Sec. 132. Congressional adjournment.
Sec. 133. Committee procedure.
Sec. 134. Committee powers.
Sec. 135. Conference rules on amendments in nature of substitute.
Sec. 136. Legislative oversight by standing committees.
Sec. 137. Decisions on questions of committee jurisdiction.
Sec. 138. Legislative Budget.
Sec. 139. Hearings and reports by Appropriations Committees.
Sec. 140. Records of Congress.
Sec. 141. Preservation of committee hearings.
Sec. 142. Effective date.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

PART 1—STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL PERSONNEL

Sec. 201. Increase in compensation for certain Congressional officers.
Sec. 202. Committee staffs.
Sec. 203. Legislative Reference Service.
Sec. 204. Office of the Legislative Counsel.
Sec. 205. Studies by Comptroller General.
Sec. 206. Expenditure analyses by Comptroller General.
Sec. 207. Correction of Military and Naval Records.

PART 2—STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

Sec. 221. Improvement of Congressional Record.
Sec. 222. Joint Committee on Printing.
Sec. 223. Joint Committee on the Library.
Sec. 224. Transfer of functions.
Sec. 225. Joint Committee on the Economic Report.
Sec. 226. Economic Report of the President.

PART 3—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CAPITOL AND PAGES

Sec. 241. Remodeling of caucus rooms and restaurants.
Sec. 242. Assignment of Capitol space.
Sec. 243. Senate and House pages.
Sec. 244. Authorization of appropriations and personnel.
Sec. 245. Effective date.

TITLE III—REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Definitions.
Sec. 303. Detailed accounts of contributions.
Sec. 304. Receipts for contributions.
Sec. 305. Statements to be filed with Clerk of House.
Sec. 306. Statement preserved for two years.
Sec. 307. Persons to whom applicable.
Sec. 308. Registration with Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House.
Sec. 309. Reports and statements to be made under oath.
Sec. 310. Penalties.
Sec. 311. Exemption.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

PART 1—SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Definitions.

PART 2—ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT OF TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 403. Claims of \$1,000 or less.
Sec. 404. Reports.

PART 3—SUITS ON TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 410. Jurisdiction.
Sec. 411. Procedure.
Sec. 412. Review.
Sec. 413. Compromise.

PART 4—PROVISIONS COMMON TO PART 2 AND PART 3

Sec. 420. One year statute of limitations.
Sec. 421. Exceptions.
Sec. 422. Attorneys' fees.
Sec. 423. Exclusiveness of remedy.
Sec. 424. Certain statutes inapplicable.

TITLE V—GENERAL BRIDGE ACT

Sec. 501. Short title.
Sec. 502. Consent of Congress.
Sec. 503. Tolls.
Sec. 504. Acquisition by public agencies.
Sec. 505. Statements of cost.
Sec. 506. Sinking fund.
Sec. 507. Applicability of title.
Sec. 508. International bridges.
Sec. 509. Eminent domain.
Sec. 510. Penalties.
Sec. 511. Rights reserved.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Sec. 601. Compensation of Members of Congress.
Sec. 602. Retirement pay of Members of Congress.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

(b) If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE I—CHANGES IN RULES OF SENATE AND HOUSE

RULE-MAKING POWER OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE

SEC. 101. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

PART 1—STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 102. Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XXV

"STANDING COMMITTEES

"(1) The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, with leave to report by bill or otherwise:

"(a) Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Agriculture generally.

"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

"3. Animal industry and disease of animals.

"4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

"5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

"7. Agricultural economics and research.

"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

"9. Dairy industry.

"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.

"11. Human nutrition and home economics.

"12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

"13. Agricultural educational extension services.

"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

"15. Rural electrification.

"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-one Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"(c) Committee on Armed Services, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Common defense generally.

"2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.

"3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.

"4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

"5. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.

"6. Selective service.

"7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.

"8. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.

"9. Ammunition depots.

"10. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.

"11. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

"12. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

"(d) Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Banking and currency generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

"3. Deposit insurance.

"4. Public and private housing.

"5. Federal Reserve System.

"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

"(e) Committee on Civil Service, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. The Federal civil service generally.

"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.

"4. Postal-savings banks.

"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.

"6. The National Archives.

"(f) Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including—

"2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.

"3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.

"4. Adulteration of food and drugs.

"5. Taxes and tax sales.

"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.

"7. Municipal and juvenile courts.

"8. Incorporation and organization of societies.

"9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

"(g) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

"(h) Committee on Finance, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Revenue measures generally.

"2. The bonded debt of the United States.

"3. The deposit of public moneys.

"4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

"5. Reciprocal trade agreements.

"6. Transportation of dutiable goods.

"7. Revenue measures relating to the insular possessions.

"8. Tariffs and import quotas, and matters related thereto.

"9. National social security.

"10. Veterans' measures generally.

"11. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"12. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the armed forces.

"13. Compensation of veterans.

"(i) Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which com-

mittee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

"2. Treaties.

"3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

"4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

"5. Neutrality.

"6. International conferences and congresses.

"7. The American National Red Cross.

"8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

"9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

"10. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.

"11. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

"12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.

"13. Foreign loans.

"(j) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate railroads, busses, trucks, and pipe lines.

"3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

"4. Civil aeronautics.

"5. Merchant marine generally.

"6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

"7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

"8. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.

"9. Merchant marine officers and seamen.

"10. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, life-saving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

"11. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

"12. The Coast Guard, including life-saving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.

"13. The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.

"14. Weather Bureau.

"15. Except as provided in paragraph (c), the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.

"16. Inland waterways.

"17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

"18. Bureau of Standards including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

"(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.

"2. Constitutional amendments.

"3. Federal courts and judges.

"4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.

"5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

"6. National penitentiaries.

"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

"8. Holidays and celebrations.

"9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.

"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.

"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.

"12. Civil liberties.

"13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

"14. Patent Office.

"15. Immigration and naturalization.

"16. Apportionment of Representatives.

"17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.

"18. Interstate compacts generally.

"(1) Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.

"2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

"3. Wages and hours of labor.

"4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

"5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

"6. Child labor.

"7. Labor statistics.

"8. Labor standards.

"9. School-lunch program.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation.

"11. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

"12. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

"13. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and Saint Elizabeth's Hospital.

"14. Public health and quarantine.

"15. Welfare of miners.

"16. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"17. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"18. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"19. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

"(m) Committee on Public Lands, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

"2. Mineral resources of the public lands.

"3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

"4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

"5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

"7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

"10. Mining interests generally.

"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

"12. Geological survey.

"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.

"14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

"16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and

general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

"(n) The Committee on Public Works, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

"2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, and bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

"3. Water power.

"4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

"5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

"6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, custom-houses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

"7. Measures relating to the Capitol building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

"8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

"9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.

"10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads.

"(o) (1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to consist of thirteen Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"(A) Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

"(B) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statutory and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

"(C) Except as provided in paragraph (n) 8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

"(D) Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

"(E) Matters relating to parliamentary rules; floor and gallery rules; Senate Restaurant; administration of the Senate Office Building and of the Senate Wing of the Capitol; assignment of office space; and services to the Senate.

"(F) Matters relating to printing and correction of the Congressional Record.

"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the Senate; and, in cooperation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate. Such

committee shall also have the duty of assigning office space in the Senate Wing of the Capitol and in the Senate Office Building.

"(3) Each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed.

"(3) Each standing committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee, subject to the provisions of section 133(d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more."

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 103. Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XVI

"AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS

"1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or Act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate submitted in accordance with law.

"2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction or the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

"3. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner, amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills, establishing post roads, or proposing new post roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

"4. No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, or shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; nor shall any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law be received if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency; and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate; and

any such amendment or restriction to a general appropriation bill may be laid on the table without prejudice to the bill.

"5. No amendment, the object of which is to provide for a private claim, shall be received to any general appropriation bill, unless it be to carry out the provisions of an existing law or a treaty stipulation, which shall be cited on the face of the amendment.

"6. (a) Three members of the following named committees, to be selected by their respective committees, shall be ex officio, members of the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on said committee when the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purpose specified in the following table opposite the name of the committee is being considered by the Committee on Appropriations:

Name of committee and purpose of Appropriation:

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for the Department of Agriculture.

Committee on Civil Service, for the Post Office Department.

Committee on Armed Services, for the Department of War; for the Department of the Navy.

Committee on the District of Columbia, for the District of Columbia.

Committee on Public Works, for Rivers and Harbors.

Committee on Foreign Relations, for the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

"(b) At least one member of each committee enumerated in subparagraph (a), to be selected by his or their respective committees, shall be a member of any conference committee appointed to confer with the House upon the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the foregoing table opposite the name of his or their respective committee.

"7. When a point of order is made against any restriction on the expenditure of funds appropriated in a general appropriation bill on the ground that the restriction violates this rule, the rule shall be construed strictly and, in case of doubt, in favor of the point of order."

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 121. (a) Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE X

"STANDING COMMITTEES

"(a) There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

"1. Committee on Agriculture, to consist of twenty-seven Members.

"2. Committee on Appropriations, to consist of forty-three Members.

"3. Committee on Armed Services, to consist of thirty-three Members.

"4. Committee on Banking and Currency, to consist of twenty-seven Members.

"5. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"6. Committee on the District of Columbia, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"7. Committee on Education and Labor, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"8. Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"9. Committee on Foreign Affairs, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"10. Committee on House Administration, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"11. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of twenty-seven Members.

"12. Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of twenty-seven Members.

"13. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"14. Committee on Public Lands, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"15. Committee on Public Works, to consist of twenty-seven Members.

"16. Committee on Rules, to consist of twelve Members.

"17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

"18. Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of twenty-seven Members.

"19. Committee on Ways and Means, to consist of twenty-five Members.

"(b) (1) The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time.

"(2) At the commencement of each Congress, the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the Members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman, the Member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman; and in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

"(3) All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more."

(b) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XI

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

"(1) All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subjects listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively: *Provided*, That unless otherwise provided herein, any matter within the jurisdiction of a standing committee prior to January 2, 1947, shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of that committee or of the consolidated committee succeeding generally to the jurisdiction of that committee.

"(a) Committee on Agriculture.

"1. Agriculture generally.

"2. Inspection of livestock and meat products.

"3. Animal industry and diseases of animals.

"4. Adulteration of seeds, insect pests, and protection of birds and animals in forest reserves.

"5. Agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

"6. Forestry in general, and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

"7. Agricultural economics and research.

"8. Agricultural and industrial chemistry.

"9. Dairy industry.

"10. Entomology and plant quarantine.

"11. Human nutrition and home economics.

"12. Plant industry, soils, and agricultural engineering.

"13. Agricultural educational extension services.

"14. Extension of farm credit and farm security.

"15. Rural electrification.

"16. Agricultural production and marketing and stabilization of prices of agricultural products.

"17. Crop insurance and soil conservation.

"(b) Committee on Appropriations.

"1. Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government.

"(c) Committee on Armed Services.

"1. Common defense generally.

"2. The War Department and the Military Establishment generally.

"3. The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally.

"4. Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

"5. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.

"6. Selective service.

"7. Size and composition of the Army and Navy.

"8. Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards.

"9. Ammunition depots.

"10. Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

"11. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

"12. Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

"(d) Committee on Banking and Currency.

"1. Banking and currency generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

"3. Deposit insurance.

"4. Public and private housing.

"5. Federal Reserve System.

"6. Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"7. Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

"8. Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

"9. Control of prices of commodities, rents, or services.

"(e) Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

"1. The Federal civil service generally.

"2. The status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

"3. The postal service generally, including the railway mail service, and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service; but excluding post roads.

"4. Postal-savings banks.

"5. Census and the collection of statistics generally.

"6. The National Archives.

"(f) Committee on the District of Columbia.

"1. All measures relating to the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general, other than appropriations therefor, including—

"2. Public health and safety, sanitation, and quarantine regulations.

"3. Regulation of sale of intoxicating liquors.

"4. Adulteration of food and drugs.

"5. Taxes and tax sales.

"6. Insurance, executors, administrators, wills, and divorce.

"7. Municipal and juvenile courts.

"8. Incorporation and organization of societies.

"9. Municipal code and amendments to the criminal and corporation laws.

"(g) Committee on Education and Labor.

"1. Measures relating to education or labor generally.

"2. Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

"3. Wages and hours of labor.

"4. Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

"5. Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

"6. Child labor.

"7. Labor statistics.

"8. Labor standards.

"9. School-lunch program.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation.

"11. United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

"12. Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital; and Saint Elizabeths Hospital.

"13. Welfare of miners.

"(h) (1) Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

"(A) Budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations.

"(B) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

"(2) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;

"(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

"(C) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government;

"(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

"(i) Committee on Foreign Affairs.

"1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

"2. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.

"3. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.

"4. Neutrality.

"5. International conferences and congresses.

"6. The American National Red Cross.

"7. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.

"8. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.

"9. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.

"10. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.

"11. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.

"12. Foreign loans.

"(j) (1) Committee on House Administration.

"(A) Employment of persons by the House, including clerks for Members and committees, and reporters of debates.

"(B) Expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.

"(C) The auditing and settling of all accounts which may be charged to the contingent fund.

"(D) Measures relating to accounts of the House generally.

"(E) Appropriations from the contingent fund.

"(F) Measures relating to services to the House, including the House Restaurant and administration of the House Office Buildings and of the House wing of the Capitol.

"(G) Measures relating to the travel of Members of the House.

"(H) Measures relating to the assignment of office space for Members and committees.

"(I) Measures relating to the disposition of useless executive papers.

"(J) Except as provided in paragraph (o) 8, matters relating to the Library of Congress and the House Library; statutory and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

"(K) Except as provided in paragraph (o) 8, matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

"(L) Matters relating to printing and correction of the Congressional Record.

"(M) Measures relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; and Federal elections generally.

"(2) Such committee shall also have the duty of—

"(A) examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House; and in cooperation with the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that they are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the House, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the House;

"(B) reporting to the Sergeant at Arms of the House the travel of Members of the House;

"(C) arranging a suitable program for each day observed by the House of Representatives as a memorial day in memory of Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have died during the preceding period, and to arrange for the publication of the proceedings thereof.

"(k) Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

"2. Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"3. Regulation of interstate and foreign communications.

"4. Civil aeronautics.

"5. Weather bureau.

"6. Interstate oil compacts; and petroleum and natural gas, except on the public lands.

"7. Securities and exchanges.

"8. Regulation of interstate transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government water power projects.

"9. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

"10. Public health and quarantine.

"11. Inland waterways.

"12. Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and the metric system.

"(l) Committee on the Judiciary.

"1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.

"2. Constitutional amendments.

"3. Federal courts and judges.

"4. Local courts in the Territories and possessions.

"5. Revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

"6. National penitentiaries.

"7. Protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies.

"8. Holidays and celebrations.

"9. Bankruptcy, mutiny, espionage, and counterfeiting.

"10. State and Territorial boundary lines.

"11. Meetings of Congress, attendance of Members, and their acceptance of incompatible offices.

"12. Civil liberties.

"13. Patents, copyrights, and trade-marks.

"14. Patent Office.

"15. Immigration and naturalization.

"16. Apportionment of Representatives.

"17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.

"18. Interstate compacts generally.

"19. Presidential succession.

"(m) Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

"1. Merchant marine generally.

"2. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

"3. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage.

"4. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.

"5. Merchant marine officers and seamen.

"6. Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water (except matters subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission) and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

"7. The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.

"8. United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.

"9. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

"10. The Panama Canal and the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone; and inter-oceanic canals generally.

"11. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

"(n) Committee on Public Lands.

"1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.

"2. Mineral resources of the public lands.

"3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

"4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.

"5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.

"6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.

"7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting the revenue and appropriations.

"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects, and acquisition of private lands when necessary to complete irrigation projects.

"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

"10. Mining interests generally.

"11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

"12. Geological survey.

"13. Mining schools and experimental stations.

"14. Petroleum conservation on the public lands and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

"15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

"16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

"(o) Committee on Public Works.

"1. Flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

"2. Public works for the benefit of navigation, including bridges and dams (other than international bridges and dams).

"3. Water power.

"4. Oil and other pollution of navigable waters.

"5. Public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States generally.

"6. Measures relating to the purchase of sites and construction of post offices, customhouses, Federal courthouses, and Government buildings within the District of Columbia.

"7. Measures relating to the Capitol Building and the Senate and House Office Buildings.

"8. Measures relating to the construction or reconstruction, maintenance, and care of the buildings and grounds of the Botanic Gardens, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution.

"9. Public reservations and parks within the District of Columbia, including Rock Creek Park and the Zoological Park.

"10. Measures relating to the construction or maintenance of roads and post roads, other than appropriations therefor; but it shall not be in order for any bill providing general legislation in relation to roads to contain any provision for any specific road, nor for any bill in relation to a specific road to embrace a provision in relation to any other specific road.

"(p) Committee on Rules.

"1. The rules, joint rules, and order of business of the House.

"2. Recesses and final adjournments of Congress.

"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

"(A) Un-American activities.

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

"(r) Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

"1. Veterans' measures generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the armed forces.

"4. Compensation, vocational rehabilitation, and education of veterans.

"5. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"6. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"7. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.

"(s) Committee on Ways and Means.

"1. Revenue measures generally.

"2. The bonded debt of the United States.

"3. The deposit of public moneys.

"4. Customs, collection districts, and ports of entry and delivery.

"5. Reciprocal trade agreements.

"6. Transportation of dutiable goods.

"7. Revenue measures relating to the inland possessions.

"8. National social security.

CXV—2268—Part 27

"(2) (a) The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules—on rules, joint rules, and order of business; the Committee on House Administration—on the right of a Member to his seat, enrolled bills, on all matters referred to it of printing for the use of the House or the two Houses, and on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House; the Committee on Ways and Means—on bills raising revenue; the Committee on Appropriations—on the general appropriation bills; the Committee on Public Works—on bills authorizing the improvement of rivers and harbors; the Committee on the Public Lands—on bills for the forfeiture of land grants to railroad and other corporations, bills preventing speculation in the public lands, bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers, and bills for the admission of new States; the Committee on Veterans Affairs—on general pension bills.

"(b) It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules (except it shall not be called up for consideration on the same day it is presented to the House, unless so determined by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members voting, but this provision shall not apply during the last three days of the session), and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of. The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which shall provide that business under paragraph 7 of rule XXIV shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

"(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege.

"(d) The Committee on House Administration shall make final report to the House in all contested-election cases not later than six months from the first day of the first regular session of the Congress to which the contestee is elected except in a contest from the Territory of Alaska, in which case the time shall not exceed nine months.

"(e) A standing committee of the House (other than the Committee on Appropriations) shall meet to consider any bill or resolution pending before it (A) on all regular meeting days selected by the committee; (B) upon the call of the chairman of the

committee; (C) if the chairman of the committee, after three days' consideration, refuses or fails, upon the request of at least three members of the committee, to call a special meeting of the committee within seven calendar days from the date of said request, then, upon the filing with the clerk of the committee of the written and signed request of a majority of the committee for a called special meeting of the committee, the committee shall meet on the day and hour specified in said written request. It shall be the duty of the clerk of the committee to notify all members of the committee in the usual way of such called special meeting.

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees."

DELEGATES AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

SEC. 122 Rule XII of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XII

"DELEGATES AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

"1. The Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska, and the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, shall be elected to serve as additional members on the Committees on Agriculture, Armed Services, and Public Lands; and they shall possess in such committees the same powers and privileges as in the House, and may make any motion except to reconsider."

REFERENCE OF PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

SEC. 123. Paragraph 3 of rule XXI of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Committee on the Judiciary."

PART 3—PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO BOTH HOUSES

PRIVATE BILLS BANNED

SEC. 131. No private bills or resolution (including so-called omnibus claims or pension bills), and no amendment to any bill or resolution, authorizing or directing (1) the payment of money for property damages, for personal injuries or death for which suit may be instituted under the Federal Tort Claims Act, or for a pension (other than to carry out a provision of law or treaty stipulation); (2) the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream; or (3) the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

SEC. 132. Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

SEC. 133. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (except the Committees on Appropriations) shall fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee, and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary.

(b) Each such committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each such committee to report or cause to be

reported promptly to the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(d) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

(e) Each such standing committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.

(f) All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

COMMITTEE POWERS

SEC. 134. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of \$10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable. Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

(b) Every committee and subcommittee serving the Senate and House of Representatives shall report the name, profession and total salary of each staff member employed by it, and shall make an accounting of funds appropriated to it and expended by it to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, at least once every six months, and such information shall be published periodically in the Congressional Directory when and as the same is issued and as Senate and House documents, respectively, every three months.

(c) No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

CONFERENCE RULES ON AMENDMENTS IN NATURE OF SUBSTITUTE

SEC. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order.

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the

subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

DECISIONS ON QUESTIONS OF COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

SEC. 137. In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the presiding officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$."

HEARINGS AND REPORTS BY APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

SEC. 139. (a) No general appropriation bill shall be considered in either House unless, prior to the consideration of such bill, printed committee hearings and reports on such bill have been available for at least three calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered.

(b) The Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses are authorized and directed, acting jointly, to develop a standard appropriation classification schedule which will clearly define in concise and uniform accounts the subtotals of appropriations asked for by agencies in the executive branch of the Government. That part of the printed hearings containing each such agency's request for appropriations shall be preceded by such a schedule.

(c) No general appropriation bill or amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House if it contains a provision reappropriating unexpended balances of appropriations; except that this provision shall not apply to appropriations in continuation of appropriations for public works on which work has commenced.

(d) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses are authorized and directed to make a study of (1) existing permanent appropriations with a view to limiting the number of permanent appropriations and

to recommend to their respective Houses what permanent appropriations, if any, should be discontinued; and (2) the disposition of funds resulting from the sale of Government property or services by all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government with a view to recommending to their respective Houses a uniform system of control with respect to such funds.

RECORDS OF CONGRESS

SEC. 140. (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed, acting jointly, to obtain at the close of each Congress all of the noncurrent records of the Congress and of each committee thereof and transfer them to the National Archives for preservation, subject to the orders of the Senate or the House, respectively.

(b) The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to collect all of the noncurrent records of the House of Representatives from the First to the Seventy-sixth Congress, inclusive, and transfer such records to the National Archives for preservation, subject to the orders of the Senate or the House, respectively.

PRESERVATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 141. The Librarian of the Library of Congress is authorized and directed to have bound at the end of each session of Congress the printed hearings of testimony taken by each committee of the Congress at the preceding session.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 142. This title shall take effect on January 2, 1947; except that this section and sections 140 and 141 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

PART 1—STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL PERSONNEL

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL OFFICERS

SEC. 201. (a) Effective January 1, 1947, the annual basic compensation of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the Presiding Officers of the two Houses) shall be increased by 50 per centum; and the provisions of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall not be applicable to the compensation of said elected officers.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for the "Office of the Vice President" the sum of \$23,130; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for the "Office of the Speaker" the sum of \$20,025.

(c) The Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives are each authorized to employ an administrative assistant, who shall receive basic compensation at a rate not to exceed \$8,000 a year. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payment of such compensation.

COMMITTEE STAFFS

SEC. 202. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff mem-

bers shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(b) Subject to appropriations which it shall be in order to include in appropriation bills, the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to appoint such staff, in addition to the clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as each such committee, by a majority vote, shall determine to be necessary, such personnel, other than the minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as the committees respectively may prescribe, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House also is authorized to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as it may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction and in accordance with procedures authorized by the committee by a majority vote, including the rights and powers conferred by House Resolution Numbered 50, adopted January 9, 1945.

(c) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable; and the position of committee janitor is hereby abolished. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work.

(d) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the Congress and all members of the committee and the respective Houses shall have access to such records. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound such testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee.

(e) The professional staff members of the standing committees shall receive annual compensation, to be fixed by the chairman, ranging from \$5,000 to \$8,000 and the clerical staff shall receive annual compensation ranging from \$2,000 to \$8,000.

(f) No committee shall appoint to its staff any experts or other personnel detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government, except with the written permission of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(g) No individual who is employed as a professional staff member of any committee as provided in this section shall be eligible for appointment to any office or position in the executive branch of the Government for a period of one year after he shall have ceased to be such a member.

(h) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions—

(1) The committee employees of the existing Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and of the existing Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall be continued on the rolls of the respective appropriations committees established under title I of this Act during the fiscal year 1947, unless sooner removed for cause.

(2) Committee employees of all other existing standing committees of each House shall be continued on the pay rolls of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, through January 31, 1947, unless sooner removed for cause by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House, as the case may be.

(3) The appropriations for the compensation of committee employees of standing committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, shall be available for the compensation of employees specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection and of employees of the standing committees of the Senate and House of Representatives succeeding to the jurisdiction of the standing committees specified in such Appropriation Act; and in any case in which the legislative jurisdiction of any existing standing committee is transferred to two or more standing committees under title I of this Act, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate with respect to standing committees of the Senate, and the Committee on House Administration, with respect to standing committees of the House, shall allocate such appropriations in an equitable manner.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

SEC. 203. (a) The Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to establish in the Library of Congress a separate department to be known as the Legislative Reference Service. It shall be the duty of the Legislative Reference Service—

(1) upon request, to advise and assist any committee of either House or any joint committee in the analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of legislative proposals pending before it, or of recommendations submitted to Congress, by the President or any executive agency, and otherwise to assist in furnishing a basis for the proper determination of measures before the committee;

(2) upon request, or upon its own initiative in anticipation of requests, to gather, classify, analyze, and make available, in translations, indexes, digests, compilations and bulletins, and otherwise, data for a bearing upon legislation, and to render such data serviceable to Congress, and committees and Members thereof, without partisan bias in selection or presentation;

(3) to prepare summaries and digests of public hearings before committees of the Congress, and of bills and resolutions of a public general nature introduced in either House.

(b) (1) A director and assistant director of the Legislative Reference Service and all other necessary personnel, shall be appointed by the Librarian of Congress without regard to the civil-service laws and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office. The compensation of all employees shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That the grade of senior specialists in each field enumerated in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not be less than the highest grade in the executive branch of the Government to which research analysts and consultants without supervisory responsibility are currently assigned. All employees of the Legislative Reference Service shall be subject to the provisions of the civil-service retirement laws.

(2) The Librarian of Congress is further authorized to appoint in the Legislative Reference Service senior specialists in the following broad fields: Agriculture; American government and public administration; American public law; conservation; education; engineering and public works; full employment; housing; industrial organization and corporation finance; international affairs; international trade and economic geography; labor; mineral economics; money and banking; price economics; social welfare; taxation and fiscal policy; transportation and communications; and veterans' affairs. Such specialists, together with such other members of the staff as may be necessary, shall be available for special work with the appropriate committees of Congress for any of the purposes set out in section 203(a) (1).

(c) There is hereby authorized to be ap-

propriated for the work of the Legislative Reference Service the following sums: (1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, \$550,000; (2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, \$650,000; (3) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, \$750,000; and (4) for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Service.

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

SEC. 204. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the work of the Office of the Legislative Counsel the following sums:

(1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, \$150,000;

(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, \$200,000;

(3) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, \$250,000;

(4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, \$250,000; and

(5) For each fiscal year thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the work of the Office.

STUDIES BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 205. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of restrictions placed in general appropriation Acts limiting the expenditure of specified appropriations therein, with a view to determining the cost to the Government incident to complying with such restrictions, and to report to the Congress his estimate of the cost of complying with such restrictions and such other recommendations with respect thereto as he deems necessary or desirable.

EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 206. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to make an expenditure analysis of each agency in the executive branch of the Government (including Government corporations), which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, will enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently administered and expended. Reports on such analyses shall be submitted by the Comptroller General, from time to time, to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to the Appropriations Committees, and to the legislative committees having jurisdiction over legislation relating to the operations of the respective agencies, of the two Houses.

CORRECTION OF MILITARY AND NAVAL RECORDS

SEC. 207. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, respectively, under procedures set up by them, and acting through boards of civilian officers or employees of their respective departments, are authorized to correct any military or naval record where in their judgment such action is necessary to correct an error or to remove an injustice.

PART 2—STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

IMPROVEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 221. The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to provide for printing in the Daily Record the legislative program for the day, together with a list of congressional committee meetings and hearings, and the place of meeting and subject matter; and to cause a brief résumé of congressional activities for the previous day to be incorporated in the Record, together with an index of its contents. Such data shall be prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, respectively.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

SEC. 222. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act Providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents", approved January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 601), is amended to read as follows: "That

there shall be a Joint Committee on Printing, consisting of the chairman and two members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the chairman and two members of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, who shall have the powers hereinafter stated."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

SEC. 223. The Joint Committee of Congress on the Library shall hereafter consist of the chairman and four members of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the chairman and four members of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 224. The functions, powers, and duties imposed by statute, resolution, or rule of either House of Congress on the effective date of this section on a standing committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives (or the chairman thereof) are, insofar as they are consistent with this Act, hereby transferred to that standing committee created by this Act (or the chairman thereof) to which is transferred the legislative jurisdiction over the subject matter to which such functions, powers, and duties relate; except that the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House created by this Act shall be members of the National Archives Council.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

SEC. 225. Section 5(b)(3) (relating to the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "May 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1".

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 226. Section 3(a) (relating to the time for filing the economic report of the president) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the beginning of each regular session".

PART 3—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CAPITOL AND PAGES

REMODELING OF CAUCUS ROOMS AND RESTAURANTS

SEC. 241. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to prepare plans and submit them to Congress at the earliest practicable date for the remodeling (a) of the caucus rooms in the Senate and House Office Buildings to provide improved acoustics and seating facilities and for the presentation of motion picture or other visual displays on matters of national interest; and (b) of the Senate and House Restaurants to provide for more convenient dining facilities.

ASSIGNMENT OF CAPITOL SPACE

SEC. 242. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall cause a survey to be made of available space within the Capitol which could be utilized for joint committee meetings, meetings of conference committees, and other meetings, requiring the attendance of both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives; and shall recommend the reassignment of such space to accommodate such meetings.

SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

SEC. 243. (a) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, are authorized and directed to enter into an arrangement with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia for the education of Congressional pages and pages of the Supreme Court in the public school system of the District. Such arrangement shall include provision for reimbursement to the District of Columbia for

any additional expenses incurred by the public school system of the District in carrying out such arrangement.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the District of Columbia in accordance with the arrangement referred to in subsection (a).

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, said page or pages may elect to attend a private or parochial school of their own choice: *Provided, however,* That such private or parochial school shall be reimbursed by the Senate and House of Representatives only in the same amount as would be paid if the page or pages were attending a public school under the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 244. All necessary funds required to carry out the provisions of this Act, by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, are hereby authorized to be appropriated, and the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House are hereby further authorized to employ such administrative assistants as may be necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this Act under their respective jurisdictions.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 245. This title shall take effect on the date of its enactment; except that sections 202 (a), (b), (c), (e), (f), and (h), 222, 223, 224, and 243 shall take effect on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

TITLE III—REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(a) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

(b) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure.

(c) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons.

(d) The term "Clerk" means the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

(e) The term "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

DETAILED ACCOUNTS OF CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 303. (a) It shall be the duty of every person who shall in any manner solicit or receive a contribution to any organization or fund for the purposes hereinafter designated to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions of any amount or of any value whatsoever;

(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution of \$500 or more and the date thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such organization or fund; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made and the date thereof.

(b) It shall be the duty of such person to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating

the particulars, for every expenditure of such funds exceeding \$10 in amount, and to preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of at least two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

RECEIPTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 304. Every individual who receives a contribution of \$500 or more for any of the purposes hereinafter designated shall within five days after receipt thereof render to the person or organization for which such contribution was received a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution and the date on which received.

STATEMENTS TO BE FILED WITH CLERK OF HOUSE

SEC. 305. (a) Every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307 shall file with the Clerk between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, a statement containing complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution of \$500 or more not mentioned in the preceding report; except that the first report filed pursuant to this title shall contain the name and address of each person who has made any contribution of \$500 or more to such person since the effective date of this title;

(2) the total sum of the contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (1);

(3) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such person during the calendar year;

(4) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of \$10 or more has been made by or on behalf of such person, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(5) the total sum of all expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (4);

(6) the total sum of expenditures made by or on behalf of such person during the calendar year.

(b) The statements required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous statement only the amount need be carried forward.

STATEMENT PRESERVED FOR TWO YEARS

SEC. 306. A statement required by this title to be filed with the Clerk—

(a) shall be deemed properly filed when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and directed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, District of Columbia, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such statement shall be promptly filed upon notice by the Clerk of its nonreceipt;

(b) shall be preserved by the Clerk for a period of two years from the date of filing, shall constitute part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.

PERSONS TO WHOM APPLICABLE

SEC. 307. The provisions of this title shall apply to any person (except a political committee as defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and duly organized State or local committees of a political party), who by himself, or through any agent of employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the

principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

(a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

(b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

REGISTRATION WITH SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 308. (a) Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers in writing and under oath, his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Each such person so registering shall, between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk and Secretary a detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work; to whom paid; for what purposes; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials; and the proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or opposition to legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity; nor in the case of any newspaper or other regularly published periodical (including any individual who owns, publishes, or is employed by any such newspaper or periodical) which in the ordinary course of business publishes news items, editorials, or other comments, or paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or individual, engages in no further or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation, other than to appear before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to such legislation.

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the Congressional Record.

REPORTS AND STATEMENTS TO BE MADE UNDER OATH

SEC. 309. All reports and statements required under this title shall be made under oath, before an officer authorized by law to administer oaths.

PENALTIES

SEC. 310. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this title, shall, upon conviction, be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) In addition to the penalties provided for in subsection (a), any person convicted of the misdemeanor specified therein is prohibited, for a period of three years from the date of such conviction, from attempting to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage

or defeat of any proposed legislation or from appearing before a committee of the Congress in support of or opposition to proposed legislation; and any person who violates any provision of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of a felony, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 311. The provisions of this title shall not apply to practices or activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act nor be construed as repealing any portion of said Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

PART 1—SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Federal Tort Claims Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 402. As used in this title, the term—
(a) "Federal agency" includes the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States, and corporations whose primary function is to act as, and while acting as, instrumentalities or agencies of the United States, whether or not authorized to sue and be sued in their own names: *Provided*, That this shall not be construed to include any contractor with the United States.

(b) "Employee of the Government" includes officers or employees of any Federal agency, members of the military or naval forces of the United States, and persons acting on behalf of a Federal agency in an official capacity, temporarily or permanently in the service of the United States, whether with or without compensation.

(c) "Acting within the scope of his office or employment", in the case of a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, means acting in line of duty.

PART 2—ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT OF TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

CLAIMS OF \$1,000 OR LESS

SEC. 403. (a) Subject to the limitations of this title, authority is hereby conferred upon the head of each Federal agency, or his designee for the purpose, acting on behalf of the United States, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle any claim against the United States for money only, accruing on and after January 1, 1945, on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death, where the total amount of the claim does not exceed \$1,000, caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss, injury, or death, in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred.

(b) Subject to the provisions of part 3 of this title, any such award or determination shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government, except when procured by means of fraud, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

(c) Any award made to any claimant pursuant to this section, and any award, compromise, or settlement of any claim cognizable under this title made by the Attorney General pursuant to section 413, shall be paid by the head of the Federal agency concerned out of appropriations that may be made therefor, which appropriations are hereby authorized.

(d) The acceptance by the claimant of any such award, compromise, or settlement shall be final and conclusive on the claimant, and shall constitute a complete release by the

claimant of any claim against the United States and against the employee of the Government whose act or omission gave rise to the claim, by reason of the same subject matter.

REPORT

SEC. 404. The head of each Federal agency shall annually make a report to the Congress of all claims paid by such Federal agency under this part. Such report shall include the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claim.

PART 3—SUITS ON TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

JURISDICTION

SEC. 410. (a) Subject to the provisions of this title, the United States district court for the district wherein the plaintiff is resident or wherein the act or omission complained of occurred, including the United States district courts for the Territories and possessions of the United States, sitting without a jury, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on any claim against the United States, for money only, accruing on and after January 1, 1945, on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss, injury, or death in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. Subject to the provisions of this title, the United States shall be liable in respect of such claims to the same claimants, in the same manner, and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances, except that the United States shall not be liable for interest prior to judgment, or for punitive damages. Costs shall be allowed in all courts to the successful claimant to the same extent as if the United States were a private litigant, except that such costs shall not include attorneys' fees.

(b) The judgment in such an action shall constitute a complete bar to any action by the claimant, by reason of the same subject matter, against the employee of the Government whose act or omission gave rise to the claim. No suit shall be instituted pursuant to this section upon a claim presented to any Federal agency pursuant to part 2 of this title unless such Federal agency has made final disposition of the claim: *Provided*, That the claimant may, upon fifteen days' notice given in writing, withdraw the claim from consideration of the Federal agency and commence suit thereon pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That as to any claim so disposed of or so withdrawn, no suit shall be instituted pursuant to this section for any sum in excess of the amount of the claim presented to the Federal agency, except where the increased amount of the claim is shown to be based upon newly discovered evidence not reasonably discoverable at the time of presentation of the claim to the Federal agency or upon evidence of intervening facts, relating to the amount of the claim. Disposition of any claim made pursuant to part 2 of this title shall not be competent evidence of liability or amount of damages in proceedings on such claim pursuant to this section.

PROCEDURE

SEC. 411. In actions under this part, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure, shall be in accordance with the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064); and the same provisions for counterclaim and set-off, for interest upon judgments, and for payment of judgments, shall be applicable as in cases

brought in the United States district courts under the Act of March 3, 1887 (24 Stat. 505).

REVIEW

SEC. 412. (a) Final judgments in the district courts in cases under this part shall be subject to review by appeal—

(1) in the circuit courts of appeals in the same manner and to the same extent as other judgments of the district courts; or

(2) in the Court of Claims of the United States: *Provided*, That the notice of appeal filed in the district court under rule 73 of the Rules of Civil Procedure shall have affixed thereto the written consent on behalf of all the appellees that the appeal be taken to the Court of Claims of the United States. Such appeals to the Court of Claims of the United States shall be taken within three months after the entry of the judgment of the district court, and shall be governed by the rules relating to appeals from a district court to a circuit court of appeals adopted by the Supreme Court pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064). In such appeals the Court of Claims of the United States shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred on a circuit court of appeals in respect to appeals under section 4 of the Act of February 13, 1925 (43 Stat. 939).

(b) Sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended, shall apply to cases under this part in the circuit courts of appeals and in the Court of Claims of the United States to the same extent as to cases in a circuit court of appeals therein referred to.

COMPROMISE

SEC. 413. With a view to doing substantial justice, the Attorney General is authorized to arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim cognizable under this part, after the institution of any suit thereon, with the approval of the court in which suit is pending.

PART 4—PROVISIONS COMMON TO PART 2 AND PART 3

ONE-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

SEC. 420. Every claim against the United States cognizable under this title shall be forever barred, unless within one year after such claim accrued or within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, is presented in writing to the Federal agency out of whose activities it arises, if such claim is for a sum not exceeding \$1,000; or unless within one year after such claim accrued or within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later, an action is begun pursuant to part 3 of this title. In the event that a claim for a sum not exceeding \$1,000 is presented to a Federal agency as aforesaid, the time to institute a suit pursuant to part 3 of this title shall be extended for a period of six months from the date of mailing of notice to the claimant by such Federal agency as to the final disposition of the claim or from the date of withdrawal of the claim from such Federal agency pursuant to section 410 of this title, if it would otherwise expire before the end of such period.

EXCEPTIONS

SEC. 421. The provisions of this title shall not apply to—

(a) Any claim based upon an act or omission of an employee of the Government, exercising due care, in the execution of a statute or regulation, whether or not such statute or regulation be valid, or based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government, whether or not the discretion involved be abused.

(b) Any claim arising out of the loss, miscarriage, or negligent transmission of letters or postal matter.

(c) Any claim arising in respect of the assessment or collection of any tax or customs duty, or the detention of any goods or

merchandise by any officer of customs or excise or any other law-enforcement officer.

(d) Any claim for which a remedy is provided by the Act of March 9, 1920 (U.S.C., title 46, secs. 741-752, inclusive), or the Act of March 3, 1925 (U.S.C., title 46, secs. 781-790, inclusive), relating to claims or suits in admiralty against the United States.

(e) Any claim arising out of an act or omission of any employee of the Government in administering the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended.

(f) Any claim for damages caused by the imposition or establishment of a quarantine by the United States.

(g) Any claim arising from injury to vessels, or to the cargo, crew, or passengers of vessels, while passing through the locks of the Panama Canal or while in Canal Zone waters.

(h) Any claim arising out of assault, battery, false imprisonment, false arrest, malicious prosecution, abuse of process, libel, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, or interference with contract rights.

(i) Any claim for damages caused by the fiscal operations of the Treasury or by the regulation of the monetary system.

(j) Any claim arising out of the combatant activities of the military or naval forces, or the Coast Guard, during time of war.

(k) Any claim arising in a foreign country.

(l) Any claim arising from the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

ATTORNEY'S FEES

SEC. 422. The court rendering a judgment for the plaintiff pursuant to part 3 of this title, or the head of the Federal agency or his designee making an award pursuant to part 2 of this title, or the Attorney General making a disposition pursuant to section 413 of this title, as the case may be, may, as a part of the judgment, award, or settlement, determine and allow reasonable attorney's fees, which, if the recovery is \$500 or more, shall not exceed 10 per centum of the amount recovered under part 2, or 20 per centum of the amount recovered under part 3, to be paid out of but not in addition to the amount of judgment, award, or settlement recovered, to the attorneys representing the claimant. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$2,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

EXCLUSIVENESS OF REMEDY

SEC. 423. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the authority of any Federal agency to sue and be sued in its own name shall not be construed to authorize suits against such Federal agency on claims which are cognizable under part 3 of this title, and the remedies provided by this title in such cases shall be exclusive.

CERTAIN STATUTES INAPPLICABLE

SEC. 424. (a) All provisions of law authorizing any Federal agency to consider, ascertain, adjust, or determine claims on account of damage to or loss of property, or on account of personal injury or death, caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, are hereby repealed in respect of claims cognizable under part 2 of this title and accruing on and after January 1, 1945, including, but without limitation, the provisions granting such authorization now contained in the following laws:

Public Law Numbered 375, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066; U.S.C., title 31, Secs. 215-217).

Public Law Numbered 267, Sixty-sixth Congress, approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1054; U.S.C., title 33, sec. 853).

Public Law Numbered 481, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184; U.S.C., title 31, sec. 224b).

Public Law Numbered 112, as amended, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; U.S.C., title 31, secs. 223b, 223c, and 223d).

Public Law Numbered 182, as amended, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 705; U.S.C., title 34, sec. 600).

Section 4 of Public Law Numbered 18, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved June 16, 1921 (42 Stat. 63), as amended by Public Law Numbered 456, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 22, 1934 (48 Stat. 1207; U.S.C., title 31, sec. 224c).

(b) Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to repeal any provision of law authorizing any Federal agency to consider, ascertain, adjust, settle, determine, or pay any claim on account of damage to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death, in cases in which such damage, loss, injury, or death was not caused by any negligent or wrongful act or omission of an employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, or any other claim not cognizable under part 2 of this title.

TITLE V—GENERAL BRIDGE ACT

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 501. This title may be cited as the "General Bridge Act of 1946".

CONSENT OF CONGRESS

SEC. 502. (a) The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges and approaches thereto over the navigable waters of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) The location and plans for such bridges shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War before construction is commenced, and, in approving the location and plans of any bridge, they may impose any specific conditions relating to the maintenance and operation of the structure which they may deem necessary in the interest of public navigation, and the conditions so imposed shall have the force of law.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (b), it shall be unlawful to construct or commence the construction of any privately owned highway toll bridge until the location and plans thereof shall also have been submitted to and approved by the highway department or departments of the State or States in which the bridge and its approaches are situated; and where such bridge shall be between two or more States and the highway departments thereof shall be unable to agree upon the location and plans therefor, or if they, or either of them, shall fail or refuse to act upon the location and plans submitted, such location and plans then shall be submitted to the Public Roads Administration and, if approved by the Public Roads Administration, approval by the highway departments shall not be required.

TOLLS

SEC. 503. If tolls shall be charged for the transit over any interstate bridge of engines, cars, street cars, wagons, carriages, vehicles, animals, foot passengers, or other passengers, such tolls shall be reasonable and just, and the Secretary of War may, at any time, and from time to time, prescribe the reasonable rates of toll for such transit over such bridge, and the rates so prescribed shall be the legal rates and shall be the rates demanded and received for such transit.

ACQUISITION BY PUBLIC AGENCIES

SEC. 504. After the completion of any interstate toll bridge constructed by an individual, firm, or corporation, as determined by the Secretary of War, either of the States in which the bridge is located, or any public

agency or political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of five years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual costs of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 per centum of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

STATEMENTS OF COST

Sec. 505. Within ninety days after the completion of a privately owned interstate toll bridge, the owner shall file with the Secretary of War and with the highway departments of the States in which the bridge is located, a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of a highway development shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge. For the purpose of such investigation the said individual, firm, or corporation, its successors and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 504 of this title subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SINKING FUND

Sec. 506. If tolls are charged for the use of an interstate bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a State or States or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of this title, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed twenty years from the date of constructing or acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

APPLICABILITY OF TITLE

Sec. 507. The provisions of this title shall apply only to bridges over navigable waters of the United States, the construction of

which is hereafter approved under the provisions of this title; and the provisions of the first proviso of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; U.S.C., title 33, sec. 401), and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, shall not apply to such bridges.

INTERNATIONAL BRIDGES

Sec. 508. This title shall not be construed to authorize the construction of any bridge which will connect the United States, or any Territory or possession of the United States, with any foreign country.

EMINENT DOMAIN

Sec. 509. There are hereby conferred upon any individual, his heirs, legal representatives, or assigns, any firm or corporation, its successors or assigns, or any State, political subdivision, or municipality authorized in accordance with the provisions of this title to build a bridge between two or more States, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the respective States needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

PENALTIES

Sec. 510. Any person who fails or refuses to comply with any lawful order of the Secretary of War or the Chief of Engineers issued under the provisions of this title, or who fails to comply with any specific condition imposed by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War relating to the maintenance and operation of bridges, or who refuses to produce books, papers, or documents in obedience to a subpoena or other lawful requirement under this title, or who otherwise violates any provisions of this title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not to exceed \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

RIGHTS RESERVED

Sec. 511. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is hereby expressly reserved as to any and all bridges which may be built under authority hereof.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Sec. 601. (a) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$12,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of \$20,000 per annum each.

(b) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made; such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

(c) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Res-

ident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments," is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress reconvenes.

(d) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments," is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Sec. 602. (a) Section 3(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "elective officers" the words "in the executive branch of the Government".

(b) Such Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after section 3 the following new section:

"Sec. 3A. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1) This Act shall not apply to any Member of Congress until he gives notice in writing, while serving as a Member of Congress, to the disbursing officer by whom his salary is paid of his desire to come within the purview of this Act. Such notice may be given by a Member of Congress within six months after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 or within six months after any date on which he takes an oath of office as a Member of Congress.

"(2) In the case of any Member of Congress who gives notice of his desire to come within the purview of this Act, the amount required to be deposited for the purposes of section 9 with respect to services rendered after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, shall be a sum equal to 6 per centum of his basic salary, pay, or compensation for such services, together with interest computed at the rate of 4 per centum per annum compounded on December 31 of each year; and the amount to be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each such Member of Congress for the purposes of section 10 shall be a sum equal to 6 per centum of such basic salary, pay, or compensation.

"(3) No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity as provided in this section until he shall have become separated from the service after having had at least six years of service as a Member of Congress and have attained the age of sixty-two years, except that any such Member who shall have had at least five years of service as a Member of Congress, may, subject to the provisions of section 6 and of paragraph (4) of this section, be retired for disability, irrespective of age, and be paid an annuity computed in accordance with paragraph (5) of this section.

"(4) No Member of Congress shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this Act unless there shall have been deducted and withheld from his basic salary, pay, or compensation for the last five years of his service as a Member of Congress, or there shall have been deposited under section 9 with respect to such last five years of service, the amounts specified in paragraph (2) of this section with respect to so much of such five years of service as was performed after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the amounts specified in section 9 with respect to so much of such five years of service as was performed prior to such date.

"(5) Subject to the provisions of section 9 and of subsections (c) and (d) of section 4, the annuity of a Member of Congress shall be

an amount equal to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of his average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation as a Member of Congress multiplied by his years of service as a Member of Congress, but no such annuity shall exceed an amount equal to three-fourths of the salary, pay, or compensation that he is receiving at the time he becomes separated from the service.

"(6) In the case of a Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service before he completes an aggregate of six years of service as a Member of Congress, and who is not retired for disability, the total amount deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation as a Member of Congress, together with interest at 4 per centum compounded as of December 31 of each year shall be returned to such Member of Congress. No such Member of Congress shall thereafter become eligible to receive an annuity as provided in this section unless the amounts so returned are redeposited with interest at 4 per centum compounded on December 31 of each year, but interest shall not be required covering any period of separation from the service.

"(7) If any person takes office as a Member of Congress while receiving an annuity as provided in this section, the payment of such annuity shall be suspended during the period for which he holds such office; but, if he gives notice as provided in paragraph (2) of this section, his service as a Member of Congress during such period shall be credited in determining the amount of his subsequent annuity.

"(8) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prevent any person eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an annuity computed in accordance with this section and an annuity computed in accordance with section 4, but in computing the annuity under section 4 in the case of any person who (A) has had at least six years' service as a Member of Congress, and (B) has served as a Member of Congress at any time after the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, service as a Member of Congress shall not be credited.

"(9) No provision of this or any other Act relating to automatic separation from the service shall be applicable to any Member of Congress.

"(10) As used in this section, the term 'Member of Congress' means a Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a Territory, or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; and the term 'service as a Member of Congress' shall include the period from the date of the beginning of the term for which a Member of Congress is elected or appointed to the date on which he takes office as such a Member."

Approved August 2, 1946.

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS

(U.S. Congress, Senate: Hearings Before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Evaluation of the Effects of Laws Enacted To Reorganize the Legislative Branch of the Government)

REPORTS AND ARTICLES

OPERATION OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

(By George B. Galloway, Senior Specialist in American Government, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

One of the responsibilities of the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and House of Representatives is to "evaluate the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government." In the exercise of part of this responsibility the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held hearings during February 1948, on the operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Three

years have now passed since those hearings were held and, altogether, Congress has had 4 years experience with the workings of this law. It is timely, therefore, to undertake a fresh review of the operation of the so-called La Follette-Monroney Act in terms of its own objectives, and to consider whether or not, in the light of this experience, the act needs to be amended and strengthened.

OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT

As conceived and formulated by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and as enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress with some significant omissions, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 had the following objectives:

1. To streamline and simplify congressional committee structure.
2. To eliminate the use of special or select committees.
3. To clarify committee duties and reduce jurisdictional disputes.
4. To regularize and publicize committee procedures.
5. To improve congressional staff aids.
6. To reduce the workload on Congress.
7. To strengthen legislative oversight of administration.
8. To reinforce the power of the purse.
9. To regulate lobbying.
10. To increase the compensation of Members of Congress and provide them retirement pay.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Modernization of the standing committee system was the first objective of the act and the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. By dropping minor, inactive committees and by merging those with related functions, the total number of standing committees was reduced by the act from 33 to 15 in the Senate and from 48 to 19 in the House of Representatives. This reform has now survived 4 years and two Congresses—one controlled by the Republicans and one controlled by the Democrats—without change or successful challenge. Senators Holland and Wherry offered a resolution (S. Res. 58) on February 7, 1949, to create a standing Senate Committee on Small Business which was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration on June 29, 1949. But after extended debate the Senate, by a 2-to-1 vote, decided to create a select committee to investigate small-business problems. Thus the reorganized standing committee system seems to have won congressional acceptance for the time being.

Under the old system the standing committees of the House ranged in size from 2 to 42 members and averaged 19 members each. Under the act, 15 out of the 19 House committees had 25 or 27 members each in the Eighty-first Congress and the average size was 25 members. Rules, with 12 members, and Un-American Activities, with 9 members, remain unchanged in size. Appropriations now has 50 members, compared with 42 before, and Armed Services has 35, compared with a combined membership of 61 on the old Military and Naval Affairs Committee.

Before the act the standing committees of the Senate ranged in size from 3 to 25 members and averaged 15 members each. Under the act all the Senate standing committees have 13 members, except Appropriations which has 21, as compared with 25 before.

Before the act, every Senator was entitled to serve on three major committees and two minor committees. Some had up to 10 committee assignments each. There was conflict in committee meetings, duplications in committee jurisdiction, and inefficient distribution of the legislative work load among committees. Under the act, no Senator may serve on more than two standing committees except that majority party Senators may also serve on the District of Columbia and Expenditures committees. With minor excep-

tions, each House Member now serves on only one standing committee instead of from three to five, as many members did in the past. The rule limiting minority Senators to two committees each has had the effect, with a change in party control of the Senate, of requiring minority Senators to resign from one of their three former committees in cases where they had served on the District of Columbia and Expenditures committees in addition to two national committees. The result was to deprive these second-class committees during the Eighty-first Congress of the continued service of experienced members like Senators Aiken and Ferguson who, being limited to two committees, felt that they owed it to their constituents to elect to serve on two national committees.

To meet this situation, Senator Taft introduced a resolution (S. Res. 24) on January 10, 1949, proposing to increase the membership of 8 Senate committees from 13 to 15 members each; to permit 8 minority Senators to serve on three standing committees each; and to permit majority Senators to have a third committee assignment upon any one of five specified minor committees. Senate Resolution 24 was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which took no action upon it. In its behalf Senator Taft argued that (a) in many cases a committee of 13 members is too small to handle its work load, and (b) new Senators are deprived of important committee assignments under the two-committee-assignment rule because older Senators fill up the limited number of seats on the more attractive committees and leave only the second-class committees open for the freshman Senators. Opponents argued that to differentiate between the size of the standing committees of the Senate would be to create a system of major and minor committees; that the proposed change would break down the two-committee-assignment rule and increase the work load and responsibilities of Senators in unrelated legislative fields; and increase absenteeism in the Senate.

Many of the old standing committees of Congress were minor, inactive committees—"ornamental barnacles on the ship of state" in Alvin Fuller's phrase—hang-overs of lively legislative issues long since settled. Under the new scheme all the standing committees in both Houses are major committees, assigned important duties; although some Members still refer to the District of Columbia and Expenditure Committees as "second-class," an inappropriate appellation to apply to the Expenditure Committees which were rejuvenated by the act and given weighty responsibilities in the machinery of government field.

It is often said and perhaps widely believed that the reduction from 81 to 34 in the number of standing committees of Congress affected by the act has been offset by the creation of a rash of subcommittees. The fact is, as the records show, that the number of standing subcommittees has not changed since 1945. In that year Congress had 131 standing subcommittees: 34 in the Senate and 97 in the House. In 1950 there were 131 standing subcommittees: 66 in the Senate and 65 in the House. During the Eighty-first Congress six House committees and four Senate committees had no standing subcommittees at all. Special subcommittees are set up from time to time in both Houses to handle individuals bills and their number fluctuates from week to week, making comparisons misleading. The tendency has been, since the act, for standing subcommittees to replace special subcommittees for individual bills, affording committeemen and their staffs an opportunity to become specialists in correlated fields of legislation.

Some Congressmen are critical of subcommittees, believing that the entire membership of a committee should handle matters referred to it. Others believe that sub-

divisions are necessary for the preliminary study of complex matters and are an inescapable feature of the heavy duties now imposed upon the consolidated committees of Congress. The advantages that flow from the division of labor and specialization of function will probably lead most congressional committees to continue to subdivide their work, and to rely on consideration at the full committee stage for coordination and the overall view.

In the form in which it passed the Senate, the act prohibited special committees. Although this provision was stricken in the House, the spirit of the act clearly frowns on the creation of special committees. The La Follette-Monroney committee had recommended that the practice of creating special investigating committees be abandoned on the ground that they lack legislative authority and that the jurisdiction of the new standing committees would be so comprehensively defined in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. Thus, to set up a special committee would be to trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee. In practice, special committees have not been abandoned, but their number has diminished. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, before the act, there were 18 of them: 6 in the House, 9 in the Senate, and 3 joint select committees. In the Eightieth Congress there were 12 special committees: 6 in the House, 3 in the Senate, and 3 joint ones. Nine special committees were created during the Eighty-first Congress: 6 in the House on small business, lobbying, use of chemicals, campaign expenditures, veterans education, and the roof and skylights; and 3 in the Senate on small business, organized crime, and roof and skylights. They had a combined membership of 65 in 1950. The Senate has complied more closely than the House with the spirit of the prohibition. During the Eightieth Congress the Senate converted its old Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program into a standing subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and its Special Small Business Committee into a standing Subcommittee on Banking and Currency. But in 1950 the Senate revived its Select Committee on Small Business in response to the persistent efforts of Senators Murray and Wherry who maintained that small-business problems cut across the jurisdiction of many of the standing committees of the Senate and who wanted a forum for their activities in this field. In the House special committees on small business and campaign expenditures are hardy biennials.

Although the Senate version of the act sought to stimulate joint action between the twin committees of the two Houses, this optional provision was struck on the House side; so the act made no change in the joint committee structure of Congress except to make the long-standing Joint Committees on Printing and the Library in effect joint subcommittees of the two administration committees of the House and Senate. However, the creation of roughly parallel committee systems in the two Chambers, with similar nomenclature and jurisdictions, has tended to facilitate joint action on measures of mutual interest by means of joint hearings and staff collaboration. In recent years several successful joint hearings have been held by twin committees or subcommittees on the reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia, the budget requirements of the District government, on foreign economic cooperation and military aid, and on public housing. There has also been a good deal of collaboration between the professional staffs of corresponding committees in the way of exchanging information, memorandums, etc., but few instances of joint research or cooperation in the preparation of committee reports.

The Foreign Affairs Committees have occasionally met together since the war to hear reports and statements by the Secretary of State, saving him the loss of time in a duplicate appearance, and have then considered and reported their conclusions separately to the two Houses. Despite the evident advantages of joint action, it is opposed by some Senators as an impairment of their "appellate jurisdiction," and by some Representatives who are jealous of their own independence and prerogatives. Critics of joint hearings doubt if they save much time and suggest that they raise questions of protocol about such simple things as the seating of Congressmen around the table and precedence in interrogation. Other alleged deterrents to joint action are the different time tables of House and Senate, surviving jurisdictional differences between the parallel committees, and differing perspectives, interests, and modes of operation among the Members.

Despite these objections, the number of joint standing committees in Congress has doubled since 1946. In the Seventy-ninth Congress there were four standing and three select joint committees; in the Eightieth Congress there were seven standing and four select joint committees; and in the Eighty-first Congress there were eight joint standing committees. The new Joint Committees on the Economic Report, on Atomic Energy, and on Foreign Economic Cooperation were appointed during the Eightieth Congress; and the new Joint Committee on Defense Production was established by the Defense Production Act of 1950. The Joint Committee on the Library dates back to 1806 and the Joint Committee on Printing to 1846. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was created in 1926 and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures (the Byrd committee) in 1941. On February 24, 1950, Senator Humphrey introduced a bill (S. 3116) to abolish the Byrd committee because, he said, it was duplicating the work of the Expenditures Committees and was a waste of money. This move stirred up a hornet's nest in the Senate and the Byrd committee is still extant. Eighty-two Members of Congress were serving on its joint committees at the end of 1950, exclusive of the insignificant Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers—the so-called wastebasket committee. Both Houses are always equally represented on the joint committees which, therefore, always have an even number of members. The most important and successful of the existing joint congressional committees are those of the Economic Report, which has four active subcommittees, and on Atomic Energy which alone among the joint committees has legislative authority.

The act also called for joint action on the part of the revenue and spending committees of both Houses in the formulation of a "legislative budget." But this provision, which I shall discuss more fully below, has miscarried.

COMMITTEE OPERATION

Consolidation of the standing committees and definition of their duties in the rules—an innovation in the Senate—have reduced but not eliminated jurisdictional disputes over the reference of bills. Although House bills are occasionally re-referred by unanimous consent, open conflicts between committees in the lower Chamber have almost disappeared. But several jurisdictional questions have arisen in the Senate since 1946. Bills dealing with the complex economic and social problems of the modern world sometimes cut across the defined jurisdictions of two or more standing committees. Intricate legislation designed to solve the problems of an interdependent economy cannot always be reduced to the clear-cut lines of a blueprint of committee duties.

During the Eightieth Congress, for example, Senate committees argued over the reference of the portal-to-portal bill, the bill proposing unification of the Armed Forces, autos for disabled veterans, an interstate oil compact, and over the interstate water rights on the Colorado River. Senator Taft questioned the conflicting jurisdiction of the Finance and Labor Committees on the subject of veterans' affairs which, he thought, ought to be "all in one committee." During the Eighty-first Congress Senate committees quarreled over jurisdiction over small-business problems, the reference of Reorganization Plan No. 8 relating to the Department of Defense, and the reference of the foreign military assistance bill. The reference of this bill was settled by the unique device of sending it for joint study and report to the combined Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations—an arrangement which worked quite well. Most of the bills implementing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were referred in both Houses to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Department, despite the possibility of conflict implicit in the combination of provisions for both policy and structural changes in some of these measures.

Evidently the language of the act still leaves room for jurisdictional disputes as Senator Vandenberg pointed out in his ruling on the reference of the Armed Forces unification bill. The fact is that jurisdiction over the various aspects of several subject-matter fields is split among many standing committees in both Houses of Congress. The Committees on Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, Armed Forces, Expenditures, and Foreign Commerce are concerned with various phases of our foreign relations. National defense policies and expenditures are reviewed in piecemeal fashion by several committees in both Houses. At least two-thirds of the 15 standing committees of the Senate regularly touch upon some aspect of the security problem. Jurisdiction over our international economic relations is likewise widely scattered. The fiscal machinery of Congress is also splintered and fragmented. Control over major water resource programs is split in both Houses between the Public Lands and Public Works Committees. Several discrepancies in the jurisdiction of parallel committees remain to be rectified.

Several remedies for these jurisdictional problems have been proposed. This includes the reference of bills, in cases of conflict, to the claimant committees concurrently, consecutively, jointly, or to a joint subcommittee of the interested committees as was done in the case of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid (the Herter committee) in the Eightieth Congress. Another suggestion calls for the creation of Senate and House leadership committees in fields like national defense and foreign relations composed of members drawn from all committees whose jurisdiction covers some fragment of the field. Cross-membership among committees in overlapping areas is another solution. More joint hearings and joint action by committees with common interests, following the example of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees on the military defense assistance program, is also advocated. Some favor further use of joint standing committees. In any event, a thorough study of existing committee duties and a redistribution of jurisdictions along more rational lines seem to be clearly called for.

Under section 133 of the act, committee procedure has been regularized as regards periodic meeting days, the keeping of committee records, the reporting of approved measures, the presence of a majority of committeemen as a condition of committee action, and the conduct of hearings. In practice, 13 Senate committees and 9 House committees have fixed regular weekly or bi-weekly meeting days; the other 12 meet upon

the call of their chairmen. I assume that most committees keep fairly full minutes of their meetings. There may have been some infractions of the rule requiring the presence of a majority for committee reports, because many committees have experienced difficulty in securing the attendance of a majority or even a quorum of their members, both at executive sessions and at open hearings. Under this rule, proxy voting is permissible only after a majority are actually present. It is a common and discouraging experience on Capitol Hill for invited witnesses, who have worked hard and long on the preparation of their testimony, to appear before committees and find only one or a few members present. The requirement for the advance filing of written statements of their testimony is observed by some committees and ignored by others. Hearings are sometimes called on too short notice for witnesses to file advance copies of their statements. Most committees have held open hearings except the House Committee on Appropriations which has availed itself of the allowed option of holding its hearings in camera. Committee offices, staff personnel, and records are now kept separate and distinct from those of committee chairmen.

In accordance with section 134(b) of the act, semiannual reports of all standing and select committee staff personnel and payrolls are made and published in the Congressional Record in January and July. Useful information on the staffing of congressional committees is thus made public. This provision has been interpreted, however, as not applying to joint committees or party policy committees. In practice, the prohibition against standing committee meetings being held while the Senate or House is in session has been so frequently waived, by special leave, especially in the upper House, as to be ineffective in promoting that full attendance on the floor which was its primary purpose. On several occasions in recent years Senators have criticized granting leave to committees to sit while the Senate was in session, but have not been so discourteous as to refuse unanimous-consent requests to this end.

Regarding conference committees, the act restated the old rule that the authority of a conference committee is limited to matters which are in disagreement between the two houses, while recognizing their right to report a substitute on the same subject matter. No points of order against conference reports under this rule have been sustained in recent years. After an intensive study of 56 conference committees from the Seventieth to Eightieth Congresses, inclusive, Gilbert Steiner concludes that the influence of the House outweighed that of the Senate in 57 percent of the cases. A recent example of the triumph of Senate conferees, however, was seen in the conference report on the Executive Reorganization Act of 1949. Three matters were in dispute between the conferees on this bill: (1) the duration of the grant of reorganization power to the President; (2) the exemption of specified agencies from the scope of the act; and (3) the legislative veto procedure: one- or two-House veto of the reorganization plans. After this bill had been deadlocked in conference for 1 month, the House conferees finally yielded on each of these three issues. They limited the operation of the act to 4 years; they eliminated the agency exemptions sought by the House; and they accepted the one-House veto procedure favored by the Senate.

On September 15, 1950, the Senate agreed to a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) providing that every conference report shall be accompanied by a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee. The House of Representatives adopted a similar rule on Febru-

ary 27, 1880 (Rule XXVIII-1b). The Army civil functions appropriation bill for fiscal 1950 was in conference from June 1 to October 3, 1949—a period longer than any within the memory of living Members. According to Representative Cannon, "the delay was due to the unanimous objection of the managers on the part of the House to agreeing to exorbitant and unwarranted expenditure of public funds proposed by the other body." One man's opinion of the power of conferees was reflected in a satirical speech by Senator Fulbright who congratulated the conferees on the national defense appropriation bill "for so forthrightly disregarding the wishes of the common lay Members of the Senate and the House."

"I submit, Mr. President," he said, "in all sincerity that there is no need whatever for the ordinary, lay Member of Congress to come back to Washington for a special session. It is clearly evident, Mr. President, that to save the world and the people of this country from disaster, all that is needed is to reconvene, preferably in secret, only those incomparable sages, the conferees of the Appropriations Committee. From their deliberations the same results would be achieved and without the expense and trouble to everyone that is involved in going through the archaic ritual of pretended legislation. It is quite clear that regardless of what the common Members of this body may wish, the conferees make the decisions."

Party ratios on the standing Senate committees have traditionally corresponded with the party division in the Senate. In accordance with this principle, during the Eightieth Congress there were 11 committees with a 7-6 ratio and three committees with an 8-5 ratio. Appropriations, with 21 members, was divided 12-9. In the Eighty-first Congress there were 6 of the 7-6 committees and 8 of the 8-5 committees, reflecting the shift in the party ratio in the whole body from 51-45 in 1947-48 to 54-42 in 1949-50. Appropriations was divided 13 to 8. In the Eighty-second Congress the party ratio is 7-6 on 14 of the Senate standing committees and 11-10 on Appropriations. It is a matter of voluntary discretion with the majority leadership to decide which shall be the 7-6 committees and which shall be divided 8-5.

When the Democrats announced their decision on January 5, 1949, as to the party ratios which would obtain on the Senate standing committees during the Eighty-first Congress, Senator Vandenberg sharply protested the change in the ratio on Foreign Relations from 7-6 to 8-5. He regarded as a departure from the spirit of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs and as implying that Republican Senators are not quite trustworthy. Senator Barkley defended this change as justified by the shift in the political complexion of the Senate and as entirely free from partisan motivation. Four Democrats had lost seats on Foreign Relations in 1947 as a result of the Reorganization Act. But no Senator was being removed from the committee in 1949 because of the change in ratio. (Hatch and Barkley retired from the Senate; Wagner asked to be transferred to Judiciary.)

A majority of one on the 7-6 committees is a rather thin one on controversial issues. The question has been raised whether some change should be made to permit the majority party to exercise stronger committee control. It is argued that the ratio should be higher because a single defection can upset majority control.

Party ratios on the standing committees of the House of Representatives are determined by agreement between the majority and minority leaders. Ways and Means is presently fixed at 15-10; Rules at 8-4. On the other House committees the ratio corresponds roughly, but not with mathematical precision, to the party division in the Chamber.

PARTY POLICY COMMITTEES

Party policy committees were set up in the Senate in 1947 to plan the legislative program, coordinate and guide committee activity, focus party leadership and strengthen party responsibility and accountability. The creation of such policy committees in both Houses was originally recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and in the Heller Report on Strengthening the Congress, and approved by the Senate in passing the legislative reorganization bill. This provision was lost in the House, but restored for the Senate in the form of an item in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act. Additional funds are obtained from the appropriation for clerical assistance to the Majority and Minority Conferences.

Both Senate party policy committees have now been operating actively for 4 years. They meet regularly each week while Congress is in session. During the Eighty-first Congress the Democratic Policy Committee had six regular members: Lucas (chairman), Tydings, Russell, O'Mahoney, Green, and Hill; and two advisory members: McMahon (conference secretary) and Myers (party whip). It had a staff of two lawyers, one legislative analyst, and three clerks. Meanwhile, the Republican Policy Committee had 11 members: Taft (chairman), Millikin (conference chairman), Young (conference secretary), Wherry (floor leader), Saltonstall (party whip), Bridges, Cordon, Hickenlooper, Ives, Margaret Smith, and Vandenberg. It had a staff of 12 employees, including a staff director, seven researchers, three clerks, and one secretary.

Republican policy committeemen are elected by their party conference for 2-year terms and are limited to two consecutive terms. Democratic policy committeemen are appointed for an indefinite term by the party leader on authority of the party conference.

With the aid of their staffs, the Senate Policy Committees have performed a variety of useful functions. They have surveyed legislation pending before the standing committees and on the Senate calendar and, when in the majority, have scheduled business for floor consideration. They have met with the chairmen of standing committees to coordinate committee work. They have heard individual Senators present their views on matters of personal and party interest and have tried to reconcile divergent views within the party on legislative questions so as to achieve party unity. They have considered and recommended with regard to Presidential nominations of national and party importance, advised on the institution of certain committee investigations, considered questions of parliamentary procedure, recommended the calling of party conferences, and prepared broad statements of party policy. On occasion, the Senate Republican Policy Committee has met with its counterpart committee in the House. During the early months of the Eightieth Congress it employed a personnel adviser to assist the committees and members of the Senate with their staffing problems.

As devices for coordinating legislative policy making and strengthening party leadership, the Senate policy committees have thus far failed to achieve their full potential. As instruments for promoting more effective liaison and cooperation with the President, they have also been a disappointment, due in part to the lack of similar party policy committees in the House of Representatives. Their limited achievements to date can be attributed, I suggest, to their composition, to the fragmentation of power in Congress, and to the deep internal divisions within both of our major political parties. They are not composed of the chairmen of the standing committees, as was originally contemplated.

The parties in the House have continued their informal steering committees which are

roughly comparable to the Senate policy committees, but have no staffs. The Republican steering committee, now called the House Republican policy committee, is presently composed of 21 members elected biennially: The floor leader (chairman), chairman of the party conference, secretary of the conference, party whip, chairman of the congressional committee, three chosen by the committee on committees, and 13 others selected on a geographical basis. This is an advisory committee to the Republican leadership and membership, and meets prior to any important action on the floor, discusses these issues with committee members handling the bills, and reports its suggestions for action and policy to a party conference or through the whip organization. No major issue affecting national party policy shall be brought to the floor of the House with the consent of the Republican leadership until after a party conference has been held and the subject fully discussed. No Republican Member of Congress is bound by the decisions of the policy committee, but its suggestions are designed to guide the Members to a firmer national policy.

The Democratic steering committee in the House is composed at present of the Speaker, the majority floor leader, chairman of the party caucus, party whip, the chairmen of Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Rules, and 1 Representative from each of the 15 zones into which the country is divided for party purposes, each such Representative being elected by the Democratic delegation in the House from the zone. The steering committee is, in effect, the executive committee of the caucus. It has the continuing responsibility of watching legislative developments and making decisions from day to day with respect to party action. In performing this function, it exercises wide discretionary powers.

STAFFING OF CONGRESS

More and better staff aids for Members and committees of Congress was a major objective of the act. And much progress in the staffing of Congress has been achieved. Most Senators have appointed administrative assistants at \$10,000 a year who are helping them in many ways. Four of them are Senators' sons and many were formerly senatorial secretaries. A similar provision for Congressmen was lost in the House, but meanwhile the clerk-hire allowance of each Representative has been raised to \$12,500 a year. Established in 1919 to draft bills for Members and committees of Congress, the staff of the Office of Legislative Counsel has increased under the act from 11 to 28 persons. The Senate office now has a staff of 14 persons: 7 counsel, 3 law assistants, and 4 clerks; and the House office likewise has 14 persons, 7 counsels, 3 law assistants and 4 clerks. The chief counsels are appointed by the President pro tempore and Speaker, respectively; and the staff members are appointed by the chief counsel on each side. It is a permanent career staff independent of politics. The budget for the combined office is \$199,500 for fiscal 1951. The services rendered by these offices are of the highest quality.

Now in its thirty-fifth year, the Legislative Reference Service was greatly strengthened by the act (sec. 203) as the research and reference arm of Congress. The duties of the Service were defined for the first time in statutory form and the appointment of all necessary personnel was authorized "without regard to the civil-service laws and without reference to political affiliation solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office." Senior specialists were authorized to be appointed in some 19 subject fields "for special work with the appropriate committees of Congress." Under the act, appropriations to the Service have increased from \$178,000 in 1945 to \$790,000 for fiscal 1951 and its staff has grown from 66 persons in 1945 to 156 in 1950, of whom 14 are polit-

ical scientists. Fifteen senior specialists have been appointed in a dozen different subject fields. Several of them have been detailed to the professional staffs of congressional committees for varying periods and five of them (Elliott, Galloway, Graves, Kreps, Wilcox) have served as staff directors of such committees. Several new types of service have been inaugurated in recent years, including the public affairs abstracts and bulletins, digests of committee hearings, and special studies for committees of Congress. Under the able guidance of Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, its director, there has been a steady upward trend in the congressional use of the Service over the past decade.

In the professional staffing of the standing committees the act marked a real innovation. Section 202 authorized each standing committee (other than the Appropriations Committees on which no staff ceiling was placed) to appoint "not more than four professional staff members * * * on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office." In 1946, before this section became effective, Senate and House committees employed 356 clerks at a total annual payroll of \$978,760. Few of them were professionals, with the exception of the staffs of the Appropriations Committees and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and a few others. During 1950, after the act had been in effect 4 years the committees of Congress, standing, special, and joint, had a combined staff of 673 persons and a total payroll of more than \$3,000,000. Two hundred and eighty-six of them were classified as professionals. Ninety-eight were employed by House committees, 135 by Senate committees, and 53 by joint committees. Ten House and all 15 Senate standing committees had their full quota of 4 or more professional staff members. Five House committees and 11 Senate committees had received authority to expand their professional staffs beyond the figure (4) fixed in the act. Thus, the House Expenditures Committee with its subcommittees had a combined professional staff of 20 persons in 1950, while the Senate Judiciary Committee had 19 experts. Meanwhile, the House Appropriations Committee had 14 professionals, 18 clerks, and 42 special investigators on its payroll; and the Senate Appropriations Committee had 12 professionals and 6 clerks. Joint committee professional staffs ranged from 1 on the Byrd committee to 17 on Internal Revenue Taxation.

A survey of the professional staffs of congressional committees, made in 1949 showed that 43 percent of them were lawyers, 43 percent had formerly been employed in the executive branch of the National Government, 68 percent had previous congressional experience, and 81 percent were college graduates. Lawyers constituted the largest single occupational group, with a scattering of economists, political scientists, and engineers. Their basic annual compensation ranges from \$5,000 to \$8,000 which grosses \$7,775 to \$10,846. About half of them receive the maximum salary.

The authors of the Legislative Reorganization Act recommended creation of an Office of Personnel Director for the Congress who would develop a modern personnel system for all its employees and abolish the patronage system, but this provision was lost in the Senate debate. In its place, Mr. George Smith, secretary of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, developed a plan for the efficient professional and clerical staffing of the committees of the Senate and circulated it among their chairmen on the eve of the Eightieth Congress. Mr. Smith was also instrumental in the appointment of a personnel adviser early in 1947 who was of material assistance in the staffing of the Senate during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Meanwhile, the writer developed a set of job specifications for the new professional and clerical positions on all

the reorganized standing committees of both Houses, of which some use was made.

After 4 years' experience, the quality of the professional staffs appears mixed. About half of the standing committees are staffed with well-trained and competent experts in their subject fields. Their handwork is reflected in the improved performance of their committees, in more adequate records, better hearings and reports, more effective liaison between their committees and the corresponding administrative agencies, and general improvement in efficiency. Many committees have carried out the intent of the act in the appointment and retention of qualified people. At the opening of the Eighty-first Congress, with the change in party control of both Houses, there was a turnover of one-third among the professional staffs of the standing committees, but two-thirds of them were retained from the Eightieth Congress, despite Senator McGrath's remark that it might be necessary to find some Democratic experts. After an intensive study of committee staffing, Professor Gladys Kammerer concluded in 1949: That not all Members of Congress know how to use staff; that some Members use staff data to support preconceived ideas or party dictates; that some professional staff people feel frustrated by the subordination of facts to political exigencies and sectional prejudices, and by the occasional inactivity of their committees; that political considerations are often paramount in staffing; that systematic personnel arrangements are still lacking in committee staffing; and that there is room for improvement both in the quality of professional staff and in the processes of recruitment and selection.

According to Ernest Griffith's evaluation of committee staffing, "some committees have survived changes in party control without impairment, largely in instances in which party considerations did not influence the original appointments. In other instances a reasonable stability has been secured by the division of appointments between the parties. Other have been partisan. Lawyers and journalists have been employed in considerable numbers, economists and subject specialists perhaps somewhat less so than would have been anticipated, a few have been obtained on loan from the Legislative Reference Service, and this has resulted in almost perfect integration of the two agencies in those cases in which this took place."

In the absence of a personnel director, no one is centrally situated where he can evaluate all the professional committee staffs. But committee staffing appears to be still in transition from the old patronage system to a modern merit system. Congress is handicapped by the lack of a modern system of personnel administration. If it needed a Congressional Personnel Office in 1945, as the La Follette-Monroney committee said, it needs it more than ever today to help Members and committees with their staffing problems, to secure the selection of qualified personnel, and to develop safeguards of tenure. Experience has also shown that the limit on the number of professionals imposed by the act is too low and should be lifted, that there has been little coordination of staff work between the twin committees of the two Houses, that larger staffs are needed to assist the more active committees with their onerous legislative and supervisory duties, and that Representatives from the more populous districts should be given administrative assistants such as Senators now have.

Seen in historical perspective, "this act marked the birth of a full-fledged congressional staff," as Ernest Griffith has recently observed. Although the results of its operation on the staff side have been uneven as between committees, Members, and subject-matter fields, striking gains have been achieved. Total appropriations for committee staffs, the Legislative Reference Service, and

the office of the Legislative Counsel have multiplied fivefold since 1944. They amount to more than \$5 million for fiscal 1951. The staffing of Congress effected by the act has introduced a "third force of experts, usually designed as a corrective to the bias of the special interests and to the substantive recommendations of the executive * * * the enlargement and strengthening of the staffs of Congress have in fact been the major factor in arresting and probably reversing a trend * * * in the direction of the ascendancy or even the virtually complete dominance of the bureaucracy over the legislative branch through the former's near-monopoly * * * of technical competence * * * Congress has mastered—or has provided itself with the tools to master—the problem of assuring itself of an unbiased, competent source of expert information and analysis which is its very own."

CHANGES IN WORKLOAD

Another major objective of the La Follette-Monroney committee was to reduce the workload on Congress caused by nonlegislative duties and by the consideration of private and local legislation. To this end it recommended more staff aids for Members and committees, expansion of the bill drafting and Legislative Reference Services, creation of a stenographic pool, reduction in committee assignments to one or two per Member, delegation of private claims, and home rule for the District of Columbia. Most of these recommendations were embodied in the act.

In practice, the workload of committees has more than doubled since 1946 in terms of the number of measures referred to and reported by them. The ban upon the introduction of four categories of private bills, imposed by section 131 of the act, effected some reduction in the private-bill workload in the Eightieth Congress, but this gain was lost in the Eighty-first Congress when 1,052 private laws were enacted, which was 55 percent of all laws passed prior to the "lame duck" session. The continuing flood of private bills consists largely of claims bills, whose introduction is still permitted under the exceptions allowed by the Federal Tort Claims Act (Title IV of the Legislative Reorganization Act), and private immigration bills whose introduction is unrestricted. In 1949 Congress received a record total of 1,351 private bills designed to permit aliens to enter or to remain within the United States, reflecting the efforts of displaced persons to find permanent refuge within our borders. In addition, the Eightieth Congress widened the power of the Attorney General to stay the deportation of aliens here illegally. Such suspensions must be confirmed in each individual case by concurrent resolution of Congress; 5,000 cases were handled in 1949-50 by the Judiciary Committees whose calendars are engulfed by the rising flood of private bills.

Despite the effort of the act to distribute the legislative workload more evenly among the standing committees of Congress, in practice the burden varies within wide limits from time to time and from session to session, depending upon the nature of the national and international problems that are paramount at the time. The Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees have been among the hardest working since the war because of the importance of their measures and mounting international problems. The authors of the act never claimed that structural reforms in legislative machinery would reduce the volume of congressional business. The burden of this business has inevitably become increasingly onerous with the steady expansion of governmental activities at home and abroad in recent decades. The purpose of the changes in committee structure was not so much to reduce the workload as it was to effect a more systematic and rational division of labor among the reorganized committee. The reorganization of committee

work is an improvement over the previous situation as a result of the elimination of duplicating and overlapping jurisdictions and the consolidation of related functions effected by the act.

The workload of individual Members of Congress has not been lightened by the act, but more and better staff aids have enabled them to do a better job. Administrative assistants to Senators have helped them immeasurably with their departmental business, constituent inquiries, and speech writing. And enlargement of the Legislative Reference Service has been followed by a great increase in its use by individual members for legislative research, speech writing, fact finding, and answering constituent inquiries. The Service is currently handling congressional inquiries at the rate of more than 38,000 a year. One measure of the effect of the act on the individual workload is seen in the limitation of standing committee assignments to one per Member in the House and two per Member in the Senate, with minor exceptions. But this reduction has been offset in part by service on subcommittees and on special and joint committees. Yet there was a decline of 50 percent from 1946 to 1949 in the average number of committee assignments of all kinds for each Senator.

Despite these gains, the burden of work imposed upon the Members and committees of Congress by their legislative and investigative duties and the importunities of constituents is truly enormous. According to George Smith, close observer of the congressional scene, the work load is more than they can handle. "There are now signs that the limits of capacity have been reached * * * This enormous extension of activities of the Federal Government generates a volume of detailed and complex business which I believe has gone beyond the capacity of Congress to handle. * * * A law of diminishing returns is actively at work in the field of Federal Government. * * * The workload is beyond effective legislative control."

If Congress desires to lighten the mounting burden of its business several steps are available. It could complete the evolution begun in 1946 by (a) repealing section 421 of the Federal Tort Claims Act which excepts 12 classes of claims from its provisions; (b) delegating the adjustment of immigration and deportation cases to the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and (c) delegating the issuance of land patents to the Bureau of Land Management or to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior. Senator Wiley, who was chairman of Judiciary in the Eightieth Congress, has suggested that the introduction of private bills could be banned in both Houses merely by amending their standing rules. Congress could grant home rule to the District of Columbia and thus get rid of its duties as a city council for the city of Washington. It could prohibit its Members from appearing before administrative agencies on the claims and complaints of their constituents, as Prof. Lawrence Chamberlain has suggested. It could try to reduce the magnitude of Federal operations via the devolution of appropriate functions to State and regional authorities, as George Smith has urged. It could authorize Members of the House of Representatives to employ administrative assistants such as Senators now have. It could save much of its time every session by voting by electricity and by the central scheduling of committee meetings to avoid conflicts. And it could expedite its business by staggering committee meetings and chamber sessions on alternate days. Taken together, these steps would go far to bring the work load of our national legislature within its capacity to carry.

OVERSIGHT OF ADMINISTRATION

Another main objective of the act was to promote closer cooperation and better rela-

tionships between the executive and legislative branches. To this end the standing committees were directed (section 136) to exercise "continuous watchfulness" of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies under their jurisdiction. In recommending "legislative oversight by standing committees," the La Follette-Monroney Committee observed that "without effective legislative oversight of the activities of the vast executive branch, the line of democracy wears thin. * * * We feel that this oversight problem can be handled best by directing the regular standing committees of the Senate and House, which have such matters in their jurisdiction, to conduct a continuous review of the agencies administering laws originally reported by the committees. * * * Such review might well include a question period by the committee. * * * We recommend that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned. * * * By directing its standing committees to perform this oversight function, Congress can help to overcome the unfortunate cleavage between the personnel of the legislative and executive branches."

Some critics of the act have alleged that this section provided, in effect, for duplicating and overlapping investigations of the executive branch of the Government by many committees. But it was the intention of the authors of the act to bring about a three-way division of labor in the performance of the oversight function. Their thought was that the Appropriations Committees, on the one hand, would exercise financial control before expenditure through scrutiny of the departmental estimates; that the Expenditure Committees would undertake to review administrative structure and procedures, on the other hand; while the legislative committees would review the operation of substantive legislation and consider the need of statutory amendments.

This feature of the act has met with only partial success to date. Many standing committees have been too heavily burdened with their legislative duties and limited staffs to keep very close watch upon the executive agencies within their jurisdiction. A survey of committee activity during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress shows that 10 standing and 5 special committees of Congress were carrying on special investigations of matters which involved some oversight of executive activities. The most active committees in this field have been the Appropriations, Expenditures, Armed Services, and Commerce Committees. Perhaps the most publicized inquiry last year was that by a subcommittee of Foreign Relations into charges of disloyalty among Department of State personnel. A new watchdog subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, set up last July under the chairmanship of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, is probing deeply into the administration of the national defense program. The detailed results achieved by these supervisory committees are set forth in their reports. The work of certain Government corporations such as the Maritime Commission, subversive activities in Government, national defense preparations, and the manipulations of the 5 percenters have been among the chief fields of legislative oversight in recent years.

Parliamentary government has virtually disappeared in Europe. Its survival in the United States largely depends upon congressional oversight of administration. Administrative agencies are responsible for making decisions within the policy standards and procedural machinery fixed by statute, subject to judicial review to assure compliance with the statutory requirements. Congress is responsible for amending the law if a change in standards or methods of procedure proves necessary. Legislative oversight of agency operations is the means by which Congress discharges its responsibility. Creation in re-

cent years of several so-called watchdog committees in such fields as atomic-energy control, foreign aid, Federal expenditures, and defense production has focused attention on this oversight function. The joint committee is a useful device for performing this function because its duties are explicitly assigned by statute, seniority does not apply in its selection, and it provides an outlet for the zest and zeal of younger Members. It is also a valuable instrument of legislative surveillance and statutory amendment in experimental and controversial fields where economic stability and national security are at stake. In times of crisis, with growing concentration of power in the executive, more energetic performance of the oversight function would appear to be in the public interest, provided that both Congress and the agencies keep within their respective spheres of responsibility.

In exercising its oversight function several tools are available to the Congress. It can study the periodic and special reports which the agencies submit to the legislature. These reports contain valuable information on agency operations and expenditures, their administration of the statutes, and particular problem areas. Investigations of particular agencies may be conducted by the appropriations or expenditure committees, or by the standing committees charged with jurisdiction over their activities, or by the joint watchdog committees like the Atomic Energy Committee, or by special committees like the Kefauver committee on interstate crime. An appropriations committee may look into an agency's budget requests to see if they are excessive or inadequate, comparing notes meanwhile with the appropriate standing or watchdog committee concerned. An expenditure committee may make a post-audit of an agency's administration of its affairs to see if it has been economical or wasteful. A legislative committee may hold hearings or an informal question period with agency officials to determine whether or not they are enforcing a statute in accordance with the legislative intent, or to discuss constituent complaints concerning alleged agency abuses of authority, or to consider proposed legislation in the light of past decisions and regulations. A joint watchdog committee may be used to investigate novel or emergent problems of mutual interest to both Houses such as the international control of the hydrogen bomb or raw material shortages. Or a special committee may be set up to investigate a particular problem or agency such as speculative transactions on the commodity markets by Government employees or the Federal Communications Commission. In general, I believe that the oversight function should be exercised by standing rather than special investigating committees. The latter trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of the standing committees, they lack continuity and legislative authority, and they impair the efficiency of the administrative agencies of the Government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of Congress in cases where legislative action is indicated.

Another tool in the oversight kit is the committee report evaluating agency operation and suggesting changes in current administration of existing law. Good examples of such reports were the activities reports of the Senate Expenditures Committee and its Investigations Subcommittee at the end of the Eightieth Congress, and the series of intermediate reports on various agencies and commissions issued by the House Expenditures Committee during the Eighty-first Congress. The Legislative Reorganization Act does not require such committee reports, but they are required of the "watchdog committees" created by the Taft-Hartley Act and the Atomic Energy Act.

Informal conferences at the committee and/or staff level with agency officials is another method which has proved helpful in performing the oversight function. First used by Chairman Lanham and Administrator Blandford on national housing matters, it has helped resolve complaints and misunderstandings, made for closer cooperation, and laid a foundation of mutual respect and confidence. During the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a series of such meetings with representatives of 14 regulatory agencies in its field. The committee stated that these meetings enabled it to exercise closer supervision over these agencies; it was a means of acquainting the new members of the committee with the activities with which they would become concerned; and it provided a means for the various agencies to present their ideas to the committee concerning possible measures for improving their work or making it more effective. Only a few committees have made sporadic use of this conference technique for oversight purposes. The practice might well be generalized of holding periodic meetings at the subcommittee-commission level or through the increased use of qualified staff personnel to study the problems of particular agencies. To this end some expansion of the professional staffs of the supervisory committees appears necessary.

Intervention of individual Members of Congress in the affairs of administrative agencies with a view to expediting or influencing agency decisions on behalf of constituents is considered improper, where the Congressman is not a member of the corresponding supervisory committee and is not merely seeking information or making a routine inquiry. It was the intention of the authors of the Legislative Reorganization Act that the oversight committees would serve as a clearing house to which Members would refer all such constituent complaints and inquiries and which would then bring them to the attention of the agencies concerned. The volume and character of such complaints would be a rough index of the performance and weakness of the agency. At the same time, as the Hoover Commission task force report on regulatory commissions remarked, "this method would shield both the Congressman and the Commission from the suspicion of influence inherent in direct approaches for constituents."

In a lucid analysis of the oversight problem, the Committee on Administrative Law of the Bar Association of New York City believes that "vigilant and conscientious exercise of proper oversight and consultation are much to be desired and encouraged." The problem is one of achieving a "suitable accommodation of popular control and flexible administrative expertness." They also suggest the advisability of erecting certain self-imposed boundaries. Legislative committees ought not to try to influence the decision of pending cases or issues before an agency or the manner in which a particular case is being handled—"a precept not universally respected in practice." Nor should decided cases be criticized with a view to influencing an agency to reverse a previous ruling or limit a trend in agency decisions except where a committee is genuinely considering amending the statute. However, it is considered proper for a committee to make suggestions to an agency with respect to its procedures or internal organization and to comment upon proposed substantive rules.

STRENGTHENING FISCAL CONTROLS

One of the major aims of the act was to strengthen the congressional power of the purse. To this end the act provided for a legislative budget (sec. 138), development of a standard appropriation classification schedule (sec. 139b), studies by the Comptroller General of restrictions in the appropriation acts (sec. 205), expenditure analyses by the

Comptroller General (sec. 206), studies by both Appropriations Committees of Permanent appropriations and of the disposition of funds resulting from the sale of Government property or services (sec. 139b), and expansion of the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations (sec. 202b).

In practice, many of the fiscal reforms embodied in the act have been virtually ignored or have failed to work. Attempts to carry out the legislative budget provision during 1947-49 proved abortive; in 1950 this section was ignored and appears to be a dead letter. In congressional circles the aim of the legislative budget is generally regarded as laudable, but experience with it seems to have shown that the instrument is not properly suited to its task. Its failure to date is attributed to the shortness of time allowed for the job, the unwieldy size of the Joint Budget Committee, inadequate staffing, improper adjustment to the appropriation process, resistance within Congress to ceilings on appropriations for favorite agencies, current Federal accounting practices, and external spending pressures on the legislature. There is strong sentiment in Congress for further trial of the legislative budget idea and measures have been introduced to amend section 138 of the act with a view to overcoming the difficulties mentioned above.

The Wherry resolution (S. Con. Res. 38, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), presented on May 11, 1949, by a bipartisan group of eight Senators, would reduce the Joint Budget Committee to 20 members, authorize it to employ an expert staff, and to report a legislative budget with a recommended ceiling on expenditures by February 15. There would be no formal adoption of the budget by concurrent resolution under the Wherry plan. Senate Concurrent Resolution 38 was reported favorably by the Senate Rules Committee on April 14, 1950, and has been on the Senate Calendar ever since.

The McClellan bill (S. 2898, 81st Cong., 2d sess.), introduced on January 19, 1950, would repeal section 138 of the act and create in its place a Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget to carry on a continuing year-round study of budget requests and requirements. It would be a 10-member group, with 5 members selected from the Appropriations Committee of each House. It would make its reports to these committees and to other standing committees. Every Federal agency would be required to submit to the joint committee a duplicate of any money request made to the Budget Bureau. This would apply to both regular and supplemental appropriations. This would permit a long-term study of each agency's needs, its own requests for funds, as well as the amount which the Budget Bureau finally asks Congress to authorize. Aside from this detailed study of each agency's budget request and requirements; the joint committee would make periodic reports on any improper uses of funds or deviations from congressional authorizations, on methods of achieving greater economy and efficiency, and on estimated revenues and general economic conditions.

The need of simplifying and standardizing the pattern of the appropriation bills, which the act called for and which the Hoover Commission recommended has been carried out in part in the 1951 performance budget and in the Budgeting and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

The studies by the Comptroller General on useless restrictions in appropriation bills were completed in January 1948 and will probably result in the elimination of many of these obsolete provisions which have been carried on from year to year in the supply bills. But the expenditure analyses of Government departments which he was directed to make, so as "to enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently administered and

expended," have not yet been made because funds for the purpose have been denied by the Appropriations Committee.

No systematic study of permanent appropriations appears to have been made although the House subcommittees reviewed these items during their 1948 hearings and the Senate committee gave them considerable attention during 1947-49.

On the staffing of the Appropriations Committee, the La Follette-Monroney committee recommended that four qualified staff assistants be assigned to each of the subcommittees on a year-round basis. But at the insistence of the leaders of the House Appropriations Committee, a change was made and they were authorized by the act to employ whatever staff they considered necessary. "This was done," according to Senator Monroney, "in the belief that they would add sufficient professional personnel to gain a complete understanding of every item in every appropriation request." In practice, the staff of the House Appropriations Committee has been increased above the stenographic grade from 11 clerks in 1946 to 17 clerks during the 6-month period from January 1, 1950, to June 30, 1950. During the same period the committee also employed an investigative staff consisting of 2 full-time investigators, 23 part-time investigators borrowed from 12 administrative agencies, and 11 temporary clerical and editorial assistants borrowed from 10 agencies on a reimbursable basis and 4 clerk-stenographers. Total expenditures for the combined clerical and investigative staff for the fiscal year 1950 amounted to \$290,628.98. No administrative analysts or professional staff have been employed by the House committee "because of a conviction that professional and clerical staff impede each other." Thus, considering both the clerical and investigative staff, the combined 42-man staff handled a workload of appropriations during 1950 of more than \$1,000,000,000 per staff member. "No one can question the ability of those employed," observes Senator Monroney, "but I feel that a greatly enlarged staff would enable the committee to ferret out of the money bills much more information and facts regarding the agencies than is now done with the small staffs used."

During the Eightieth Congress, on the other hand, the Senate Appropriation Committee took advantage of the act's authority to recruit a professional staff of eight experienced persons in addition to the regular clerical and investigative force. And during the first 6 months of 1950 this committee had a staff of six clerks, six professionals, and six clerical assistants at a gross annual salary for the fiscal year of \$132,927. The Senate committee needs a smaller staff than the House committee, because the former sits and holds hearings only on specific appeals from House decisions.

Thus, the greatest failure of reorganization has been in the field of more effective fiscal control. This failure was offset in part in 1950 by the consolidation of 11 separate supply bills into 1 omnibus appropriation bill for the first time in more than a century and a half. Hitherto, the supply bills have gone through the legislative process in piecemeal fashion. Last year they were merged into one measure which was ready for the President's signature two full months ahead of the budget completion date in 1949. The big money bill represents a forward step in appropriation procedure in that, by bringing all the general supply bills together into a single measure, it gives Congress and the country a picture of the total outlay contemplated for the coming fiscal year. The new procedure also permits a comparison of total proposed appropriations with the latest available estimates of total Treasury receipts. This comparison enables Congress to decide in its wisdom whether to balance the budget or to create a surplus for debt retirement or to incur an increase in the public debt. The new procedure also allows Congress

to see the claims of spending pressure groups in relation to the total national fiscal picture and thus to appraise their relative worth. The consolidated supply bill procedure falls short, however, of the objectives of the legislative budget in that it does not fix a ceiling on expenditures or give a coordinated view of prospective income and outgo. But no ceiling on expenditures could long contain the huge current outlays for national defense.

LIGHT ON LOBBYING

Title III of the act requires persons whose principal paid activity is seeking to influence Federal legislation to register and file quarterly financial statements of receipts and expenditures with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House. The La Follette-Monroney committee had recommended that all lobbyists should register and file statements; it did not intend that registration and reporting should be limited to persons principally engaged in lobbying. The joint committee was led by testimony it heard, as well as by its own independent studies, to believe that the registration of the representatives of organized groups would enable Congress better to evaluate and determine evidence, data, or communications from organized groups seeking to influence legislative action and thus avoid the distortion of public opinion. It was also influenced by the recommendation of the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association in 1945 that "all groups, representatives of which appear before congressional committees, should register and make full disclosure of their membership, finances, and so forth." The joint committee believed that inclusion of a lobby title in the act would strengthen the Congress by "enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." To turn the spotlight of publicity on lobbying activities and expenditures would be a big step forward, they felt. After the lobby law had been in operation for a few years, experience would reveal any defects in it which could be corrected by amending and strengthening the act.

In practice, the administration of the lobby law has furnished Congress and the country with more useful and important information about lobbyists; their identity, sponsorships, sources of support, and legislative interests than has ever been known before. The compilation of filings and financial data which are published quarterly in the Congressional Record provide a wealth of informative data on the activities of these gentry. The facts on lobbying, for example, for the first quarter of 1950, consumed 177 pages of the Record of July 14, 1950, and reflected the work of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities which secured adoption of a new standard of reporting form and a record of outstanding compliance with the law. Under the chairmanship of Representative Frank Buchanan, this committee made an objective and intensive study during 1949-50 of lobbying by private groups and individuals and Government agencies: its extent, fund-raising and lobbying techniques, grass-roots pressure, causes and costs of lobbying, etc. It shed much fresh light on modern methods of lobbying and recommended several improvements in the law.

Administration of the lobby law has been handicapped by its vagueness and ambiguities. Many organizations and individuals who are engaged in influencing legislation have not complied with the act, on advice of counsel, because they claim that their "principal purpose" is not to influence legislation. They claim principal means "primary" or "major." Many persons have registered who disclaim that they are engaged in lobbying, or who assert that lobbying is only incidental to their other activities. An analysis of experience under the lobby law during the Eightieth Congress, made by W. Brooke Graves, showed that, out of 1,807 organizations maintaining offices in Washington, 667

registered during 1947 and 725 during 1948. Eight hundred and thirty-five organizations failed to register either year, although representatives of 198 of them appeared before the Judiciary Committees during 1948-49. By the end of 1949 a total of 2,878 persons and groups had filed under the lobby law, of which 495 were original filings; their reports showed that they had collected more than \$55,000,000 since the act went into effect and had spent more than \$27,000,000. Dr. Graves concludes that it is almost impossible to estimate the extent of compliance with the lobby law. "While the existing law marks a significant advance, its provisions are in urgent need of strengthening and revision, if the objectives of the framers are to be fully realized."

Impartial students of the subject are agreed that there is urgent need for some kind of supervision and control over lobbying in Washington; that the lobby law of 1946 suffers from a defective draftsmanship; and that it should be revised and clarified after a thorough investigation of the whole problem such as the Buchanan committee has now made. Specific suggestions for revision include clarification of the law's terminology, coverage, and filing requirements; centralization of responsibility for its administration in a specific agency equipped with an adequate full-time staff to file, tabulate, and analyze registrations and financial reports and investigate compliance with the act; provision for termination of inactive registrations; exact specification of financial data required; submission of full information regarding an organization's membership, internal structure, and methods of policy determination; and extension of the act's application to lobbying before administrative agencies as well as Congress.

COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT

The final aim of the act was the provision raising congressional salaries 25 percent to \$12,500 a year, granting each Member a tax-exempt expense allowance of \$2,500 a year, and extending to Members of Congress optional retirement coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The salary boost was designed to help meet the rising cost of living and campaigning. The allowance was to assist in defraying expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties. The eligibility to participate in the Federal retirement system on a contributory basis might encourage superannuated Members to retire and conduce to a greater sense of security and independence of thought and action on the part of younger members.

The salary increase and expense allowance became effective on the day in which the Eightieth Congress convened. To be entitled to a retirement annuity a Member of Congress must have served at least 6 years, have attained the age of 62, and have contributed a percentage of his base pay to the retirement fund at the rate provided by the Retirement Act. The annuity of Members of Congress consists of 2½ percent of their average salary received as a member, multiplied by their respective years of service. As of June 30, 1950, 52 former Congressmen were drawing annuity benefits. As of August 3, 1950, 476 Congressmen and Senators were contributing to the civil service annuity fund.

Some who have analyzed the responsibilities, duties, and importance of the congressional job believe that it is worth a salary of \$25,000 and that the expenses of the job call for such a salary. They assert that congressional salaries should be such that Members would have no excuse for augmenting their income by means which might be prejudicial to the effectiveness of their work; and that the salary should be such that it would widen the field that could be drawn upon for congressional talent and thus in the long run raise the level of the legislative ability. It is also urged that the salary should be such as to lead toward the desirable objective of up-

grading the salaries of all public service positions.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we can report that the basic reforms in committee structure have survived four years' trial and worked well on the whole. Committee procedure has been improved and regularized in several respects, although some jurisdictional disputes still occur. Party policy committees have functioned actively in the Senate, but have failed to achieve their full potential. Striking gains have been achieved in the staffing of Congress, but there is room for improvement in the quality of professional committee staffs and in the methods of their selection. Congress is handicapped by the lack of a modern personnel system, but its new staff aides have apparently arrested its decline in relation to the executive branch. The workload on Congress has not been reduced by the act, but more and better staff aides have enabled it to do a better job. The Judiciary Committees are overburdened with thousands of private bills about matters which should be handled elsewhere. Operation of the oversight function has been partially successful and various devices are available for its fuller performance. The fiscal control provisions of the act have either been ignored or have proved unworkable in practice. The greatest failure of congressional reorganization has been in the fiscal control field. Administration of the lobby law has disclosed a wealth of new information concerning the identity and finances of lobbyists, but has been handicapped by defects in the statute which needs revision and clarification. Congressional salaries have been raised and 476 out of 531 Members of Congress are presently participating in the Federal retirement plan.

Representative government has broken down or disappeared in other countries. Here in the United States it remains on trial. Its survival may well depend upon its ability to cope quickly and adequately with the difficult problems of a dangerous world. Congress is the central citadel of American democracy and our chief defense against dictatorship. Hence the importance of congressional reorganization and of further steps toward strengthening our national legislature.

ADMINISTRATION EFFORTS TO CONTROL INFLATION

HON. RALPH T. SMITH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what I consider an excellent statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury, giving the administration's view of the budget outlook and their assessment of their efforts to control inflation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. DAVID M. KENNEDY,
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to appear before you for an examination of the budget outlook and an assessment of our efforts to control inflation. This subcommittee has made an important contribution in serving both the Congress and the executive branch as a respected forum for discussion and review of economic policy. In the tradition of reasoned analysis which has

characterized the deliberations of the subcommittee, it is appropriate to review the conduct of fiscal policy by the Nixon Administration during its first eight and one-half months in office.

Director Mayo will give you the budget outlook for the current fiscal year. The projected surplus of nearly \$6 billion is essential in the present economic environment. In its report on the January 1969 Economic Report of the President, the Joint Economic Committee argued persuasively for a significant surplus, and we are in complete agreement with that position. Our determination to restrain Federal spending and to maintain sufficient revenues to adequately cover expenditures supports the objective which we all share—to preserve a positive role for fiscal policy in the maintenance of economic stability. The failure in recent years to make prompt and timely use of fiscal policy to counteract impending inflationary tendencies has been a source of considerable disruption and inequity in the economy.

The American people understand the falseness of an inflated prosperity, and I know many of them have communicated this understanding to their elected representatives in Washington; many have also expressed their concern to me personally. The real wages of the average manufacturing worker are only \$1.45 a week higher today than they were in 1966—despite higher and higher wage settlements. Inflationary excesses create hardships for all segments of our society. Monetary values are eroded, purchasing power is diminished, decision-making is distorted, and interest rates are disproportionately inflated.

The control of inflation is more than a matter of domestic concern. Last week I met with the financial representatives of over 100 countries. They impressed upon me their own deep concern over inflation in the United States. The American economy is so large and its influence so widespread, especially because the dollar is a key currency, that the excesses of either inflation or recession affect the entire world economy. It is important that we improve our competitive position in foreign markets and maintain international confidence in the dollar. The current inflation is unhealthy for both America and the rest of the world, and its control is therefore both a domestic and an international necessity.

Since assuming office last January, this Administration has moved quickly and firmly to bring the policies of the Federal Government in line with the country's most urgent economic priority—to halt the spiral of rising prices. Our basic strategy has been to restore stability through the coordinated application of fiscal, debt management, and (with the cooperation of the Federal Reserve Board) monetary policies designed to moderate aggregate demand pressures.

In April the President proposed two major actions to increase tax revenues: (1) extension of the income tax surcharge at 10 percent for the first half of fiscal 1970 and at 5 percent for the second half of fiscal 1970; and (2) repeal of the investment tax credit. The Congress has approved extension of the full surcharge through this calendar year, but action to continue the surcharge at its reduced rate and to repeal the tax credit remains to be taken in the Senate. I want to emphasize again that these measures are essential to our overall strategy and require the earliest possible action. They are in complete agreement with the recommendations made by the Joint Economic Committee last spring.

Enactment of these two tax proposals will produce an estimated \$3.3 billion in revenues. Including the requested extension of present excise tax rates and the proposed imposition of new user charges, a total of \$4 billion of necessary revenues depends on favorable legislative consideration. With-

out positive Congressional action, fiscal policy will not be exerting the measure of restraint appropriate for effective inflation control.

Assuming favorable action on these revenue-raising proposals, total budget receipts for fiscal 1970 are now estimated at \$198.8 billion, or \$0.4 billion below the May 20 estimate. This relatively small change in total receipts is primarily due to a \$0.5 billion reduction in estimated corporate tax total receipts is primarily due to a \$0.5 billion reduction in estimated corporate income tax receipts, reflecting our lower estimate for 1969 corporate profits. The economic assumptions underlying these latest estimates are shown in the following table. Changes since May 20 largely resulted from revisions in National Income Account data by the Commerce Department.

Economic assumptions, calendar year 1969

[In billions of dollars]

Gross national product, May 20 estimate	927
Current estimate	932
Personal income, May 20 estimate	739
Current estimate	745
Corporate profits before taxes, May 20 estimate	97
Current estimate	94½

On the expenditure side, the President has demonstrated his determination to regain Executive control over Federal outlays by his commitment to hold expenditures below the Congressionally authorized limit. Total outlays for fiscal 1970 are estimated to be \$192.9 billion, the same figure used for the May 20 estimate. Director Mayo will discuss budget expenditures in greater detail.

The net result of these fiscal actions will be the generation of sufficient revenues to more than cover substantially trimmed outlays. The Federal budget will be contributing importantly to the control of inflation.

Nine months ago, we knew that this would be an arduous and lengthy task. Aggregate spending was under strong upward momentum, and inflationary expectations were well entrenched. It has been our deliberate policy to restore economic stability through the careful application of restrictive fiscal and monetary measures. The evidence that this policy is being effectively applied is beginning to mount.

Real economic growth is well below the basic trend rate of capacity growth;

The September unemployment rate was reported at four percent;

The combined index of leading business indicators has slowly declined for three consecutive months;

Industrial production registered a small monthly decline in August; and

Consumer surveys indicate a significant decline in buying sentiment.

While there is ample evidence that real growth has been declining in recent months, the desired abatement of price level increases has not yet become evident in the statistical indicators. This is not unexpected, since prices invariably tend to lag behind changes in the underlying market conditions. But regardless of the source of inflationary pressure, whether from excess demand or from rising costs, the absence of sufficient demand to clear markets at inflated prices must result in inventory accumulation and inevitably lead to price reductions. Investment and production decisions reached under the assumption of a continuation in current rates of inflation will come to be sorely regretted.

We are encouraged that our strategy is beginning to show results. The difficulty of pursuing this task must not be underestimated, however, and cooperation from the Congress is vitally important to our maintaining appropriate fiscal restraint. The revenue-raising measures proposed by the

Administration must be enacted to continue the desired budgetary effects.

Only last month, a distinguished former Secretary of the Treasury told a Senate committee that both the executive and legislative branches had committed a serious policy error by failing to control the budget during the 1965-1966 period. As a result, fiscal policy came to exert a completely undesired influence on an overinflated economy during the fiscal year 1968. Madam Chairman, it is my hope, and I am certain this important subcommittee shares my concern, that we can maintain fiscal policy in its proper role of contributing to economic stability. That, I believe, is the purpose for these hearings; and that is why I am pleased to be here for a discussion of this important issue with you.

THE RISING COST OF AGRICULTURE'S BAD IMAGE

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize the valuable contributions our distinguished colleague from Texas, Bob POAGE, has made in the formulation of national agricultural policy over three decades. As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, he has worked untiringly to improve the economic situation confronting the Nation's farmers.

In the November issue of "Agri-Industry News," published by the Corn Refiners Association, Chairman POAGE pinpoints a major problem with agriculture and the plight of the farmer. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am pleased to include his remarks:

THE RISING COSTS OF AGRICULTURE'S BAD IMAGE

(By Representative W. R. POAGE)

The American people enjoy the world's highest standard of living primarily because of efficiencies achieved in agriculture. One farmer now feeds 43 persons, compared to 23 just a decade ago. In fact, output per man hour on the farm is up 82 percent over the past ten years. This means that considerable labor previously required for production of essential food and fiber may now be used to produce an unmatched variety of consumer goods.

Yet the farmer's undeniable contribution to the material quality of life in America goes largely unrecognized. Many consumers regard farm programs as a form of welfare; few perceive any difference between the problems of commercial and non-commercial agriculture. Fewer still recognize that, indirectly, government assistance to farmers represents a subsidy to consumers.

Trying to pinpoint responsibility for agriculture's poor image with consumers and taxpayers is a useless exercise. Suffice it to say that agriculture's side of the story has been ineffectively told, and the entire farm community must share the blame and the consequences.

Granted that farmers, suppliers and processors—the whole agribusiness—represent perhaps the nation's most diverse minority. Granted, also, that important segments within this minority will continue indefinitely to disagree on substantive issues.

But philosophical controversies and other equally wasteful outlets of energy have become a rising cost that the farm community can no longer afford. The fact that agriculture's special problems and contributions to the total economy are not clearly understood should be a danger signal to the entire farm community.

What is needed is a broad-based attack on the mutually shared and overriding problem of a bad image—one that threatens the very existence of government-sponsored programs of assistance of agriculture. Somehow the point must be gotten across that these programs do not benefit agriculture alone.

With the country rapidly becoming more and more urban, agriculture must unite to take its case to the city. What is called for is a systematic program of education designed to make the public aware that in return for efficiencies that benefit all Americans, the farm community asks only a fair share of existing prosperity.

END THE SURCHARGE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "End the Surcharge," published in the Daily Progress, Charlottesville, Va., on November 24, 1969.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END THE SURCHARGE

When a man such as Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. of Virginia speaks out on the income tax surcharge, the Senate would do well to listen.

Last week, Sen. Byrd introduced an amendment to the tax reform bill which would abolish the surcharge on Jan. 1. At the same time he warned the Senate that the way to combat inflation is to reduce spending—not to increase taxes. And he added there still remains significant areas of fat in the budget that can be trimmed.

But essentially Sen. Byrd was concerned that the "temporary" surcharge on the income tax is in danger of becoming a permanent tax. It has been in force for 21 months for individuals and 24 months for corporations.

While giving full credence to the President's good intentions in his pledge to allow the tax to die on July 1, Sen. Byrd declared, "I fear the temptation to extend it beyond that date will be very strong—just as was the temptation to extend it beyond its previous termination date of June 30."

"Each extension of a tax makes the next extension easier. Sooner or later—and I suspect the time is at hand—the government begins to regard the temporary tax increase as a permanent part of the tax structure."

"I think that this must be avoided. I think that the government must keep faith with the people. The way to keep faith with the people is to kill the surcharge on income taxes as of the end of this year."

Sen. Byrd objected to the American people having to pay a surcharge on their income taxes to help finance an increase in such things as foreign aid.

Elimination of the 5 per cent surcharge proposed for the first six months of 1970 would cost the government only \$1.7 billion, not a great deal in what may be a \$200 billion budget.

"I admit that if the surtax is eliminated, it will make the budgetary choices ahead of us more difficult. But I feel that we must undergo necessary discipline. We must control spending," said Sen. Byrd.

The only thing we could add to Sen. Byrd's statement is that the American taxpayer deserves a bit of a break, even though the surcharge may not represent a great addition to his income. Congress should give him that much relief.

SEPARATION NEEDED

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, few public figures and probably no elected public figures escape occasional barbs from the press. However, as I ponder Vice President AGNEW's remarks in Iowa and Alabama, I am reminded of occasional confrontations between former President Harry S. Truman and the press and the quotation he displayed in his White House office:

If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen.

Sure, I have had a few bad days in the press. I have been misquoted, misinterpreted, my remarks have been distorted at times. Sometimes I have phoned an editor directly to clarify a position that he questioned.

Like anyone, I am sensitive to "bad press," but the slightest suggestion that any individual, group, or party should be able to dictate the manner in which the press will cover an event, or the hint that certain public officials should be immune from the scrutiny of the press makes me shudder.

Let us take a look at what the current administration would have the press report to the American people if it had its way. Administration spokesmen informed the press a number of times in recent weeks that it was assured of at least 52 votes for the Haynsworth confirmation. History will record a 55-45 vote against Judge Haynsworth.

The Vice President told the American people and his listeners in Alabama that the Washington Post and its subsidiaries spoke with one voice editorially. That same week the Washington Post recommended editorially that Judge Haynsworth be confirmed by the Senate; Post subsidiary WTOP radio recommended the judge be rejected.

There was no criticism on the part of the Vice President of the fact that the networks chose not to give extensive coverage to the November moratorium, though it surely was of national significance. This and other omissions from the Vice President's double attack on the press illustrates a very real fact: criticism of the press usually depends upon the critic's point of view.

Further, if the Attorney General had had his way the American people would have been told that the march last week here in Washington was insignificant in numbers and significant in violence. As a matter of fact, the facts of the situation completely contradicted Justice Department statements that march participants were bent on violence. Incidentally, the free press, left to report freely, did an excellent job of placing the violent elements in the march in context and in informing the American people that the great majority of participants in the march abhorred the violence as much as I or the Attorney General did.

Criticism of the press is as old as the press itself. Individuals will find fault with the press as long as individuals have differing views. But the press must re-

main free of control or threatened control.

In line with my personal commitment that all views should be represented not only in the press but here in Congress, and at the specific request of Rev. Robert H. Laird of the First United Presbyterian Church in Whitefish, Mont., I include the November 20 editorial from the Whitefish Pilot in the RECORD at this point:

SEPARATION NEEDED

Considering the penchant members of the liberal press and particularly television network newsmen, for self flagellation about their country, one wonders why they react so severely when their profession is criticized by an elected official.

Certainly Vice President Agnew is no statesman and his speeches have a heavy salting of Harry Truman, but he was only "telling it like it is", a favorite expression of the liberals during the last election.

The slanting of most network television news is appalling to anyone trained in the old school of newspaper reporting where the idea that "your opinion belongs on the editorial page" was drummed into the neophytes with a verbal club.

Agnew's claim that the press does not give a president a fair shake when he makes a television address is not only true and provable, it is inevitably given the national format. Any news department employee charged with the job of putting together a panel to discuss a presidential speech that selects his panel from those who agree with the president is obviously ready to look for a new job. He must provide controversy and disagreement in order to produce an interesting show. Such tactics in newspapering were labeled and are labeled "sensationalism" but in television it goes under the alias of "reporting in depth".

The basic problem of course is that the solid citizen with his conventional ways is not good copy. The same solid citizen is the one who demands that his news be of a sensational nature. But TV, because of its impact, has gathered so much power unto itself that it now tends to select its news for impact on the direction of the country rather than for its ability to represent a movement or to present facts. It has become so accustomed to editorializing throughout its presentation of "news" that it now seems unable to separate the presentation of fact from the presentation of opinion. In our mind, trained as it was that opinion belongs where this column appears, ABC does the best job of labeling its opinions as distinct from the presentation of what happened. CBS comes in second and NBC, in our opinion does the most effective job of editorializing with pictures, words and commentator's expressions.

We would fight a suggestion that television be restrained from presenting opinion—but we would cheer any attempt to introduce some of the old news values about opinions and news labeled as such. In short the TV boys need to become a bit more responsible in their use of the powerful weapon they control.

NIXON'S SUPPORT

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, yesterday the Washington Evening Star published a particularly well reasoned and well written editorial which pointed up the significance of the recent Gallup poll showing President Nixon's broadly

based support among the American people.

There is little doubt that the President's Vietnam speech convinced the great majority of Americans of the bold, bare truth: that he is doing his level best to end the war in the only possible way as of now.

Public support is sorely needed by the President if he is to implement his policies and bring about a settlement of the Southeast Asian war. Without public approval, President Nixon—or any President—is rendered nearly powerless to end the conflict. A lack of support only serves to stoke the fire of the enemy position and propaganda.

President Nixon is pursuing a course of peace which can lead to a decent settlement of the war itself, protect this country's interests and maintain mutual trust and confidence among our allies around the world.

It is a difficult—but wise—course of action.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Nixon's Support," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON'S SUPPORT

The rise in Richard Nixon's popular support among the American people and the reasons given for it must be particularly gratifying to the President at this time.

A man's popularity in a public opinion poll is a sometime thing—here today and gone tomorrow. Nevertheless, the findings in Dr. Gallup's latest survey show a solid basis of public approval of the way the President is handling his job. As of November 15, the final day of the mass demonstration in Washington and subsequent to his Vietnam speech, 68 percent of the people questioned approved of the Nixon performance in office. Only 19 percent disapproved, and there were the usual "no opinions," in this case 13 percent.

This was the President's highest rating since moving into the White House, three percentage points above the July figure of 65 percent. The disenchanted, of course, will not be impressed or persuaded. But they would be having a field day had the poll reflected a drop in the President's support.

After the Vietnam speech on November 3 there was a vast amount of headshaking and tut-tutting among the anti-Nixon pundits. They accused the President of holding fast to the discredited policies of Lyndon Johnson. They said that all he had accomplished was to outrage his critics and lay a foundation for a bigger and angrier anti-war demonstration. It was a great pity, they said, that Mr. Nixon obstinately turned a deaf ear to the sweet voice of reason.

Well, it hasn't worked out that way. The President, in a gamble, bid for the support of what he called the great silent majority. And it looks as though he got it.

There is more in this however, than merely a gratification for the President. Comments from those interviewed in the poll indicate that the speech convinced many people that Mr. Nixon is doing the best he can to end the war and that his peace policy is the only one possible as of now. Furthermore, the public reaction to the demonstration was unfavorable, and it probably would have been more so had the poll been taken after the violence which marked the last day.

To us, all of this means that the President has gained sorely needed time to effectuate his Vietnam policies. No one can say how much more. But at the very least he will not

now be stampeded into some other course of action. And this is very important—important because Mr. Nixon, in our judgment, is following not only the right course, but the only course that can possibly lead to a decent settlement in Vietnam and the safeguarding of vital American interests in that tortured part of the world.

EXTENSION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House will soon be taking up legislation to authorize extension of the antipoverty program. Admittedly, there are those of us who differ as to various aspects of the program. But I would hope that there is one subject upon which we can get bipartisan agreement. I have reference to the so-called Murphy amendment which was appended to the bill in the Senate. The amendment places in the hands of the Governors of the several States a power of veto over legal service programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The past few weeks has seen a tremendous reaction on the part of bar associations throughout the country in opposition to the Murphy amendment.

I am pleased to place before the House a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of New Jersey State Bar Association expressing the concern of the association as to the effect of the Murphy amendment. I associate myself with this expression and I am pleased to commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 7, 1969

Whereas, the adoption by the United States Senate of an amendment to S. 3016 seeks to place in the hands of the Governors of the various States, a power of veto over the activities of Legal Services Programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

And whereas, such power contravenes the New Jersey State Bar Association's commitment to secure full and effective legal services to the poor by providing every person in our society with access to the independent professional services of a lawyer of integrity and competence;

And whereas, enlarging the scope and effectiveness of the power to veto legal services programs is highly undesirable because experience has shown that the power to veto may be used to circumscribe the freedom of legal service attorneys in representing their clients to address issues of governmental action or omission affecting the rights of their clients, and to discourage actions which are politically unpopular or adverse to the views of the majority;

And whereas, such limitations impair the ability of legal services programs to respond properly to the needs of the poor and constitute oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the citizen;

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the New Jersey State Bar Association reaffirms its position that the Legal Services Program should operate with full assurance of independence of lawyers within the program not only to render services to individual clients

but also in cases which might involve action against governmental agencies seeking significant institutional change.

And, further resolved, that representatives of the New Jersey State Bar Association be authorized to express the concern of the Association as to the effect of the aforesaid amendment.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, an excellent article concerning the unique attitude of San Jose Police Chief J. R. Blackmore toward law enforcement was published in the Sacramento Bee on November 16. His ideas are progressive and thought provoking.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN JOSE POLICE CHIEF BLACKMORE REGARDS HIS MEN AS "SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS"

(By Robert Strand)

SAN JOSE, CALIF.—San Jose Police Chief J. R. Blackmore has 40 years' experience in which he has fought lynch mobs as well as gangsters. He believes police should take the side of social change.

Blackmore, 62, wields his commanding influence to get benefits for racial minority groups. He sees his men, more than anything else, as "social service workers."

"We are now coming to realize that the police should not remain passive bystanders. We can no longer remain mute in view of the social problems that surround us daily," he said.

These are views of a man who joined the force in 1929 before the department had radios. Blackmore a semi-pro baseball player, was recruited by the department so he could play on its team.

MOB SCENE

In 1934 Blackmore and one other officer fired tear gas for hours in an unsuccessful attempt to keep a mob from battering down jail doors and lynching two suspected kidnapers. Other police occupied themselves directing traffic nearby.

Blackmore has devoted much time in his 23 years as chief to raising money for charities and urging passage of municipal bond issues.

"I can raise \$50,000 in an evening for a good cause," Blackmore said.

He is an active member of just about every civic organization in town, an elder of the Presbyterian church, and local 1969 Man of the Year of the City of Hope project.

Blackmore's style is illustrated by his handling of a demonstration by Mexican-American youths last year at City Hall.

"I marched them right into the council chambers, and we had a long talk," he said. "The result was a system by which we take these kids on a regular basis for rides in patrol cars. They have a ball."

When troubled by a group of youthful gangs: "We corralled them down to my office, and the result was new training and athletic programs. Later, in a murder case, they told us if the killer was one of theirs, they'd turn him in. He turned out to be an Anglo."

TROUBLE CENTER

In San Jose, one of the nation's fastest-growing cities, with a population of 450,000,

the main trouble spot is the East Side. It is home to impoverished Negroes who are 2 per cent of the population, and Mexican-Americans, 15 per cent.

Now the Police Athletic League is building its own athletic center on 16 acres of donated East-Side land, with \$1.4 million from private, municipal and federal sources.

The police themselves, on and off duty, will operate the center, and Blackmore expects it to be an example for the nation.

"Our department has a wealth of champion athletes," Blackmore said. "Kids worship champions. That's the value of the thing."

The department is in the process of setting up an East Side substation for the sole purpose of permitting booking, processing and releasing persons in their own neighborhood, rather than downtown.

San Jose police have 63 programs considered community relations by various departments in the country. The number of officers doing this work is four times the percentage in San Francisco.

Blackmore's officers arrange with citizens to chat with their neighbors in their homes, conduct weekly radio broadcasts in two languages, make numerous speeches in schools about narcotics, take teen-agers to visit prisons and keep weekly office hours at a troubled high school.

When minority students complained bitterly about the apprentice program at City College, Blackmore intervened and obtained a solution satisfactory to the students.

"I took a stand, and I think I had a right to take a stand," Blackmore said. "If a dispute is going to cause a riot, it's going to affect me directly."

"The sooner we speak out in law enforcement, better off we will be. The answer isn't in giving us more guns and gas."

However, Blackmore thinks police should get involved in social issues only "when we are going to be part of the result."

At San Jose State College, which has 24,000 students and its quota of demonstrations, Blackmore says he insisted his personnel have regular meetings with faculty and students.

"We want to know who is right," Blackmore said. "I'm damned if I want to go over there and push people around if they are right."

"The whole concept of law enforcement is changing. People think our purpose is to arrest people, but you don't arrest them for going 27 miles an hour in a 25-mile zone."

FUTURE BRIGHT FOR SALINE WATER CONVERSION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker—

The day is approaching, I am happy to say, when the benefits of low-cost water from saline sources will be available to all mankind—and the specter of thirst will be removed forever.

This was the prediction of Dr. C. M. Wong, Director, Office of Saline Water, at the Government-Industry Conference on Saline Water Conversion, October 29, 1969, on cooperative efforts to meet the challenge of desalination.

Dr. Wong in his presentation gave one of the best summaries I have seen in quite some time of the efforts of the Federal Government present, past and future in the field of saline water conversion,

through which much of the Nation's future water needs will be met.

The House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which I have the privilege to chair, has for some time expressed an active interest in desalination. However, if the Congress is to meet the challenge of the decades ahead, each Member of this body must be fully aware of the problems and appreciate the efforts which are being made by our Government to provide an adequate water supply.

Therefore, I thought it appropriate to share with my colleagues the following remarks made by Dr. Wong:

REMARKS OF DR. C. M. WONG

With the saline water conversion program growing so rapidly, we expected a sizeable attendance at this conference—and, sure enough, you have turned out in fine style. Your presence will be rewarded, I think, with the reassurance that we in OSW and you in industry are eyeballing the thorny issues that confront us with what I hope is 20-20 vision!

When reasonable men sit down and reason together, nothing but good can come from it. And, in this instance, the good will bring benefits to the generations yet to be born in a complex world faced by many fresh water problems.

As Assistant Secretary Klein told you, we already have considered many of the committee recommendations; in fact, we have not only reacted, we have acted—by actually implementing some of the proposals.

In this regard, I want to comment on some of the subjects brought up by the Committee on Contractual Policies, Procurement Procedures and Practices.

Number One—Procurement of equipment and engineering and scientific services from other than U. S. firms. The committee recommended that OSW procure engineering and scientific services and equipment from U. S. manufacturers. This recommendation was accepted; however, the Federal Procurement Regulations and Buy American Act must be given due consideration.

Number Two—OSW research and development demonstration programs. The committee suggested that OSW and industry establish a closer working relationship and continue discussions of priorities in research and development programs. Continuation of the OSW-Industry meetings demonstrates the acceptance of this recommendation.

Number Three—Technical specifications. In those cases where OSW desires guaranteed performance standards, the committee recommends that the detailed specifications be left to the ingenuity of industry. This item is still under review and cannot be answered in general terms. In some instances, contractors must build to specific specifications if technology is to be tested. In others, where performance is a governing factor, then the detailed specifications should not be provided by OSW.

Number Four—Time delay in the award of contracts. OSW has initiated action to speed up the award of contracts—and a goal of 48 hours has been established for awarding them.

Number Five—Payment terms. A workable arrangement has been reached after discussions with Survey and Review and the Office of the Solicitor. Payments are being made on a provisional basis, both monthly and quarterly, in accordance with specifications in the contract. Payments to contractors are not being processed as fast as hoped for, but significant improvements are expected in the next several months.

Number Six—Unsolicited proposals. The committee pointed out that OSW had awarded contracts, based on unsolicited proposals, for development of a piece of equipment

similar to a type already available in the commercial market. We will continue our current policy, but prior to awarding a contract, we will make sure that (1) the idea being considered is unique and proper and not available through other sources, and (2) the idea does not infringe on the concepts of equipment developed by other firms or labs.

So much for the committee recommendations. Except to say that I can assure you, as Assistant Secretary Klein did, that we will give every recommendation a thorough review. I intend to work long and hard for a strong and dynamic program at all levels.

It is OSW's responsibility to discharge its assignment by carefully exercising our judgment to invest the taxpayers money, which has been entrusted to our care by the Congress and the Administration, into the most promising projects. We must constantly review all proposals and programs in order to obtain the greatest return for this money.

OSW is going to put its support behind the projects which industry will not or cannot justify the risk. We will employ system methodology to select and finance proposals that offer the greatest potential. Our organization will be reformed as necessary to operate on a streamlined basis with strong management and the necessary manpower and resources to attain a quantum jump in accomplishment, and a breakthrough in technology. We will leave the responsibility of providing process refinements to industry, because you can do so well in this respect.

We do not intend to compete with industry. We expect to cooperate with you and we hope you consider us to be your friend.

We are well aware that the oceans, covering three-fourths of the earth's surface, offer an unlimited source of water for conversion processes. A not-so-visible, but equally important, source of water is the underground brackish supplies. Seawater normally contains 3.5 per cent salt, or 35,000 parts per million (PPM) of total dissolved solids. Brackish water contains much less salt, of course, generally being defined as having between 1,000 and 15,000 PPM. The Public Health Service recommends no more than 500 PPM for human consumption.

Because groundwater is such an integral part of desalting's scope and potential, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss some of its characteristics.

As you may know, about 10 per cent of the rain that falls on the earth soaks into the ground and is held there in immense sponge-like subterranean reservoirs called aquifers. These aquifers have been filled over the centuries. Presently, they contain—within a half-mile of the earth's surface—a quantity of water 35 times as great as the amount in all of the world's fresh-water lakes and rivers at any one time. Groundwater is usually free of turbidity and harmful bacteria—a definite advantage—but many aquifers are brackish in nature. In fact, one-half of the land area of the continental United States alone is underlain by groundwaters containing between 1,000 and 3,000 ppm.

Significant, I think, is the fact that groundwater is usually found close to the point of use. Consequently, the desalting of brackish groundwater can be an economical solution to water shortages. A most attractive water source is deep, saline well waters, which have been protected from short-term fluctuations of the weather, evaporation and surface pollution; this is especially true in the many regions where surface and shallow well water supplies have been reduced to dangerously low levels by drought conditions.

Being so widely distributed, brackish water is used by more than 1,000 communities in North America. With its high mineral content, this type of water imposes substantial costs on the user above and beyond the water bill itself. These "hidden" costs include (1)

purchase of bottled water for drinking and cooking, (2) the use of home water softeners, (3) excessive corrosion and, consequently, more rapid replacement of water-using appliances, pipes, and plumbing fixtures, and (4) money spent for larger quantities of soap and detergent required.

What does all this mean to us as desalters and consumers? It means the desalination industry can remove excess salts and minerals with the membrane technology available now—and thus reduce those extra expenses to consumers.

Whether it's groundwater or seawater, desalting's future role offers some unassailable advantages. First and foremost, desalination provides an entirely new source of high quality water that can supply needs as they arise. This supply of potable water can be manufactured at locations and in time frames of man's own choosing without being dependent on the whims of nature.

This ability to locate desalting plants in or near areas of greatest need may be further expanded to produce both fresh water and electricity in a dual-purpose nuclear-powered operation. Other types of desalting plants, using brackish waters, can provide modest additions to water supply for small and medium-sized urban areas at a pace easily adjusted to growth.

In summation, I believe it is safe to say that desalination can provide a much more flexible and less expensive addition to water supplies in many parts of the world. We realize that desalting is not the single answer; nor are dams, conservation methods, or weather modification—all technologies will contribute to the ultimate solution of creating alternate supplies of fresh water.

Because of desalting's many advantages, the state-of-the-art has come a long way in recent years. When the government program began in 1952, only a few land-based plants produced a trickle of water at costs ranging upward from \$4 per 1000 gallons. Today, nearly 700 desalination plants are producing more than 250 million gallons of fresh water daily for cities and industries around the world. We believe the total production of desalted water will reach 1 billion gallons-per-day by 1975 as the demand for fresh supplies increase. At the same time, desalting's potential will become more widely recognized and accepted by water planners.

From the beginning, the main thrust of the desalting program has been to find new techniques, or improve upon old ones, and cut production costs to the bone. The costs have been driven down considerably—from more than \$4 to a reported 85 cents per 1000 gallons. The new 7.5 mgd desalting and power plant near Tlajhuana, Mexico, is expected to produce potable water from the sea for 65-75 cents per 1000 gallons. Sometime after 1980, we may be able to use desalted water for irrigation of high-value crops and the yield is a function of the quality, as well as the quantity of water.

To attain our objectives in OSW, we conduct a very broad basic research program. We must understand the substances, both solid and liquid, with which we work to improve or discover new concepts for desalting. With this basic knowledge, we must then acquire the engineering technology to actually produce water—at first in modest amounts, but eventually in very large quantity. This requires the construction of pilot plants, test beds, modules and prototype plants. Some of the older and more familiar systems of desalting (distillation and electrodialysis, for example) are advanced to the point where they can presently be purchased in the commercial marketplace. A 100,000 gpd freezing process plant—the world's first commercial plant utilizing this new process—is now under test in the Virgin Islands.

Among the more promising new developments are the membrane processes, which were originally designed for brackish waters.

The two areas of the membrane processes, electrodialysis and reverse osmosis, show bright promise toward lowering the cost of product water—and we are making a major thrust in this field.

Electrodialysis is the most popular system for desalting brackish waters, at present—there are more than 150 such plants scattered around the world; and plant sizes are increasing dramatically. These plants would be even more efficient if the temperature could be raised and if a cheaper, long-life anion membrane, and easy assembly technique, could be developed.

The reverse osmosis process is quite promising for future applications; it may demonstrate economic superiority over any process known today, not only for brackish water, but seawater as well. Although reverse osmosis has been developed largely during the past decade, this type of plant now numbers more than 100 that produce from 1,000 to 100,000 gallons per day. In August I had the privilege to dedicate a 100,000 gpd plant at Plains, Texas.

Besides brackish waters, reverse osmosis is used effectively in the processing of irrigation return flows, polluted waste water and acid mine drainage. In addition, a membrane that can desalt seawater has been developed, but it needs improvement for commercial use. Field tests using this membrane have shown that seawater can be desalted to a potable level in a single pass in contrast to the two passes required previously.

As Assistant Secretary Klein has noted, the reverse osmosis process has many other potential applications. These include depollution and renovation of pulp and paper mill spent liquor wastes, conversion of cheese whey to a useful food product or vitamin supplement, recovery of sugar from sugar beet processing liquors, concentration and upgrading of citrus and fruit juices, depollution of radioactive wastes, and recovery of water for re-use in outer space missions.

Speaking of membranes, we are also looking into the use of special, thin membranes in a novel process termed piezodialysis, which uses high pressure as its energy source. The pressure systems are promising because, very simply, pressure is cheaper than heat and pressure process requires no phase change for the work fluid-water. We must also develop practical pumping systems which will be anti-corrosion, offer constant, no fluctuated pressure to enhance the membrane's life.

The new Brackish Water Test Center at Roswell, New Mexico, will play a leading role in developing membrane technology. The center is conducting experiments on 10 types of brackish waters commonly found throughout the United States. These tests will help develop economic processes for improving the water supplies of American communities now using sub-standard water.

We are also moving ahead in the distillation field. The new Materials Test Center at Freeport, Texas, is studying the corrosion resistance of both metallic and non-metallic materials to hot seawater. These tests hopefully, will turn up the best materials for building more economical evaporators and thus lower the cost of distilled water.

As you know, we are now building a VTE-X test vehicle at the San Diego Test Facility. We expect to obtain valuable engineering and operating data on the vertical tube evaporator process for use in large plants. The VTE-X will utilize the newly-developed double-fluted tubes; they are expected to demonstrate transfer capabilities double those of present distillation plants and hence cutting the capital investment nearly 20%.

Studies show that the VTE process may be used to greatest advantage in large plant sizes when combined with the best features of the multi-stage flash (MSF) process. Because the combined systems would reduce capital investment cost 30% and reduce the water cost by as much as 15 percent, it is

now apparent that the VTE/MSF process is a leading contender for large seawater desalting plants.

Let me ask you one question. What good will it do to develop low-cost desalting processes only to find that they cannot be utilized because of the brine disposal problem?

Efficient and economical brine disposal methods are needed not only for desalting, but also for those industries that discharge large quantities of chloride, sulphate, or other effluents that pollute our rivers and lakes. Searching for answers, in order to meet the water quality standards that recently have been established, manufacturing and processing companies can only utilize existing technology, which essentially requires evaporation to concentrate the effluents, followed by a crystallization process to reduce these wastes to easily disposable solids. This is indeed an answer to stream pollution, but it is a high cost answer.

I not only believe we can develop better and cheaper processes for brine and waste disposal, I think it is imperative that we develop better solutions to this very critical problem.

We are looking diligently into the utilization of various fluidized-bed technologies as perhaps a more efficient method of treating inland brines. One technique has been successfully employed by the nuclear industry as a practical low-cost method of radiation waste disposal.

The outstanding features of the suspension phenomena which assures scale free performance appears to have potential major application for brine and waste disposal.

If you have a better solution, we encourage you to submit a proposal for our review and consideration.

In reviewing the past, these developments and many others, represent substantial advances in desalting technology. As a result OSW and industry have provided a practical solution to water supply problems along the world's sea coasts and many inland areas.

The day is approaching, I am happy to say, when the benefits of low-cost water from saline sources will be available to all mankind—and the specter of thirst will be removed forever.

FUTURE IMPORTANCE OF THE NORTHERN WATER ROUTE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the pioneering voyage of the SS *Manhattan* last summer through the Arctic is an indication of the future importance of the northern water route through the ice to the Alaskan North Slope. The fabulous oil reserves in Alaska have been well publicized. The *Manhattan's* voyage indicates that it may soon be possible for the development of an intercontinental deep-water all-season tanker route via the historic Northwest Passage for the development of this resource.

Mr. Anthony Harrigan, who is the assistant editor of the Charleston News & Courier, has discussed the defense implications of this important development in a fine article published in the December 1969 Military Review of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Mr. Harrigan is well known for his articles on military strategy and tactics published in the leading military journals of the world. He points out that this new

route will require a vast change in the configuration of our naval defense. Until now, the ice conditions in the North have given us no reason to plan extensively for the defense of the land areas of the Far North. After all, there were no land targets of major importance in this area.

However, if the potential of the North Slope is tapped and if the necessary handling and storage facilities are constructed in this region, there would be many military targets of crucial significance.

Mr. Harrigan says:

The United States and Canada would be compelled to consider systems of protection for these facilities, resources and installations. It would be necessary to give naval protection to northern waters—protection now normally afforded commercial ships in the Atlantic, Pacific and Caribbean. The U.S. defense posture—for the first time in history—would have to become northern oriented.

Mr. Harrigan points out that we have been able to ignore the North, but that the Soviets, with their extensive experience in Siberia, have long had development programs for defense and development of the North. He goes on to cite the Soviet history in this regard. He notes that the Soviets will be challenging us on this sea route which will be of decisive importance for their own commercial interests. The northern sea route, says Mr. Harrigan, "lays the foundation for Soviet domination of the top of the world."

Mr. President, the article is of great concern to all of us who are interested not only in the defense of this Nation, but also in its development and progress. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Northern Defense Frontier," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN DEFENSE FRONTIER

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Over the last quarter century US defense authorities have had to be concerned with many regions of the world, including the rice paddies and swamps of Southeast Asia, the jungles and grasslands of Africa, and the sandy wastes of the Middle East. Only the planners of the Nation's radar defenses have had to be extensively concerned with the Far North—the frozen frontier of North America. In the 1970's, however, the United States may have to revise its strategic concepts and plans and give serious consideration to security in the arctic region.

At long last, the Arctic is in the process of being opened to commercial development on a major scale. The giant icebreaker-tanker SS *Manhattan* pioneered—in late summer 1969—a transcontinental, deepwater, all-season tanker route to the Alaskan North Slope via the historic Northwest Passage.

For centuries, men dreamed of the Northwest Passage serving as a short sea route between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. The first transit in a single season was not accomplished until 1944. In the 1950's, US nuclear submarines voyaged under the ice. Speculation was voiced as to the feasibility of submarine cargo carriers using the northern route. Only in 1969, however, did the Northwest Passage appear to be a practical route for surface vessels.

OIL DISCOVERED

Discovery of oil on Alaska's North Slope—a discovery which promises to make the United States the world's leading producer

of petroleum—provided the incentive for equipping a supertanker for a daring voyage through ice that is sometimes 50-feet thick. Shipping interests now envision the possibility that a fleet of 30 or more icebreaking supertankers will operate on the northern route between the Alaskan oilfields and the east coast refineries.

If oil can be successfully transported by this route, it also is reasonable to conclude that bulk carriers will ply these sea lines in the future, transporting the vast stores of minerals that lie beneath the frozen soil of the Canadian Far North and Alaska. The arctic area is considered a treasure house of minerals—gold, iron, copper, zinc, lead, uranium, tungsten, and other base and precious metals. The only reason the Arctic has not been opened to development is the lack of transportation for materials in bulk. If ships can break through the ice, if transarctic navigation becomes a reality, the North America's last frontier will be opened to exploitation.

The opening of this frontier on the north will entail a reappraisal of the defense needs and position of North America. Throughout the cold war era, the danger to the United States and Canada has been on the eastern, western, and southern sea frontiers. While North Americans have had to be deeply concerned about Soviet missile attack over the North Pole, the region itself has not been regarded as a danger zone in terms of other weapons and threats. There has been no need to plan extensively for protection of the land areas of the Far North. The northern reaches of the continent have been lacking in targets of major importance.

RICH MILITARY TARGETS

If the mining potential of the Far North should be tapped, if harbor facilities and storage areas should be constructed, and if giant vessels regularly ply the Northwest Passage, then, the northern, region suddenly would become rich in military targets. The United States and Canada would be compelled to consider systems of protection for these facilities, resources, and installations. It would be necessary to give naval protection to northern waters—protection now normally afforded commercial ships in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Caribbean. The U.S. defense posture—for the first time in history—would have to become northern oriented.

The United States is not without experience in the Far North. U.S. troops have exercised in Alaska and units have been stationed in Greenland and northern Canada under special arrangements. U.S. Coast Guard icebreakers also have operated in arctic waters. The U.S. Department of Commerce operates weather stations in remote northern areas. And the United States has been vitally interested in the Canadian Operation Arctic Supply. This is a force of icebreakers, freighters, and landing craft that each summer calls at scores of arctic and subpolar ports to off load supplies needed by defense outposts in the nine-month freezeup which begins in October.

Nevertheless, United States and Canadian experience and interest in the Far North are minor compared to the total Soviet involvement in northern regions. The Far North has loomed large in Soviet plans since the beginning of Communist rule. While fighting was continuing in the Russian Far East in 1919, the new Soviet Government organized the "Northern Scientific Industrial Expedition."

In 1932, the Soviets established a special department to deal with northern development and transportation. It was given the name of Chief Administration of the Northern Sea Route. This department was directed to supervise all phases of Soviet arctic development, including construction of port facilities, provision of radio service, exploitation of trade opportunities, and Sovietization of native peoples.

It should be borne in mind that the area of arctic lands in the Soviet Union is over

2.2 million square miles, a far larger area than the arctic lands controlled by any other nation.

The Soviets moved ahead rapidly in the 1930's to develop the northern sea route as an alternate to the Trans-Siberian Railway as a means of supply and communication. While specially constructed ships and ice-breakers must be used, the northern sea route is a major transportation artery for the USSR and is being used on an ever-growing basis. The Soviets have promised to open the northern sea route to international shipping, but like so many other Soviet promises, nothing has come of it.

The northern route offers immense advantages to the USSR in terms of distances. By way of Suez, the voyage from Leningrad to Shanghai was 11,700 miles and 8,600 miles when a ship used the northern route. Now, with Suez closed and Soviet vessels having to steam around Africa, the northern sea route has become just that much more important. Viewed overall, the northern sea route aids the economic development of the Soviet Far North, provides a vital supply line, schools Soviet seamen in the ways of the Arctic Ocean, and lays the foundation for Soviet domination of the top of the world.

More than a generation ago, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the great arctic explorer, wrote a book in which he argued that the Far North was destined to take on tremendous significance in the years ahead.¹ His words have special meaning now as US oil companies develop oilfields on the Alaskan North Slope and strive to open the Arctic Ocean to navigation by tankers:

Tacitus was wrong when he said people would never by choice live as far north as France; the Moors of the Middle Ages were short-sighted when they under-valued the possibilities of Britain. We have not come to the northward limit of communal progress. There was a pause but no stop to the Westward course of empire until we came to the place where East is West. There is no northern boundary beyond which productive enterprise cannot go until North meets North on the opposite shores of the Arctic Ocean as East has met West on the Pacific.

NEW FRONTIER

Now, almost a half century later, the north is coming into its own as the last frontier on this continent. Three hundred miles north of Fairbanks, Alaska, on Prudhoe Bay, docks are being constructed, airstrips are being designed, surveys are being made for pipelines—in short, the infrastructure of a new frontier region is being created.

The US Department of Transportation reports that, on the North Slope, the oil deposits contain about 40 billion barrels of oil, adding that:

The Prudhoe Bay field is just one field out of about 20 equally rich geologic structures in the North Slope area alone. So rich is the region in petroleum that its impact upon the United States and world economy has yet to be fully assessed. Yet it seems certain that these oil discoveries could make the United States the world's leading petroleum producer with an output surpassing that of the oil-rich sheikdoms of the Persian Gulf.

The consequences of the economic exploitation of the Far North are likely to be enormous. For example, when northern oil starts reaching the market in 1972, it likely will free the United States and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations of heavy reliance on the oilfields of the Arab nations. Japan and northern European countries, which depend on oil from the Middle

East, will not have to go so far for their oil supplies. In the case of the European nations, the current tanker route around the Cape of Good Hope is long and expensive.

CLARIFY STATUS

Both Japan and the NATO allies also are likely to become concerned about protection of new sealanes through the Arctic. If these countries come to depend on the movement of oil through northern waters, they will have to devote much attention to the security of the northern route and adjacent waters of the North Pacific and North Atlantic.

Some aspects of the northern route are unclear. Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau of Canada said in a statement to the House of Commons in August that, while Canada undisputedly owned all the islands in the North American Archipelago, he was not sure about the status of the waters around and between them. Given the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union in deploying its naval forces and its zeal to dominate the Arctic, it will be important for the status of the waters between the Canadian Islands to be clarified. The Soviets have been obdurate and restrictive insofar as waters on their side of the North Pole are concerned.

Concepts of antisubmarine warfare and merchant vessel protection will have to be considered anew if the northern route is extensively used by U.S. tankers and bulk carriers. The bulk carriers might begin operations out of Baffin Island where the Mary River iron ore deposits are of sufficient quality to feed directly into steel furnaces.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINES

Viewed in military terms, the Arctic is preeminently the domain of the nuclear submarine. As early as 1961, a contributor to the *United States Naval Institute Proceedings* predicted that:

With their demonstrated interest in the Arctic commercially, scientifically and strategically, the Soviets can be expected to direct their nuclear submarines north and under the ice.

As the submarine is the only feasible anti-submarine weapon in the Arctic, the United States, in turn, may have to deploy a strong undersea flotilla in the Far North and create a new naval command geared to the operational problems of the region.

How much of a population will be located in the United States and Canadian northern regions a decade hence is a guess. Last August, *The Washington Post* speculated that:

Despite the tardiness of men in opening the Northwest Passage, we may see new settlements along that route and new operations in the frozen northern wastes long before there are any way stations on the moon.

D. A. W. Judd, former administrator of the Yukon, wrote that the future of the north "will depend on needs and motives to the south." He pointed out that the north:

Is an empty land not because it is inhospitable but because it has been the preserve of industrialized and advanced nations who have not needed the area either for lebensraum or wealth. In bureaucratic jargon, it has been 'surplus to requirements.'

Only time will reveal the precise pattern of northern development on this continent. The Soviet north supports 10 times the population of the United States and Canadian northern areas, but the democracies of North America cannot do things in the Soviet way. They cannot issue orders and have empty lands filled with settlers. A frontier area has to offer the persuasion of prosperity, whereas the Soviets have developed their northern lands by compulsion. At long last, however, the top of North America promises the wealth that attracts permanent settlement.

Suddenly, there is a quickening of interest in the Far North. This interest necessarily extends to strategic factors involving the

northern regions and to questions concerning defense of land, air, and sea along a frozen frontier. Military professionals, as much as specialists in transportation and industry, will be faced with new challenges and demands as a result of northern development.

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: YOUTH AND POLITICS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the discontent of young people in America with the political process has been documented, disseminated, analyzed, and criticized. The League of Women Voters has found that youth speaks in many voices. In "Political Perspective: Youth and Politics," six young people give their views on what is wrong—and what is right—about the "system," and some of them offer suggestions on how to go about achieving political results.

A transcription of the League of Women Voters' program on this subject follows:

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: YOUTH AND POLITICS

Participants in the order they are heard:

Torrey Baker, former broadcaster, Voice of America.

Jack Jordan, Republican Committee of Pennsylvania.

Rick Margolies, Institute for Policy Studies. Tony Gittens, Howard University Graduate. Clarence Mitchell, Maryland State Senator. Sam Brown, Harvard graduate student and campaign worker.

George Gallup, Jr., President, Institute of Public Opinion.

BAKER. The League of Women Voters brings you political Perspective: Youth and Politics. This is Torrey Baker speaking to you from Washington.

There are 24 million young people in the United States between the ages of 21 and 29. How do they feel about politics and voting? About the political process? What attracts them and what turns them away? What turns them on and what turns them off? Obviously there is no one answer; youth speaks in many voices:

Jack Jordan of the Republican Committee of Pennsylvania—

JORDAN. . . in Pennsylvania a youth plays an important role in not only the party organization . . . young people have been integrated into the party on a year around basis.

BAKER. Rick Margolies of the Institute for Policy Studies—

MARGOLIES. I think that those people who still look to the traditional political process which was established before the industrial revolution if they think that that political process speaks to the poor, to the young, I would say they are being unrealistic.

BAKER. Tony Gittens, Howard University graduate.

GITTENS. The only thing this country understand is power which experience has shown to black people any way that is not merely through the vote and that is not because they don't want to take part but because the system has shown itself to be sterile. The system has shown itself not to be in the best interests of black people. I know myself I shouldn't bother to register to vote.

BAKER. Clarence Mitchell III, a state Senator in Maryland, still in his 20s—

¹ Vilhjalmur Stefansson, *The Northward Course of Empire*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., N.Y., 1922.

MITCHELL. There are many, many young people in this country who do believe there is an opportunity available to them in the system and are willing to work within the system to bring about the kinds of changes that we feel ought to come.

BAKER. Sam Brown. Harvard graduate student and campaign worker—

BROWN. Students who come into the political process come there largely out of commitment on issues though they do not come out of commitment to party.

BAKER. The political independence of youth was pointed out by George Gallup, Jr. at a meeting sponsored by the American Heritage Foundation.

GALLUP. This group . . . the nation's youngest adults, those who are between the ages 21 and 29, clearly represent crucial battle grounds for both major parties, not only because they account for one-fifth of the total electorate, but because a large proportion of them are presently uncommitted to either party . . . 40% are independents, 22% say they are Republicans and 38% say they are Democrats.

BAKER. Sam Brown does not feel that commitment to party is important.

BROWN. The questions are not ones of party affiliation and I think polls and discussion of which party and whether party are ones that are largely irrelevant to where the youth are going today and more particularly students are going today. In short I think students today are far more concerned about the issues at hand than they are concerned about the particular candidate who becomes the personification of those issues.

BAKER. And those issues are? Tony Gittens?

GITTENS. Well, naturally being black the racial problem in this country—white oppression of black people in this country and across the world, around the world—that is the thing that I think about most. That, as far as I am concerned, is the biggest problem to me and my people and that is the problem I try to resolve. I use most of my energies to try to deal with that.

BAKER. Sam Brown?

BROWN. I think more intensely than any single group in the population today students, both undergraduates and graduate students, feel the pressure of the war, are engaged in a community life really which I think has been more hostile to and more critical of the war than any other segment of the population. As it happened I dropped out of Harvard when I went to work and the latest survey of students at Harvard showed 97% opposed to the war. In short, I came from an environment in which the question of the war particularly was felt very deeply. It was one which really drove many of us to become involved in politics because we began to see it as the only way of having any substantial effect on the political process.

BAKER. In the Gallup poll on college attitudes there was of course a question on the draft. Mr. Gallup reports the results—

GALLUP. College youth by an overwhelming margin—77% to 20%—think graduate students should be draft deferred but a few say they would break the law or leave the country if they were to receive a call.

BAKER. Mr. Gallup makes another point about young attitudes, especially on the college campuses.

GALLUP. The student revolt in America appears directed against traditionalism and complacency or as what is known as the "establishment."

BAKER. Some students revolt against the "establishment" on the campus as a step toward inroads on the political establishment. Tony Gittens?

GITTENS. While I was at Howard University I was chairman of something called Ujamaa—that's Swahili for Unity. It was a black student nationalist organization and we tried to revolutionize Howard and to try to make it move away from its bourgeois aura to one of blackness and we tried to make the univer-

sity what we call the black university, instituting courses in black history, producing—establishing a black institute and becoming the center for Afro-American studies and I think through those efforts—the efforts of the organization—we have accomplished something. Howard University is looked upon as the leading Negro higher education institution. We felt that if Howard University changed possibly a lot of other Negro institutions would change and therefore the thinking of a lot of black people would change so I think that at least that's one way that I'm trying to do my part.

BAKER. Rick Margolies thinks that decentralization and personal commitment may be the answers.

MARGOLIES. And I think that young people are beginning to deal with some of the realities of forging out a new type of life that doesn't conceive of itself only in terms of political systems but in fact begins to look toward a synthesis between an individual's life philosophy and some sort of political activism.

Some of the essential realities of contemporary existence are being dealt with more by young people than by people who continue to talk in the rhetoric of a national democratic system with two parties for a country of 200 million people. I think young people are looking toward the eventuality of a decentralization so that people can again begin to cope with their environment.

People on the street, whether it's in the ghetto or in the suburb or in the city environment, can't cope with their environment. The channels for reaching power, for reaching institutions so they can make changes which are agreeable to them—the channels are too extended; they are too drawn out.

So young people are beginning to grapple with the question of decentralization and what does that mean? We are beginning to express ourselves in direct action because we think that the vote doesn't speak to the types of changes that are necessary.

BAKER. On the other hand young Senator Mitchell has a different point of view. He seems to feel that the more conventional political methods can work.

MITCHELL. I was jailed a number of times back in 1960 for picketing, for demonstrating, but then I discovered that the most meaningful way of becoming involved was to start "sitting in" in the State Legislatures as members and helping to make the policy rather than standing on the outside and yelling and not being in a position to actually bring about the kind of change that we sought.

In my own campaign when I was 22 and there were a lot of people in our community who said I couldn't get elected, but we believed in the involvement of young people and not just in the high school or junior high school age level. We even had elementary school kids involved.

BAKER. Mr. Gallup makes another point about young attitudes.

GALLUP. Less than half of the 21 to 29 year olds, 48%, are presently registered to vote in the precinct or election district in which they live, compared to 74% for persons 30 to 49 years old and 84% for persons 50 or older. Related to this voter turnout among young adults has consistently been lower than among older age groups, as I'm sure you know. In the 1964 presidential election, for example, 53% of young adults cast a vote, but 65% of persons over 30 did so.

BAKER. Jack Jordan points out the need for an active recruitment campaign in the political parties.

JORDAN. We encourage young people to run for public office and play an active role in the election of others at all levels, most particularly at the local level. And it has been shown possible and has been proven that young people can achieve a high position rapidly because the criteria is an ability and desire, not age.

In Pennsylvania the Republican organization has four youth groups starting with the STARS, the Sub-Teen Age Republicans; the YR's, the Young Republicans; the TARs, the Teen-Age Republicans, and the College Council, starting at the age of nine and going up through 37 with the four groups.

Youth in Pennsylvania is encouraged especially through the training received in the YR's to run for office at the local level in particular and we stress the fact that youth is wanted in the Republican organizational structure. As a matter of fact the 30-man Executive Committee of the Republican Party of Pennsylvania, which makes all the decisions for the party, have three members from the youth groups.

It is mandatory to integrate youth into the political organization, mandatory because without youth the organization soon will wither and die and there's a lot more in politics for the young people than just the glamour of a presidential election and getting our young people interested in politics and getting them interested in government is synonymous. This cannot and will not happen unless the senior party organizations encourage real leadership possibilities and potential at the same time granting autonomy and recognition to youth. Senior party leadership must work with youth and not work over them.

BAKER. Speaking for youth that doesn't wish to be integrated into the political system as now constituted, Rick Margolies says—

MARGOLIES. Until we began to provide and win back people's interest in the question of social concern then we'll never get any adequate solutions at a larger level.

That's what I think the new politics is beginning to speak to. It begins to say we must build a base which is democratic—which has people in their area where the issues are related to their life. But there also comes into formation a new type of national politics which is sympathetic to the question of decentralization. There has to be a national politics which walks hand in hand with the local politics which says we help you in every way.

BAKER. And Tony Gittens comments on voting—

GITTENS. It has done very little good in the past so we can only assume that it's going to do very little good in the future. Things like the Presidential elections—well, it's almost a waste of time for black people to expend much of their energy trying to influence that one way or another. They have very little to say or control on what goes on in this country. Perhaps on the local level they will have some say.

BAKER. And Sam Brown—

BROWN. The political process must remain open.

BAKER. And Senator Mitchell sums up his feeling on the matter—

MITCHELL. I started off at 14 campaigning for an opportunity to get our first Negro state Senator in Maryland and I really was out there knocking on doors and campaigning and the system did respond and we elected our first state senator and through this we began to recognize that ours is in fact "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," but it is "of the people and by the people and for the people" that participate in it and if you don't participate then you can't expect it to be responsive to you.

BAKER. Youth may not speak with one voice but it's obvious that young people are speaking up and they are being heard and they are becoming involved in politics.

Our thanks to George Gallup, Jr., Jack Jordan, Rick Margolies, Sam Brown, Tony Gittens, and Clarence Mitchell, III.

This is Torrey Baker speaking to you for the League of Women Voters bringing you Political Perspective: Youth and Politics.

OUR VOCAL VEEP

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, some editors in this country sidestep dealing with controversial subjects. Others approach them with considerable apprehension and empty rhetoric.

One editor, George W. Cooper, in Woodstock, Va., did not mince any words or duck the issue, in an editorial published in the Shenandoah Herald of November 20.

Cooper, in an editorial entitled "Our Local Veep," approves highly of the job the Vice President is doing, particularly his recent speech on network television.

I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR VOCAL VEEP

We recall how the liberals laughed when Spiro Agnew sat down to play at being Vice President.

"Spiro who?" they inquired.

They gave him all the scorn reserved for a member of an ethnic group who doesn't hew to the left-wing Democratic line. He was high comedy.

Now they know how to spell his name, and they aren't laughing. This son of a Greek fruit peddler has suddenly become a spokesman for many of the frustrations of the so-called Silent Majority.

First he said he didn't think dirty, impudent youngsters should be allowed to wave enemy flags and dictate our foreign policy. The liberal press waited for lightning to strike, but the White House just kept saying he was doing a fine job.

Then Agnew landed with both feet on another sacred cow. He complained about the way that a handful of network TV commentators select and slant the news that goes into millions of American homes every day.

In our opinion, Agnew was justified in his criticism and it does not constitute an attack on basic freedom of the press.

Too many television newsmen have followed in the pattern of the late Edward R. Murrow, who started this bit of the anguished expression and upraised eyebrow to turn a simple sentence into an indictment. They get the idea that being faced with a camera makes them a source of instant wisdom.

Many of these self-appointed TV geniuses grew up with the New Deal in Washington and became a part of it. Some have been moved to the point of tears when an election wasn't going to the left.

People have known this for a long time. They weren't surprised when most TV networks, in the name of "analysis," were critical of President Nixon's Nov. 2 speech to the nation. Or that peace marchers and radicals often tend to be glorified.

But Agnew came out and said it, and the flood of phone calls and telegrams showed he was on the same wavelength with a lot of Americans.

We'll go a step further. If you don't like the TV political prejudice that's being fed you—and your children—don't write the networks or the White House.

Write the sponsor. He's the one who's paying for slanted news. If that's the way he wants it, stop buying the product.

Meanwhile we wish good hunting to Spiro Agnew, spokesman for the silent.

We hope to hear from him soon on such subjects as Democratic Congresses that don't legislate, vending machines that steal your money and those football officials who keep robbing the Washington Redskins.

THE VALUE OF LIBERTY

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, Gen. John D. Ryan, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, has written a perceptive and persuasive article in the November 1969 issue of *Airman* magazine about the Nation's need for maintaining an effective nuclear deterrent. I believe that many of our colleagues will be extremely interested in General Ryan's remarks, and for that reason I insert the text of the article in the RECORD at this point:

THE VALUE OF LIBERTY

Maintaining an effective nuclear deterrent today demands much time, money, materiel, and many people. These are the very national resources urgently needed in many other fields of endeavor. So it may seem aggravating to some to see our expensive deterrent forces poised year after year for an attack which their very existence is intended to prevent.

The fact is, however, that to prevent war, the nation must stay prepared for war. To eliminate or reduce our deterrent forces to a point below which they no longer deter would encourage war—provided that a threat actually exists.

Is there a threat? Well, a threat must be presumed if a capability to attack exists, even if the intentions of those who have the capability seem to be benevolent and peaceful. This reasoning is axiomatic in the art and science of war, whether the conflict is cold or hot. No rational nation can base its state of preparedness exclusively on what it believes to be the intent of its potential enemies. Our defense posture must derive essentially from the capabilities of potential aggressors.

A capability for another major power to launch a nuclear attack against the United States has existed for two decades. It exists now, and I believe will exist for some time to come. These are the cold facts of the nuclear age. The Soviet Union has more land-based ICBM launchers in place or under construction than does the United States. They also have a formidable force of long-range strategic bombers. Regardless of the Soviets' ultimate intentions, their overall strategic nuclear capability must be considered to pose a threat to the Free World. Consequently, every possible effort must be made to deter the Soviet Union from using this force for aggressive purposes.

Providing the Air Force portion of the overall US nuclear deterrence is the mission of the Strategic Air Command. For the people of SAC, it is a never-ending job. They must stand watch around the clock. As this issue of *AIRMAN* portrays, they must respond immediately should deterrence fail and the command be ordered into action by national authority. Their job is tedious, repetitious and sometimes dangerous. They would be less than human if they did not occasionally ask themselves, "Is it all worthwhile? Is it worth the price we and the nation must pay?"

The lessons of history are clear. They tell us that weakness in the face of strength possessed by potential conquerors is an open invitation to disaster. Is strength worth its price? The British author Oscar Wilde has said that a cynic is a man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. In America today, a growing number of responsible people are taking long, hard looks at the costs of national defense. They are asking, "Is it worth the price?" It is a valid question. But the correct answer must necessarily lie somewhere within the answer to another question. "What is the value of liberty?"

TEMPORARY TAX

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Extensions of Remarks* an editorial entitled "Temporary Tax?" published in the *Northern Virginia Daily* of November 18, 1969. Mr. J. J. Crawford is editor and Mr. E. E. Keister publisher.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPORARY TAX?

When is a temporary tax not a temporary tax? This is the question posed by Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr.'s new amendment to the pending Tax Reform Bill.

The amendment, known as H.R. 13270, would end the surcharge on income taxes as of the first of next year. The Virginia legislator said, quite logically, that a tax is no longer temporary when it has already been extended once.

In arguing for his amendment on the Senate floor, Sen. Byrd told the lawmakers:

"I give full credence to the President's good intentions in his pledge that the tax will be allowed to die as of July 1, 1970, but I fear that the temptation to extend it beyond that date will be very strong—just as was the temptation to extend it beyond its previous termination date of June 30, 1969.

"Each extension of a tax makes the next extension easier.

"Sooner or later—and I suspect the time is at hand—the government begins to regard the temporary tax increase as a permanent part of the tax structure.

"I think that this must be avoided. I think that the government must keep faith with the people."

Sen. Byrd takes the position that the best way to combat inflation is to cut government spending—not by increasing taxes. He contends that there is a lot of fat which can be trimmed from the budget without touching the muscle.

This is doubtless true. There is a lot of fat which could be trimmed from foreign aid, and there are many domestic areas such as anti-poverty, in which waste and inefficiency are rampant. Even the military budget could probably be cut, beyond the \$2 billion reduction already made, without seriously interfering with our war effort or defense posture.

Sen. Byrd's position on the surtax is sound. It should not be extended on the pretext of being anti-inflationary.

The Administration has made a number of effective moves to stem inflation. These are beginning to show results, even to the point that some economists are saying the Administration has gone far enough for the present in cooling things off.

Naturally, the government hates to surrender a source of taxation which during the 6 months' extension to July 1, 1970, at the 5 percent proposed by President Nixon, will yield approximately \$1.7 billion.

But, this is precisely the point. The longer a temporary tax stays on the books, the less temporary it becomes and the easier it becomes to regard it as permanent.

PINKVILLE

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, officers and troops of the United States of America killing old men and women, children, little babies.

I read the "Pinkville" story with a profound sense of shock and horror. It could not help but bring to mind the atrocities of Nazi Germany, the Russian massacres in Katyn Forest, and all the other atrocity stories in the long history of man's inhumanity to man.

Perhaps this is just an isolated incident; perhaps our Government will see that the perpetrators of this deed that tarnishes all Americans are properly punished; perhaps the men involved were unique—perhaps.

But the thought lingers that the nature of the war in Vietnam—the war no Congress ever proclaimed—is striking at the very moral fiber of our country.

In this century we have been involved in two great world wars involving millions of Americans; and we fought in Korea. Undoubtedly, there were, in these wars, as in any war, individual sadistic acts by men who happened to be wearing American uniforms. No nation, no race is or can be free of such individuals. But never in this century have we seen anything of a comparable nature and scope by men in the uniform of the United States of America.

Why in South Vietnam and not in Okinawa, France, South Korea, North Africa, or Germany?

Perhaps because this war, this undeclared war, is different. For the first time we are fighting in a country on the side of a corrupt regime which clearly lacks the support of its own people.

Our soldiers do not fight only a well defined, uniformed group of soldiers. Every hamlet and village, every field, every street may contain enemies in civilian clothes, a situation which obviously contains the explosive potential of triggering the brutal reaction against the civilian population we are now seeing unfold.

Mr. Speaker, this war is brutalizing our young men in the armed services; this war is creating increasing bitterness and alienation among the youth on our college campuses; this war is devouring the resources which should be channeled to alleviate the tensions in our cities and prevent the poisoning of the very air we breathe, the water we drink, the land we till.

Mr. Speaker, only two groups will benefit from this war: the extremists of the

right who will feed on the divisiveness of this unpopular war and the Communists and other extremists of the left who are using it to radicalize our youth, and to limit our power to deal with the problems of the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this terrible incident emphasizes the need for us to take immediate steps promptly to remove our military presence from Vietnam.

SERVICES TO THE BLIND

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in 1829 Louis Braille invented the alphabet that bears his name, and thousands were enabled to gather meaning from the writings of others.

In 1878, Thomas A. Edison invented the phonograph, making it possible for millions to enjoy the voices of performers whom they could never see in person.

In 1904, Congress passed legislation creating a limited, free service for the blind, utilizing the braille alphabet. During the years that followed, additional legislation established a central, free library service for the blind.

In 1966, Congress extended this service to all persons unable to read conventional printed matter because of any physical limitation. In addition to books printed in braille, this service developed what is known as "talking books," utilizing a record player and records.

OPENING NEW DOORS

Today over 165,000 Americans, including about 1600 Kansans who are unable to see, hold a book, or turn the pages of a book, are participating in this unique program, opening many new doors of education and enjoyment for themselves.

Because of the efforts of both professionals and volunteers, best sellers, classics, vocational guides, and current news and special interest magazines are transcribed into braille and onto records and tapes. About 3,200,000 different pieces of material are available in the program. From June 1968 to June 1969, there were 5,729,000 requests for the material. In fiscal year 1968-69, 624 new titles were recorded as talking books and 314 were added in press braille. On tape, 461 were added.

All material is geared to all age groups and a wide variety of personal interests and is distributed on a loan basis, free of charge.

Participation in the program also includes biennial book catalogs and bi-monthly book reviews in written text, braille, or on record, free of charge. Talking book machines also are loaned without charge.

OTHER BENEFITS

The borrowing period for braille or recorded material is usually 1 month. The material is received and returned in a sturdy container provided free of charge and sent through the mails with no postage. The "talking book" ma-

chine may be retained as long as participation in the program continues.

TO QUALIFY

To qualify, an individual must secure a brief statement describing the physical disability and verification that he cannot use conventionally printed materials from a doctor, optometrist, registered nurse, physical therapist, professional staff member of a hospital or institution or, in the absence of any of these, a professional librarian.

The statement is then sent to one of 43 regional libraries for the blind and physically handicapped. The library for Kansas is the Wolfner Memorial Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, 3844 Oliver Street, St. Louis, Mo. 63108.

Addresses of regional libraries for other States may be secured by contacting Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20542.

Library service begins about 2 weeks after the regional library receives certification of disability.

RESPONSIBILITY, APPLAUSE

Mr. President, in addition to Library of Congress Division Chief Robert Bray, his very fine staff in the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped bear the responsibility and deserve the applause for this program.

In addition, however, there are thousands of unsung heroes—volunteers, professionals and private organizations and State agencies—who are also devoting endless energy and talent to make this program a success.

The national organizations include: American Association of Homes for the Aging, American Nursing Home Association, Arthritis Foundation, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults, paralyzed veterans, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., American Foundation for the Blind, American Printing House for the Blind, Howe Press of the Perkins School for the Blind, Recording for the Blind and Telephone Pioneers of America.

Joining hundreds of volunteers throughout the country in transcribing books into braille and serving as proof-readers are 42 Kansas people. They are:

Hutchinson: Mrs. Donald Gibbs, Mrs. Betty J. Carman.

Wichita: Miss Shirley Smith, Mrs. Anne Buhl, Mrs. Dorothy Anderson, Mrs. Hazel Cravens, Mrs. C. I. Stein, Mrs. Dorothy Dinwiddie, Mrs. Von Eulbert, Mrs. Emma Graham, Mrs. Jean Hedges, Mrs. Dorothy Jocelyn, Mrs. Janice Kellerman, Mrs. Marguerite Lee, Mrs. Norma Lobaugh, Carlton B. Martin, Mrs. Grace Martin, Miss Mary Jane Sauzek, Thelma E. Showman, Mrs. Octavia Trueheart.

Derby: Mrs. Dottie Devine.

Caney: Mrs. Eva M. Walker.

Dodge City: Zola Thomas, Walter A. Thomas.

El Dorado: Mrs. Florence K. Leonard.

Haven: Mrs. Marvel Kollman.

Iola: Mrs. Joy Lingle.

Kiowa: Mrs. Hazel Johnson.

Lansing: C. S. Anderson.

Lawrence: Mrs. Hilda Holmes.

Leavenworth: Miss Veta Miller.

Medicine Lodge: Mrs. Fannie Stevens.
Nashville: Mrs. Bonnie Randolph.
Parsons: Mrs. Clifford Jones.
Prairie Village: Annemarie Goldfarb,
Mrs. Betty Keating, Mrs. Leah Sheiffer,
Mrs. Dolores Ufford, James Wees.
Sedgwick: Mrs. Connie Nordstedt.
Shawnee Mission: Mrs. Margaret L. Twin.
Pretty Prairie: Mrs. Lois Smelser.
Valley Center: Mrs. Jennie Byerly.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT SHOULD NOT BE A PARTISAN ISSUE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Vietnam should not be a partisan issue, and this sentiment has been voiced by thousands of people, including Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. I would like to put into the RECORD an editorial from the October 8, Nashville, Tenn. Banner which I recommend to my colleagues:

NIXON HAD NO PART IN CREATING SORRY MESS IN VIETNAM

Democratic Senators, et al., tuning up with their national chairman for louder blasts at President Nixon's Vietnam policy, would have done well to have heeded instead the sage counsel of Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. By more than inference it was advice—inseparable from the opinion he expressed:

"I think the President is doing everything he can, according to the best advice he can get, to get out of Vietnam. It is not a partisan issue. It is something we must all try to work toward a solution of, and I am hopeful it can be accomplished in the not too distant future."

If such party colleagues as National Chairman Fred Harris, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (Senate Whip), J. William Fulbright, et al., heard it, they gave no sign. By Harris' signal-calling, October is the big month for a frontal policy assault—with no holds barred. Characteristically they were talking when they should have been listening; and when they could have been examining for previous party shoals the cross-currents on which they were blithely embarking.

Republican Chairman Rogers C. B. Morton wound up and let them have it Tuesday squarely between the eyes. He recalled some facts about when, how, and by whom, the United States got involved militarily in that war. The quotes suffice, as a matter of record, with which the nation is acquainted:

"Democratic administrations committed over a half million U.S. troops to a war in Vietnam."

"It was Ted Kennedy who supported President Kennedy's escalation in Vietnam, and Fred Harris who supported Hubert Humphrey on Vietnam, and Hubert Humphrey who supported President Johnson's proposals."

"It is President Nixon who has ordered 60,000 troops out of Vietnam, and who has cut draft calls by 50,000."

Raucous voices in the Harris-Fulbright-Kennedy corner won't be restrained by any appeal to reason or statesmanship issued by the Senate Majority Leader, though Senator Mansfield could wish his party Whip would grow to a stature of judgment and maturity suited to that office. In the interest of a nation confronting a matter that tran-

scends partisanship, he devoutly could wish that.

He counselled wisely, but has been ignored by these colleagues.

In the eyes of a nation that knows the score—and the record cited—hardly can they ignore the fact that they have been hit by their own boomerang of political mischief.

How did the United States get into that war?

In his "Editor's Notebook" column on Sept. 28, John S. Knight, head of the Knight Newspapers, published the significant background of that involvement:

"Some readers have questioned my statement that the late Ngo Dinh Diem, first president of South Vietnam, was 'largely an American creation, promoted by the late Francis Cardinal Spellman and financed by the Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy.'"

"Former Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon explains that 'it was Cardinal Spellman who arranged for a public relations firm to build up Diem as the Catholic puppet of South Vietnam, and that Diem's brother, the Catholic bishop of Saigon, beat a path to Spellman's door to promote the war.'"

"Drew Pearson reported that Cardinal Spellman enlisted the support of Joseph P. Kennedy, a heavy contributor to Spellman's charities, to hire the Harold Dram public relations firm, at a fee of \$3,000 a month, to represent Diem as 'the man who could save Vietnam.' The Cardinal helped organize 'the American friends of Vietnam' to promote Diem and American aid."

"Ironically, when Ngo Dinh Diem proved to be a liability to the Kennedy administration, he was assassinated in 1963 and without protest from the U.S. government."

"The unpopular Ngo Dinh Diem, noted for high-handed edicts enforced by corrupt subordinates, was once described by Lyndon Johnson as 'the Winston Churchill of Southeast Asia.'"

Subsequent to such a start of this thing, the late President John F. Kennedy committed the first 16,000 U.S. troops. And it might incidentally be recalled that it was then-Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara and his successor, Clark M. Clifford, who, over so many years, conducted the war in a manner that denied to the military any victory which is the one essential of combat.

This is the sorry story of U.S. involvement in that stinking mess, for none of which can Richard Nixon or his administration bear the slightest blame.

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "The Foreign Aid Bill," published in the Daily Progress, Charlottesville, Va., on November 19, 1969.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

A report from the chairman of the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations gives rise to some further doubts about the level of foreign aid being provided by the United States to much of the rest of the world.

A main question raised is how far this nation should go in continuing to share its resources with the world when the U.S. public debt now stands at \$57,081,000,000 more

than the combined public debt of all the other nations.

The subcommittee chairman also reported that new budget requests made in the first six months of this calendar year totalled more than \$10 billion for foreign assistance in the form of loans, grants and credits; that there were unexpended balances from prior years of more than \$18 billion; that if the new requests should be approved, the total funds available would be more than \$29 billion and that the net cost of the foreign aid program to this country since World War II is more than \$182 billion.

This is an imposing list of reasons why Congress should go slow before it votes any more foreign aid authorizations and certainly before it grants all the requests for funds that have been made.

It is difficult also to understand why additional funds are being sought at a time when so much money is still in the pipeline—the \$18 billion in unexpended balances from previous years. It would seem that much money could keep the foreign aid program going quite satisfactorily for several years at least.

Americans will not begrudge much of the \$182 billion they have provided to help other nations of the world in the past 25 years. At the conclusion of World War II many war-torn countries were prostrate; some no doubt could not have survived without the American aid that was cheerfully sent to them by the taxpayers of this country.

But most of these countries are back on their feet now and an unfortunately large number of them with little memory of what the American people did for them in their hour of pressing need.

And desirable as it may be to help the under developed nations of the world to raise their living standards, the United States, rich as it is, simply does not have all that money. There is a bottom to the barrel, even in this wealthiest of all nations.

The dreary balance of payments situation faced by this country and the domestic inflation which seems to be increasing as far as the housewife is concerned are due as much concern and action as is the welfare of other nations in the world.

A step in the right direction would be the defeat, or at least a drastic reduction in funds called for in the foreign aid bill which the House Foreign Affairs Committee has reported out and which may be voted upon next week.

JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman representing Cape Cod, I would like to take this opportunity to express the sorrow and condolences of myself and my constituents at the death of our distinguished neighbor, a great American, Joseph P. Kennedy.

In his own right, Joseph P. Kennedy fully deserves the eulogies that his memory is receiving from business and government leaders across the country. As Ambassador to Great Britain, as first chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and as an innovative member of the U.S. Maritime Commission during one of the crucial points in our history, Joseph P. Kennedy made an indelible mark on the direction of this Nation.

But, beyond his own noteworthy achievements, Joe Kennedy will be remembered as the father of perhaps the foremost family in 20th-century American politics. He gave the Nation a President, an Attorney General, and three Senators, all who demonstrated a style, character, and charisma unparalleled in American history.

Through his own life and through those of his sons, Joe Kennedy demonstrated the full potential of the American dream. He was tough, and ambitious, sentimental, sometimes reactionary, and sometimes wrong. He was always controversial, and he was astonishingly successful. Only in America could a man of his background reach the heights that Joe Kennedy did. America gave Joe Kennedy great opportunity; he took it, and repaid it in full measure.

My own constituency felt the impact of this remarkable man even more than the rest of the country. He spent his early years as assistant manager of the Bethlehem Shipyard, in Quincy; he spent most of his retirement years as a resident of Hyannisport, where he presided over the most accomplished family in the Nation, and made the "Kennedy compound" an internationally known landmark.

We felt his presence in other ways also, through his generosity and philanthropy. The Boys Clubs in New Bedford and Fall River, the Cape Cod Hospital, the Kennedy rink in Hyannis—these and other worthy causes all have been helped by Joe Kennedy, and the memory of his generosity will linger there for years to come.

I recall one particular incident that epitomizes, in a way, the kind of man Joe Kennedy was. Some years ago, the Cape Cod Hospital reached the end of a fundraising campaign, short of their \$1 million goal by \$15,000. When Joe Kennedy heard of this, he wrote a check for that amount and sent it to the fundraising headquarters in the hands of his son—now Senator—TED KENNEDY.

That was Joe Kennedy. He was a distinguished public servant, a remarkable successful businessman, and a generous philanthropist. Few men have had a more accomplished lifetime, and few men have made a more lasting imprint on the fate of their nation.

So on behalf of myself, and the many constituents who admired the man and his work, let me extend our heartfelt and sincere sympathies to his gracious widow Rose, and to the rest of his family.

KEEPING FAITH WITH THE YOUNG

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, with the Nation finally galvanized for a fight to clean up our environment and conserve our great out-of-doors, it is time we turn from talk to action. Mr. Michael Frome, conservation editor of *Field and Stream* magazine and nationally known figure

in outdoor recreation, youth conservation and environment, recently spoke in graphic terms about the problems of our outdoors.

He also focused on Youth Conservation Corps legislation presently before this Congress as an "important proposal," as a "chance for our generation to keep faith with the young" and as an aid in conserving the heritage of our public lands and forests.

So that the Members of Congress can benefit from Mr. Frome's remarks, I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF MICHAEL FROME, CONSERVATION EDITOR, FIELD AND STREAM, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL CAMPGROUND OWNERS ASSOCIATION, ST. LOUIS, MO., OCTOBER 31, 1969

Fellow campers, fellow conservationists, anyone who protects open space and provides the American people with a healthful and inspirational experience in the outdoors I consider a partner in conservation. This is why I have come here. Most private campground owners I have met impress me as being lovers of nature and of people. They expect to make a living and deserve to, yet they seem to find service more satisfying than profit. I hope this may always be the case.

Your president, Tom Jones, asked me to implant the "seeds of purpose." The sum and substance of my message in fulfillment of his request are simple: The future growth of the private campground industry depends on sustaining or restoring a healthy, wholesome national environment, with clean air and clear water, upon protecting, expanding and enhancing recreation lands both public and private, ranging from wilderness to resorts. At the same time, the campground industry can contribute to the national environment by cultivating a sense of respect for it among campers and by joining with us in the conservation movement.

I don't have to tell you the world today is in one big, filthy mess. When I left Washington yesterday I looked down from the airplane window: our beloved national capital was enveloped in a blanket of smoke. It was nothing new, different or extraordinary. It was not smog that comes and goes with the wind—it was smoke, chronic and permanent. Coming into this great city in the heart of America, the smoke was even worse. Recently an airline pilot—a man who flies the largest type of aircraft in service today—came to see me. He said that a mass of smoke more than 30,000 feet thick hangs over the country from the Atlantic Seaboard to the Mississippi River and even much of the West. He told me that air pollution—by whatever name it may be called—is an increasing threat to flight safety because the vision of the pilots is seriously obscured.

Experts say the earth is smothering with the stuff man is throwing away, and soon there may be no more "away" to throw it to. This came home to me forcefully last week when I received a copy of a recent speech by the Deputy Minister of Tourism in Ontario, Mr. A. S. Bray. One thinks of Canada as a large and unspoiled frontier. Yet he voiced expressions of desperate concern.

America the Beautiful, he said, can all too often be described as America the Contaminated, and anxiety about the quality of life has become a rising political issue. In the summer of 1969, Canadian families beginning their vacations at the lake, river or shore, where they used to swim without a second thought, often took along a new piece of equipment: a laboratory bottle and instructions on how to collect water samples. Just about everyone now knows about coliform counts. On New Brunswick's St. John River, the government Fisheries Department opened a three-and-a-half million dollar salmon

hatchery last summer, only to find that at least 5000 smolt died within a few months because of polluted river water.

The same crises extend to every society around the globe, where over-expanding industrialization has created excessive waste that is poisoning plants, wildlife and man himself. Almost every week brings new warnings of impending ecological upsets—of certain birds becoming extinct, hauls of inedible fish, mysterious animal sicknesses.

Clearly, we must tackle without delay pollution caused by DDT and other pesticides, by radioactive waste, chemical fertilizers and hot water from nuclear power reactors; we must act to reduce the shattering cacophony of modern noises that grate on the nerves and even damage living organisms; we must face and resolve the challenge of festering cityscapes and blighted roadsides; we must examine the pollution of visual ugliness.

"Modern man," said Thor Heyerdahl, the great Norwegian explorer and scientist, "seems to believe he can get everything he needs from the corner drug store. He doesn't understand that everything has a source in the land or sea, and that he must respect those sources. If the indiscriminate pollution continues, we will be sawing off the branch we are sitting on."

I agree and for this reason believe in camping and in promoting it—not necessarily more camping in terms of quantity, but more in terms of quality, more better camping. Adventures in the outdoors are essential to appreciating the mechanism of the land. The further we move from the natural ways of our ancestors and the further we move into urbanized insulation, the more do people lose touch with their origins. A society that relies on sewers to carry away its offal, living in cities recklessly spewing waste into streams, subjected to unending propaganda promoting throw-away bottles, cans and packages, can hardly understand its dependence on natural resources, or express much effort to protect them.

Camping spans a multitude of definitions and reasons, each of which has its place and purpose. But in the sum total of all our motivations there is a common denominator: The urge to be free, to tear loose from urban and suburban ways. Camping is a natural and necessary reaction and antidote to a frenzied supercivilized age—a return for sustenance to pioneer pathways and to nature's bosom. The extent to which people flock to the prettiest lakes, the most attractive scenery, and the shadiest glens emphasizes the desire to enjoy unspoiled natural settings of the highest quality.

In the old days everything necessary for a camper's comfort and survival he had to provide himself; it was part of the culture, a rather challenging but rewarding way of life. Today the trick seems to be to spend enough money so that everything is done for you, with all the mechanical contrivances and conveniences of indoor life at home adapted into outdoor life away from home. There is scant emphasis on self-reliance or on the need to respect the environment of nature. Thus equipped—and often overequipped—with everything but basic training, our campers take to the open spaces, congregating as close together as possible, as if there were safety in numbers. Presently they completely transform the setting into the kind of littered, noisy, and overcrowded ghetto they left behind.

If I had my way, new campers would be required to start with a one-week training course. They would go into the woods in groups and learn to pitch an old-fashioned pup tent, build a fire, and get along without mechanical gadgetry. They'd have discussions on appreciation of the outdoors and on the fundamental blessings and benefits of camping . . . On second thought, make that a two-week course, for these lessons come slowly.

Instead, though campers think they may be following the footpaths of the frontiersmen, their incomplete, faulty schooling and the inadequate guidance they receive drive them to follow city ways.

As I travel over the country, I see many examples of overuse and misuse of campgrounds, both public and private. Trampled vegetation and exposed tree roots are common sights, proving as damaging to watershed values as the uncontrolled bulldozer, logger or miner. These are the obvious results of pounding by too many feet. But even without physical damage, the presence of too many people demeans a setting. A lake may be rich in appeal when ten people are on its shores. It may retain most of that appeal with 50 or even 250. But at some point sheer numbers alone must transform a pleasant campground into a housing colony and ultimately into an outdoor slum.

This is one reason why I favor rationed use of campgrounds in national and state parks and in the wilderness areas of the national forests. Russell Tobey, director of state parks in New Hampshire, put it very well when he told me: "A few years ago we thought we were doing the kindly thing to make room for everybody, to let them hang from the trees and behind rocks. But we suffered dire consequences in overcrowding, in overstrained staffs, roads and water systems. We concluded we must strive for optimum, rather than maximum development. This firm policy has encouraged private campgrounds all over the state and they are a considerable factor in the economy."

Alas, too often, because of lack of imagination or courage, state and federal officials take the easy way out. They misread the aspirations of their clients and misjudge their own responsibilities. Instead of devising new techniques to introduce people to nature and nature to people, they pour concrete for more highways, transpose such devices as "motor nature trails" to the back country, and congest visitors on treeless barren camping suburbias. In the process they destroy the natural features people have come to enjoy.

We need look no further for an example than the Great Smoky Mountains, the country's most popular national park. The so-called "master plan" which citizen conservationists have been fighting for more than two years, is a bizarre design of roads gutting the wilderness, of massive campgrounds of 200 or 300 or 600 units that rob the camper of a true park experience and take up priceless national real estate for sheer bedroom space.

Public areas, and private ones as well, need to give people a capsule course of ecology in the campground so they realize the site is alive, delicate and fragile. But even when the grounds are kept clean and neat and landscaped, this in itself will stimulate respect.

I believe that national parks and many national forests should be restricted to tent camping, that trailers should be diverted outside. Trailers and large luxury vehicles are increasingly difficult to accommodate on park roads and parking areas. They require as much space as buses, yet carry only a handful of people.

Elimination of large trailer sites, water systems, sewer systems, electrical hookups and the like would not mean the exclusion of people, but rather the protection of choice country for the enjoyment of people. It would also mean the enlargement of regional vacation areas, with more surrounding state parks, private campgrounds and resorts to serve the rising tide of recreational travelers.

In this regard, I must say that I find the continued rivalry among federal agencies, the tunnel vision, the inability to project beyond boundaries, and the lip service given to be intolerable. It must end; the interest of the people must prevail.

As an example of how a regional plan could work, campers bound for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park would receive their assignments by reservations in advance or at the entrances. When all spaces were taken other arrivals would be directed to private campgrounds, the adjoining national forests, and the Cherokee Indian Reservation. In this way the entire region would be embraced in the camping design; then visitors could reach trails in the national park aboard a tramcar or bus. The same reservation system could be applied at the gateways to Acadia, the Everglades, the Tetons and Yellowstone. At Cape Cod, a central clearance headquarters is urgently needed—to save the national seashore as well as to take care of the public.

The national parks and national forests are both entering into a vital new era as environmental study areas for the young people of our country. An important proposal before Congress would establish a Youth Conservation Corps toward that end. I envision it as a chance for our generation to keep faith with the young, to show with deed that our legacy is not simply one of war and hate and environmental degradation, but of hope and confidence and peace.

It was the late Aldo Leopold, a distinguished conservationist and educator, who declared, "I am glad I shall never be young without wild country to be young in." The national lands maintain the opportunity for successive generations to acquaint themselves firsthand with conditions that have shaped our culture. Such contacts are essential to the sense of being an American. That young people are shut off from healthful outdoor experiences undoubtedly contributes to the rising tide of crime and violence.

The use of public lands as environmental study areas means the role of the private lands must grow in meeting recreational needs, and, hopefully, with a conservation conscience.

In this regard, I would like to mention briefly what two other organizations in the travel field are doing.

First, the American Hotel and Motel Association. It has a national Committee for a Quality Environment, with nineteen functioning state committees. It issues to its members kits containing a variety of publications showing what they can do in the area of conservation.

In addition, All AH&MA members are asked to pledge themselves to:

- (1) Preserve beauty where it now exists.
- (2) Provide beauty where it is lacking.
- (3) Build with conservation and beauty in the forefront of our thinking.
- (4) Conserve our natural resources of land, air and water.

(5) Lead in this effort in the communities. The second organization is the Society of American Travel Writers, of which I am proud to be a former president. Two years ago we established a Committee on Conservation and Preservation and this year issued our first "Connie" Awards, reflecting—as our president, Robert S. Kane, declared—the concern of travel writers over "the increasing assaults on our country's great wilderness areas, wildlife sanctuaries, free-flowing rivers and historic sites."

As he put it, "The sacrifice of natural beauty and historic landmarks for the construction of jetports, super-highways, housing developments and other facilities in the name of progress is fast depleting the very elements which make up our quality travel and recreational environment. Campaigns of conservationists often go unnoticed, unsupported and unsung, and these dedicated efforts deserve nationwide recognition. To this end the Society has established the 'Connie' Award."

At our recent convention in Las Vegas we presented Connies to six worthy recipients. I hope that in the future we shall be giving such awards to various individuals

and organizations in the campground industry.

I love to camp and have been camping within the past month. Everyone to his own taste, but for me wilderness camping is the ultimate experience. It has sophistication in its utter simplicity. I'm not even sure that all of this type of high quality camping resource must be limited to public lands.

I would summarize my feeling and conviction about the whole picture as follows: If you offer the people excellence they will find it out and respond to it.

OSCAR SETTERQUIST RETIRES

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. Oscar Setterquist on his retirement from the Greater Vallejo Recreation District after 25 years of distinguished service. It is indeed an honor to have had such a fine and dedicated gentleman meeting the recreational needs of the largest population center in the Fourth Congressional District.

A great tribute can be paid Mr. Setterquist for his untiring service to the growing recreational needs of the Greater Vallejo area. However, the greatest tribute has already been given by those who have worked and persevered with him over the past 25 years in developing our Vallejo Recreation District into the second largest in the State of California.

Today, we can only confirm the good judgment of the people of Vallejo in electing him the first chairman of the Greater Vallejo Recreational District on July 12, 1944. From his earliest efforts with Vallejo's Defense Recreational Committee in 1941 to his assuming the recreation chairmanship, Mr. Setterquist has shown the greatest ingenuity and creativity in budgeting and building the recreation and leisure activities in Greater Vallejo.

Let us only look to the accomplishments of Mr. Setterquist and his staff from 1950 to 1960. During this period, the Greater Vallejo Recreational District, by purchase or lease, developed the Blue Rock Springs Park, Terrace Park, the Washington Playground, the Country Club Crest area, the Lake Chabot Rosa Minipark, Carquinez Park Area, College Park, and the property adjacent to Lake Dalwigk.

He has now been chairman of the Greater Vallejo Recreational District for 18 years. Twenty-five years ago, when he was first informed of his appointment, Mr. Setterquist was quoted as saying:

I consider it an honor to be asked to serve on the Commission . . . I will do my best at all times.

Mr. Setterquist has done his "best at all times." It is indeed an honor for me to know him. I wish him even greater success in the years to come. I can only wish him the degree of contentment and enjoyment that he has brought the people of Greater Vallejo with his recreational ideas and accomplishments.

LAND REFORM IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues another in the series of informative articles on South Vietnam's problems by Mr. Frank Herbert of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

Mr. Herbert recently returned from Vietnam where he accompanied Dr. Roy L. Prosterman of the University of Washington, adviser to the South Vietnamese Government on land reform.

The article follows:

WHERE DOES WHITE HOUSE AUTHORITY START AND FINISH?

(By Frank Herbert)

In the executive branch, the military and the great bureaucracy of our government, a largely secret political-guerrilla war over Vietnam is going on right now which, in its deadly potential, overshadows the bloody fight taking its daily toll far across the Pacific.

You are going to read here as full a description of that "other war" as I can produce—names of people involved and the battlefields: troop withdrawal, cease fire, land reform.

Here is the arena of secret decision "for their own good" about which the public seldom learns until it's too late, until their sons are being killed and their tax dollars squandered.

And the horrible part of this is that these secret decisions often are made at the middle echelons of the bureaucracy and go directly opposite orders being received from the top.

There were moments during the gathering of this information when I wondered if the Presidential writ didn't stop at the edge of the White House lawn.

It's obvious that President Nixon wants maximum troop withdrawal from Vietnam consistent with security there, he wants an honorable cease fire as soon as possible, and he wants a workable land reform law in South Vietnam upon which that tortured nation can begin building political stability.

OPPOSED

He is being opposed every step of the way, often by people in odd corners of the bureaucracy and at key crossroads in the implementing of decisions, people who can make their will felt subtly, but surely, even against a president.

We'll go into this in detail presently.

The stakes in the "other war" (the fight in the bureaucracy)—are high—careers and advancement, political power, prestige, self justification.

The well known ability of the human mind to rationalize decisions for personal benefit, no matter the deadly consequences to others, gets its daily workout on all sides in this battle.

Yet the American public knows little about this secret war.

The reasons are many. There is a certain down-the-nose disdain about "the public" in the minds of some of those involved—which says something about their real belief in functioning democracy.

Unhappily, much of the press tends to be an acquiescent partner in the secrecy. We are trained to protect our sources.

This means we don't use names of people who give us powerful data under the cloak of anonymity. We don't even use some of the data directly because it points so obviously to the source.

HUNGER

The name of this game is "career hunger" and our own careers depend on the daily input of usable information. If the sources dry up, our careers suffer.

Lives of soldiers and civilians dying in Vietnam are disregarded in this scramble—not entirely out of cynicism, but, what is worse, out of an unspoken agreement in which such consequences are disregarded for "larger" reasons.

It's easy to find a larger reason when that reason coincides with your own desires.

Let's trace one case history as an illustration—that of Joseph Mendenhall, head of the Vietnam desk for USAID in the State Department. USAID is our international development agency.

Mendenhall, as political counsel to the Saigon Embassy in 1960-63, presided over many of our blunders during the darkest days of the Diem-Nhu regime.

He was one of those who praised the Rand Report. This so-called study, since thoroughly discredited by two congressional investigating committees, was written by a man who had never been in Vietnam.

The report set out to prove that Vietnamese political stability depended largely on the landowner class—certainly that segment of the population which is most opportunistic and would be the first to dump us in a crisis.

As late as last April, Mendenhall still was working hard for a voluntary land purchase program which would extend its effect over some 12 years.

Now, however, he obviously has heard the others passed down from the White House through Secretary of State William Rogers.

ALIGNED

The former land reform opponent today appears fully aligned with current policy, but it's an alignment which deserves examination.

Mendenhall argues that the Vietnamese land reform must have an "adequate application system" under which the tenants and sharecroppers can ask for and get their land.

Pressed, he explains he means a complicated system of deeds and paper work—a system certain to bog down administration and open wide the doors to corruption.

Asked why he favors this, Mendenhall says: "Well, you know there may be many tenants who don't want to be landowners."

(Hearing this, a Washington official close to the White House jibed: "Sure! Lots of people want to starve.")

Bogging the law down in paperwork appears to be the one thing Mendenhall can do with impunity to sabotage federal policy, but he also has taken out what might be called an insurance policy.

The new chief of Land Affairs for USAID in Saigon, Richard Hough, is a Mendenhall man.

Hough doesn't really see why we should give land to the peasants. (They've only been paying for it at the rate of 35 to 90 percent of their crop annually all their lives.)

CHARGED

He believes the peasants should be charged for the land under a long term plan certain to eliminate immediate political impact.

You will recall Mendenhall earlier favored a voluntary land purchase plan.

When pressed on the built-in delays of his proposals, Mendenhall's only response is a question: "Why are you so concerned about immediate application of the law?"

The answer to his question is quite simple: Saigon needs every day it can get to build a solid political base among the rural population ahead of U.S. withdrawal.

Our withdrawal rate is perhaps the most inflammatory arena of this "other war."

Gen. Craigton Abrams, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, must know the White House is insisting on a maximum permissible rate of troop withdrawal. He has been told this in so many words.

Abrams translates this as "somewhere around 25,000 a quarter," adding: "We could perhaps go down to 449,000 by next June. With everything we can read now, this seems practical."

(Hearing this, one Washington official said: "The damn fool is living in a political dream world. Even Pres. Nguyen Van Thieu knows more about the U.S. political climate than that!")

In effect, Abrams is trapped by the rosy reports he has transmitted to Washington on the successes of our pacification program and Army of the Republic of Vietnam's increased effectiveness.

No doubt there's some truth in his pronouncements, but their implications are deceptive.

Much emphasis is placed on the Hamlet Security Map showing that 80 percent of South Vietnam's population is in areas classed "C" or better.

DANGEROUS

The "C" classification translates as "Subject to infrequent VC (Vietcong) harassment." In practice, it means: "Relatively safe in the daytime, dangerous at night."

The city of Saigon, it's well to note, has a "C" classification.

MACV (Military Assistance Command-Vietnam) is a bit hesitant to explain how it arrives at its classifications, but appears to place great store on the fact that the data comes out of a computer. (It apparently is based on a physical count of the number of VC incidents.)

Obviously, MACV has not heard the old computer operators' axiom: "Garbage in: garbage out."

It's equally obvious they haven't heard the assessment I did from former Vietminh intelligence officers.

The Vietminh was the force which fought under Ho Chi Minh to defeat the French—a combined army of communists and Vietnam nationalists.

The former Vietminh in South Vietnam are those who could not stomach communism and fled to the south. They are among the most violently anti-communist of all residents in the south today.

These officers believe much of the VC infrastructure we have eliminated was put there by the communists for just that purpose and that the hard core infrastructure is still waiting in many communities for an opportune moment to act.

The most likely opportune moment would follow a cease-fire and would occur during a subsequent election campaign period. There's no doubt the communists are planning their tactics carefully with a cease-fire in mind.

Their plans certainly include new terror tactics designed to influence an election.

TERRITORY

The U.S. military in South Vietnam, no matter its rosy and stiffly argumentative reports still is committed to a largely conventional type of war for territory.

The VC is fighting a war for people.

The communists have been setting most of the political pace and controlling the casualty totals. A key point in their political strategy is to maintain a high level of casualties in American forces.

This exerts maximum political pressure at home and, they hope, will force the U.S. to accept a cease-fire on communist terms.

Plans for a cease-fire are very touchy in Saigon. Thieu has just stated he doesn't

believe a cease-fire is feasible. A strong segment of our State Department agrees with him.

Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker has been known to support this position, although he has considered alternatives. He recently told an American group in Saigon: "It may come to a cease-fire yet."

PARTITION

The official position on this involves a leopard-spot standstill cease-fire with regrouping followed by supervised elections. This would amount to de facto partition of Vietnam.

A leopard-spot cease fire is just what the name implies: we would button up in areas we now occupy. The Viet Cong would do the same.

In Saigon, Bunker said: "Thieu has come a long way toward accepting de facto partition."

Bunker's number two, Ambassador Samuel Berger, now holding down the post in Saigon, put it even more strongly: "There can be no cease fire solution under present circumstances. It'd only be a cover for a 25 to 50 per cent buildup by the VC."

On his way to a much needed vacation in the U.S., Bunker stopped off to discuss mutual concerns with our delegate to the Paris peace talks, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

From Lodge's reaction to reports about Bunker's opinions on a cease fire, it was apparent to me when I talked to Lodge a week ago in Paris, that our Ambassador to Saigon did not brief our peace negotiator on these points.

Lodge's reaction:

"You know, that's the second time today someone's told me that and I'd never heard it before."

INTERPRETS

It would be difficult to interpret this failure by Bunker. Perhaps he changed his mind between Saigon and Paris. Perhaps he's still strongly committed to the military-solution-only plan.

One thing certain: it could not have been an oversight.

Several mysteries crop up when you examine what information has been passed along to Lodge and what has not.

Philip Habib, political counsel to our peace talk delegation, is another old Saigon hand who fought against land reform with every means at his disposal.

Habib represented Lodge at the recent White House conference on our Vietnam-Paris posture. This was the conference attended by Bunker, Abrams, Admiral John McCain (Honolulu), Secretary Rogers and their aides plus Nixon advisors.

During the four-hour Washington conference, the leverage that effective land reform in Vietnam could give us at the Paris talks was certainly mentioned.

It appears rather clear that as long as the Hanoi delegation can smell victory, can look into the future and see only improvement of their political position, they won't budge at the conference table.

Spokesmen for our Paris delegation make it painfully clear this is the actual case. One aide says: "These really aren't talks. We're just at the yelling, screaming and accusation stage."

Effective land reform from Saigon, however, would change the political picture in South Vietnam and Hanoi knows this. Their own recruiting program in the Mekong Delta leaned heavily on this propaganda weapon.

"We gave you the land; give us your sons."

From Lodge's reaction, it's plain this argument was not emphasized by Habib, if it was mentioned at all.

Habib, it must be remembered, was one of those who kept feeding President Johnson arguments on why we should not stop our bombing of North Vietnam.

BOMBING

Even many of the South Vietnamese military now say that this bombing was a major element in unifying North Vietnam and stiffening communist purpose.

This is the way it goes in the bureaucracy and the military—a war within a war. There's much more to it than these examples, but these are crucial high points.

Mendenhall and Habib, two of the men who have been heavily responsible for data on which many of our blunders in Vietnam turned, still hold powerful positions where they can influence policy against executive decisions.

The chief of our military mission in Vietnam obviously is at loggerheads with President Nixon's avowed purpose of reducing our troop strength in Vietnam by 250,000 over the next eighteen months.

Perhaps we should interpret this entire conflict in the light of the old Vietnamese proverb: "When the water recedes, the sandcrabs eat the fish; when the water rises, the fish eat the sandcrabs."

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FOOD, NUTRITION, AND HEALTH

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health will be held in Washington on December 2, 3, and 4 to focus national attention and national resources on our country's remaining—and changing—nutrition problems.

Over 2,500 educators, scientists, medical and health professionals, representatives of agriculture and the food industry, and spokesmen for consumer and social action groups, will join with Federal, State, and local government officials at the meeting. Twenty-six pre-Conference panels have met during the summer and fall to consider a wide range of food and nutrition problems.

They have drafted provisional recommendations which they will discuss with the Conference participants in small, working sessions. From this interchange, the Conference expects to produce its final conclusions—a carefully developed and broadly acceptable body of recommendations for the President, Government, the private sector of the economy, and the American people.

Among the questions to which the Conference will address itself are: how to insure continuing surveillance of the state of nutrition of our citizens; how to improve the nutrition of the poor, pregnant and nursing mothers, children and adolescents, the aged, and Indians; how to monitor the wholesomeness and nutritional value of our foods in the face of new technologies of food production, processing, and packaging; how to improve nutrition education in the schools; and how to improve programs that affect nutrition.

I hope that when recommendations are made by the Conference, action will be taken to implement them as quickly as possible. It is a sad and tragic anomaly that in this land of abundance and affluence, millions of persons suffer from

hunger, millions of others lack a balanced diet, and still many others are in poor health.

Mr. Speaker, this is a challenge we must not ignore, for if we fail, we will not only desert persons in desperate need of help, but America's reputation for being a Nation of compassion, will be ridiculed.

SAN JOAQUIN WILDERNESS AREA

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the proposed San Joaquin Wilderness lies between the John Muir and Dana Minarets Wildernesses and would fill the one gap that is missing in an otherwise continuous strip of wilderness along the crest of the Sierra Nevada in California. Zigzagging through this virgin country is the longest, finest, mountain wilderness trail in the country. Nowhere else can one hike 300 miles in the same general direction without ever crossing a road or passing a settlement.

Starting in Yosemite Valley one can follow the famous John Muir Trail for 200 miles south, to the summit of Mount Whitney, 14,496 feet. Shunning the easy routes along the canyon bottoms, the Muir Trail climbs the highest passes and winds close to the highest peaks. South of Mount Whitney one can follow other trails for almost another hundred miles, to the gentler wilderness of the Kern Plateau.

There are no competing uses of any importance in the area. Some small mineral deposits exist, such as iron and tungsten, but none is of commercial quantity and quality. Nor are there any stands of commercial timber. Tentative plans for water development have existed on paper for years, but they have not proved to be economically feasible and have not attracted the interest of any agency or utility.

Nevertheless, the area is persistently threatened by the promotion of another trans-Sierra highway, just 25 miles south of the splendid new Tioga Pass route through Yosemite Park. There are already eight other paved roads across the Sierra Nevada, three kept open the year round where possible.

Promoters of the proposed Minaret Summit Highway continue to insist that the route would support commercial truck traffic and provide access to skiing on Mammoth Mountain, despite findings by the California Highway Department to the contrary. These findings were confirmed by two of the largest trucking concerns, PIE and Delta, in statements indicating that no freight-rate benefits would occur if such a highway were built. Fifty miles of this route lie above the snow line—over 6,000 feet—in a portion of the Sierra known for its 7-month winters and very heavy snowfall.

The proposed area of 43,280 acres is suitable for wilderness classification. It has great beauty and wildness. Its virgin forests of red fir are broken by small

meadows, deep canyons, and sheer cliffs. It has native trout and abundant deer. It is spacious. It offers solitude, grandeur, and dramatic mountain scenery.

Most important of all, it is the needed link in the narrow chain of wilderness that follows the crest of the High Sierra.

SELF-EXAMINATION FOR ALL NEWS MEDIA

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the widespread public support for Vice President AGNEW's recent criticism of the mass media should be sufficient evidence of the need to have this admittedly controversial matter given a thorough public airing. In an unemotional and reflective editorial on November 18, 1969, the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., examined the Vice President's comments and concluded:

News media in general, instead of reacting with more invective or self-righteous postures, might well ponder the statements of AGNEW and others and attempt to review objectively their system of news gathering and presentation. That includes both the printed media and the broadcast industry.

Hopefully, this will be the positive result out of all the current fire and smoke that surrounds this controversy. I commend the editorial "Self-Examination for All News Media" to the attention of my colleagues:

SELF-EXAMINATION FOR ALL NEWS MEDIA

Vice President Spiro Agnew, to say the least, is not endearing himself to the liberals of the nation or the national news media. His recent speeches have caused a storm of reaction, charges and counter-charges.

But the one that really brought the roof down was in Des Moines last week where the vice president blasted the television news industry. Let it be noted here that this speech was preceded by an earlier Agnew blistering of the nation's newspapers in a national news magazine article.

Agnew criticized the larger newspapers in particular for what he called misinformation and misconceptions in news presentation and later slapped the national television networks for what he termed "instant analysis and querulous criticism" of President Nixon's Nov. 3 speech on Vietnam policy. He referred to network commentators who criticized Nixon's speech immediately after the President went off the air.

The vice president was later joined by George Romney, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and others in the administration, in criticizing the news media in general.

Agnew, Romney and the others talked about lack of objectivity in news reporting. The vice president and Romney specifically alleged that the national media is dominated by a small group of newsmen who live and work in Washington, D.C., or New York City. Sometimes it's called the "eastern establishment press."

Agnew in his Des Moines speech said:

"Both communities bask in their own provincialism, their own parochialism. We can deduce that these men thus read the same newspapers, and draw their political and social views from the same sources.

Worse, they talk constantly to one another, thereby providing artificial reinforcement to their shared viewpoints."

The vice president charged that commentators who criticized Nixon's Vietnam policy speech on the same night that it was delivered to the nation, had made up their minds in advance and prepared rebuttals before listeners even had a chance to digest what the President said.

What Agnew seems clearly to be suggesting is that a relatively small but powerful segment of the American national news media—including newspapers, television and magazines—are doing a calculated hatchet job on the present occupant of the White House.

This is not the first time this charge has been made and it probably won't be the last. Similar accusations were made during the administrations of other American presidents, and with some validity.

We do not necessarily agree with every criticism Agnew has made of the news media or those who oppose administration policies. Neither do we agree that his comments can be dismissed as an attempt at suppression.

In our opinion certain of the so-called "eastern establishment" news media do seem to present a consistently one-sided or inbred view of national and international issues.

News media in general, instead of reacting with more invective or self-righteous postures, might well ponder the statements of Agnew and others and attempt to review objectively their system of news gathering and presentation. That includes both the printed media and the broadcast industry.

We accept, too, the responsibility of local components of the mass media to regularly evaluate news presentation, to be responsive to public attitudes and to resist the inbreeding of opinion which can result from talking only to ourselves.

Whatever he may have intended, this is the real message in Agnew's remarks from which all of us can profit.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR STUDENT ANTIVIOLENCE ACT

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced the student antiviolence bill on June 2, 1969, with 19 cosponsors, and events since that time have shown such legislation is needed now more than ever.

The law-abiding student in America has the right to pursue a higher education without fear of violence or intimidation. This is his civil right—and it is academic freedom in its fullest sense.

Recognition that the law-abiding student must have the legal means to rid his campus of radicals is growing across the country.

The most recent expression of public support comes from radio station WJCM in Sebring, a small community in south-central Florida. The station reported that in a survey of listeners, 99 percent—or 4,500 persons—said they supported my student antiviolence bill, while only 1 percent—or 300 listeners—were against it.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks at its convention in Dallas was so concerned about growing anarchy on America's campuses that the Elks adopt-

ed a strong resolution calling for a crack-down on those who interfere with the rights of law-abiding and conscientious students.

The time has come to serve notice to the campus revolutionaries that their days are numbered. The time to provide protection for the serious, conscientious student is now. I would urge prompt action on my student antiviolence bill.

BLOW TO AMERICAN FARM TRADE

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the European Common Market to postpone an overhaul of its unreasonable farm program is a tragic blow to freer trade for American farmers. This decision, taken at a Council of Ministers meeting in Brussels earlier this week, means the barricades to U.S. agriculture will be raised higher. It means farmers the world over face depressed prices resulting from mountainous surpluses of European grain and dairy products brought on by a totally unrealistic farm price support system.

I take this time to suggest that the United States renew its protest of unfair trade treatment with Common Market officials in an attempt to get reconsideration. The outmoded farm system which a handful of European nations insist on maintaining has proved disastrous to world agricultural trade. It is contrary to the reciprocal trade agreements to which the Europeans as well as the Americans have committed themselves.

Today's Wall Street Journal carries an article describing in some detail the implications of the Common Market action, and I include it at this point in my remarks:

COMMON MARKET DELAYS A FARM OVERHAUL; HIGH COSTS AND SURPLUSES SEEN CONTINUING

BRUSSELS.—Common Market farm problems will be getting worse, which augurs world markets plagued by commodity surpluses.

Under heavy political pressure from farmers, Common Market ministers meeting here postponed a drastic overhaul of the European Economic Community's farm system. The net effect will be the present high cost, surplus-building farm system is likely to remain in effect at least through 1970.

And that decision may add to Britain's problems when a Common Market summit meeting is held Dec. 1-2 in the Hague to consider possible British entry into the six-nation group.

Currently, the community comprises France, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands, West Germany and Luxembourg.

The latest Common Market action, taken at a Council of Ministers meeting here, provides more time for consideration of the proposed massive overhaul of the farm system. But, this is at the expense of retaining a system which most economists, Common Market authorities, and government sources say has already outlived its usefulness.

The present system maintains high prices for farm products within the communities by applying levies on agricultural imports. These levies bring the price of imports up to the high domestic price levels established to help farmers in the communities. The price levels have been set high under pressure from inefficient farmers in the six-country group. This has stimulated overproduction of dairy products, soft wheat, sugar and various other products.

In the 1969-1970 crop year, the Common Market farm program will pay out \$2.6 billion, about a third higher than in the preceding year. About 95% of that money is used to finance price supports in the Common Market and to pay export subsidies aimed at trying to get rid of surpluses. Even dumping, however, hasn't been enough to eliminate the "butter mountain" which has reached a peak of about 450,000 metric tons (a metric ton is 1.1 U.S. tons). Meanwhile, the Common Market wheat surplus has helped upset an international wheat pricing agreement which had been laboriously drawn during the last major tariff-cutting round under the aegis of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

But the political clout of farmers in the six countries makes it difficult for Common Market ministers to curtail overproduction by slashing subsidies and price levels. Even as ministers met in Brussels, French farmers were spreading manure on highways in the Nantes area as a protest. Earlier demonstrations against the lot of farmers in France resulted in jailing of several of the leaders. Yesterday, farmers protested against the jailing.

In Germany, farmers are so incensed at the likelihood of lower prices, that they now are boycotting Common Market farm programs. "How can we introduce any program which cuts payments to our farmers when they believe they already are underpaid?" one German government official asked in Bonn.

At the Council of Ministers meeting, Jean Rey, president of the Common Market's executive commission, emphasized that the farm situation in the community is "sharply deteriorating as a result of the ever mounting financial burden it imposes on member countries."

In discussions, the Common Market countries agreed that a farm overhaul was overdue, but they failed to show the political will to follow commission suggestions for price slashes. By postponing the decision, it now will be left to top officials at the Hague meeting to recommend a solution. The Common Market Council of Ministers will meet again after the summit session in the Hague, hopefully to take further action before the end of the year. The consensus is that the likeliest action, however, merely will be continuation of the present program probably through 1970, while efforts are made to meet some of the political opposition to the farm overhaul.

Britain has an interest in the proceeding, because France has indicated that it wants a new farm financing program completed before it will support British entry. Under the present system, France draws considerably more out of the farm program than it puts into it. France wants to be sure that such a financing system will remain in effect, even if Britain does become the seventh member. Britain, however, may not be so interested in joining if that financing program puts a heavy burden on it.

The overhaul being considered by the Common Market basically provides for sharp reduction in payments to farmers, while diverting more funds to structural farm reforms, such as vocational training for other jobs, promotion of mechanization and land restructure.

QUERY: NEED MANKIND FOLLOW THE FLIGHT OF THE DODO?

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, it was my pleasure to be the keynote speaker at a conservation leaders' forum held at—and sponsored by—Cornell University at Ithaca, N.Y., in the district I am honored to serve.

There has subsequently been a flattering amount of constituent interest in my remarks on that occasion, and a number of suggestions that I ought to share them with my colleagues—which I am pleased to do for such value as they may have:

WHAT "THE PEOPLE" ARE SAYING—ABOUT THEIR ENVIRONMENT

One has to feel signally honored to be invited to "keynote" this important Conference—especially in light of the quality of the talent gathered here to focus on what is perhaps our most-serious, if still largely unrecognized as such, domestic problem.

It is not often that you find a politician—which vocation is, at least, my temporary calling—somewhat at a loss for words.

But I am!

For the full scope and true breadth of the environmental crisis we face is so difficult to really grasp, as the Congress has latterly been discovering, that I am uncertain where I should start.

Those who have put this program together have tried to be somewhat helpful by suggesting that I should tell you what "the people" have been saying to their legislators in Washington about the quality of their environment.

That's a good idea, I suppose—though it's not as easy to work out as I had thought at first.

For if, by "people," you meant my own constituents, while I am sure they are aware of our environmental problems, a brief check of my correspondence files indicates that, by and large and except when aroused by some specific situation, they are not yet articulating that concern to me as you might imagine they would be.

However, in every sampling of public opinion that I have seen reported upon—including those essayed recently by my Congressional colleagues, something I intend also to do again at the end of this year—the "people" clearly indicate their strong concern about their deteriorating environment, and give attention thereto a high Federal priority, as I certainly agree it should have.

And I suppose that the most-revealing of such samplings is still that rather recent Gallup Poll that reported 86 percent of our citizens so interviewed were "concerned"—and over 50 percent "deeply concerned"—about the condition of their natural environment; to back up which statement 3 out of every 4 so interviewed also said (whether they meant it or not) they would be willing to pay higher taxes to improve their environmental surroundings.

In any event, other "people" have addressed themselves significantly to this problem from time to time, some of the most-familiar lines being these:

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,

And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. . . .

And God said, Let there be light; and there was light,
And the evening and the morning were the first day. . . .

And God saw that it was good.

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . . .

Male and female created He them. . . . (saying),

Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. . . .

And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. . . .

And then (finally) the Lord God planted a garden eastward of Eden. . . .

My friends, I do not know what the Supreme Court's attitude might be towards my reading these verses of scripture here, in a building maintained by this educational institution, but I suspect it is all right if I do so for illustrative purposes.

The illustration I would wish to draw therefrom being, of course, that hereupon was established one of the most significant trusteeships of all time—for it was as "trustees" that we were given dominion over this small—and from outer space still lovely—portion of God's universe.

From close up, it is—unfortunately—not so beautiful!

Indicating that, from nearly every angle, we have been poor managers—trustees who, in a court of law, would probably be found delinquent!

Arthur Godfrey, whose familiar radio voice has recently been raised loudly in support of stronger conservation practices, recently suggested that perhaps the reason for our failure was that we took only one portion of the foregoing scripture as "gospel"—that portion being God's order to us to "subdue" the earth.

And, for whatever reasons, I think it is true that we Americans have always been more or less at odds with our environment.

Originally, to many of our ancestors, their environment was a hostile thing to be conquered—and to be overcome like the marauding Indians that, to them, probably seemed a part of it.

So we have had an historical impulse to overcome—the thought that from our early days the environment was like a third person to us—an object!

This fact may have made it easier for us, later, to abide the smells and the wastes of such as paper mills and tanneries—because, as someone once said, they "smelled like money!"

And of course, the fast-disappearing "elbow room" we used to enjoy made it easier for us to accept the idea that it was all right to dump our dirty water into the handiest stream so we could be both wealthy and clean, even though our downstream neighbors might thereby be rendered both poor and dirty.

But all these attitudes are rapidly changing—as we are learning to identify the land we devour—just like the waters we despoil and the air we pollute—as part of ourselves!

Learning, as Charles Ogburn, Jr., recently editorialized in "The Washington Post," that "... thanks to our vaulting technology, the fate of the continent . . . and of the life it supports, our own and that of the infinite variety of . . . plants and animals, is now largely in our hands."

And then he states—which is why I earlier turned to the Bible—"To the extent that we can desolate the earth or glorify it, we have displaced the rule of nature or, as Jefferson had it, 'nature's God'; and (at the very

least) . . . we have made ourselves the surrogates of the Supreme Power."

Precisely so, and then—as Ogburn concludes (and please listen carefully): "Along with attaining . . . breathtaking possibilities, we have shouldered awful possibilities. Supplant a king, and the functions of the king devolve upon you. Supplant a God and his, equally, are yours to discharge!"

Well—strong words, but true.

And it is thus now necessary, in such a fashion, to consider our collective responsibility for the fact that we continue to torture this once "good earth" by:

Pouring some 130 million tons of dangerous pollutants into the air each year, as a result of which—so I understand—we have been able (as if this were an accomplishment!) to raise the carbon-dioxide content of the entire earth's atmosphere by some 10 percent!

(Surely, there is some limit beyond which such a change, assuming it doesn't first choke us all to death, will alter the earth's climate, with unpredictable but distinctly unattractive possibilities to follow).

(And surely, while there is proper concern about the relationship between lung-cancer and cigarettes—and I'm no longer sure about my pipe!—there is also need for similar concern over the reputed fact that, simply by walking the streets of his city for a solid day, a New Yorker will breathe in the toxic equivalent of close to two packs of cigarettes!).

Continuing to savagely pollute almost all our major water systems, thus seriously threatening our Nation's supply of fresh water, and leaving many of our rivers systems and at least one of the Great Lakes, Lake Erie, denuded for all practical purposes of the free oxygen needed to support marine life.

(And did you ever think you would live long enough to hear of one of our Nation's rivers—the Cuyahoga, running through Cleveland into Lake Erie—so polluted that it is actually a "fire-hazard" in that it occasionally does catch fire!).

So polluting our environment with useful but, at the same time, harmful pesticides that, so I understand, the earth's biosphere—that thin, fragile envelope of air, water and land that sustains all life—is now laden with some 500 million pounds of DDT, a persistent and nearly-immortal pesticide!

(Certainly, we should have known more about the effects of such pesticides before using them in such quantities as we have!).

Throwing literally tons and tons of hot water from industrial cooling processes—along with residual radioactive particles as nuclear power-plants come into greater usage—into countless lakes, streams and estuaries, thereby upsetting that ecological balance upon which all living things depend in such an intricate, delicate state of interdependence that, seemingly, it could only ever have been ordered and devised by some Supreme Power!

And then, right here in America, by producing nearly five pounds of solid waste per person, per day—of paper, garbage, ashes, metal, glass, you name it!—some 360 billion pounds of non-biodegradables annually, for the Nation, so I am told!

(This veritable mountain of trash—that you and I help lug out to the curb on every refuse-collection day, marveling as we do so at where it all came from—stands as a monument to both our ingenuity and our affluence, and marks a far cry from that not-so-distant day when most American families ate everything that came from the corner grocery; for there were then no plastic containers, no aluminum-enclosed "TV" dinners, no cardboard bottles and, in fact, no "no return" bottles, and not even any beer cans—of which there must be a billion on the bottom of Cayuga Lake!—because everybody then so-inclined "rushed the growler"

down at the corner saloon and carried his own "bucket of suds" home with him).

And then, finally, for no discussion of our worldwide environmental challenge would be complete without mention of this, by continuing to have babies—and then more babies—blessed things though they are, but heedless of the fact that man lives, as has been said, in a finite world which can support only a finite population, so that, eventually, population growth must equal zero!

(Of all the various aspects of the worldwide environmental challenge we face, this one is probably the most-difficult with which to deal—and for obvious reasons. But as Garrett Hardin states in his penetrating analysis, "How Freedom in a Commons Brings Tragedy," that I encourage you all to get and read, it is vitally necessary for mankind, if he is to achieve the greatest good per person, to also identify and achieve the optimum population this earth's resources can support).

(No society—unfortunately not even our own—has yet done this, and no progress will come in this direction unless and until man rejects the false hope that it will happen intuitively. Instead, as Hardin suggests, man must re-examine his supposed "freedoms", including his supposed right to "occupy the commons" with his off-spring—or, else, all the direct predictions of Malthus will surely come to pass, and man could be reduced to the pitiful role of scavenger, endlessly combing the litter of a ravaged biosphere in search of scraps overlooked in prior searches by vast hordes of fellow scavengers!).

(I have no desire to frighten anyone, but I strongly suspect it is true that, no matter how we might increase our resource-management efficiency, such an effort unaccompanied by internationally practiced birth-control could only still lead that species we call "man" rapidly down a one-way road to oblivion!).

(At least, here in this Nation, some progress is being made toward a free and open political discussion of this once-tabu subject; and I am glad to be able to tell you that I am one of the sponsors in this Congress of President Nixon's proposal to establish a "National Center for Population and Family-Planning," which is, at least, a place to begin; and the voice of "the people" in support of that measure would be welcome for Congress has yet to act!).

In such terms, then, can be defined our—and the world's—environmental challenge; one made up of numerous inter-related and disparate parts, but all of which can be summed up in this fashion, borrowing now the words of Professor Richard A. Falk, of the Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences:

"The planet and mankind," he wrote, "are in grave danger of irreversible catastrophe. . . . Man may be skeptical about following the flight of the dodo into extinction, but evidence points increasingly to just such a pursuit. . . . There are four interconnected threats to the planet—wars of mass destruction, overpopulation, pollution, and the depletion of resources. They have a cumulative effect. A problem in one area renders it more difficult to solve the problems in any other area. . . . (And) the basis of all four problems is the inadequacy of the sovereign states to manage the affairs of mankind in the 20th Century (using "sovereign states" here in the sense of referring to all of our worldwide governmental institutions, of whatever nature.)!"

Where, then, do we go from here?

I can only speak with any authority at all about our own governmental institutions—and, specifically, for the United States Congress, a stubbornly sluggish and unwieldy body whose critics often charge is not responsive to the demands and needs of our time.

And, as to Congress—though "the people" as I have said are not as articulate as they

might be about demanding solutions to our environmental crises—Congress is surely listening to the background noises that signal their developing concern.

Listening, especially, to the collective voice of "the people" that seems to be repeating, with respect to wherein may lie the blame for what we have done to our once "good earth," these marvelous lines from that comic-strip character, Pogo: "We have met the enemy, and he is us!"

For the most-hopeful sign I can see on the environmental horizon is that "the people" do seem to be recognizing that it will do no good to blame our factory-owners, our paper-mill operators, those utility companies who are trying somehow to meet a demand for electrical power that is doubling every ten years, their own "town fathers" or even the Congress and those who manufacture beer-cans, for what we have done to our environment—because the blame falls upon us, all!

And that only by all working together, in a more-enlightened manner than we have so far adopted towards most of our other problems, can our environmental problems be solved—and this great challenge met.

Where do we begin?

Well, we begin, I suppose, by unscrambling some of our national priorities that have become so badly distorted not so much, for the moment, because of the threat of "wars of mass destruction," as Professor Falk put it—though that is part of it—as by this miserable and so-mistaken war in Vietnam.

I have no desire, naturally enough, to resume the arguments pro and con about that war that took place on this campus two weeks ago, but I say to you—flatly—that this war is ending, the only question now being "when" and "under what circumstances!"

That eventually will have several meanings—not the least of which is that there will be a "peace dividend," so-called, albeit of uncertain size, to add to what we normally think of as the more or less regular, Federal "growth dividend" in revenues that Congress may apply towards one or the other of our manifold domestic problems.

Once this "peace dividend" takes shape, I am sure that there will be a natural enough demand for some major portion of it to be used to give, especially, the over-burdened "middle-income" taxpayer some relief from his Federal tax share.

If—as Dr. Gallup suggested—3 out of every 4 Americans will, nevertheless, support higher—or continued, in this instance—taxes in order that something can be done about preserving and improving his environment, that is something that Congress ought to be hearing about from the "people."

Perhaps this Conference could explore possible public attitudes in this respect.

Where else might we begin?

Well, sorting out competing priorities is never an easy task—as I, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, can surely attest to—but it might make sense for us to begin our attack on cleaning up our environment by concentrating on the need for cleaner water.

I do not say this is the most severe environmental problem we face, but I would like to suggest that it is the one best lending itself to the "systems-analysis" approach, under which our technical competence in solving industrial problems could be turned loose to see what it could do, here—further developing the problem of water pollution beyond the distance we have so far gone in rather helter-skelter fashion, identifying more positively pollution sources and responsibility, and making technical comparisons of alternative methods for solution.

Another reason for choosing this one aspect of our overall pollution problem as the beginning point for the kind of national commitment that will ultimately have to be made, is that—from a political standpoint—

there is already a good "head of steam" behind the public's desire for clean water; it is cause with which people easily identify, and one that Congress, itself, has willingly and rather fully embraced.

Evidence of this abounds almost everywhere—whether it be in the form of resolutions to Congressmen from local chapters of the League of Women Voters, public referendums such as established New York's "Pure Water Authority," or in popular attitudes such as pertain in Los Angeles where, to the man in the street, water is no longer a commodity but a religion!—and has been clearly reflected in Congress.

Besides which, a good working partnership has already been created in the water-resource field between our Federal, State and local governments—indicating that, here at least, Professor Falk's "sovereign states" are endeavoring to make up for their prior management inadequacies.

For whatever it may be worth, then, perhaps this Conference would be willing to explore the wisdom (or lack thereof!) behind this suggestion—it being my further thought that, once our society learned how to successfully deal with our water-resource problem, similar problems relating to air, solid-waste disposal, and possibly even noise and crowding (lest we forget to include those in the environmental picture), might then more easily be solved.

Now, there is a hazard—I must admit—in so dividing and separating environmental problems into categorical pigeon-holes. That hazard rests on the chance that, in so doing, we might lose sight of their interrelationship and their cumulative ecological effect. It would also be unwise, I think, to assume that soil and water management practices, for instance, can—or should—be separated one from the other; as unwise, for instance, as to assume that our so-called "urban problem" can—or should—be treated separately and without reference to the nature and pace of sprawling suburban growth taking place around our cities' central cores.

Thus, let us understand that, if we begin our national commitment to a better environment by concentrating on water-resource problems, we are thinking of "water-resources" in their broader sense.

In any event, we have to begin somewhere to re-insert man into his environment, as I like to think of it, in such a way that his manner of life from now on, and the use he makes of what Ogburn called his "vaulting technology," will make him once more a part of nature—and not the antagonist thereof!

For—contrary to what a few, pure anti-technologists seem to be suggesting—I do not believe it is possible for us to send our planet back whence it came, there to be refurbished into its original, pristine condition.

To do that, would seem to mean we would have to close down our factories, shut down our electric power-plants and turn off our lights, refrigerators, toasters, air-conditioners (or, now that that it is Fall once again, our electric blankets!), while meanwhile throwing away our electric toothbrushes, can-openers and hair-dryers.

It would mean discarding even our color TV sets—and, perish the thought, learning to talk with members of our family once again.

And how about our planes and buses—and even those outboard motors we use to putt-putt up and down such as Cayuga Lake out here, with nary a thought for the unhappy fact that outboard motors, by design, actually dump overboard, unburned, anywhere from 10 percent to one-third of the mixture of the fossil fuels on which they run, thus destroying with hydro-carbons the very environment their owners so dearly love?

And how about our automobiles?

Could we ever really learn to walk again?

And finally, will we ever have to learn not to use the bathroom, now that so many of us have finally stepped up to that ultimate

luxury of having more than one such facility in our homes?

I do not believe it should be necessary to do any of these things—even provided the American people were willing to try.

For if it is true, as it is, that our ingenuity and affluence—working in conjunction with our growing technical competence—largely got us, and the world, into the environmental fix we have finally awakened to, it is not equally true that we can so use our same technical competence to find and then maintain a satisfactory and sensible accommodation between the demands of man on the one hand, and the equally urgent demands of nature on the other?

I think we have to believe that this is possible.

But, we had best get at it for we are fast running out of lead time!

We are in—as Professor Falk put it—"grave danger of irreversible catastrophe."

Let's not kid ourselves about that!

Man could follow the "flight of the dodo into extinction"—and, for far too long we have been heedlessly flying in that direction!

As President Nixon recently remarked, "Together we have damaged the environment"; but then he declared, "together we can improve it!"

And, together, I have to believe, we can take man off the list of "endangered species."

We can, if wish to do so—and there is a cause here we can all serve; one more permanent and far-reaching than any other issue of the day, including Vietnam and Black Power, and thus one that ought to be attractive to our young people who so often seem, to us, to be "marching to different drums" than we ever heard. For, through their enlistment in this cause, it could well be their generation that breaks the historical chain that has made it the lot of every succeeding generation since Cain and Abel to come into a world that could have been a paradise if the people over thirty hadn't spoiled it!

And, surely, we have to believe we can rise to the environmental challenge we face—monumental though it be—once "the people" of this planet willingly understand once again that they live on it not as possessors, but as tenants and trustees, and that they therefore have obligations towards the human race that go beyond their immediate acquaintance with it or their immediate concerns . . . and that there are things before which they should be humble!

DESIGNATE ILLINOIS HIGHWAY IN HONOR OF SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to join with our State's two Senators, Senator PERCY and Senator SMITH, in offering legislation that would designate that part of Interstate Highway 74 which runs through the State of Illinois as the "Everett McKinley Dirksen Highway."

From the east the highway enters our State at Danville, Ill. on the Indiana border, follows a diagonal course from the southeast to the northwest, leaving our State at the Iowa border in the Quad-Cities area. Following this path, the highway passes through the Peoria-Pekin area where Senator Dirksen was born and where he grew up.

The city council of my hometown, Peoria, Ill., has petitioned the State of Illinois to honor our dear friend and beloved colleague, the late Senate minority leader, and certainly I think it is most appropriate that travelers entering our State by automobile or bus from either the east or west should see the name of one of our most famous Illinois sons on the road signs as they enter our State.

He was indeed a national figure and to see his name will remind those passing through our State of his distinctive appearance, his magnificent voice, his unique style of oratory, his wonderful sense of humor and, most importantly of all, his massive contribution to the progress and welfare of our system of government over a 40-year period of public service. To be so reminded will make their trip through our State a pleasant journey, indeed, and will help keep alive the memory of this great man who was so loved and respected by millions of Americans.

ADVICE TO FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, my concern for American fighting men listed as missing in action or as prisoners of war in Vietnam continues to grow. I am co-sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 334, regarding treatment of prisoners by North Vietnam, and I have spoken out many times of my grave concern for our men.

But, another step that can be taken has come to my attention which might help these men. The Air Force Association has suggested writing the Ambassadors of nations which might influence Vietnam, and to newspapers. The following is the AFA's recommendation:

AMBASSADORS

Mr. Thay Sok, Charge d'Affairs, Embassy of Cambodia, 4500 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20011.

His Excellency Charles Lucet, Embassy of France, 2535 Belmont Road, N.W., Washington 20008.

His Excellency Nawab Ali Yavar Jung, Embassy of India, 2107 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 20008.

His Excellency Jerzy Michalowski, Embassy of Polish Peoples Republic, 2640 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 20009.

His Excellency Corneliu Bogdan, Embassy of Socialist Republic of Romania, 1607 Twenty-third Street, N.W., Washington 20008.

His Excellency Hubert de Besche, Embassy of Sweden, 2249 R Street, N.W., Washington 20008.

His Excellency Anatoly F. Dobrynin, Embassy of USSR, 1125 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 20036.

OTHERS AND COST OF AIR MAIL LETTER

Agence Khmere Presse, Ministry of Information, Phnom Penh, Cambodia (25 cents).

Times of India, New Delhi 1, India (25 cents).

Pravda, Moscow A-47, U.S.S.R. (25 cents).

LeMonde, Paris 8, France (20 cents).

Zycie Warszawy, Warsaw, Poland (20 cents).

Romania Libera, Bucharest, Romania (20 cents).

Svenska Dagbladet, Stockholm, Sweden (20 cents).

Xuan Thuy, North Vietnam Delegation, Paris Peace Talks, Paris France (20 cents).

Now, what should be said in these letters? Ask that their nations intercede for proper treatment of our men. Ask that their governments use their influence with North Vietnam to live up to the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war. Point out that no American wants us to withdraw from Vietnam if it means leaving these men at the mercy of North Vietnam.

Say it in your own words. Keep it simple. Remember, the translators of these letters may not have large English vocabularies.

Pressure such as this, plus that from organizations such as the Reunite Our Families Groups now forming around the country, plus our prayers can only help in this struggle to obtain information on our missing and captured military men.

AGNEW HAS RIGHT TO OPINION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the reaction to Vice President AGNEW's recent speeches has been almost hysterical in some quarters of the news media and to balance that view I insert an editorial from the November 24, 1969, edition of the Peoria Journal Star in the RECORD at this point.

AGNEW TOO HAS RIGHT TO OPINION (By C. L. Dancey)

Let it be known that we do not join in the attitude that characterizes Vice President AGNEW's two recent speeches as "attacks on the press".

This approach whether by NBC, CBS, ABC, or the Associated Press, seems to us an oversensitivity that has greatly strained their journalistic judgment.

It has become increasingly clear that the vice president neither seeks "censorship" nor even anti-trust actions, and is not attacking the press but doing something the press has a great obligation to do itself—defend people's "right to know."

People do have a "right to know" that there are link-ups between "different" news media, TV-newspapers-news magazine, where such links exist. They have a right to know that they are getting the "same opinion" from several apparently different sources that are not really different in terms of the source of their policy.

In his first speech, Agnew asked, "Who are these people?" (The anonymous policy makers actually in charge of the production of TV news shows.)

SAME BOSS, SAME LINE

In his second speech, he was specific in pointing out some of these multi-ownerships of complementary media that are "peddling the same line" in several ways out of Washington and New York . . . because they have the same boss.

He made it abundantly clear that he does not propose anything resembling censorship, that he does not deny their right to an opinion, and indicated that his philosophy

doesn't even lean toward pursuing the liberal thrust toward breaking up such combinations of ownership. (A thrust sometimes surprisingly feeble in regard to the networks on TV, compared to former movie networks.)

He simply insists on his right to criticize the critics, with facts, and the people's "right to know" about these combinations. To over-react to the point of transforming this into "attacks on the press" and "threats" and "censorship" is to dodge the issue, or simply panic.

Throughout both talks, Mr. Agnew has been emphasizing the need for more information, not less—and for fairer and fuller treatment of all sides, not one side.

Far from seeking to restrict, he raises the real question of whether some of the restriction has already been overdone.

CRITICISM FAIR FOR ALL

We sympathize with him. We think the press is subject to the same criticism it so freely dishes out—and for a decade the "Forum" as well as news columns of this paper have borne this out very heavily.

We believe in "balance", and in addition to our news columns our editorial page commentators include a running mixture of "right wing," left liberals, and "uncommitteds."

We don't think this is such a frightful and terrible thing to ask of others. Neither is it terrible to ask for the best job humanly possible of separating news from editorial comment, and making it clear which is which.

The terrible fuss this creates in some areas is more damning in itself, than anything Spiro Agnew has said.

Immunity from criticism was never part of "freedom of the press," and being subject to criticism does not constitute an abridgment of that freedom.

This is the same absurd approach taken by some of the New Left who insist on their right to attack everything in sight, and protest that nobody can criticize them for it without "violating" their "Freedom of expression!"

Freedom cuts both ways.

We should be the last ones to protest that our freedom is so sacred it obliges other people, including the vice president, to keep his mouth shut about us.

As far as we're concerned, Spiro Agnew can go on "telling it like it is," getting down to the "nitty gritty," and standing up for his rights . . . and for our "right to know" more than what some of the "Eastern establishment" is putting out these days.

MARYLAND STATE BAR ASSOCIATION OPPOSES MURPHY AMENDMENT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, on November 6, 1969, the board of governors of the Maryland State Bar Association adopted a resolution opposing the Murphy amendment to the OEO authorization bill. That amendment would give State governors veto authority over OEO-financed legal services programs.

I know the outstanding job legal services attorneys are doing in Maryland and throughout the Nation. They are working diligently to provide equal justice for the poor. To reward their efforts with the ill-considered restriction proposed in the Murphy amendment would mean the end

of the most successful program we have seen in the antipoverty effort.

I join the Maryland State Bar Association in opposing the Murphy amendment, and I will oppose any other amendment which might limit the right of legal services attorneys to give indigent clients the same vigorous and effective representation more fortunate citizens expect from the profession. The November 6, 1969, resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Maryland State Bar Association is herewith included in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE MARYLAND STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 6, 1969

Whereas, the adoption by the United States Senate of an amendment to S. 3016 seeks to place in the hands of the Governors of the various States a power of veto over the activities of Legal Services Programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity; and

Whereas, such veto power will permit state officials to circumscribe and to frustrate efforts of the Bar devoted towards providing full and effective legal services to the poor by providing full access to the independent professional services of a lawyer of integrity and competence; and

Whereas, such limitations will impair the ability of legal services programs to respond properly to the needs of the poor and constitute oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the client:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Maryland State Bar Association is opposed to the "Murphy Amendment" to Senate Bill 3016.

VIETNAM INCIDENT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the reports of the My Lai massacre in South Vietnam, almost 2 years ago, are among the gravest charges ever made against America.

I urge a complete investigation of these charges.

In an emotion-charged situation such as this, it is important that we do not prejudge our country's actions nor the actions nor activities of our soldiers.

However, the stories out of Vietnam and here at home on this incident are so arresting and are so at variance with the traditions, principles, ideals, and philosophy of the American Government and the American people that every effort should be made to ferret out the true facts, being sure that we do not confuse propaganda on either side.

If our investigations point to the truth of these terrible allegations, we must admit our error and do whatever is necessary to see that we do not ever again do violence to our tradition, our principles and the philosophy that has made us a great nation.

We must constantly be on guard that we do not dehumanize our society.

There is no excuse in God's world for such a thing to have happened, but if it has, we must insist on justice being done to those responsible for this reprehensible act.

VETERANS DAY

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, this past Veterans Day saw thousands of speakers in every corner of the Nation rising in praise of the fighting men of this Nation, past and present. One of the most moving of these was given by Senator John Parker, minority leader of the General Court of Massachusetts.

John Parker spoke in the historic Hall of Flags, in the center of Boston's ancient statehouse. His message is so moving that I felt it was worth sharing with the readers of the RECORD.

It follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATE MINORITY LEADER, SENATOR JOHN F. PARKER, TAUNTON, STATEHOUSE, BOSTON, VETERANS DAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1969

December 22, 1865, was a long, long time ago—104 years, to be exact.

It was a cold, crisp day here in Boston, but along the sidewalks thousands and thousands of people huddled against the wind as it swept across Boston Common and they looked up at this great State House decorated with bunting from top to bottom, standing here majestically high on Beacon Hill, buzzing with activity as never before, its corridors crowded with citizens, officials, military men and others.

December 22d was a very special day for this Commonwealth, a day unlike any ever seen before or since. It was the long-awaited day when the battle flags came home here to safe harbor in the halls of this splendid old building.

It was the day when those who fought through more than four years of terrible Civil War marched proudly under their colors for the last time—eight months after Lee had surrendered at Appomattox. They had come here with their beloved Massachusetts regiments and other military units to mount these steps to Doric Hall and stand smartly at attention as the flags under which they had fought from Bull Run to Gettysburg, Cold Harbor, Richmond, Atlanta and beyond were returned to Governor John Andrew and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

No human being, either Union soldier or civilian, is still alive who remembers that magnificent day. But it is recorded that the awesome spectacle of more than 65 Massachusetts regiments—individual light and heavy artillery batteries, the cavalry, naval units, and the like—marching up Tremont Street into Park Street, up the hill to the State House to turn over their colors, left an impression that never could be matched.

The sheer emotion of that day, the drum beats, the stirring band music, could not be captured in the mere print of a newspaper, but it is a fact that for heart-tugging drama and the surge of patriotism, that brisk December day was the high point of this Commonwealth's military history.

One by one each unit swung along Tremont Street into Park Street, their regimental colors flying proudly in the breeze. And it was the wind that brought home to the assembled thousands what these battle flags had been through. As the colors whipped on their standards, the people saw the huge holes rent by shot and shell, the bloodstains, the rips and tears, the mud, dirt, and grime of combat, and the inscriptions on each regimental flag which conveyed the feelings and attitudes of those who carried them into battle—such inscriptions as "Fidelity to

duty, whenever it may call . . . wherever it may lead . . ." the motto of Co. G, 7th Bristol County Regiment from my home town.

Brevet-Colonel Francis N. Clarke, United States Mustering Officer, was in charge of proceedings that day. It was his duty to turn over the flags to Major General Darius N. Couch, artillery hero of the Civil War, from my home town of Taunton. He would accept the flags from the color bearers and in turn pass them along to Governor Andrew.

Colonel Clarke was brief, for it was no day for long speeches. He said simply to General Couch: "These colors become the property of the state to be placed in her archives . . . there to remain as emblems of victory and a re-established union to the fidelity of her Governor . . . and the courage, devotion and honor of her sons . . ."

General Couch was equally brief in accepting the colors. He responded in part: "It is with deep emotion that I receive from your hands these eloquent emblems of the bravery and patriotic devotion to their country of Massachusetts soldiers. The object for which they were first unfurled has been accomplished, and the principles they symbolize triumphantly underscored and the Union of States restored upon a firm and enduring basis . . ."

You may notice above, the painting of Governor Andrew as he stands at the top of the stone steps leading to Doric Hall and accepts the flags of his beloved Massachusetts regiments. No more would these banners look down on the awful carnage of war, hear the agonizing cries of the dying, or soak up the blood of the fallen or be picked from the ground and raised on high as the heat of battle struck down color bearer after color bearer. These precious rallying points were home at last. They would now become silent sentinels here at the State House.

As Governor Andrew spoke, the vast throng stood in silence. He told of 146,000 men who went off to the Civil War, 13,000 of whom died, the loss of 16 million dollars in treasure to the state and, choking with emotion, he said: "I accept these flags in behalf of the people and the government. They will be preserved and cherished amid all the vicissitudes of the future as mementoes of brave men and noble actions. They represent proud memories of many fields, sweet memories alike of valor and friendship, of fallen brothers and sons. They will remain here as exultant memories of the great and final victories of our country, our Union, and the righteous cause."

Then Governor Andrew accepted one by one, the battered regimental colors. As all the emotion of four and one-half years of war reached its final moments, the people and the soldiers wept openly.

And the battle flags, the regimental colors, in all their grime and glory, they wept, too.

Now, as I stated in my opening remarks, all of this took place 104 years ago, December 22, 1865, and every single one of those who stood here at the State House that day, soldier and civilian alike, has gone from our midst. All that remains are these silent sentinels of days and nights of sacrifice and glory. They were joined by other flags from other conflicts, until now there are more than 300 priceless relics behind these glass enclosures, each weeping softly on this Veterans Day for the men who rallied to their splendor and who are gone from this earth.

They weep softly today, these flags, for past glories, to be sure, but in the midnight silence of this sacred Hall of Flags it must be that they weep more loudly and rustle their folds in despair at what they know is happening beyond these walls across this beloved land, yes, and across the world, and even no more than a stone's throw from this very Hall of Flags.

They weep, these banners, that dissent in many cases has now come license. The frenzy of unbridled dissent is polluting America with its defiance, bitterness, hatred, and

floods of four-letter words that would make an old Civil War Sergeant cringe and shake his head.

Yes, they weep, these standards, at the thing called confrontation and the sad news that Americans burn, desecrate and stamp on American flags, caring nothing that the Stars and Stripes should be held in reverence second only to God. They become nauseated, these emblems, that the disgraceful spectacle of a North Vietnamese flag should dishonor the hallowed ground of Boston Common and Copley Square. Only in America could this happen and in the name of rights and protection of the law.

On this Veterans Day, the flags weep at the naivete of certain persons of all ages and certain of those in places of great political, intellectual, and academic responsibility who cry out that all will be well if we simply trust our enemies and stand naked before them, taking no stock of the age-old warning that eternal vigilance is the price one must pay for liberty. Is it any wonder the flags weep in this sacred chamber?

They weep on this Veterans Day for the awful blunders of Vietnam that involved this nation in a land war in Asia some eight years ago and which has dragged on mercilessly, longer than any conflict in our history.

They weep for the sincerely troubled and stable segments of our youth who deeply believe as commonsense Americans that this nation's foreign policy should not be based on pleasing only those who take to the streets.

They weep in appreciation and prayer for those who work to extricate America from its involvement in Vietnam, knowing that the answers are always easier on the street corners and on the sidelines than they are in the cold, hard realities men must face who are charged with the responsibilities of ending this war and who fervently wish to do so without dipping the American flag in abject surrender and humiliation, and with a guarantee that the whole security of this nation does not crumble in the bargain.

Beyond the tears, if these honored flags could but speak today, they would remind us that because we are Americans, we must look out upon the vast and beautiful resources which God has given us with a deep sense of appreciation for our heritage. They would remind us that we have enemies within and without who would deprive us of those treasures and spread ruin upon our cities and towns, destroy our churches and our institutions, make a shambles of our achievements and the ideals for which they went into battle.

They would tell us that we must believe in material, moral and spiritual strength and that they are inseparable, or we have no nation.

They would tell us to give thanks to Almighty God for the Blessings of the past and pray earnestly that we may be worthy to seek a continuation of His bounties for the future.

In this hour of terrible division in our nation, and as the line grows thinner between democracy and anarchy, these flags would remind us that they will continue to weep unless we, the vigilant and quiet Americans, give full support to our country, our people, and our government in the search for a lasting peace at home and abroad.

VIETNAM VETERAN RETURNS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Charles Harford, a fine young man

from Baltimore, Md., has just returned from Vietnam after 14½ months of service there. The 20-year-old soldier was stationed in Duc Pho. While in Vietnam he was awarded the Purple Heart, the Vietnam Service Medal and the Medal of the Vietnam Republic.

Charles Harford has completed his service obligation and will be entering the construction industry.

THE SMUT EXPLOSION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore News American in its issues of November carried a timely and useful series of three articles by Ralph Mahoney entitled "The Smut Explosion." Detailing the efforts of the organization, Morality in Media, a group which represents all religious faiths, professions, business, and industry, Mr. Mahoney's account is indeed encouraging that responsible measures are being taken to counter the proliferation of obscene and pornographic materials in this country.

Part 2 of the series reports on the efforts of the American Civil Liberties Union—ACLU—and the role it is playing in defending the smut peddlers and their constitutional rights. As I have observed in the past, the ACLU consistently fails to draw the line between liberty and license, and, as they state in their own publication the first amendment covers all forms of expression.

Morality in Media is headed by Father Morton A. Hill, S.J., who helped to organize a community effort to combat the smut threat under the title of "Operation Yorkville." Father Hill's experience in this field was largely responsible for his appointment to the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography which is presently exploring this problem. As I have also pointed out in the past, it hoped that the Commission produces worthwhile recommendations in its final report although the chairman and the legal council are members of the above-mentioned ACLU.

Accolades are in order to the Baltimore News American and particularly to Mr. Ralph Mahoney for making available to the public these three informative articles on the smut problem. To help further disseminate the series, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Baltimore News American, Nov. 16, 1969]

THE SMUT EXPLOSION—PART 1: FILTH PEDDLERS HIRE TOP ATTORNEYS (By Ralph Mahoney)

NEW YORK.—From a cramped, walk-up office on New York's upper east side, an interfaith group is waging a determined attack on one of the major social problems of our times—the tidal wave of hard-core pornography flooding the nation's newsstands, book counters and theaters.

It is an uneven struggle.

The meager resources of the organization, Morality in Media Inc., are pitted against a

smut industry estimated presently to gross in excess of \$2 billion a year.

The filth peddlers can afford the best legal talent in the country and the American Civil Liberties Union is their constant friend in court.

On the other hand, Morality in Media is repeatedly disarmed by the courts which can not make up their minds over what, legally, constitutes obscenity. Their indecision, in turn, discourages law enforcement agencies from joining with the community in keeping the prurient trash from reaching the young.

Despite the setbacks Morality in Media has suffered over the years, the community group is working to expand its program across the nation. In time, MM hope to have regional offices on an approximate footing with its ubiquitous adversary—the CLU.

"We believe people are finally waking up to the terrible threat of obscene printed materials and films to the lives of our young people," said the Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., president of MM.

"There is no question in the minds of most of our law enforcement officials and behavioral scientists that smut, particularly the dreadful examples now being openly circulated, is inciting youth to violence, promiscuity, perversion and drug use."

Displaying a number of publications which, in photographs and print, advocated unbridled sexuality and perversion, Father Hill said:

"By no standards can this degrading material be construed as art or literature, whatever the courts might say about so-called redeeming social qualities. Between 75 and 90 percent of these publications find their way into the curious hands of children."

"Added to this is the new wave of 'underground' publications, specifically addressed to teenagers, which frankly encourage them in sexual and drug experimentation."

Father Hill, soft-spoken priest with crew-cut white hair, has been active in the war on smut since 1962 when he helped organize a community group called "Operation Yorkville"—the forerunner of Morality in Media.

Operation Yorkville sought the co-operation of news and bookstore owners in halting the circulation of pornography among youths and children. With the opening of offices in commercial quarters in 1966, the group became the first full-time, professionally staffed organization of its kind.

Serving with Father Hill as executives of MM are Rabbi Julius G. Neumann, board chairman, the Revs. Constantine Volaitis and R. N. Usher-Wilson as vice-presidents, and the Rev. R. E. Wiltenburg, director. The 27-man board represents all faiths, professions, business and industry.

Father Hill defined MM as "... people ... the community expressing its concern in order to inhibit the flow of obscene material to youth."

"All obscenity laws are based on community standards," he said, "and the voice of the community can make itself heard by law enforcement officials, in legislative chambers, by media makers and even by the courts—if it is a strong, continuous, reasoned voice."

In addition to keeping authorities posted on community opinion, MM maintains contact with the media, police and the district attorneys' offices and provides witnesses in court actions involving accused smut peddlers and publishers.

Father Hill made it clear, however, that MM is not permeated by any prudery which demands censorship of all references to the human anatomy or sexual functions.

"We do not believe in censorship or prior restraint," the priest said firmly. "We believe in free expression—in the free expression of all the people."

"We do not believe this freedom is the exclusive province of producers, publishers, authors and a handful of media makers. We

believe it belongs also to viewers, readers, listeners—to the community."

"And we believe the ACLU is absolutely wrong in seeking to protect under the first amendment any and all writings that deal with sex, no matter in what manner portrayed."

"The willingness of the ACLU to come to the defense of even the professedly obscene makes them extremists like the very 'blue noses' they condemn."

"Reasonable men must find sanity somewhere in between."

The principal aim of MM, Father Hill insisted, is the protection of youth from the degradations openly expoused in the rank magazines, newspapers and films currently inundating the nation.

"Make no mistake about it," he said, "smut is big business."

"So big, in fact, that we understand that the Mafia is starting to move into the market."

"Our legal panel recently received reports that the Mafia is buying up huge quantities of pornographic books and films in Denmark—where there are no anti-smut laws—and unloading them in this country at fat profits."

The Mafia shrewdly discovered there is as much money to be made with this filth as with narcotics—and at a comparatively minimum risk of penalty."

[From the Baltimore News American, Nov. 17, 1969]

THE SMUT EXPLOSION—PART 2: ACLU DEFENDS FILTH PEDDLERS (By Ralph Mahoney)

NEW YORK.—Almost any accused publisher or peddler of hard-core pornography who gets arrested in this country can count on the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to send him a defense lawyer.

The Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., president of Morality in Media Inc., an interfaith group fighting the flow of obscene books and films to youth, said he feels this readiness to defend pornographers—and with such success—is speeding the undermining of authority so prevalent in the nation.

Over the past seven years that Father Hill has been prominently identified with the campaign against smut, he has tangled with the various units of the ACLU many times.

"With its tremendous financial resources, its regional and state offices, the ACLU can afford to exhaust every legal means of delaying, prolonging and appealing every smut case in which it is involved—to the detriment of the community and its youth," Father Hill said.

"The ACLU undertakes these cases with the avowed intention of protecting the rights of individuals and enforcing the free speech guarantees of the First Amendment. But in the light of our experience, it is pretty hard to reconcile such lofty aims with the results."

Father Hill noted that in addition to protecting the pornographer, and permitting him to go on his way of polluting the minds of youth, the ACLU often is found working in behalf of other individuals and causes that could contribute to the breakdown of legal authority.

Ticking off the issues supported by the ACLU over the years, Father Hill cited the defense of accused communists, draft card burners, and the advocacy of civilian-manned police review boards.

The Jesuit priest said the ACLU also has been in the forefront of moves to legalize abortion and homosexuality between consenting adults.

The inconsistency between the ACLU's announced aims and the type of litigation it pursues was the subject of a series of articles written for Barron's the financial newspaper, by Shirley Scheibla two years ago.

These articles, cited by Father Hill, noted that attorneys from ACLU units often represented individuals who sued officials for attempting to quell or prevent riots in the cities even though those disturbances resulted in death, injury and property destruction.

"The cases ACLU refuses to take are just as significant as those it does handle," Mrs. Scheibla wrote.

"It has refused to defend right-to-work laws. It also has turned down a request to protect the civil liberties of one group of Washington, D.C., merchants whose businesses were destroyed by riots.

"According to ACLU, holding federally funded 'Head Start' classes in churches and having Catholic nuns as teachers of such classes does not violate the constitutional separation of church and state.

"Yet it has argued in court that church-and-state separation is violated by inserting the phrase 'under God' in the oath of allegiance."

Mrs. Scheibla said the record shows ACLU clearly prefers to defend leftist causes.

But when it suits its purpose, ACLU will defend a radical rightist, she said. In one such case, the group defended the Ku Klux Klan against an attempt by the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate it—because the ACLU opposed the committee and wanted it abolished.

Father Hill said that in pornography cases, the ACLU has maintained it must be proved there is a "clear and present danger" that the material will cause anti-social (criminal) conduct on the part of the persons who view or read it.

"Such a direct link is, of course, difficult to prove in a specific case and the ACLU knows it," Father Hill said. "It is a way of clouding the issue and confusing the court." In an explanation of its own position on obscenity, published in a pamphlet entitled "Obscenity and Censorship," the ACLU declared that the First Amendment "covers all forms of expression."

While recognizing the concern of parents, clergymen and the community about obscene material, the ACLU insisted the right of expression under the First Amendment is "too frequently abridged under the vague and uncertain standards of obscenity which now operate."

In one pornography case it defended, the ACLU argued: "The use of materials to advocate a change in 'public morality' should be constitutionally protected in order to prevent a far greater evil—the enforced imposition by society of conformity in thoughts and ideas."

On the other hand, Father Hill pointed out that law enforcement officers have found evidence that rapists, sex offenders and drug addicts have been influenced by pornographic books and films.

Arrests of such individuals invariably are followed by the discovery of virtual libraries of pornography squirreled away in the offenders' homes, he said.

To the argument of pornography's defenders that there is "no proof" of its connection with anti-social behavior, Father Hill quoted Dr. Max Levin, a noted psychiatrist and neurologist, who said:

"Can anyone imagine that healthy attitudes (can be) promoted in the youngster who devours the sadistic paperbacks in which the beautiful blonde is raped, stabbed and viciously dismembered?"

"The gravest charge against pornography is not its connection . . . with rape or some other spectacular crime that reaches the headlines. The gravest charge is the damage it does to the youngster's image of sex.

"Pornography must be weighed in the scale of human values. Does it elevate, or does it degrade the human spirit? Does it enrich, or does it impoverish our society?"

[From the Baltimore News American, Nov. 18, 1969]

THE SMUT EXPLOSION—PART 3: PUBLIC PRESSING CONGRESS ON SMUT

(By Ralph Mahoney)

NEW YORK.—Emboldened by favorable court decisions and the general atmosphere of permissiveness, the smut peddlers are in a dizzying race to flood the country with wares even more shocking than their products of only a year ago.

Newsstands and book stores now abound with publications whose illustration and printed material go far beyond explicit nudity and sexuality to glorify the most execrable perversions, including sado-masochism.

So arrogant have the merchants of filth become that they are now bombarding homes with unsolicited brochures advertising their products—brochures displaying, in expensive color, samples of the books and films they are selling.

One effect of this lewd barrage has been to awaken people to a warning sounded seven years ago by the Rev. Morton A. Hill, S. J., president of Morality in Media, Inc.—that the smut peddler, like a dope pusher, spares nobody in his determination to degrade and corrupt the innocent, at a price.

Father Hill, whose war on the smut industry led to his appointment last year as a member of the presidential commission on obscenity and pornography, said:

"Scarcely a day goes by without a letter from a concerned parent about obscene material being received in the mail."

And at a press conference last August, a visibly concerned President Nixon reported:

"American homes are being bombarded with the largest volume of sex-oriented mail in history . . . mothers and fathers are asking federal assistance to protect their children from exposure to erotic publications."

In September, Pope Paul VI called on Roman Catholics to combat eroticism which he said had reached epidemic proportions.

He told his weekly general audience that human dignity was being offended by "the very grave and insidious" threat of eroticism "which has become epidemic and aggressive, pushed to unbridled and repulsive expressions, public and advertised."

The avalanche of obscenity on the stage, in the films and in published works, even moved the brilliant and sophisticated essayist and author, Marya Mannes, to protest.

Writing in McCall's magazine in September, Miss Mannes wearily concluded:

"We have, in short, now reached a state in our society when anything goes, where all is permitted, and where no limits are placed on the appetites of the individual, on the gratification of his desires and fantasies . . .

"Sadistic pornography is an act of violence against sex. It is the violation and abuse of the body of a man or woman, totally foreign to the act of love. Obscenity for its own sake—or the sake of shock—is an act of violence against language. Both are perversions and diminutions of the human spirit. Both are ugly.

"Yet even if this is so—and I firmly believe it to be—it not only is much simpler but more popular in today's climate to champion freedom than to counsel restraint and much more difficult to define social good than individual liberty.

"What concerns me, in fact, is the virulence with which any talk of restraint is immediately equated with censorship, with which any reservations as to freedom of expression are damned as nice-nellyisms, the last gasp of the puritan ethos, or the first heralds of the police state."

And from a critic on England's Manchester Guardian came this observation:

"The imagination can not be made the private preserve of the arts and entertainment industry, exempt from moral scrutiny

because moral consequences . . . do follow from imaginative acts."

Father Hill said the widespread revulsion finally being stirred by unbridled pornography is reflected in the demands now being made by Americans for action from their congressmen.

"At last count, about 150 anti-smut bills were reported under consideration by the House Judiciary Committee," Father Hill said. "There are at least 50 similar bills in the hoppers of other committees."

The rapidly swelling reaction to pornography is even beginning to sting the pornographers as evidenced by the savage and vicious attack leveled at Father Hill by a recent issue of a publication whose very title is so obscene that it can not be repeated here.

The attack on the priest branded him as "Nazi-oriented" and a "cowardly censorship lover."

Considering the source, Father Hill obviously felt no dismay over the name-calling.

The attack was clearly grounded on fear and that—for Father Hill—was a light at the end of a long, uphill tunnel.

ALBANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD an address delivered by our distinguished colleague WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan, on Monday, November 24, in observance of Albanian Independence Day.

We recognize Congressman BILL BROOMFIELD to be one of the outstanding members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. May I remind the Members of the House that BILL was privileged to serve as a delegate to the 1967 session of the U.N. General Assembly where he compiled an outstanding record.

In this address to the Detroit chapter of the Albanian National Front, Congressman BROOMFIELD demonstrates his tremendous grasp of the complex problems in foreign affairs. He further demonstrates the deep knowledge which he possesses of conditions affecting Albania and other Communist dominated areas. The address follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD AT ALBANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION

It is a privilege for me to join tonight with the members of the Detroit Chapter of the Albanian National Front, Balli Kombetar, and with your Secretary General and my good friend, Ekrem Bardha, to celebrate the anniversary of Albanian Independence.

It is a special pleasure because I am convinced that those of you in the Albanian-American community belong to a very special class of Americans.

As a Member of Congress, I have an opportunity to meet and speak with a broad cross-section of people from all walks of life, from diverse backgrounds, and with differing political and ideological beliefs.

Like many of you, I have been disturbed in recent years by the growing tendency on the part of some to take the greatness of this country for granted, and even to admit a sense of guilt about the prosperity we enjoy and the freedoms we possess.

Some of our young people, especially, seem to have lost sight of the relative greatness of America.

They complain that we are not a perfect society. Because we are not perfect, they somehow reason that we must destroy all that has been achieved.

That is a brand of logic I find difficult to understand.

You and I would be among the first to admit that despite 200 years of striving, we have not yet attained that ideal society. But we have made progress. And, measured against the long history of man's efforts to create a perfected society. We have come further than most.

The American system, imperfect as it is, offers a great deal to those who want to live in freedom, work at their jobs, and raise their families in peace.

But it offers even more than that.

For those dissatisfied and impatient with its shortcomings, it provides a Government responsive to change with built-in procedures for evoking that change efficiently and peacefully.

To those mostly young, unsettled Americans who tell me that the system is controlled by the Establishment and that change cannot be affected unless you are part of that Establishment. I offer the example of my own experience.

My family certainly could not claim any such distinction.

As a matter of fact, I had no idea 25 years ago that I would ever have an opportunity for a political career of any sort. Much less one that would take me to the Congress of the United States.

My father, who was a dentist, gave me little in the way of material things to sustain me in life.

But he did instill in me a deep belief in some of the simple, fundamental values which, perhaps, are not stressed often enough or firmly enough today.

It is not fashionable these days to talk about the results that can be achieved by applying the timeless virtues of hard-work, honesty, dedication to principle, and belief in the future.

Nevertheless, those were the fundamentals you and I were raised with and they have served us well over the years.

When I was a very young man, there were great opportunities. But I knew that I would have to devote my full energies and ambition to make the most of those opportunities. When I was 22, I went into business for myself—operating a small gas station.

I worked hard and put in long hours. Within a few years that small business had grown to a point where I had become involved in commercial property management.

Then, when I was 26 years old, I ran for a seat in the Michigan State Legislature and had the good fortune to be elected by 80 votes. That opportunity was due, at least in part, to the many kind people I served and came to know through my business.

The work in the Legislature was difficult and demanding, but it also contained opportunity. It led to the great responsibility of serving in the United States Congress, to acquaintances with Presidents and foreign heads of state, and eventually to service as our country's representative to the United Nations.

Those things have all happened to me in this great country. I am proud of the opportunities the American way of life has provided me and of the things I have been able to accomplish because of them.

A great many of you, I know, came to America and began building a career or a business much later in life. Yet, most of you attained success through the application of those same fundamental principles and the exercise of that same opportunity.

You represent a very special class of Americans because you have had first-hand

experience with life under a totalitarian Communist government. More than that, you and your ancestors fought for more than five centuries to preserve your identity, your heritage, and your desire for independence in a country under almost continual oppression from the Ottoman Turks.

Because you have suffered under centuries of oppression in your homeland, you can better equate the price of freedom.

Because you have lived without the blessings of prosperity, you can better explain their value.

Because you have shouldered the twin-burdens of both Soviet and Chinese-oriented communism, you can better understand the virtues of American democracy.

It is that appreciation and understanding which this country needs so badly at this moment in history—a moment marked by division and self-doubt.

These are the great strengths that you in the Albanian-American community and other groups of newer Americans have to offer the rest of us.

If every American understood as well as those of you here tonight the bitter truths about life under Communist rule, we would have fewer Americans marching in the streets waving Communist banners.

Very few, if any, sons and daughters of Albanian-Americans have been found demonstrating in protest against the American way of life.

The convictions you hold with such certainty about the values of a free and open society are very much like the convictions on which this country was founded.

Two hundred years ago, there was little doubt in the minds of men such as Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin about their determination to build and maintain a free and open society.

They fought a long and bitter war to gain independence. Many of them died defending it.

But since then, Americans have had the good fortune to live with relatively few threats to their basic way of life.

With the exceptions of the War of 1812 and the Civil War, our involvement in armed conflict with other nations largely has occurred away from our shores. That especially has been true during the last one hundred years.

Americans require constant reminders, therefore, that the blessings of liberty, like all other blessings, are costly. We need to be impressed again and again that the challenges to our way of life must be faced squarely, if that way of life is not to be eroded.

The courage and toughness of newer Americans have sustained this country throughout its history during periods of stress. Those qualities, so much in evidence in the Albanian-American community, are needed desperately again today.

I wish more Americans were familiar with the long history of oppression of the Albanian people. It is a history in which the bright light of independence has shone only briefly since the pre-Roman era. Nevertheless, that light has never been permitted to flicker and die.

For doubtful Americans there is great inspiration to be found in the heroic and determined exploits of Albania's great hero Skanderbeg.

The high value he placed upon honor, heroic death, and the virtues of a never-ending struggle against outside domination of his country can serve us well today.

Five-hundred years later, the same high qualities that characterized the life of SKANDER-BEG marked the deeds of the Albanian patriots who proclaimed their country's independence in the early years of this country.

That dedication to independence and persevering patriotism against great odds—the threads that run through all of Albania's

long history—remain the great hope for the future.

It is a hope that history will see fulfilled again.

For the one certainty in the hectic century in which we live is change. And change in a shrinking world that more and more resembles a single, small village with each new decade means an end to diversity.

The stark distinctions which now divide the governments of the free world and those of the totalitarian world must inevitably give-way.

They cannot, forever, withstand the universal desire for freedom, peace, and prosperity held by people everywhere—people who, for the first time, are fused together by the miracles of new technology, abundance, and education.

One of the greatest Americans, Abraham Lincoln, made a similar prophecy about the United States just before the Civil War more than one hundred years ago.

"A House divided against itself," Lincoln said, "cannot stand. I believe this government cannot long endure half-slave and half-free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the House to fall. But I do expect that it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other," he said.

What Lincoln said about the fate of America a century ago has meaning today in considering the future of the world.

The world cannot continue permanently "half-slave and half-free."

Freedom is stirring in every corner of the world—in Africa, in Latin America, in Asia, throughout Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union and Red China.

Soviet tanks may crush those stirrings temporarily in Czechoslovakia as they did in Hungary a few years ago. But they cannot forever hold-off the surge of ideas and the explosion of technology which are sweeping the world.

That is why it is so important for you, working through organizations such as Bal-Li Kom-Be-Tar, to preserve your culture, maintain your ideals, and honor your heritage in preparation for the day when Albanian Independence will again be a reality.

That day will be hastened by the new global foreign policy launched during the past several months by President Nixon. It is a dramatically new policy which, as it unfolds during the coming years, will reveal a recognition and deep understanding of those forces of change now unleashed in the world.

American foreign policy is always a reelection of a combination of factors. They include the philosophy and temperament of the man who is President and the mood, pressures and requirements of the moment in history in which he leads the nation.

In the case of this Administration, and in international affairs particularly, the views and experience of President Nixon and the needs of the moment are especially well blended.

This is true for several reasons.

First, Mr. Nixon is a highly-trained and sophisticated foreign affairs expert, whose professional experience goes back for a quarter of a century.

He served, for example, on the Herter Committee, which developed the Marshall Plan. In the 16 years before he assumed the Presidency—eight of them as Vice President and eight more as a private citizen—he traveled extensively and became closely acquainted with many world leaders and their problems.

Moreover, the President's political support, so representative of the broad middle body of American thought, gives him a degree of flexibility in dealing with other nations that would be denied to a President who represented either political extreme.

Mr. Nixon himself observed recently that in the past American foreign policy has been content merely to react to events as they

occurred. We have lacked, the President said, the perspective and long-range view so essential to a viable and effective global policy.

We are now taking the offensive in foreign affairs, replacing years of defensive floundering with a clearly thought-out, pragmatic and flexible approach.

This new policy recognizes the diversity of our problems and the variety of nations to which we must relate. It is a policy which has differing objectives in different contexts.

President Nixon has said he wants to open the door to a new "era of Negotiation" with the major powers of the world rather than confrontation.

But he has been careful to define "negotiation" as a two-way street characterized by hard-headed bargaining rather than airy rhetoric.

In heading into this new era, the President has said that we are prepared to "take risks for peace—but calculated risks, not foolish risks."

We will not bargain away our security for vague improvements in the "international atmosphere."

Progress in East-West relations can only come out of hard bargaining on real issues. A detente that exists only in "atmosphere" without being related to specific improvements in the relationships between the great powers is worse than no improvement at all.

It tempts us to lower our readiness, while providing no really concrete basis for reduction of tensions.

If tensions are to be genuinely lowered, progress must come in the solution of outstanding issues of a concrete nature—issues such as access to Berlin and European security; a Middle East settlement; a permanent resolution of the war in Vietnam; or in the strategic arms limitation talks.

That is a fundamental part of the new Nixon policy. But there are other facets, as well.

The President's trip around the world last summer ending with a visit to Romania offered the first outlines of some of these parallel courses.

Independent of the progress of negotiations with the other big powers, we will continue to strengthen our relations with our Friends. This was a major objective in the President's visits to Asia as well as Europe and is related closely to the fulfillment of our treaty obligations.

In Europe, for example, he repeatedly assured our NATO allies that we view the alliance as an evolving partnership, one which is capable of growing to meet changed needs.

Another facet of this new policy affects our approach to governments behind the Iron Curtain. Our dealings with those governments will be marked by a new firmness. But President Nixon's visit to Romania showed clearly that he will not miss an opportunity to capitalize on the great affection of oppressed peoples for America.

No amount of Communist propaganda could hide the outpouring of warmth with which the Romanian people greeted the President during his visit to Bucharest.

It was in reality a demonstration of warmth and understanding from the people of Romania to the people of America. The President recognized this feeling in one of his speeches when he said:

"Of all the countries I have visited, none has been more memorable than Romania. This is true because of the wonderfully heart-warming welcome we have received from the people everywhere we have gone."

"I am convinced after this visit that regardless of the differences in policies between our governments, the peoples of the world are determined to be one."

It is that deep-rooted goodwill between the people of Eastern Europe and the people of this country that the President sought to

cultivate. It remains the foundation on which our hopes for the future rest.

Maintaining that firm foundation is another reason it is so important for the United States to make good on its commitments throughout the world.

Vietnam is the immediate and crucial test of the integrity of our policy.

Many Americans, weary of the long war, question the importance of obligations incurred years ago. They point to our problems at home, problems which suffer because of resources diverted to Vietnam, and they ask why our national commitment is so important.

One answer lies in the hopes of oppressed people not only in Southeast Asia, but wherever they are in the world, including Eastern Europe.

If they are to retain their faith in the ideal of self-determination for all peoples, we must not abandon our commitment to support that ideal.

Firmness toward our commitments, realism toward change, and respect for other nations can be seen in varying combinations in all of the Administration's approaches to the problems of foreign policy.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough to you what a great difference the application of these principles of foreign policy might have had on the future of the world 25 years ago.

Had they been applied at Yalta, Stalin might not have been permitted the concessions which eventually awarded him most of Eastern Europe.

The application of these principles 25 years ago might have stirred the free world rather than allowing it to sit idly by as Stalin broke pledge after pledge made at Yalta and took over Poland and Romania as satellites.

It might have prevented an American military strategy that played into the hands of the Soviets by allowing the Russian Army to liberate Berlin and Prague.

It might not have sanctioned the overhasty withdrawal of the American armies from Europe, and the consequent creation of a power vacuum into which the Soviets moved quickly.

Such a policy might have done more than issue protests as religious leaders were persecuted, political prisoners executed, and Soviet darkness gradually enveloped Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary and Poland.

Finally, it might have handled differently the secret agreements, also drafted at Yalta, which led to the formation of the United Nations.

The concessions granted the Soviet Union in the new world organization at that conference coupled with the suspicious manner in which they were leaked to the world set the UN off on the wrong foot.

It was an unfortunate beginning from which the United Nations has never fully recovered.

For all of its shortcomings, the UN remains the boldest experiment in international organization yet attempted by man. In its 24th year, it still holds a great hope for the establishment of world order and peace and especially for the protection and preservation of small independent states.

As a principal delegate to the UN in 1967, I can confirm to you, however, that it remains a long way from attaining the ability to deal effectively with the world's problems.

One reason, as President Eisenhower warned at the opening of the 15th UN General Assembly, is that the world has failed to make a "historic decision" concerning its future.

Confronted with the development of terrifying new weapons, the opening of new frontiers in outer space, mounting difficulties in Southeast Asia, and the persistent problems of poverty, illiteracy, and disease, the President said in 1960 the world faced this urgent choice:

"We can strive to master these problems for narrow national advantage or we can begin at once to undertake a period of constructive action which will subordinate selfish interest to the general well-being of the international community."

"The United Nations," President Eisenhower continued, "is available to mankind to create just such a true world community."

My experience in the 22nd General Assembly two years ago convinced me that as we approach the new decade of the 1970s and the world's problems continue to multiply, we still have not come to grips with that "historic decision" President Eisenhower described.

The UN continues to serve as a world forum for airing the misunderstandings and grievances that threaten to fester and erupt into world conflict.

And, it remains a place where representatives of every nation can gather officially to attempt solution to delicate international problems.

But, to date, it has had little success in resolving those problems.

It has been an ineffective tool because we have put-off the decision to allow its full potential to be used as a powerful and serious instrument of world order.

We continue to approach international problems mainly from the standpoint of narrow national advantage.

This was demonstrated to me time and again in my assignment to represent the United States in debating the Communist-bloc nations' objections to the continued presence of UN troops in South Korea.

Day after day, I witnessed the deliberate and cynical use of that world forum for the purpose of personal verbal abuse and propaganda of the most primitive sort rather than for real bargaining and negotiation.

The UN is still young in terms of men's lives, younger still in comparison to the life-cycle of nations, and an infant in the long record of history.

But time is running out.

President John F. Kennedy shared President Eisenhower's deep feeling about the latent potential of the UN. But he cautioned in a speech to the General Assembly in 1961 that it was in danger of wasting that promise.

"The United Nations," President Kennedy said, "will either grow to meet the challenges of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect."

"Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn our future."

"For in the development of this organization rests the only true alternative to war—and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind."

Those words are an eloquent epitaph to a great American no longer with us."

They provide a blueprint in the quest for peace which lies ahead.

But the world organization has so far had great difficulty in following that blueprint. There is no more graphic example of this failure than the UN's inability to deal effectively with the fundamental denial of human rights to whole nations of people in Eastern Europe.

It has now been more than a quarter of a century since the Soviets launched their expansion program to swallow-up the Baltic States—each of them a great nation with a long history of individual sovereignty, culture, and history.

Yet the oppressed peoples of these nations have been rebuffed time and again in efforts to bring the focus of world attention to bear through the United Nations on their ruthless suppression under Communist rule.

That burden, carried by all of the peoples

of Eastern Europe, has fallen heaviest on Albania. For the people of your homeland have suffered under the double yoke of first Soviet oppression and now Red Chinese-oriented Communism, most regressive and insidious kind of repression.

Under the Soviets, the Albanian people were transformed into a force of slave workers, driven to obey blindly the Communist Party Line at the penalty of instant death or, worse, starvation. The systematic destruction of your country's great, traditional social values followed.

But that unbearable situation was made worse for the people of Albania when its Communist rulers chose to align with the Red Chinese.

For in doing so, they assured that the Albanian people would also be denied the benefits of the economic and scientific progress that is sweeping all of Europe and even sweeping into the Soviet-dominated regions of the East.

Despite a great deal of propaganda, there has been very little in the way of tangible expression of the relationship between Albania's Communist leaders and Red China.

Economic aid has been slow to materialize as have the technical experts promised by China to replace their Soviet counterparts. The result has been a mostly paper relationship with the Albanian people again bearing the burden of failure.

Probably the single most effective effort to call the attention of the world community to the great suffering and injustice that has become a part of the daily lives of the oppressed peoples of Europe was launched by President Eisenhower in 1959.

Mr. Eisenhower was at his best when he proclaimed Captive Nations Week urging the people of the world to "study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations."

Each year in the decade since that proclamation by President Eisenhower, an American President has issued a similar summons placing the spotlight of world attention squarely on the oppression of Eastern Europe.

During those years, as President Nixon observed during Captive Nations Week this past summer, "many things have changed in international affairs."

"The one thing," Mr. Nixon said, "that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe."

The hopes and dreams of the peoples of those nations, dashed temporarily by the Turks, World Wars, and now Communism, remain intact, rekindled and nourished by assurances from a sympathetic America.

Your task as members of the Albanian-American community must be to provide unified leadership to ensure that America never forgets the continuing, courageous struggle of your countrymen.

You have demonstrated that you not only understand that task but that you possess the ability and determination to carry it out very well, hastening the day when national independence and the full enjoyment of human rights and freedoms will again return to Albania. Thank you.

WOULD HAVE VOTED "YEA" ON INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was late arriving in the Chamber

November 18 due to a mechanical problem on the airplane in which I was traveling from Florida.

Had I been present during the vote on House Resolution 675, providing for agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on H.R. 12829, to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, I would have voted "yea."

CHINESE PROPAGANDA FOR ARAB TERRORISTS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Mao Tse-tung regime in Communist China is engaged in a very sinister propaganda campaign in the Middle East against the United States.

This regime is extolling the Arab guerrillas as fighters against the "aggression launched by U.S. imperialism and its lackey Israel in 1967."

An article in the summer 1969 issue of *Prevent World War III* published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., of New York, an international research organization, deals with some aspects of this propaganda, much of which has never been adequately publicized.

Therefore, I include this material in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE PROPAGANDA FOR ARAB TERRORISTS

Mao Tse-tung's regime in communist China has long attacked the United Nations as a "tool of imperialism and revisionism, controlled by the United States and the Soviet Union"—two powers that are the objects of Peking's most virulent dislike.

In the Middle East, Israel becomes—according to the Maoist idiom—"the stooge of U.S. imperialism," the U.S.S.R. is denounced for "consenting" to a UN ceasefire at the end of the 1967 war, and the Arab guerrillas of El Fatah are praised both for their rejection of any "political solution" that may be proposed by the Security Council and for their determination "never to lay down their arms."

POLITICS FROM A GUN BARREL

In short, Peking's foreign policy—as officially restated at the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China in April, 1969—continues to be that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." The further application of this principle in the Middle East can only be likened to pumping gasoline into an already flaming building.

Within the past six months Mao Tse-tung's government has made support of the Arab guerrillas a major theme for its propaganda. During this period no fewer than fifteen articles—plus innumerable short items—have appeared in *Peking Review*, the official English language weekly of the Peking regime, all devoted to attacks on Israel or the United States, and to praise of the Arab cause.

The April 25, 1969, issue features a story entitled "Mao Tse-tung Thought Inspires Arab People's Advance." "More and more Arab people," we are told, "through their struggle and especially through the war of aggression launched by the U.S. imperialism and its lackey Israel in 1967, have come to understand profoundly that invincible Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought is

the beacon light illuminating their road to liberation and their spiritual atom bomb in the struggle against U.S. imperialism."

Then we are given a series of purported quotations from Arab guerrilla fighters who are supposed to have been "inspired" by the Red Chinese line.

For example:

"Munir, a heroic fighter who died gloriously in battle in February, had got a set of Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung in Arabic. He treasured it dearly. . . . He often told his comrades: 'China is the most reliable friend of the Palestinian people. . . . Only by persevering in a protracted people's war can the Palestinian revolution finally defeat Zionism, which is supported by U.S. imperialism.'"

And here is another example:

"A guerrilla fighter in Al Fatah told a Hsinhua (Chinese press) correspondent . . . with deep understanding, 'Our enemy Israeli Zionism, supported by U.S. imperialism, is powerful in appearance. But inspired by Chairman Mao's teaching that all reactionaries are paper tigers, we dare to struggle and win.' . . ."

In preceding months, *Peking Review* has featured articles with such titles as: "Arab People Combat the 'Political Solution' Plot," "Arab People Are Not to be Bullied," "Rising Anti-U.S. Strength," "Daring Palestinian Guerrillas: Ever More Brilliant Battle Results," "Palestinian Armed Struggle Grows From Strength to Strength," etc.

The last article summed up the El Fatah version of "victories" against Israel. "The bombs of the Guerrillas have struck fear into the reactionary regime in Tel Aviv," we are told. "On June 22, a bomb exploded in the main lobby of Jerusalem's Ambassador Hotel. On August 18, four explosions rocked Jerusalem, and on August 21 the U.S. consulate was bombed. . . ."

SPURIOUS "VICTORIES" CLAIMED

On January 17, 1969, an article praised the fourth anniversary of the Palestine Liberation Organization (Arab League financed guerrillas) and El Fatah, presenting in detail claims of "victories" against Israel. "El Fatah released a statistical report in Cairo on January 1," we are told, which said that "in the past four years a total of 3,650 Israeli soldiers and 44 officers were killed by commando forces. . . ."

Obviously, the Chinese propagandists, like the Arabs they support, are fine practitioners of the art of exaggeration—multiplying every figure at least ten-fold. Nevertheless, the guerrillas are a grave threat to the peace of the Middle East and to the security of Israel.

PEKING'S MID-EAST AMBITION

As all the world knows by this time, some of the armament used by the PLO and El Fatah has been supplied by the Chinese Communists, although most of it is Soviet-made, delivered by way of Egypt or other pro-Moscow governments.

The suddenly increased emphasis on the Middle East appearing in Chinese Communist propaganda obviously indicates that the Peking government has decided to enlarge its participation in Arab affairs. Two years ago, Peking was one of the first capitals to receive an official "ambassador" from the Palestine Liberation Organization—and he was immediately given a large segment of time on Radio Peking for the purpose of propagandizing East Asian peoples, in support of intransigent Arab nationalism. Radio Peking has since greatly stepped up its pro-Arab agitation in broadcasts aimed toward South Asia, the Middle East and Africa.

The flowery and emotional language of Peking propaganda, unfortunately, fits in all too well with the Arab temperament, and matches the exaggerated and romanticized language of many Arab politicians. Behind any typical Peking release is the old theme that "Israel is the tool of United Nations and American imperialism"—but the text is apt

to end up, as did one recent hand-out, with a poem by a Moroccan Arab guerrilla fighter that closed with the line "Glory to the fighters who stare death in the face!"

U.N. ATTACKED

The United Nations and Ambassador Jarring's mission come in for special attack. Jarring's function is said to be "to peddle the 'political solution' swindle." *"The Soviet Union, the U.S., France and Britain were planning to send troops into the Middle East under the banner of the U.S.,"* the Arabs are warned. But, the release concludes, *"El-Fatah resolutely opposes the 'political solution' scheme and rejects all formulas, above all, the U.N. Security Council 'resolution.'"*

It is highly doubtful that Peking can effectively support the guerrillas. Meanwhile, Peking propaganda unquestionably is helping to keep the present unofficial war in the Middle East stirred up, and it certainly does much to prevent several Asian and African governments from supporting plans for peaceful solution. It is also reflected in much of the "New Left" agitation in the United States and other countries, especially on college campuses. Advocates of peaceful solutions and supporters of the United Nations must inevitably regard these developments as deeply disturbing.

(NOTE.—Except where otherwise indicated, all quotations used in the above article are from the official text of the *Peking Review*.)

AGNEW AND THE NETWORKS

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AGNEW's recent comments on the inadequacies of network TV news reporting have generated considerable response, some in agreement with and some opposed to the Vice President's views.

Two articles attributing a positive note to Mr. AGNEW's remarks appeared in the November 15 and 18, 1969, issues of the *York Dispatch*, a prominent daily newspaper in my congressional district. Because of the timeliness of these articles, I submit them to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the *New York Dispatch*, Nov. 15, 1969]

AGNEW AND THE NETWORKS

What Vice President Spiro T. Agnew had to say about the coloration of network TV news reporting has needed saying for a long time.

Selection of the news and pictures or film, clever inflection of voice, choice of nuance words—all these contribute to the "news" package.

Points of view on national issues are formed from the visual package. The choice of words in news handling is particularly important. For example, following President Nixon's speech on Vietnam earlier this month, the networks rounded up staffers to provide commentary.

Invariably, the word "failed" cropped up in their discussion. Nixon, it was said, "failed" to set a timetable for troop withdrawal. He "failed" to renounce the Saigon government.

Even one national news service, UPI, said he "failed" to do those things. The word was later changed to refused.

"Failed" whom? The expectations of peaceniks, or the desires of commentators trying to sway public opinion?

Before anybody gets carried away, the is-

sue as we see it is not censorship, but more responsibility in TV news which, it seems, involves more the emotions than the intellect.

The problem with TV news is that it strikes the viewer, makes its impact and vanishes. It can't be slowed down, mulled over and compared to the public record. The average viewer has neither the time nor the facilities for this. Yet the formation of sound judgment on issues requires more study than so-called electronic journalism is capable of giving in its news forest.

TV news has got to be straight—without a point of view—because of its fleeting nature.

Even before Agnew raised the issue, it has been apparent that TV news is both a marvelous blessing and a deceptive curse in a society afflicted with controversy. The medium, strumming the emotions, can give more dimension to Apollo—and to a Stokely Carmichael, too.

[From the *New York Dispatch*, Nov. 18, 1969]

HATCHET JOB ON AGNEW?

If you watched the Huntley-Brinkley report on Nov. 14, the evening after Vice President Spiro T. Agnew's "network news" speech, you might have formed an impression about what he means by news power.

Let's take things in sequence.

Agnew delivered his speech after the Huntley-Brinkley report the evening of Nov. 13. Channel 8, an NBC outlet, carried the Agnew speech and later that night, the rebuttal by the president of NBC, Julian Goodman.

On Friday, Nov. 14 in the last segment of the Huntley-Brinkley report, Chet Huntley noted that Agnew had criticized network TV reporting, then dwelled on the mechanics of how Agnew happened to be invited to Des Moines to talk. Nothing about what he said. Nothing relevant to the issue. Then, lo and behold, Goodman appeared on the screen once again to deliver his full-length criticism of Agnew.

No self-respecting journalist could successfully maintain that the Huntley-Brinkley report in this instance was objective. It seemed like a pure hatchet job totally lacking finesse. And since David Brinkley's absence from the show was not explained, it's just possible he didn't show because he wanted no part of the clumsy effort.

TERMINAL CONTROL AREAS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, 1969, the Federal Aviation Administration published notice 69-41, docket No. 9974 in the Federal Register. This FAA proposal would put all aircraft operating in designated airspace surrounding certain busy airports under active ground control. Such "terminal control areas" are designed to reduce the potential for midair and near midair collisions.

Since that time, the FAA has received and is considering literally hundreds of alternate proposals designed to achieve the same goal of lessening the probability of midair collisions. One such proposal, by the Massachusetts Aviation Trades Association, suggests the concept of air corridors similar to those used by the military.

Although I do not take a position on

the issue at this time, I would like to include the proposal I mentioned in the RECORD at this point. It should be viewed for what it explicitly claims to be—an alternate proposal that would still achieve the FAA safety goals embodied in notice 69-41. It follows:

MASSACHUSETTS AVIATION TRADE ASSOCIATION, Re proposal 69-41.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, Office of The General Counsel, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: This association has voted unanimously to oppose the concept of terminal control areas.

MATA is well aware of the grave need for positive control of air traffic in our "high density" air terminal areas. It is felt, however, that the circular designation of such vast areas of airspace around our terminal areas would result in a gross waste of otherwise useable airspace particularly when these restrictions might result in limited use of many of our much needed peripheral general aviation airports.

ALTERNATE PROPOSAL

This association suggests that FAA study the concept of air corridors, such as those used by the military for the past decade, along with an extension of the present control zones to 7000'. An air corridor/extended control zone plan could incorporate a series of geographic corridors to separate turbine and piston aircraft along with "GATE" type points of entry and departure. Positive control could begin and end for arriving and departing traffic in the same manner as outlined in the terminal control area plan. Such a system might even work well enough to delay the eventual need for transponders in VFR aircraft.

CONCLUSION

The alternative air corridor/extended control zone concept would provide all of the safety features created by the terminal control area plan and, at the same time, establish a minimum of positively controlled airspace. This would allow most of the peripheral general aviation airports to continue normal operations without restrictions regarding altitudes, and VFR operations. MATA feels that continued encouragement by FAA to use peripheral general aviation airports is essential to the growth of the industry and to reduce the traffic loads on the primary airports. We also realize that there is a need for positive primary airport traffic control. We feel that the alternate air corridor/extended control concept would accomplish both goals.

Yours truly,

MELBOURNE S. DORR,
President.

INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESSMAN DON EDWARDS STATEMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. Chairman: The subject before this subcommittee is a vital one, for it addresses itself to a group of Americans, forgotten and long discriminated against in a manner alien to our best traditions. I am here in support

of H.R. 8416 to establish an Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs and similar legislation to establish a cabinet committee on opportunities for Spanish-speaking people, but more importantly to support broad based Federal legislative recognition of the unique heritage and problems of Spanish-speaking people.

Let me make clear certain facts of Mexican-American life. They have done everything possible to help themselves, and they have much to offer the Anglo society. It is their sweat, sometimes their tears and their blood, which have made the fields of California, and of the entire Southwest, bloom. They have retained their culture, and their family structure, enriching our society. Today they are working very hard to obtain what is every American's rights, but they are doing so in a manner designed to strengthen and enhance their own traditions.

The Spanish speaking people, the Mexican-American, did not ask to be made a part of the United States. They were made a part of this country by force of arms, followed by treaty. The United States has not fully fulfilled the obligations of that treaty, nor has it offered full and free opportunity to the Mexican-Americans. It is time we corrected the continuing mistakes of the past. They were here first, breaking the first ground, giving names to our cities including San Jose, Santa Clara and San Francisco. The problems of the Mexican-Americans are little understood. Sadly, they even are little understood in the areas in which they live, including my own Congressional District in California.

In the City of San Jose the Mexican-American population accounts for 12.5 per cent of the people living there. Recently, I checked on Vietnam casualty figures through April of 1969 for the City of San Jose. A total of 63 young men from San Jose had died in Vietnam, of those 21 were Mexican-Americans. In other words, Mexican-Americans from San Jose are dying at a rate of almost three times that of their Anglo brothers. I mention this figure because it is indicative of a number of little understood truths about Mexican-Americans. It should not be necessary to say that they have been, and are, brave and patriotic, but false and malicious racial myths still creep out from under the rocks of our society and so make this statement necessary. It shames me to have to make it. The Vietnam casualty figure also makes clear that while many white middle class youth escape the draft through college and other doors open to them, these opportunities are not available to most of our Mexican-American young men.

There are other truths about the Mexican-Americans of California, of the Ninth Congressional District, and of San Jose. They are crowded into sium housing. The schools have often ignored their needs and their culture, and necessary correctional steps are slow and timid. They even have been denied the right to press for their wages in the traditional American pattern of collective union-management bargaining. Governments have been slow to allow them representation in the councils which decide their fate.

This bill, and other similar measures, will help them, but these bills also recognize that American can only be strong and just if it responds to and protects all segments of what should be a rich and diverse society. We need far more than just cabinet recognition of Mexican-American hardships, discrimination and problems. We need special programs, geared to the children, who come to our schools from a dual language background. We need respect for cultures other than the rather narrow white middle class culture. We need housing, and we need to

agree that every man has the right to a fair wage for the work he performs, especially if that work is in the fields which feed us.

I urge approval of this or similar legislation not because it is an end, but because it is a beginning.

THE PRICE OF UNREST

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, my city of Memphis happily has ended a time of turmoil that has disrupted many of our schools and caused great suffering to teachers and children alike.

Lest someone might think that boycotting the public schools is an effective way to make a point, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and other Americans the words of a young Memphis teacher, Mr. James Patrick. Mr. Patrick has seen what has happened and what can happen, and he had enough. He quit. His letter of resignation says, in part:

Riots, disorders, student gangs running through the halls and often into the rooms, goading students to follow, destruction of buildings, equipment, papers, books and records, destruction of efforts. I am exhausted by the frightened faces of well-meaning students and teachers, tired of reasoning with hoodlums holding bricks, of threats of operating all day behind a locked classroom door, of intimidation, of secondary insults, of having my car vandalized, my room broken into.

But most of all, I am tired of not being able to teach.

I came here not as a young idealist but certainly with hopes of exerting some positive influence. These hopes are completely depleted.

Nouns and objects of prepositions are just not relevant when a child has gone through a picket line to get into his school, been advised by adults to go home, and finally, threatened by his peers if he continues.

Lunch, even if the only hot meal of one's day, is not important if one is afraid to eat it.

This must not be read as an indictment of the Memphis system. I do not know what can be done, if anything, so I do not attempt to criticize . . . but I am convinced that I can accomplish nothing academically at Melrose . . . and therefore, I resign immediately and without notice.

I will police no more riots, I am out of patience with mob rule.

Lastly, and the saddest of all, I mention my kids. With the majority of my 90 charges, I had developed a rapport, a raceless, orderly and pleasant learning condition. That necessary condition for the learning process was destroyed several weeks ago. I hope those students do not feel too strongly that I, too, have abandoned them.

But they will have to stay, they are the victims and cannot quit as I can. And soon, unless some bigger man than I radically changes this atmosphere of unreason, they too will learn to scorn learning and righteousness. They will learn to throw bricks.

Mr. Speaker, these remarks are not from an isolated voice. They represent a clarion warning that we should all heed.

SOUTH AFRICA

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the first of this month, my colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) and I, along with Mr. BRADEMAs, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, and Mr. WHALEN, wrote letters to the presidents of 10 banks which had formed a consortium extending a \$40 million annual line of credit to the Republic of South Africa.

The credit agreement was up for renewal and our purpose in writing was to urge that the banks not continue this financial assistance to a country whose apartheid policies are repugnant to all who love freedom.

The banks involved are Bank of America, Bankers Trust Co. of New York, Chase Manhattan Bank, Chemical Bank, First National Bank of Chicago, Irving Trust Co. of New York, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., Morgan Guaranty, Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, and First National City Bank of New York.

We pointed out in our letter that "the moral question raised by such a revolving credit arrangement to the racist government of South Africa is quite clear" and that the banks have helped "to strengthen the regime in South Africa and have not served to affect that government in any positive way." The full text of the letter will be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

Just yesterday, it was announced that the Government of the Republic of South Africa had requested that the line of credit not be renewed. The Finance Minister in Pretoria stated that "The Republic's strong gold and foreign exchange position" made the credit unnecessary, and that it had not, in fact, been used for the last 3 years.

Frankly, I consider the decision more a victory for civil rights and for the cause of justice and freedom everywhere. It is a clear indication that the continued and concerted efforts of private groups and committed public officials can make a difference in an action with enormous moral significance.

The American Committee on Africa and the executive council of the Episcopal Church are two of the groups which have applied pressure on the banks for at least 4 years to refrain from financial dealings which benefit the white-minority regime in the Republic of South Africa. In addition, Mr. BINGHAM's efforts at mobilizing congressional opinion have been most valuable.

I am hopeful that these developments will be studied seriously in the White House and the State Department where a review of our policy toward Africa is now taking place.

In addition, I would hope that other private investors in South Africa will consider carefully the implications of their financial involvement in that coun-

try. In my view, financial institutions cannot be indifferent to the serious erosion of the rule of law in South Africa, the increasing denial of human rights, and the evermore rigorous enforcement of apartheid. Banks and other private investors are not, in short, absolved of responsibility for the conditions around them in South Africa.

In addition to the letter to the banks, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of the news story announcing this decision from today's New York Times:

SOUTH AFRICA DROPS BANK CREDIT IN UNITED STATES

(By Edward B. Fisk)

The Government of South Africa has disclosed that it will not renew a \$40-million credit reserve provided by American banks. The credit has drawn widespread protest from civil rights advocates and is reported to have cost the banks millions of dollars in deposits.

Demonstration leaders hailed the decision as a victory for their four-year campaign against the credit arrangement, but Owen F. DeVilliers Booysen, the South African consul general here, said that it was terminated because it was no longer necessary.

He quoted Gerald W. Browne, the Finance Minister, as saying, "Because of the republic's strong gold and foreign exchange position, credit had not been used for some three years, and it was not deemed necessary to incur the expenses of extending it."

There was no immediate comment from the financial institutions involved. A spokesman for one, the Chase Manhattan Bank, said that it would be "improper" to issue a public statement on confidential dealings with a client.

The decision involved a \$40-million revolving credit plan from 11 American banks and that expires Jan. 8. The arrangement, which has been subject to annual extensions, was initiated in December, 1949, with four banks at a figure of \$10-million.

The arrangement has been the target of frequent criticism and demonstrations by churches, civil rights leaders, students and politicians. They charged that the banks were supporting and giving moral sanction to the system of apartheid, or racial separation, in South Africa.

It was defended by the banks, however, on the ground that support of South Africa's economic progress did not constitute endorsement of her racial policies.

In reply to a stockholder's question at an annual meeting in 1967, Thomas S. Gates, then president of Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, declared that withholding of credit from the country could "work a hardship" on all of its citizens.

In addition to Chase Manhattan and Morgan Guaranty, those involved in the consortium are the Bank of America, First National City Bank, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., Bankers Trust Co., Chemical Bank, Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Co. of Chicago, First National Bank of Boston, First National Bank of Chicago and Irving Trust Co.

The Rev. George Houser, executive director of the American Committee on Africa, a 15-year old organization that has coordinated demonstrations against the credit arrangements, said yesterday that he had no direct evidence that the banks had put pressure on South Africa not to renew the credit arrangement.

He added, however, "I don't believe the Government of South Africa would have come to this decision without the pressure that was applied on the institutions themselves."

Representative Ogden Reid, Republican of Westchester, who joined Representative Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat of the Bronx,

and eight other Congressmen in sending a letter to the banks on Oct. 31 asking them to drop the credit arrangements, called the decision "a victory for civil rights."

Among those applying sanctions against the banks was the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church, which voted last spring to withdraw all funds under its control from participating institutions if the arrangement was renewed.

The Most Rev. John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the denomination, said last night that preliminary steps had been taken to shift accounts from three participating banks but that these efforts will now be abandoned.

Mr. Booysen, in quoting Mr. Browne's statement, emphasized that South Africa had not exercised its right to borrow the funds in the last three years.

TEXT OF LETTER BY REPRESENTATIVES OGDEN R. REID AND JONATHAN B. BINGHAM PLUS OTHER CONGRESSMEN TO PRESIDENTS OF 10 AMERICAN BANKS REGARDING \$40 MILLION LINE OF CREDIT TO SOUTH AFRICA, NOVEMBER 1, 1969

We the undersigned, are writing to you as president of one of the ten banks comprising the consortium which has provided the government of South Africa with an annual \$40 million line of credit.

At this time, when the agreement on the consortium loan is about to expire, we would like to join the growing number of American individuals and organizations who have been deeply concerned about this assistance to the Government of South Africa. We urge you to abstain from participation in any continuation of such a line of credit for the apartheid regime in South Africa.

First of all, the moral question raised by such a revolving credit arrangement to the racist government of South Africa is quite clear. The government of South Africa has been characterized by the International Commission of Jurists "as copying the worst features of the Stalinist regime and reducing the citizen's liberty to a degree not surpassed by the most extreme dictatorships of the Left or Right."

Second, your action has helped to strengthen the regime of South Africa (especially in 1961 and 62), and has not served to affect that government in any positive way. Since 1959, when the revolving loan was established, conditions inside South Africa have become worse. The recent General Laws Amendment, establishing a Bureau of State Security (BOSS), reflects the growing totalitarian and brutal nature of the South African regime.

Third, the assistance to South Africa by ten leading American banks is an unfortunate symbol of American collusion with apartheid to the independent, majority-ruled states of Africa. The involvement of American business and finance on the wrong side of the colour curtain in Africa will have grave consequences in the years to come with our relations with free Africa.

Fourth, the continuation of your consortium credit may tend further to alienate many Americans who find the racial policies of South Africa repugnant.

In our view, it is no answer that foreign policy is the responsibility of the United States Government and that it is not up to banks or other private institutions to act on the basis of moral judgments, when the United States Government has not asked them to do so. First we believe that any major national or international institution, albeit privately controlled, has a moral obligation to consider the implications of its actions, particularly bearing in mind the sensitivities of many of your depositors and at least some of your stockholders. Second, the United States Government does distinguish between South Africa and other countries in that it does not encourage trade, investment, or business activities in South Africa as it does elsewhere. This distinction, which is not without significance, was drawn

by Asst. Secretary Joseph Palmer before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on July 10.

We would very much appreciate hearing your views on this whole question.

LETTER FROM VIETNAM

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from a young man from my district who is now serving his second tour of duty in Vietnam. This letter merits the reading by every Member of Congress and I encourage all readers of the RECORD to think about the warning in this young man's letter.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel]

LETTER FROM VIETNAM: "WE'LL CONFRONT YOU," MARINE TELLS PROTESTERS

William Wynn, who wrote the letter below, is now on his second tour of duty in Vietnam, a matter of his own choice.

A native of Lenoir City, Wynn joined the Marine Corps in 1961 and served for three years. He re-enlisted in 1965 and served in South Vietnam from April 1966 to June 1967. He was wounded on Easter Sunday in 1967 during action near the Demilitarized Zone.

According to a member of his family, the Marine cannot disclose the nature of his present assignment in the war zone. His home address is P.O. Box 454, Lenoir City, Tenn., 37771.

Here is the letter:

"NOVEMBER 12, 1969.

"EDITOR,
"Knoxville News-Sentinel,
"Knoxville, Tenn.

"DEAR SIR: I am a Marine presently serving in Vietnam. Since I cannot personally contact the people who are 'honoring' us with a moratorium, I would like to do it through this newspaper in an open 'letter of appreciation.'

"Although I take full responsibility for this letter, the opinions, thoughts and desires expressed herein have been gleaned from numerous bull sessions, reactions to radio/TV newscasts, letters from home informing us of what is happening, and from local newspapers forwarded by our families. They come from people I know, or have known, personally, from a captain with a degree in law to a private first class who is a high school dropout. The majority, however, are between 18 and 20 years old with a high school education and definite plans for the future, whether it be college, marriage, or just working to buy a new car, I think it would behoove the American people and news media to listen and take heed to what these men have to say. These are the credentials which make me think I have the first hand knowledge to write what we feel in the following 'letter of appreciation.'

"We, the servicemen fighting in Vietnam, wish to give our 'thanks' to those 'great patriots,' Abby Hoffman and David Dellinger, who are 'leading' our country in the streets and alleys as Hanoi's fifth column in the United States; to those illustrious statesmen, Senators Fulbright, McCarthy and McGovern, who 'back' our country and its fighting men 'to the hilt' in much the same way as did Caesar's friend, Brutus; to that college fraternity, the Students for a Democratic Society, which is doing so much to preserve our rights of free speech guaranteed under the Constitution, as clearly shown by their 'court-teous' attitude when an opponent to their ideas is making a speech; and to all the other 'comrades' who are giving us so much 'loyal support,' wherever they may be.

"We have heard and seen many of the things you have done for our country and us. This letter is totally inadequate to tell you how we feel, but through 'your efforts' we may be able to soon give you our 'thanks' personally. Your words and deeds are burned into our minds and we will not forget."

"Some day we will be able to tell you 'how proud you made us' as you tore our Flag from its staff and dragged it through the streets to burn."

"Some day we will be there to listen as you tell of your 'efforts' and the 'hardships' you underwent to send your blood to North Vietnam while we wasted our blood on the soil of South Vietnam."

"Some day we will get to tell you just how 'brave we thought you were' as you stood up to the 'pigs', unarmed except for bricks, bottles and bags of human waste, to burn your draft cards."

"Some day we will be able to convey to you our 'feeling' for your battle cry, 'Hell No! We Won't Go!' which has replaced our battle cry of the past, 'I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country'."

"The name of your game is confrontation and we are coming home to confront you in the streets, in the universities, in the courts of law, in the voting booths, in Our Country. Everywhere we meet we will remember what you have done and give you our personal 'thanks.'"

"Sincerely,

"WILLIAM D. WYNN,
"U.S. Marine Corps."

PINKVILLE MASSACRE—A MORATORIUM PROJECT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the moratorium crowd continue their fifth column efforts to divide our people and disgrace our country.

The disgraceful spectacle of the news media parading our fighting men before the American people exceeds even the citizens revulsion of the alleged massacre at Pinkville. In order to gain a Communist victory in Vietnam, under the guise of peace, disloyal Americans lower themselves to any level—to make a profit or gain notoriety.

The interesting story of who, why, and how the so-called massacre has been projected into the sensitivity training project of the hour, to shock the American people against our Vietnam involvement should be of interest to those seeking answers.

The columnist, Mary McGrory, not a lukewarm supporter of the moratorium bunch, tells that the news hogging massacre story was broken by Seymour M. Hersh, a Washington freelance writer.

To subsidize his work in damaging U.S. military efforts, Mr. Hersh was able to secure a \$1,000 grant from the Philip M. Stern Foundation to cover his expenses in running down the massacre witnesses. Hersh also happens to be with the radical underground antiwar news promotion service called Dispatch.

One Richard Barnet, who spent the November 15 moratorium day celebrating in Hanoi with his friends, also happens to be on the advisory board of Dispatch.

So again we find Hanoi calling the signals for its "dear American friends" in the United States. This time we find not only that our national news media is pushing the Hanoi propaganda but that they paid to buy the "news."

Hanoi has already showed its appreciation—more U.S. casualties, more propaganda, and more infiltration.

Mr. Speaker, I include clippings concerning Hersh, Barnet, and related news items:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 25, 1969]

SILENCE GREETES VIET MASSACRES

(By Mary McGrory)

The reaction to reports of mass murder in a Vietnam village by American GIs has been outrage in London, silence in Washington and dismissal in Saigon.

The story was broken by Seymour M. Hersh, a 32-year-old Washington free-lance writer, who was brought up in Chicago's "Front Page" school of newspapering. Hersh, a fast-talking, fast-moving former Pentagon reporter, was briefly (blank) campaign press secretary, and is the author of a book about chemical and biological warfare.

Hersh is against the war, but resents a London newspaper's designation of him as a "left-wing nut." He first heard of "Pinkville" through the tip of an old friend in the Pentagon who told him early in October merely that "the Army has a man in court-martial at Fort Benning, and they have accused him of killing 75 Vietnamese civilians."

Hersh was "horrified," dropped work on a book about the Pentagon, "The Ultimate Corporation," and started out on the trail. He got the name of George W. Latimer, Calley's counsel, flew to Salt Lake City to talk to him.

He got no specifics from Latimer, only "a sense of the dimensions of the story." He applied for and got a \$1,000 grant from the Philip M. Stern Foundation for investigative journalism and started flying around the country to find sources.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 26, 1969]

TINY BUREAU'S BIG STORY: TWO MEN EXPOSED "MASSACRE"

(By Robert Walters)

Although David Obst and Seymour Hersh moved into their new office in the National Press Building two weeks ago, they still don't have any furniture. And at the rate they're preceeding, it probably will be quite a while before they're organized.

Obst and Hersh simply haven't had time for the luxury of setting up desks and chairs. Instead, they have been totally occupied with the task of almost singlehandedly investigating and publicizing one of the year's biggest news stories—the so-called "Pinkville massacre."

Hersh has been jet-hopping back and forth across the country to track down leads and piece together the story of the alleged murder of at least 109 Vietnamese in the village of My Lai by U.S. Army troops.

At the same time, Obst has been busy selling the story, telephoning newspapers in this country, Canada and England as well as hustling in and out of newspaper offices in the Press Building. He says that at one point he spent 18 consecutive hours on the telephone, talking with editors.

BACKGROUNDS SKETCHED

The backgrounds of the two young men are almost as improbable as the technique they have used to bring the story to the attention of the public—and to provoke a controversy which has spread across both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Obst, the 23-year-old son of a Los Angeles

advertising man, dropped out of a California college several years ago and traveled to Taiwan to complete his undergraduate education "because I decided I wasn't learning anything in school in this country."

He spent the past year at the University of California studying Chinese.

Hersh, 32, is a Washington-based freelance writer who started his journalistic career as a police reporter with Chicago's City News Bureau, moved quickly through a string of newspaper and wire service jobs and has spent the last few years campaigning against chemical and biological warfare.

Today, Obst is general manager and Hersh the star writer for a newly established, play-it-by-ear news bureau known as the Dispatch News Service. Its principal assets are the money earned in the past two weeks from stories about the mass killing—and the enthusiasm of its employees.

SUCCESS UNIQUE

Dispatch's success is unique because almost all news stories presented to the public in this country are developed by long-established news gathering organizations—newspapers, radio and television stations, wire services, feature syndicates, magazines and other media.

The concept of two young men working for a new and unknown organization having such success in developing a major story without the knowledge of the other media and then selling the story to scores of newspapers is virtually without precedent.

How did they do it? Hersh, who has more Pentagon sources than most of the Defense Department correspondents employed by daily newspapers, got a tip about five or six weeks ago. "It was just simply a great story," he says. "I dropped everything else I was doing and started running it down."

EDITORS CALLED

Hersh, whose non-stop style overwhelms observers even when he isn't working on something important, began to criss-cross the country in search of witnesses to the alleged massacre. By Nov. 12, he had the story in hand and Obst was ready to begin a razzle-dazzle selling job on newspaper editors, who are leery of buying stories from people they don't know.

"I called the managing editor of every major newspaper in the country," says Obst, who recalls sprawling on the floor of the barren office with his shoes off and the phone to his face for 18 straight hours.

Out of 50 papers approached, 32 in this country and four in Canada agreed to buy the first story. The story caught on, other papers wanted follow-up material, the television networks became interested, and now two national news magazines are interviewing Hersh and Obst for possible stories on their operation.

"We started with very little," says Obst. "Now, we've established a news bureau. From here on out, we intend to be a clearinghouse for good investigative reporting in this country. We're already hearing from writers who say they've got good material they couldn't publish elsewhere."

Dispatch actually started in late 1968, when Obst and another American in Taiwan, former Dartmouth student Michael Morrow, decided that conventional reporting of the Vietnam war was "concentrated on the soldiers and the politicians but paid no attention to the people."

VIETNAM REPORTED

With Obst selling the material to a handful of papers back in this country from his base in Taiwan, Morrow began his in Vietnam. He was soon joined by Donald Luce, a member of the International Voluntary Services who quit his volunteer post because he thought his work was being corrupted to help perpetuate the war.

They have recently been joined by others.

Last weekend, Dispatch sold to 15 newspapers a series by Richard Barnet, who has just returned from a visit to Hanoi. Barnet is co-director of Washington's Institute for Policy Studies, a radically oriented "think tank."

And Columbia University Prof. Seymour M. Melman, a long-time critic of this country's military policies, will soon be writing for Dispatch, says Obst.

The youthful salesman acknowledges that Dispatch has a left-of-center, anti-war tone, but insists that "we're certainly not ideologues."

"We're no more an anti-war news agency than the Chicago Tribune is a pro-war news agency."

ARMY INFORMATION

Hersh, ironically, once served as a public information officer for the Army, during a six-month active duty stint at Ft. Riley, Kan., while a reservist. With a smile, he notes that he never even made it to private 1st class.

After he was discharged from the Army, Hersh worked on a Chicago suburban newspaper, then published a paper in the same area. In 1962, he joined United Press International in Pierre, S.D., but a year later switched to the Associated Press in Chicago.

In late 1966, the AP sent Hersh to Washington, where he covered the Pentagon until resigning in the summer of 1967 to work on a book: "Chemical and Biological Warfare: America's Hidden Arsenal."

Since that time, Hersh has written a dozen magazine articles on the dangers of CBW, and has been instrumental in providing material on the subject to numerous members of Congress, including the leading House opponent of CBW.

Hersh may well have readers in high places in government. In the middle of all the controversy yesterday about the incident at My Lai, President Nixon brought a virtual end to the young writer's earlier crusade by announcing an end to the use of bacteriological weapons and stringent new controls on the use of chemical weapons.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 13, 1969]

BROADCAST PUTS AUTHOR BARNET AT HANOI TALKS

Hanoi Radio named Washington author and historian Richard J. Barnet yesterday as a participant in a meeting to register support of "massive (American) demonstrations against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam."

The meeting, in Hanoi Tuesday night, was held by the Vietnam Peace Committee and the Vietnam Committee For Solidarity With the American People. Hanoi Radio said the chairman of the latter group, identified as Prof. Hoang Minh Giam, "warmly hailed the planned massive antiwar demonstrations of the American people."

Barnet, who served in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the Kennedy administration, is co-director, with Marcus Raskin, of the Institute for Policy Studies here.

TO LEAVE FRIDAY

According to informed sources, Barnet arrived in North Vietnam last Friday, and is expected to leave there this Friday. Raskin said Barnet's mission is "to inform himself of the specific negotiating position of North Vietnam," and also to write about his trip there. Few Americans have been granted visas to enter North Vietnam in recent years.

Barnet is on the advisory board of a newly formed news agency named Dispatch, formed to provide "in-depth reporting on important issues and events for national newspapers and the collegiate press."

He has been highly critical, in writing and speaking, about U.S. policy in Vietnam. His latest book, *The Economy of Death*, is an analysis of U.S. defense spending and concepts.

REMARKS PARAPHRASED

The Hanoi broadcast identified Barnet and William Meyers (a New York attorney) as "the American lawyers delegation now visiting Vietnam." Their remarks at the meeting were reported only in paraphrased form.

Hanoi Radio said Barnet and Meyers "expressed the American people's solidarity with the juts struggle of the Vietnamese people and urged an immediate and complete withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. They affirmed that the Vietnamese people's struggle against the U.S. war is in conformity with the aspiration and interests of the American people."

Neither Barnet's associates or family here could supply any independent account of the remarks attributed to him in Hanoi. Barnet is expected back in Washington early next week.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1969]
EX-SOLDIER LOSES \$100,000 DEAL ON MYLAI PHOTOS

(By Karl E. Meyer)

NEW YORK, November 25.—Whether former Army combat photographer Ronald Haeberle actually is legal owner of pictures he took of the alleged Pinkville massacre in South Vietnam last year is a question that the courts will have to settle.

But it was established today that the 28-year-old Haeberle tried to get upwards of \$100,000 for his color photographs and then lost perhaps as much as \$80,000 of it when newspapers decided last Friday that pictures taken by an Army photographer on duty were public property.

After this commercial loss, Haeberle was more subdued than indignant, according to those with whom he was bargaining. "Whatever happens," he reportedly said, "at least I'm glad the story is out."

Haeberle at one point was also seeking \$25,000 for his eyewitness account of the alleged massacre—more than twice the \$10,000 reportedly paid by CBS to the Dispatch News Service, a free-lance Washington agency, for information leading to an interview with another witness, disabled veteran Paul Meadlo.

In his negotiations here last week, Haeberle had a ready answer for those who asked why he had waited more than a year before approaching anybody with the pictures, and on what basis he could claim the photographs as his private property.

Haeberle is said to have maintained that he had taken four rolls of black-and-white film with his Army camera when the village of Sonmy was attacked in March, 1968. Then, Haeberle explained, he took 1½ rolls of color film on his own 35 mm. camera.

The black-and-white film was reportedly turned over to his Army superiors while Haeberle kept the color for himself. He is said to have insisted that he did not keep the photographs a secret, but actually, and incredibly, used the color slides in lectures on the war that he gave in his home town of Cleveland. It was not until the story surfaced that he became aware of the potential commercial value of the pictures, he told prospective buyers.

Haeberle could not be reached today for comment, and presumably he will give his own version of all this in the forthcoming issue of Life magazine, which has purchased his pictures for an estimated sum of more than \$20,000.

However, it was possible to make this reconstruction of the photographer's singular odyssey by talking with media executives with whom Haeberle talked.

Haeberle turned up in Manhattan last Wednesday at the Gotham Hotel, accompanied by Joseph Eszterhas, a Cleveland Plain Dealer staff member who was acting as the photographer's agent and adviser.

The pair was interested in selling the world rights for both the pictures and Haeberle's

eyewitness account, but found that Life was interested in only buying North American rights.

On Thursday, Haeberle and Eszterhas were approached by a foreign bidder, Associated Newspapers Ltd. of London, representing the Daily Mail, the Evening News, and Daily Sketch of London, as well as a group of British provincial papers.

The photographer and his agent are understood to have named \$100,000 as a starting price for pictures and text, and on Thursday Associated Newspapers tried to put together a consortium to make an offer. German, French and Italian publications were among those understood to have put in firm bids.

But during the day the pair reportedly decided that the price was not high enough, and a new figure was mentioned—\$125,000, of which \$25,000 would be for the text and the rest for the photographers of dead Vietnamese.

Late Thursday, Haeberle and his associate were warned that they were pushing their luck, and overnight this admonition turned out to be true. Some of the pictures had been sold separately to the Cleveland Plain Dealer, copyrighted with Haeberle's name.

On Friday, The New York Post consulted its attorneys and decided that a combat picture taken by an Army photographer was public property. The Post along with other newspapers, challenged the copyright and published the picture—at which point, the consortium dissolved because foreign bidders were interested in exclusivity.

A free-for-all developed in which Haeberle found himself forced to do what he had sought to avoid, entering into a series of individual deals. An educated guess is that the pair received a total of about \$45,000.

"Yet he wasn't angry," one prospective buyer said of Haeberle, "There was none of the indignation you might expect from someone who felt he had been wronged. 'Whatever happens,' he said, 'At least I'm glad the story is out.'"

As to the CBS interview with Paul Meadlo, network executives said that it was contrary to the television company's policy to pay persons appearing on news program interviews. In this case, CBS maintained, the money was paid to the Dispatch News Service, not to Meadlo himself, for an interview filmed in New York with Mike Wallace.

Asked if any of the fee—reported to be \$10,000—was given by the news service to Meadlo, a CBS spokesman quoted a statement by the Washington free-lance agency saying, "The kid is getting absolutely zero."

Meadlo himself has been quoted as saying, "I've already told my story. I feel I should be getting something out of it." He could not be reached for further comment.

GI'S STILL BURNED VILLAGES IN PINKVILLE AREA LAST MONTH

CHU LAI, South Vietnam, Nov. 25.—Troops of the Americal Division were burning down suspected Vietcong villages near Mylai, scene of the alleged U.S. massacre in 1968 as recently as last month.

"Within a matter of a week at the end of October, we destroyed 13 villages," said 2d Lt. Norman E. Cuttrel, 22, a platoon leader who arrived in Vietnam last month.

According to Lt. Col. Russ Whitla, the burning by "zippo squads," named after their cigarette lighters, is intended to "deny the villages to the Vietcong." It is part of the pacification program in Quangnai Province.

Before the villages are razed, the inhabitants are warned 24 hours in advance by leaflets and loudspeaker broadcasts from planes to leave their homes. They are placed in newly constructed resettlement villages that are often enclosed by barbed wire.

Members of Cuttrel's platoon described in detail how they perform their destruction.

First the zippo squads set fire to the thatched dwellings with their lighters. Sgt.

Steve Kohrt, 20, added, "When we found candles, some of us used candles. If we think it's really worth it, we throw a grenade in." How long does it take to burn down a village?

"That really varies. It depends on the wind. It also depends on the size of the village," he said.

Cuttrell added, "What we try to do is to get all of the people out of the village before we start burning. Because of the psychological effect, of course, they don't want to go . . . that's their home and everything. So what we do is to get them all out of the village and out of sight before we burn it so they won't have to stand and watch their houses burn."

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 26, 1969]
HANOI INFILTRATION RATE IS BACK TO 1968 LEVEL

The infiltration of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam is back up to the level it reached last year, after a May to October decline, but the Nixon administration does not see any need so far to halt or reverse its troop withdrawal program.

Hanoi would have to send south a massive new force, composed of much of its army, before the administration would decide to increase the number of U.S. troops. Such a force is not now in the pipeline.

Officials here are watching to see whether Hanoi has increased infiltration to replace Communist losses over the summer. The infiltration level then was lower than the casualty level.

Officials also are wondering if a new Communist offensive is being prepared. Military men in Saigon have long been predicting one.

COULD AID TALKS

An offensive in January or February might mean, paradoxically, that the North Vietnamese were preparing for serious new negotiations, the administration believes, just as the 1968 Tet offensive led into Paris talks.

The talks are stalemated. There has been nothing since mid-August—before the death of President Ho Chi Minh—that remotely resembled real negotiations in Paris.

But the administration continues to believe that negotiating with the North Vietnamese is not like an Anglo-Saxon give-and-take negotiating process of moving toward agreement.

Hanoi is likely to be most implacable just before it is ready to make a settlement, officials think.

They compare the situation to two exhausted marathon runners staggering toward a finish line. The question is who will drop first.

Once Hanoi decides the time has come, perhaps because it thinks the United States is in the right psychological mood as a result of fighting in Vietnam and domestic anti-war activities, then working out a settlement could be fairly rapid.

Because of this, the administration plans to replace Henry Cabot Lodge as the chief U.S. negotiator in Paris sometime in the fairly immediate future. There is no indication of a plan to leave the post vacant indefinitely because the talks have been barren so far.

VIEWED AS SERIOUS

The administration views the renewed heavy infiltration by North Vietnamese troops as serious.

President Nixon said Nov. 3 that the withdrawal of U.S. troops was based partially on the reduced level of infiltration and the reduction of American casualties. He warned that if increased enemy action jeopardized remaining U.S. forces in Vietnam, he would "not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation."

Nixon deliberately did not spell out those measures.

The administration is now watching the infiltration rate closely to see if some measures are necessary. So far there has been no effect on the troop withdrawal program, but it could easily be slowed down.

WHITE HOUSE RAPS VIET "MASSACRE"

The White House today deplored the alleged massacre of South Vietnamese civilians in the village of My Lai.

In the first public reaction to the case, White House press secretary Ronald L. Zeigler said such an incident is "abhorrent to the conscience of all the American people."

"The secretary of the Army is continuing his investigation. Appropriate action is and will be taken to assure that illegal and immoral conduct, as alleged, be dealt with in accordance with the strict rules of military justice."

Zeigler also said that "this incident should not be allowed to reflect on the some million and a quarter Americans who have now returned to the U.S. after having served in Vietnam with great courage and distinction."

Zeigler would not comment on facts in the case because the case is now moving through the military judicial process.

In response to questions about President Nixon's attitude regarding the massacre charges, Zeigler read a statement of his own which he said "conveys the over-all feeling of the White House, of the administration and therefore of the President."

The statement said:

"This alleged incident occurred some 10 months before this administration came into office, and as the secretary of defense said, did not reach his attention until April 1969. This delay is regrettable.

"As soon as the matter came to the secretary of defense's attention in April of 1969 a full investigation was launched by the Army.

"Both the investigation still underway, and the trial which has been announced, have been and will be conducted in strict accordance with the code of military justice.

"An incident such as that alleged in this case is in direct violation not only of U.S. military policy but is also abhorrent to the conscience of all the American people.

"The secretary of the Army is continuing his investigation. Appropriate action is and will be taken to assure that illegal and immoral conduct as alleged be dealt with in accordance with the strict rules of military justice.

"This incident should not be allowed to reflect on the some million and a quarter Americans who have now returned to the United States having served in Vietnam with great courage and distinction.

"The alleged incident is now moving through the military judicial process and because of this fact it would be inappropriate for me to comment beyond the remarks which I have just given you."

Zeigler told newsmen that the President has been kept informed regarding the alleged incident "as the secretary of defense felt it appropriate, based on information that became available to him."

He said he did not know precisely when the secretary had first informed the President of the case, but believed it was several months ago.

SILENT MAJORITY RISES TO A CHALLENGE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, I spoke before this body and urged that the "silent majority"—of whom

President Nixon spoke in his televised Vietnam message—end their silence and begin to give tangible evidence that they support their President's policy.

I also pointed out that the news media play up the role of the vocal minority and, consequently, the views of the vast majority are never heard—an opinion which has since received much attention as a result of Vice President AGNEW's speeches on the subject.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in a more positive and reassuring manner. Today I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of more than 1,400 persons from one area of my congressional district who are proud to be counted as part of the "silent majority."

Not only am I pleased to record the names of these patriotic Americans in the annals of American history, but I would also like to commend the Courier, the newspaper published in Suitland, Md., which performed this public service, and its editor, Bill Hunter, for collecting and printing these names. The list follows:

HERE'S SOME MORE OF THE SILENT MAJORITY

Mr. Bernard T. Hardy, Chillum.
Bernard T. Hardy, Jr., Chillum.
Bernard T. Hardy, Sr., Chillum.
Mrs. Louise Sharer, Chillum.
George Bell, District Heights.
Stella Bell, District Heights.
Harry A. Leibbrand, Washington.
Edith M. Leibbrand, Washington.
John E. King, Oxon Hill.
Mrs. John E. King, Oxon Hill.
Marion E. Parks, Rose Valley.
Melva L. Parks, Rose Valley.
Edward C. May, District Heights.
Howard F. McClanahan, Oxon Hill.
Faye I. McClanahan, Oxon Hill.
Bertha C. Stratton, Greenbelt.
Mrs. Jacqueline White, Oxon Hill.
Stephen A. White, Oxon Hill.
Charles B. Hall, Upper Marlboro.
Virginia I. Hall, Upper Marlboro.
James T. Snyder, Accokeek.
Alice Rummier, Silver Hill.
Herman Rummier, Silver Hill.
Robert Allwine, Hillcrest Hgts.
Mrs. Robert Allwine, Hillcrest Hgts.
Barbara Flaherty, Silver Hill.
Kenneth Barnes, Brookmont, Md.
Roger Beach, Oxon Hill.
Mrs. Roger Beach, Oxon Hill.
Robert Beach, Oxon Hill.
Mrs. Robert Beach, Oxon Hill.
Richard Beach, College Park.
Mrs. Richard Beach, College Park.
Sp4 R. David Beach, Vietnam.
Ralph Beach, Thailand.
Ray Beach, Hillcrest Heights.
Mrs. Rita Collins, Washington.
Mr. Donald Burroughs, Oxon Hill.
James Hammrich, Glass Manor.
Mrs. James Hammrich, Glass Manor.
Joseph Spargo, Laurel.
Susan Spargo, Laurel.
Howard Staples, Camp Springs.
Madeline Staples, Camp Springs.
Mrs. George Hurst, Morningside.
Deborah Brooke, Beltsville.
Robert Murphy, Bethesda.
William D. Payne, Sumner.
Mary Jane Payne, Sumner.
Richard H. Hart, Hillcrest Heights.
Alma G. Hart, Hillcrest Heights.
Mrs. William A. Harris, Riverdale.
John D. Davies, Clinton.
Mary M. Williams, Suitland.
W. R. Williams, Suitland.
Bonnie Marsh, Oxon Hill.
Mark Evers, Oxon Hill.
Dianna Evers, Oxon Hill.

Alvin Jo Marsh, Jr., Oxon Hill.
 Gregg Marsh, Oxon Hill.
 Brenda Marsh, Oxon Hill.
 Larry Evans, West Virginia.
 Golden Evans, West Virginia.
 Mottrom Burger, Mt. Rainier.
 Mrs. Mottrom Burger, Mt. Rainier.
 Joseph W. Brown, Oxon Hill.
 Gwen Lee Brown, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. John Bathurst, Hillcrest Heights.
 Karen Harvey, Fairfax.
 W. Dawson Cave, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. W. Dawson Cave, Hillcrest Heights.
 William Harris, Hyattsville.
 G. W. Easton, II, Mt. Rainier.
 Mrs. G. W. Easton, II, Mt. Rainier.
 Dale Shaner, Morningside.
 Mrs. Dale Shaner, Morningside.
 Reginald Carpenter, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Reginald Carpenter, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Lucy Sullivan, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Nella Abernathy, Forestville.
 Mary Lou Williams, Oxon Hill.
 Marian Murphy, Upper NW.
 Edward Smith, Suitland.
 Jacqueline Smith, Suitland.
 Linda Smith, Suitland.
 Diane Smith, Suitland.
 Dick Kravitz, Greenbelt.
 Harriet Kravitz, Greenbelt.
 Alice A. Adams, Hillcrest Heights.
 Chuck Tooley, Rose Valley.
 Bonnie Tooley, Rose Valley.
 Lee R. Thompson, Forest Heights.
 Richard Asmussen, Clinton.
 Lois Asmussen, Clinton.
 Michele Debari, Clinton.
 John E. Butkowski, Anacostia.
 Robbie Breeden, Forest Hills.
 Mrs. Robbie Breeden, Forest Hills.
 Mr. Martin Miller, Boulevard Heights.
 Mrs. Lucille Miller, Boulevard Heights.
 Michael Nitka, District Heights.
 Curtis H. Dall, Brentwood.
 Gerald Anderson, Alexandria.
 Roy Rudderforth, Clinton.
 Mrs. Roy Rudderforth, Clinton.
 Louis Coumaris, Chillum.
 Francis Puzak, Marlow Heights.
 Dr. Peter Puzak, Marlow Heights.
 Mrs. Sandra Locher, District Heights.
 Donald Boyd, Silver Spring.
 Rosita Fernandes, Suitland.
 Dixie Barger, Forestville.
 U.S. Rep. Lawrence Hogan, Landover.
 Brian Hill, Upper Marlboro.
 Janet Hill, Upper Marlboro.
 Albert DeCline, Clinton.
 Marie DeCline, Clinton.
 Robert Tipton, Oxon Hill.
 Mary Lee Mitchka, Clinton.
 Elizabeth Frey, Hillcrest Heights.
 Louis Lieb, Hyattsville.
 Pauline Lieb, Hyattsville.
 Walter Kelly, Oxon Hill.
 Irene Kelly, Oxon Hill.
 Alfred Cordero, Morningside.
 William Dreos, Oxon Hill.
 Sue Bridgely, Beltsville.
 June O'Donnell, Forestville.
 Ernest O'Donnell, Forestville.
 Evelyn D. Brown, Hyattsville.
 Lewis C. Brown, Hyattsville.
 Robert Chavez, Chesapeake Beach.
 Ken Leach, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. Jack Printz, Forest Knolls.
 Mrs. Jack Printz, Forest Knolls.
 Martin L. Boyer, Hyattsville.
 Jacqueline Parker, Hillcrest Heights.
 Harold Dunbar, Camp Springs.
 Mr. Thomas C. Walter, Roger Heights.
 Bill R. Hunter, Bryantown.
 Mrs. Marion Murphy, Upper Marlboro.
 Mr. Thomas Schoenboner, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Thomas Schoenboner, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. V. DiFrancis, Marlow Hgts.
 Mrs. V. DiFrancis, Marlow Hgts.
 Mrs. John N. Pappos, Suitland.
 John N. Pappos, Suitland.
 Mr. E. P. Stevenson, Takoma Park.
 Mrs. E. P. Stevenson, Takoma Park.

Walter Stevenson, Takoma Park.
 Mrs. Alice M. Weitzel, College City.
 Raymond G. Kennerly, Hillcrest Hgts.
 Cynthia K. Lassiter, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Hilda Richstone, Hillcrest Hgts.
 Lillian C. Wright, Forest Knolls.
 Laurence C. Wright, Forest Knolls.
 George P. Zevgolits, Oxon Hill.
 Beda H. Zevgolits, Oxon Hill.
 Alfred Chalmers, Oxon Hill.
 David N. Chalmers, Oxon Hill.
 Ruth Hilleary, Oxon Hill.
 Cecil B. Weller, Camp Springs.
 Ollon D. McCool, Park Land.
 Alice M. McCool, Park Land.
 Holland Bost, Camp Springs.
 Reverend J. Ewalt, Blandensburg.
 Fred Baumann, District Hgts.
 Josephine Baumann, District Hgts.
 James E. Marlarkey, Oxon Hill.
 Anne Marlarkey, Oxon Hill.
 Joseph A. Heberle, Southeast.
 Elizabeth Heberle, Southeast.
 Dr. Matthew Schrenk, Southeast.
 Mrs. Matthew Schrenk, Southeast.
 Mr. Thomas Evans, Temple Hills.
 Mrs. Thomas Evans, Temple Hills.
 Mr. Frank Esdle, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Frank Esdle, Oxon Hill.
 Jean Milligan, Clinton.
 Frances Maier, Hillcrest Heights.
 Dixie Maier, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. Carroll Hefner, Temple Hills.
 Mrs. Carroll Hefner, Temple Hills.
 Pryor Hefner, Temple Hills.
 Neil S. Allen, Fort Washington Forest.
 Patrishe N. Allen, Fort Washington Forest.
 Adele Faust, Temple Hills.
 Bertha Faust, Temple Hills.
 Ervin M. Davis I, Forestville.
 Dorothy Davis, Forestville.
 Barbra Davis, Forestville.
 Ervin M. Davis II, Forestville.
 William Burr, Forestville.
 Richard P. Malone, Camp Springs.
 Mrs. Dorothy Burr, Forestville.
 Lona Livengood, College Park.
 Warren Livengood, College Park.
 Robert L. Stoy, Washington.
 Vernon J. Haslup, Suitland.
 Stella Cossey, Clinton.
 Augusta B. Decker, Washington.
 Bessie M. Everegg, Arlington.
 Fred Garber, Hillcrest Heights.
 Sue Gibson, Tracy's Landing.
 Penelope Norris, Waldorf.
 Ila I. Sorrels, Hillside.
 Mildred V. Watts, Washington.
 Susie Bender, District Heights.
 Jessie L. Messick, Washington.
 Margarite B. Howard, Washington.
 Michael G. Harrington, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Michael G. Harrington, Oxon Hill.
 Lewis Heller, Clinton.
 Eileen Heller, Clinton.
 S. F. Adams, Hillcrest Heights.
 Raymond Shegogue Jr., Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Raymond Shegogue, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mickey Shegogue, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. G. W. Easton III, Waynesboro, Va.
 Mrs. G. W. Easton III, Waynesboro, Va.
 Sp5 Marshall Dickerson, Shawsville, Va.
 Mrs. Marshall Dickerson, Shawsville, Va.
 Joe Townsend, District Heights.
 Jo Anne Townsend, District Heights.
 Mrs. William Harris, Hyattsville.
 Goldie M. Dunbar, Riverdale.
 Jane T. Williams, Hillcrest Heights.
 Edward Haller, Temple Hills.
 Thomas Schoenbauer, Oxon Hill.
 Pam Gordon, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Charles E. B. Gordon, Hillcrest Heights.
 Charles E. B. Gordon, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. William A. Warren, Hyattsville.
 Mrs. Marie Williford, Camp Springs.
 George T. Williford, Camp Springs.
 Mrs. Timothy Youngson, Oxon Run Hill.
 Thomas Youngson, Mechanicsville.
 Mrs. Thomas Youngson, Mechanicsville.
 Jacqueline Tippet, Forestville.

Michael C. Tippet, Forestville.
 Edward B. Adams Jr., Birchwood City.
 Gertrude L. Adams, Birchwood City.
 Lloyd Fredericks, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Lloyd Fredericks, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Catherine Beach, Hillcrest Heights.
 Ronald Beach, Falls Church, Va.
 Mrs. Ronald Beach, Falls Church, Va.
 Richard M. Gemmill, Silver Spring.
 Helen R. Cordero, Morningside.
 Marine Cpl. Kenneth R. Anderson, Vietnam.
 Gerald Bartholomew, Temple Hills.
 Isabel Bartholomew, Temple Hills.
 Robert P. Anderson, District Heights.
 Claire M. Anderson, District Heights.
 Robert L. Bolen, New Carrollton.
 Margaret Burness, New Carrollton.
 Pauline M. Schoenbauer, Camp Springs.
 Mrs. Michael G. Harrington, Oxon Hill.
 Raymond W. Davis, Hillcrest Heights.
 Beverly Davis, Hillcrest Heights.
 James Geary, Oxon Hill.
 Andree Geary, Oxon Hill.
 Raymond Bourassa, Oxon Hill.
 Jean Bourassa, Oxon Hill.
 Denise Bourassa, Oxon Hill.
 Richard Bourassa, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. William Andre, Oxon Run.
 Mrs. William Andre, Oxon Run.
 Kathie Andre, Oxon Run.
 Mrs. Sharon Hawk, Oxon Run.
 Miss Mary Ray, Suitland.
 George Beaver, College Park.
 Mr. M. W. Lantz, Marlow Heights.
 Mrs. M. W. Lantz, Marlow Heights.
 Jack J. Nolan, Hillcrest Heights.
 Anna E. Nolan, Hillcrest Heights.
 Joseph P. Robson, Hyattsville.
 Mr. James R. Smith, Forestville.
 Mrs. James R. Smith, Forestville.
 Clarence Bridges, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Clarence Bridges, Hillcrest Heights.
 Edgar Bridges, Hillcrest Heights.
 Doris Lane, University Park.
 Grady Lane, University Park.
 H. W. Whitlock, University Park.
 Jane Rudolph, Silver Spring.
 Raymond Austin, Lanham.
 Mrs. Raymond Austin, Lanham.
 William Bertoni, Lanham.
 Mrs. Hilda C. Lastner, Mayo.
 Josephine Brewster, Washington.
 Ray T. Sparks, Jr., Hillside.
 Warren S. Woodward, Washington.
 C. G. Stipes, Brentwood.
 Sue Mills, Oxon Hill.
 James Mills, Oxon Hill.
 Betty Thorne, Clinton.
 Joseph Thorne, Clinton.
 Mrs. Jack Gwynn, Clinton.
 Ernest Workman, Forestville.
 Mrs. Ernest Workman, Forestville.
 William Collins, District Heights.
 Mrs. Wm. H. Collins, District Heights.
 Mr. George Lowe, Chillum.
 Mrs. George Lowe, Chillum.
 Merlyn Soukup, Laurel.
 Gail Soukup, Laurel.
 Mr. Russell B. Swindler, Brentwood.
 Mrs. Russell B. Swindler, Brentwood.
 Mr. Tookie Catena, Chillum.
 Mrs. Tookie Catena, Chillum.
 Mr. Lester Flint, White Plains.
 Mrs. Lester Flint, White Plains.
 Ruth Flint, White Plains.
 Miss Terese Vogelsson, Forestville.
 Raymond Wycoff, Morningside.
 Kathleen Wycoff, Morningside.
 Michael O'Brien, Oxon Hill.
 Renee O'Brien, Oxon Hill.
 Lauren O'Brien, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. Benjamin Tubb, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Benjamin Tubb, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. Charles Kingley, Suitland.
 Mrs. Charles Kingley, Suitland.
 Mrs. Jacqueline Cosgrove, Washington, D.C.
 Mr. Anthony J. Grado, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Anthony J. Grado, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. Raymond Lauver, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Raymond Lauver, Oxon Hill.
 Jack I. Resnicoff, Hyattsville.

Blanche Resnicoff, Hyattsville.
 Ensign Arnold E. Resnicoff, Hyattsville.
 Steven H. Resnicoff, Hyattsville.
 Joel Resnicoff, Hyattsville.
 Fred A. Greene, Jr., Lanham.
 Mrs. Fred A. Greene, Jr., Lanham.
 Mrs. Merritt P. Raymond, Beltsville.
 Mr. Robert B. Herrmann, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Robert B. Herrmann, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Matthew Kerchbaum, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. Matthew Kerchbaum, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mary Lou Williams, Oxon Hill.
 George A. Heitman, Lawrenceburg, Ind.
 Eva A. Heitman, Lawrenceburg, Ind.
 Sharon Douglas, Lawrenceburg, Ind.
 James N. White, Tokyo, Japan.
 Edward A. Sirlen, Spain.
 Roberta Humphrey, Ontonagon, Mich.
 National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, Washington.
 Mrs. Reta Everhart, Mt. Rainer.
 Mr. Victor Unruh, Riverdale.
 Mr. Franny Catena, Chillum.
 Victor Edward Unruh, Chillum.
 Donald Willett, Silver Spring.
 Teresa Willett, Silver Spring.
 Charles Stover, Suitland.
 Bonnie Stover, Suitland.
 Dorothy Young, Marlow Heights.
 Thelma Miller, Washington, D.C.
 Agnes Goodwin, College Park.
 Chester Goodwin, College Park.
 Curtis Accipiter, Coral Hills.
 Nancy Accipiter, Coral Hills.
 Mrs. Bernice Louch, Bradbury Heights.
 James Dillon, Camp Springs.
 Margaret Dillon, Camp Springs.
 Robert Beard, Camp Springs.
 Faye Beard, Camp Springs.
 Mr. Franklin West, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Franklin West, Hillcrest Heights.
 Abe Goldsmith, West Hyattsville.
 Eva Goldsmith, West Hyattsville.
 T. S. Hess, Suitland.
 Kathryn Hess, Suitland.
 P. J. Maglio, Suitland.
 Ann R. Maglio, Forestville.
 Lucile Soukup, Laurel.
 Robert Wilson Jr., Morningside.
 Rosalie Wilson, Morningside.
 Ann Maria Wilson, Morningside.
 Robert Wilson III, Morningside.
 Henry Gregg, Suitland.
 Mrs. Alfreda Howard, Suitland.
 Joyce Schavey, Suitland.
 Jean Barth, Suitland.
 Harold Hess, Suitland.
 Gerald Parker, Hillcrest Hgts.
 Harold Lyon, Camp Springs.
 Leola Lyon, Camp Springs.
 Ronald E. Wright, Clinton.
 Deloras L. Wright, Clinton.
 Steve Bostic, Clinton.
 Gordon C. Ridings, Clinton.
 Mable V. Ridings, Clinton.
 Mable V. Burgess, Clinton.
 Clyde D. Walkup, Clinton.
 David Walkup, Clinton.
 Ruth Haynes, Clinton.
 James Haynes, Clinton.
 James Thompson, Clinton.
 Joe Walkup, Clinton.
 Carl F. Tolano, Clinton.
 John L. Garden, Brandywine.
 Buthe L. Garden, Brandywine.
 Elaine Bostic, Bladensburg.
 Burl Bostic, Bladensburg.
 Robert J. Spangler, Riverdale.
 Patricia D. Gerard, Bowie.
 Ann. Gerald A. Morrow, Andrews AFB.
 Margaret I. Gerard, Bowie.
 Gladys Smith, Clinton.
 Wm. T. Smith, Clinton.
 Mr. Edward J. Schreiber, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Edward J. Schreiber, Oxon Hill.
 Melvin D. Hill, Oxon Hill.
 Joby Hill, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. J. Harris Rogers, Aquasco.
 Mrs. J. Harris Rogers, Aquasco.
 Mr. Maylon Clark, Marlow Hgts.

Mrs. Dorothy Clark, Marlow Hgts.
 Mr. Edmund E. McGuire, District Hgts.
 Mrs. Edmund E. McGuire, District Hgts.
 John A. Veit, Washington, D.C.
 Mr. Joel R. Best, Suitland.
 Mrs. Joel R. Best, Suitland.
 Mr. W. Michael White, Temple Hills.
 Mrs. W. Michael White, Temple Hills.
 Walter J. Snellings, Oxon Hill.
 Florence R. Snellings, Oxon Hill.
 Jessie Miller, Hillcrest Hgts.
 Marlene S. Hunter, Bryantown.
 Mary Hukill, Clinton.
 Joan Poland, Camp Springs.
 Harold R. Morgan, Morningside.
 Gwynn R. Morgan, Morningside.
 Henry Block, Forestville.
 Betty Block, Forestville.
 Mr. Bill Bury, Oxon Hill.
 Enlan Block, Forestville.
 Allen Block, Forestville.
 Edward Mickiewicz, Forestville.
 Adele Mickiewicz, Forestville.
 Thomas Harrison, Arlington, Va.
 Kathleen Harrison, Arlington, Va.
 R. Edward Early, SE Washington.
 Jean L. Skilton, Hyattsville.
 Jerry S. Davis, Washington.
 George T. Snow, Suitland.
 Erma Snow, Suitland.
 Louise McFall, SE Washington.
 James W. Sullivan, Suitland.
 Charlotte Sullivan, Suitland.
 Clarence Cooley, Riverdale.
 John J. Crothers, Hillcrest Hgts.
 Robert J. Caho, University Hills.
 Carlo Dinello, Clinton.
 Maria-Eleana Dinello, Clinton.
 Paul McDaniel, Hillcrest Gardens.
 Mae F. McDaniel, Hillcrest Gardens.
 Reba Reno, District Heights.
 Lamar Gowland, Hillcrest Hgts.
 Sherwood Martin, Forestville.
 Dorothy Gowland, Hillcrest Hgts.
 G. H. Knabenshue, Oxon Run.
 William Brooke, Beltsville.
 Eleanor Brooke, Beltsville.
 Gary Gentile and family, Forestville.
 Adele L. Scherchinger, Chillum Manor.
 Robert West, Morningside.
 Jean West, Morningside.
 Mary Bieber, College Park.
 Betty Harris, Oxon Hill.
 Gerald Holcomb, Hyattsville.
 William F. Ferguson, Rockville.
 Mrs. Page E. Truesdell, District Heights.
 Mr. John Reffatto, District Heights.
 Mrs. John Reffatto, District Heights.
 Alexander W. Hamilton, Riverdale.
 Mr. Edward L. Forrest, Forest Heights.
 Mrs. Edward L. Forrest, Forest Heights.
 John W. Cassidy, Upper Marlboro.
 Louis C. Cassidy, Upper Marlboro.
 Walter Beke, Friendly.
 Joyce Ervin, Upper Marlboro.
 Wallace Daniel, Suitland.
 Roy K. Heitman, Suitland.
 Dena Heitman, Suitland.
 Alice Weaver, Marlow Heights.
 State Sen. Fred L. Wineland, Silesia.
 George C. Moore, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Eleanor J. Davis, Morningside.
 Charles R. Tyler, Upper Marlboro.
 Karen Kukuda, Oxon Hill.
 C. Calvert Lancaster, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. Oliver, Humble, Bladensburg.
 William Benjamin, Bowie.
 Mrs. Arthur Krites, Hyattsville.
 Barbara Hutchinson, Hillcrest Heights.
 Bob Hutchinson, Hillcrest Heights.
 Richard Mazzella, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mark Wright, Hillcrest Heights.
 Catherine M. Merkle, Brentwood.
 Steve Buick, Oxon Hill.
 Linda Farley, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Mary Guy, Hyattsville.
 Kathlyn Freeman, Hyattsville.
 Mr. Harold Freeman, Hyattsville.
 Mrs. Harold Freeman, Hyattsville.
 George Dyer, District Heights.

Mrs. Helen Whitlow, Riverdale.
 Harold Wildfever, Forestville.
 Bill Wildfever, Forestville.
 Donald Taylor, Oxon Hill.
 Betty Taylor, Oxon Hill.
 George L. Plummer, Forestville.
 Ruth M. Plummer, Forestville.
 Mr. William L. Farley, Chillum.
 Mr. Robert L. Swetz, District Heights.
 Mrs. Robert L. Swetz, District Heights.
 John Robinson, Langley Park.
 Edward Sickels, Rockville.
 Mrs. Louise Casca, Silesia.
 Carl Foley, Suitland.
 Mr. Charles F. Kosack, College Park.
 Mrs. Charles F. Kosack, College Park.
 Joseph A. Heberle, Jr., Friendly.
 Jo Anne Heberle, Friendly.
 Francis F. Miller, Silver Spring.
 Mrs. Grace V. Miller, Silver Spring.
 Ervin Davis II, Forestville.
 Ruth Hilleary, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. V. DiFrancis, Marlow Heights.
 Mrs. V. DiFrancis, Marlow Heights.
 Cecel B. Weller, Camp Springs.
 Roma C. Weller, Camp Springs.
 Ollon D. McCool, Park Land.
 Alice M. McCool, Park Land.
 William Chappell, Camp Springs.
 John N. Pappas, Suitland.
 John M. Pappas, Suitland.
 Mr. E. P. Stevenson, Tacoma Park.
 Mrs. E. P. Stevenson, Tacoma Park.
 Walter Stevenson, Tacoma Park.
 Fred Bawmann, District Heights.
 Josephine Bawmann, District Heights.
 Francis X. Jahn, Louhow.
 Patricia Bile, Millersville.
 Roy Chambers, Camp Springs.
 Lois Chambers, Camp Springs.
 Robert Chambers, Camp Springs.
 David Chambers, Camp Springs.
 Carolyn Chambers, Camp Springs.
 Mary Ann Chambers, Camp Springs.
 Thomas Chambers, Camp Springs.
 Kenneth Chambers, Camp Springs.
 Henry Moore, District Heights.
 Kathryn B. Moore, District Heights.
 Janice K. Moore, District Heights.
 Brenda J. Moore, District Heights.
 Sgt. Michael J. Tierney, Viet Nam.
 AIC Michael B. Hartman, Viet Nam.
 Mr. Lester Nevins, Viet Nam.
 Margaret Flarerty Thompson, Silver Spring.
 Edward M. Flaherty, Silver Spring.
 George M. Thompson, Silver Spring.
 Mrs. Myrtle Sabins, Silver Hill.
 Mr. John Clarke, Jr., Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. John Clarke, Jr., Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Kitty Sherland, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. Joseph Sherland, Oxon Hill.
 Truman Walrod, Oxon Hill.
 Ann Walrod, Oxon Hill.
 Winifred Manilli, Hillcrest Heights.
 Paul Manilli, Hillcrest Heights.
 Walter P. Whittington, Washington, D.C.
 Harry E. Gibbons, Forest Heights.
 Evelyn C. Gibbons, Forest Heights.
 Hazel Whyman, Forest Heights.
 Ninna M. Absher, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. Vernis Absher, Sr., Washington, D.C.
 Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd V. Cryer, Oxon Hill.
 William B. Patton, Hillcrest Heights.
 Barbara G. Patton, Hillcrest Heights.
 William E. Patton, Hillcrest Heights.
 Robert B. Patton, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. & Mrs. Marlin D. Smith, Camp Springs.
 Mr. & Mrs. Otto D. Paugh, Camp Springs.
 Mr. & Mrs. Paul F. Meyers, Hyattsville.
 Anne C. Young, Hillcrest Heights.
 William A. Young, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. C. J. Shughure.
 Mrs. C. J. Shughure, Hillcrest Heights.
 William Craddock, Clinton.
 Mrs. William Craddock, Clinton.
 Milo Walter, Hyattsville.
 Mrs. Milo Walter, Hyattsville.
 Mr. & Mrs. Frank Bowman, Glenn Dale.
 Anthony Malonka, Deer Park Heights.

Mr. & Mrs. Donald M. Coakley, Temple Hills.
 Linda Coakley, Temple Hills.
 George Russell, Bowie.
 Mrs. Russell A. Green, Landover Hills.
 Frances Green, Landover Hills.
 Donna Adams, Hillcrest Heights.
 Donald Arvidson, District Heights.
 Marie Taylor, Brandywine.
 Oliver E. Taylor, Brandywine.
 Nina Cole, Hyattsville.
 Jean Loveless, Hyattsville.
 Emil Loomis, District Heights.
 Charles O'Malley, Ft. Washington.
 Arnold Marcum, Temple Hills.
 Rev. John Macon, Clinton.
 Mr. & Mrs. John Wright, Fleischman's Village.
 Mr. & Mrs. Norman Sanders, Hillcrest Heights.
 James H. Crisp, Camp Springs.
 Dorothy Crisp, Camp Springs.
 Arthur C. Wheeler, Arlington, Va.
 Mabel V. Wheeler, Arlington, Va.
 Norris Westover, Camp Springs.
 Louise Westover, Camp Springs.
 Kathy Westover, Camp Springs.
 Brenda Westover, Camp Springs.
 Zoe Ann Vent, Temple Hills.
 Mr. & Mrs. Esko E. Hallila, Hillcrest Heights.
 E. G. Rose, Morningside.
 Grace C. Rose, Morningside.
 Ann Rose, Morningside.
 Paul Rose, Morningside.
 John Hurlburt, Hillcrest Heights.
 Betty Drish, District Heights.
 Frank Drish, District Heights.
 Frederick Tizard, Oxon Hill.
 Dorothy Tizard, Oxon Hill.
 Arthur Dolinger, Alexandria.
 Thelma Dolinger, Alexandria.
 Mrs. Ellen Bell, Hillcrest Gardens.
 Mrs. Ann Jones, Forest Heights.
 Sharon Brown, Oxon Hill.
 Danny Brown, Oxon Hill.
 Pat Lawrence, Oxon Hill.
 Cindy Hines, Silver Spring.
 Henry Ruby, Temple Hills.
 Mrs. Henry Ruby, Temple Hills.
 Ben Lanier, Suitland.
 Jonquill Lanier, Suitland.
 James D. Atkins, Suitland.
 Betty Sue Oertly.
 Chas. J. and V. E. Mullican.
 W. W. and Gladys Godsey.
 George W. Taylor.
 Elizabeth P. Taylor.
 Mrs. Charlotte A. Foote, Accokeek.
 Mr. James Caponiti, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Lydia Caponiti, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. Billie B. Shaddix, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Lucy Shaddix, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Joanne S. Morris, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. Ralph W. Simmons Jr., Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. Edna Simons, Washington, D.C.
 Mr. Ralph W. Simons III, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. Thelma A. Cline, Mt. Rainier.
 Mr. Wm. Przybyszewski, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Lottie P. Veeder, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Jeanne F. Tierney, Quantico.
 Mrs. Jeanne F. Tierney, Quantico, Va.
 Mr. James H. Veeder, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Mildred Veeder, Accokeek.
 Mr. Fred Veeder, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Ethel F. Reigelman, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Jessie L. Miller, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. John M. Hartman, Sr., Camp Springs.
 Mr. Edward Singer, Clinton.
 Mrs. Mary Singer, Clinton.
 Mrs. Bernice L. Baker, Suitland.
 Mr. Charles Flynn, Clinton.
 Mrs. Peggy K. Flynn, Clinton.
 Mr. Denby O. Coon, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. Eleanor C. Coon, Washington, D.C.
 Mr. C. Jimmie Vaccaro, Marlow Heights.
 Mrs. Ruth M. Vaccaro, Marlow Heights.
 Mr. Henry Brinton, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Rose Brinton, Oxon Hill.

Mr. J. Walter Norris, Camp Springs.
 Mrs. Christine E. Norris, Camp Springs.
 Mr. J. Douglas Furr, College Park.
 Mrs. Lois P. Furr, College Park.
 Mrs. Grace H. Dyer, Washington, D.C.
 Mr. Walter S. Johnson, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Eleanor S. Johnson, Oxon Hill.
 Reverend Henry Swain, Accokeek.
 Mrs. LaRoca Swain, Accokeek.
 Mr. Clyde Sowell, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Elizabeth Sowell, Accokeek.
 Mr. Carlton Hall, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Ruth Hall, Accokeek.
 Mr. Edward Munney, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Sarah Munney, Accokeek.
 Mr. John Nevins, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Leitha Nevins, Accokeek.
 Mr. Russell, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Russell, Accokeek.
 Mr. Ladd Gasparovick, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Ladd Gasparovick, Accokeek.
 Mr. Horace Thompson, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Mildred Thompson, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Virginia Corbett, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Helen Storey, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Lillie Mae Conley, Accokeek.
 Mr. John Grace, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Ruth Grace, Accokeek.
 Mr. W. Ledru Koontz, Washington, D.C.
 Nora Seidler, Oxon Hill.
 Melvina Lewis, Oxon Hill.
 Adrian Mohr, Oxon Hill.
 Janine Mohr, Oxon Hill.
 Leonard Brampton, Oxon Hill.
 Velma Brampton, Oxon Hill.
 Mr. Jack Worthington, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Alva Worthington, Accokeek.
 Mr. William Clements, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Adele Clements, Accokeek.
 Mr. Fred Morris, Accokeek.
 Mrs. Grace Morris, Accokeek.
 Mr. Ford L. Dean, St. Mary's County, Md.
 Mrs. Linda Dean, St. Mary's County, Md.
 Mary Lou Harris, Suitland.
 Martha J. Pett, Suitland.
 Ruby V. Barngrover, Suitland.
 David L. Beall, Suitland.
 Leonard Hampton, Suitland.
 John J. Whelan, Suitland.
 John Scherger, Suitland.
 George H. Peacek, Suitland.
 Gardner Lowman, Suitland.
 John G. Hartung, Chillum.
 Mrs. John G. Hartung, Chillum.
 Joann Hartung, Chillum.
 John F. Ingalls, Chillum.
 Mrs. John F. Ingalls, Chillum.
 O. J. Veyeau, Chillum.
 Lorine K. Hartung, Chillum.
 Thomas Dore, Chillum.
 Mrs. Thomas Dore, Chillum.
 Pasquale G. Romano, Chillum.
 Mrs. Pasquale G. Romano, Chillum.
 Frank Rewet, Chillum.
 Mrs. Frank Rewet, Chillum.
 John Schavey, Suitland.
 Albert C. Tayman, SE Washington.
 Bertha N. Tayman, SE Washington.
 W. Crossley, Silver Hill.
 Mr. and Mrs. Daniel J. Pascale, Cheverly.
 Catherine E. Hutchison, Hillcrest Heights.
 Sherwood Hutchison, Hillcrest Heights.
 Louise Rossi, Hillcrest Heights.
 Louis Rossi, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. G. Caparell, SE Washington.
 Albert Smith, Temple Hills.
 William Jubane, Forestville.
 Penny Jubane, Forestville.
 Mary Dencola, Upper Marlboro.
 Thomas Dencola, Upper Marlboro.
 Edward C. Gross, Camp Springs.
 Anne Gross, Camp Springs.
 Mrs. Thomas C. Walter, Roger Heights.
 Mrs. Anne Taylor, Roger Heights.
 Mary Lou Williams, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. May E. Bell, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mr. Herbert M. Bell, Hillcrest Heights.
 Roy T. Sparks, District Heights.
 Marian H. Sparks, District Heights.
 Aaron L. Lewis, Forestville.

Lorraine Lewis, Forestville.
 Judson Lewis, Forestville.
 Jacqueline Green, Oxon Hill.
 Robert Green, Oxon Hill.
 Carolyn Green, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Edna Potts, Washington.
 Joan Potts, Washington.
 Mrs. Edith Small, Washington.
 Mrs. John Meehan, Hillcrest Heights.
 James E. Cosh, Washington.
 Mrs. James E. Cosh, Washington.
 Joseph Jones, Washington.
 Mrs. Joseph Jones, Washington.
 William Arnold, Washington.
 Mrs. William Arnold, Washington.
 Carl Lyle, Washington.
 Mrs. Carl Lyle, Washington.
 Ronald Brenneman, Camp Springs.
 Anita Brenneman, Camp Springs.
 James Giffen, Crofton.
 Mrs. James Giffen, Crofton.
 Harris Havard, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Harris Havard, Hillcrest Heights.
 G. M. Jordana, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. G. M. Jordana, Hillcrest Heights.
 Doris Belfield, Temple Hills.
 Joseph Belfield, Temple Hills.
 Gino Ricci, Camp Springs.
 Barbara Ricci, Camp Springs.
 Flores Colon, Camp Springs.
 Maria Colon, Camp Springs.
 Andree Geary, Oxon Hill.
 James Geary, Oxon Hill.
 Miles Geary, Oxon Hill.
 Sandra Geary, Oxon Hill.
 Suzanne Clise, Oxon Hill.
 Wayne Clise, Oxon Hill.
 Lorraine E. Ryan, Camp Springs.
 Louise Jacoby, Temple Hills.
 Mildred Bennett, Washington.
 Joseph M. Bennett, Washington.
 Emily F. Bennett, Washington.
 Douglas W. McIlvaine, Washington.
 Louise Fitzgerald, Washington.
 Debbie Green, Lanham.
 Helen Black, Lanham.
 Harvey Black, Lanham.
 Charlie M. Hurd Sr., Brentwood.
 Marilyn J. Hurd, Brentwood.
 Richard Lynch, Temple Hills.
 Mrs. Richard Lynch, Temple Hills.
 Dave Barton, Suitland.
 Helen Barton, Suitland.
 Audrey Maynard, Camp Springs.
 Frances Sullivan, Temple Hills.
 V. F. Sullivan, Temple Hills.
 Bonnie Sullivan, Temple Hills.
 Eugene Dimmick, Temple Hills.
 Mrs. Eugene Dimmick, Temple Hills.
 William Newman, Washington.
 Mrs. William Newman, Washington.
 William Stenbinsky, Suitland.
 Mrs. Wm. Stenbinsky, Suitland.
 Don Every, Suitland.
 Daria Every, Suitland.
 Harold A. Steiner, Temple Hills.
 Lemar Phillips, Oxon Hill.
 Dorothy Phillips, Oxon Hill.
 Larry Phillips, Oxon Hill.
 Bonnie Phillips, Oxon Hill.
 Robert Phillips, Oxon Hill.
 Bryan K. Swartwood Jr., Forestville.
 Mrs. Bryan K. Swartwood, Forestville.
 Jules F. Morel, Oxon Hill.
 Dorothy A. Morel, Oxon Hill.
 Elaine Yobst, Oxon Hill.
 Ernest H. Lung, District Heights.
 John Moye, Hyattsville.
 Robert Hermann, Lanham.
 Joanne Hermann, Lanham.
 William Struthers, Berwyn Heights.
 Hugh Paul, Laurel.
 Bernard Klein, Alexandria.
 Chris Andersen, Oxon Hill.
 Bernice Andersen, Oxon Hill.
 Paul Rogers, Suitland.
 Mrs. Paul Rogers, Suitland.
 William Schlossen, Hillcrest Heights.
 Mrs. Wm. Schlossen, Hillcrest Heights.
 Sen. Edward T. Conroy, Bowie.
 Mrs. Joseph Organ, Washington.

Edward M. Richardson, Washington.
 Linda H. Amkill, Suitland.
 Michael P. Nemchick, Oxon Hill.
 Pearl Walsh, Washington, D.C.
 Lella Walsh, Washington, D.C.
 Richard Walsh, Washington, D.C.
 Dwayne Milstead, Indian Head.
 Anthony Ciotti, Seat Pleasant.
 Barbara Ciotti, Seat Pleasant.
 Virginia Walsh, Washington, D.C.
 Martin R. Kennard, Hyattsville.
 Edgar C. Miller, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. Edgar Miller, Washington, D.C.
 Glenn Hefner, Temple Hills.
 Mrs. Glenn Hefner, Temple Hills.
 Clinton L. Burnett, Mt. Rainier.
 Amy E. Burnett, Mt. Rainier.
 Mrs. Goldie Pimentel, Berkshire.
 R. E. Knodle, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. R. E. Knodle, Washington, D.C.
 Walter L. Ruscik, Hillcrest Heights.
 Marie Ruscik, Hillcrest Heights.
 Helen Carter, Hillcrest Heights.
 Carlyle Stark, Oxon Hill.
 Betty Stark, Oxon Hill.
 Sonny Turlington, Bowie.
 Allen P. Sears, New Carrollton.
 Lillian M. Sears, New Carrollton.
 Mary H. Heinly, New Carrollton.
 Theodore Jaramillo, Greenbelt.
 Mrs. Lillian V. Guthrie, Silver Hill.
 O. H. Proffitt, Edgewater.
 Egmont Singer, Arlington.
 Mrs. Egmont Singer, Arlington.
 Bob Everhart, White Plains.
 Grace C. Daly, Suitland.
 Lou Ann Thomas, District Heights.
 Beverly Rholand, Colesville.
 William I. Thomas, District Heights.
 Jewell Bragunier, Indian Head.
 John Thomas, Bethesda.
 Courtney Thomas, Bethesda.
 Florence Thomas, Bethesda.
 John H. Jessie, Hillcrest Heights.
 Ruby J. Jessie, Hillcrest Heights.
 Ruby Freeman, Hillcrest Heights.
 Dr. N. J. Tavani, District Heights.
 Naomi Tavani, District Heights.
 Mary Trowbridge, Bradbury Heights.
 Robert Trowbridge, Bradbury Heights.
 Frank Miller, Bradbury Heights.
 Shirley Miller, Bradbury Heights.
 John H. McBride, Bradbury Heights.
 Lynn Paxton, Bradbury Heights.
 Linda McBride, Bradbury Heights.
 Pat Smith, Bradbury Heights.
 Pat Jones, Bradbury Heights.
 Johnson W. Jones, Bradbury Heights.
 Gladys C. Edelen, Bradbury Heights.
 Jo McAuley, Bradbury Heights.
 Paul E. Smith, Bradbury Heights.
 Ralph Provenzone, Bradbury Heights.
 Mrs. Ralph Provenzone, Bradbury Heights.
 Richard Walsh, Bradbury Heights.
 Joseph Lembo, Bradbury Heights.
 Mrs. Joseph Lembo, Bradbury Heights.
 Rudy Giacalone, Bradbury Heights.
 Alice E. Smith, Bradbury Heights.
 Donnie Lee Douglas, Bradbury Heights.
 Pat Douglas, Bradbury Heights.
 Paras S. Coleras, Bradbury Heights.
 Aren M. Cleland, Bradbury Heights.
 Frank S. Gatton, Bradbury Heights.
 James Ramsey, Bradbury Heights.
 Jessie Ramsey, Bradbury Heights.
 Evelyn Buckner, Bradbury Heights.
 Ruth M. Estep, Bradbury Heights.
 Aubrey E. Estep, Bradbury Heights.
 Doris Hall, Bradbury Heights.
 Dennis Tash, Bradbury Heights.
 Dorothy Talbert, Bradbury Heights.
 Vinter Talbert, Bradbury Heights.
 Martin Cebula, Bradbury Heights.
 Frances Cebula, Bradbury Heights.
 Erna H. Huffman, Bradbury Heights.
 Helen M. Talbert, Bradbury Heights.
 Lawrence M. Denison, Bradbury Heights.
 Leo Lagana, Bradbury Heights.
 Mary T. Lagana, Bradbury Heights.
 Eva Matanone, Bradbury Heights.
 Ignacio Matanane, Bradbury Heights.
 Florence Griggs, Bradbury Heights.

Melvin Griggs, Sr., Bradbury Heights.
 Lois V. Norton, Bradbury Heights.
 Henry C. Norton, Bradbury Heights.
 D. W. Jones, Bradbury Heights.
 A. Francis Jones, Bradbury Heights.
 Susan McBride, Bradbury Heights.
 Juanita Goheens, Washington, D.C.
 Bernard Goheens, Washington, D.C.
 Gilbert L. Seelock, Boulevard Heights.
 Nancy Seelock, Boulevard Heights.
 Betsy Edelen, Boulevard Heights.
 Audrey Day, Boulevard Heights.
 Mrs. Kenneth Estep, Morningside.
 Kenneth Estep, Morningside.
 Thomas Morgan, Morningside.
 Adrienne Estep, Morningside.
 Capt. John A. MacDonald, Greenbelt.
 Paul Pernecky, Silver Spring.
 Elsie Pernecky, Silver Spring.
 Maurine DiSilvestro, Silver Spring.
 Ann DiSilvestro, Silver Spring.
 H. T. Buckner, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. H. T. Buckner, Washington, D.C.
 T. A. Knodle, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. T. A. Knodle, Washington, D.C.
 L. R. Reno, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. L. R. Reno, Washington, D.C.
 C. J. Williams, Washington, D.C.
 Mrs. C. J. Williams, Washington, D.C.
 John P. Wallerweiler, Hillside.
 Elva D. Wallerweiler, Hillside.
 Frances Ward, Washington, D.C.
 Robert Ward, Washington, D.C.
 J. Emory Ward, Washington, D.C.
 William A. Hicky, Jr., Hyattsville.
 Mrs. Charlotte E. Anders, Hyattsville.
 Marion Robshaw, Hyattsville.
 Hubert L. Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Thelma J. Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Cheryl J. Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Danny L. Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Randall Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Patricia Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Cindy Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Kenneth Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Marcy Baker, Oxon Hill.
 Kenny Baker, Oxon Hill.
 D. Bradford Damon, Hillcrest Heights.
 Bertha F. Damon, Hillcrest Heights.
 Milda M. Himmeler, Oxon Hill.
 John I. Meehan, Hillcrest Heights.
 Kay Farmer, Washington, D.C.
 Lyle Farmer, Washington, D.C.
 Patti Farmer, Washington, D.C.
 Kathi Farmer, Washington, D.C.
 Michael Farmer, Washington, D.C.
 Frank Friberg, Oxon Hill.
 Mrs. Frank Friberg, Oxon Hill.
 Linda Patteson, Kensington.
 Mrs. Everett McConkey, Oxon Hill.
 Everett McConkey, Oxon Hill.
 Howard Dove, Laurel.
 Sarah Dove, Laurel.
 Sam Kirchner, Oxon Hill.
 Jean Kirchner, Oxon Hill.
 John Kirchner, Oxon Hill.
 John R. Walsh, Washington, D.C.
 Vicki Hamilton, Silver Spring.
 Sharon Hamilton, Silver Spring.
 Becky Hamilton, Silver Spring.
 Leslie Moreland, Silver Spring.
 Walter J. Hamilton, Silver Spring.
 Evelyn Hamilton, Silver Spring.
 William E. Gordon, Suitland.
 James Wilson, Hillcrest Heights.
 Calvin J. Foote, Waldorf.
 Bobbie E. Larson, Suitland.
 Charles E. Secrist, Jr., Hillcrest Heights.
 Stan G. Cecil, Hillcrest Heights.
 Bob Boteler, Hillcrest Heights.
 James Harrison, Hillcrest Heights.
 H. Johnson, Suitland.
 Russell Ziebell, Hillcrest Heights.
 Kenneth R. Clopper, Camp Springs.
 Melvin W. Turner, Washington, D.C.
 Chas. M. Brooks, Baltimore.
 Jimmy Carter, Suitland.
 Garry Robbison, Silver Park.
 Robert B. Ross, Hillcrest Heights.
 Bonnie Shafer, Temple Hills.
 Tom Diggs, Hillcrest Heights.
 Kathryn Sargent, New Carrollton.

Charles B. Lankford, Annandale, Va.
 Ann Christie.
 Bob Cooper.
 Da Bracero.
 Barbara L. Owens.
 Catherine A. Goodwin.
 Eleanor B. Peebles.
 Wanda L. Meade.
 Richard W. Dehmans.
 Richard A. Beekwith.
 Sally P. Beekwith.
 Linda D. Patten.
 William N. Patten.
 J. M. Chappellew.
 Nancy E. Harris.
 Nelvin J. Farrar.
 Larry A. Harris.
 John E. Gilmar.
 Patricia A. Foley.
 Walter W. Farrar.
 Brenda E. Adams.
 Mary L. Seules.
 Dorothy Rice.
 Beverly Barnes.
 Vivian Bellamy.
 Charles D. Kise, Jr.
 George Demar.
 Janet Spoerer.
 Joyce Hitt.
 Jeanne A. Sera.
 Helen Rita Payne.
 John C. Moron.
 Richard L. Carver.
 Frances Patrick.
 Erma D. Waldroop.
 Margaret E. Gilman.
 Robert E. Booker.
 Dottie L. Snow.
 Mr. & Mrs. Carl Denekas.
 Mr. Kenneth Denekas.
 Mr. & Mrs. Emerson Meyers.
 Mr. & Mrs. Everette C. Simmons.
 Mr. & Mrs. Walter J. Spangler.
 Mrs. Iva M. Glaviano.
 Mr. & Mrs. Joseph O. Ockershausen.
 Mr. & Mrs. Elbridge C. Narron, Jr.
 Mr. & Mrs. Eugene J. Holland.
 Robert Moltz.
 Paul T. Nakansil.

OREGON'S GOVERNOR TOM McCALL SPEAKS TO THE COLLEGE GEN- ERATION

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Oregon's very able Governor, Tom McCall, recently addressed the students and faculty in assembly at Oregon State University, Corvallis.

His remarks are very incisive, and responsive to the present communication problem between the generations. I am certain that you will find them very helpful as we all struggle to understand not only the younger generation, but our own as well, and seek to unite all sectors of our national ability to build a better America. Here is Governor McCall's message:

As we meet today to look into another century, it's appropriate that we honor towering figures in the fields of writing, politics, education and natural resources.

Our warmest congratulations go to the recipients of the Distinguished Service Awards . . . the brilliant debater who fought through so much valuable federal education in his 24 years in the Senate . . . the outstanding American novelist . . . the consum-

mate manager of fish and wildlife assets . . . and the great forester who later became the most powerful college president Oregon has ever known.

Oregon is a better state and Oregon State a stronger university because of their extraordinary efforts—and did you notice that, like almost any presentation for unusual service in Oregon, a goodly share of the awards were based on the recipient's commitment to the quality of the environment.

What's more, when we look together into your second century, we cannot escape the sobering thought that our greatest need will be to make our existence on this planet compatible with our environment. So massive is our degradation, so overwhelming our pollution, so intemperate our demands upon nature and nature's world which sustains us and makes our very life possible, that charting out our course is perhaps the No. 1 imperative of a dawning decade.

There is no leadership opportunity that is greater, no need more insistent, no problem area that is of more importance than balancing man's technological progress with the restorative powers of his environment.

Man himself may be the endangered specie. From our great universities, from the "Oregon States" of the nation, can come the combined voice of technical competence and social understanding to show the way.

This university has been of paramount importance in providing guidance and knowledge in improving man's lot by improving the bounty of the land and the forests and our livestock and wildlife. Accomplishments in your second century may dwarf all of this in the field of oceanography as you probe and reveal and open the treasure chest of the sea.

As magnificent as our space efforts have been, the frontier still open to man is on this planet, in using the abundance of the oceans for our betterment.

And let our stewardship of the resources of the oceans reflect our best efforts, free from our tragic ineptness in handling the resources of the land.

Our greatest challenge is to learn to live as part of nature's world, and to make nature part of our world. To this end we also look to you for leadership, as we meet at the fountainhead of Oregon State University's second century of service to man.

The growth and the deeds that came before this moment have gained unquestioned honor.

The vitality and promise of now are witnessed in every phase of this busy community of scholarship.

The future of this institution has every promise of continued greatness and growing excitement.

But in 1969, even a solid and praiseworthy past—even a dynamic present cannot offer guarantees of a future.

This is a time of great question—analysis—examination—and great diagnostic probing.

You couldn't have been young at a better time.

Of course we do not know precisely what the next century will offer. Of course you cannot know the pages of your own futures. But what great expectations are truly warranted as the entire world trembles on the edge of the universe!

Governments are changing; educational structures are revolving and evolving; lifestyles have never before plunged with such abandon into new lifestyles.

At a time when we all have so much invested in each other; at a time we are gaining such encouraging new insights, I find it foolish to think of us as entrenched and divisive generations, camped apart, and wary of each other's moods and moves.

Is there such a difference? And how about the common ground, isn't it strong and fer-

tile and well-tilled? If we stand together in a new dawn, don't we owe it to each other to sustain the old accords just a bit longer?

We are involved in a time of sensitive significance. We all share this time and its pressures together. But, at moments when our tempers run high we should remember: What other nation has allowed such scope of public comment by all segments of the majority and all segments of the minority?

Woefully lacking in many virtues we may be; bitterly hypocritical and ignorant we often prove; but the outcry of voices has not been silenced.

As long as we can maintain this monumental clamor under one mutual roof, we have earned at the very least an abashment of history. Many shades of political thought have lived on this ground before us and many more will. There is scope here for idea and there is hope here of intelligent change through compromise and agreement.

Listen to a thought expressed in 1937 by Charles Evans Hughes: "The greater the importance of safeguarding the community from incitements to the overthrow of our institutions by force and violence, the more imperative is the need to preserve inviolate the constitutional rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly, in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion, to the end that government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes, if desired, may be obtained by peaceful means. Therein lies the security of the Republic, the very foundation of constitutional government."

There is a real crisis at hand. And we are all involved in that crisis. We cannot, of course, eliminate the differences of age and experience and training; we cannot eliminate the real differences in point of view. We cannot even prevent the shock of unavoidable separation which years and change bring about. My generation suffers that affront now; yours will suffer it when you have been replaced on the evanescent throne of youth. This has always been so and probably will always be. It is part of the ground rules for living.

We share this crisis through propinquity. We all happened along in the same span of time—and here we are. Will we stone each other to death or will we set the guard, pool the rations, and light a council fire? Certainly, the fact that we are facing each other across some very dark fields in some very crucial moments has made both of our generations more important than they could have been ten years ago. So, again, here we are. Shall we—standing in this common spotlight—find common ground?

Yes, because from my point of view, I feel like an expert in knowing and caring about the young. First of all, I was there once myself. But—since leaving it—I have never been able to cut myself off from the arena of young lives, nor would I want to.

During the years of my life I have been thoroughly trained and experienced in dealing with youthful lifestyles and mindstyles—through having two sons, through nieces and nephews, through cousins, through the sons and daughters of my close personal friends.

In the lot of my own blood contacts, I've lived with both the Phi Beta Kappa and the dropout; with the decorated naval officer in Viet Nam and with the young man who took the Lompoc route away from the service; through family success and family failure; through the whole gamut of emotion and intellect. That's a lot of experience with youth. And it has kept me from growing an insulation between myself and the younger lives. It has helped stay in touch with the young mind and its exciting, fresh, robust point of view. It has made it possible for me to develop a deep personal love and concern for all of them—yes all of them—and a continuing sense of grateful responsibility for my part in helping them when I can. That's a lot of caring, and a lot of raw material for

compassion, and I'm not about to back away from that much basic training.

"It's all the young can do for the old, to shock them and keep them up to date."

George Bernard Shaw made that observation. It would be illuminating if we could hear his reactions to the current uproar between youth and age. It is probable that the pithy playwright would be dazzlingly frank, semantically exact, and completely without panic in facing the question. He was, as is the case with all great men, completely free of a false generation barrier. His lifetime was unfettered by a "generation gap."

"Generation Gap?" How often is that one heard? More often, even, than "viable" or "meaningful" or "fantastic." But what does it mean and how does it help anything or anybody? Could it be that—at least most of the time—it provides a handy cop-out phrase for the parent, teacher, or leader to disguise a deep lack of interest in or a dark fear of the young; and, balancing that, for the young to use an open-sesame for absolutely frivolous behavior or as an excuse for not listening?

Let's try to avoid making what appears to be an ancient and familiar twin mistake: abandoning reason for labels or clichés, at the same time we are replacing the search for difficult answers by the acceptance of easy and superficial stopgaps.

There is much for the elder to learn from the younger. Francis Bacon said "Young men are fitter to invent than to judge; fitter for execution than for counsel; and fitter for new projects than for settled business." Cooperative effort grows from that philosophy. We have so much in common. The ideals of age are not so different from the ideals of youth. John Dryden felt there was century-spanning unity in the "the people's prayer, the glad diviner's theme, the young man's vision, and the old man's dream."

For a moment, look at that decrepit generation over 40. As a group, it rattled the cage loudly enough to gain incredible depression-inspired reforms, and without turning to Communism as a tool for social progress; it shattered history's most massive totalitarian war machine; it shed more blood and realized more treaty-gained curbs against aggression; it fought the widest range of economic battles; and it accomplished more legislation for the advancement of ethnic and other minorities than any other generation in history.

And, of course, we botched up many projects, fumbled on many an occasion, and frequently looked the other way when the handwriting was appearing on the wall. We, as a group, can neither brag nor despair. We tried. We tried hard. We ask the same of today's youth. Our causes are remarkably wedded—and we hope you win where we failed.

Much must be reformed. This has always been true. But let's realize the reforms in the only way that any gained advantage can be assured—and that is action through the ballot box.

With every violent and mindless scourge of blood and fire, anarchy is brought ever nearer.

Every time a life is destroyed, a leader may have been lost.

Every time an institution is destroyed, a kernel of vital truth may have crumbled with it.

We cannot let violence or silence force us into a polarization of such cataclysmic potential.

And another point to consider: You may, with your extreme age-consciousness, be doing great damage to your own futures, let alone ours. I do not mean the much-discussed dreads of drugs, drinks, and dropouts. I mean the incredible chronology youth seems to have laid out. Youth speaks of an end-stop at age 30. That means, when you are 20, you have only 10 years left to live before the long, dark, nothingness of senility.

If you live past 30, what a dismal prospect for you. You will have no training for it and no taste for it. You will be shocked and hurt when the 20-year-olds behind you clam up and shun you. What—in the name of insmanship—will you do? Weep through a long and lonely medieval age? Retreat into the shades-drawn quiet of the recluse? Make fools of yourselves by tucking middle-aged spreads into tight jeans and miniskirts? Or will you make the unfavorable mistake which so many of you—now young—accuse your parents of making: that is, the futile attempt to relive your own youth by mercilessly invading and sharing the lives of your children.

It needn't happen. The gap is artificial. The ages of man are amalgamated through sharing, and so should it ever be.

Whatever the hazards ahead, somehow enthusiasm and hope must be protected and encouraged. And—beyond argument—both enthusiasm and hope leap highest in the hearts of the young.

We must seek the common ground and encourage all forms of liaison activity. We must preserve this remarkable system of democratic government while protecting all of its gaudy and glorious differences. And, certainly, one of the main motivations for concern is well and simply stated by Dr. Dale Corson, president of Cornell University: "To destroy the universities is the surest and quickest way to destroy mankind."

It is a time of bewildering paradox.

We roar in the streets for the subtle rights and the nuances of power—while there are millions in our society who can't even read what the issues are.

We campaign for curriculum detail—while one out of four students has significant reading deficiencies.

We hear that 60% of our high school students don't plan to go on to college—while most high school programs are planned solely for the college-bound student.

We hear of demonstrators demanding a voice on the podium—while denying it to others.

We hear of those who call for love, using hate to get it; who demand freedom, denying it to others; who revolt against rigidity, founding another strict format of their own.

We hear of dictums to end hypocrisy, stop wars, abolish hunger, elevate righteousness, and declare paradise.

These are excellent goals, but they will require the power of combined effort and coordinate cooperation. And they will require time.

Dr. Paul F. Lawrence, assistant commissioner in the U.S. Office of Education, San Francisco, sees no end to campus unrest in the near future.

"Though the goals and dimensions of demonstrations will undoubtedly change," he writes, "students understand—and rightly so—that our educational enterprises become repository of all sorts of hopes for curing ills that plague society, from crime and urban decay to foreign policy and Viet Nam."

Dr. Lawrence says this is the kind of response to problems that we should expect of students, and he urges those of us who are concerned about the problem to make a very real effort not only to learn more about what is upsetting the student mind—but to help see to it that the average citizen also gets with it. Perhaps Dr. Lawrence's most provocative point is this:

"Too often the primary question relates to the means which can be devised to eliminate, eradicate, or exterminate the phenomenon of student unrest. I wonder how long it will be until educated men begin to realize that the real problem is not unrest at all. *Student unrest is a reaction to—not the cause of—problems, at least some of which have been created by failures of previous generations.*"

Strong, valuable words. There is no question that the time of change is upon us again—and that most Americans want hu-

mane and intelligent improvements in the family of man. The pertinent questions now are: Toward what are we moving? What precisely have been our failures and why? What are the nature and the demands of Now and Tomorrow?

Education—if it is to hold its eminent position in the affairs of man—must be geared to the changing times and to all of the stress and demand which flux will put upon the campus.

It is going to be a demanding and an exciting time.

We are privileged to have lived in such an age as this has been and is likely to be. Will Durant wrote that life has always presented problems and difficulties and that, by facing them in times of decision and stress we gain the nourishment we need to grow in stature and in competence: "Life is good, bad as it is, and so is man," he said.

My hope is that we in this group could find a steady ground of agreement over one issue. It's the issue of what academic freedom means as a phrase and what it is in practice. To me it means we must not *politicize the university*—not for any issue and not at any time and not for any individual or group.

If we allow the University body to take one, single, rigid point of view—no matter the cause—we are opening the way for that university body to be wielded like a sword in the battleground of power struggle.

When a whole university declares a firm policy in the government of men—and backs that philosophy with the force of action—then the free-flow forum of ideas has begun to close up shop on that campus.

A university should not present itself as *the cause*; it should maintain itself as the *avenue of causes*; the arena for all, the showcase of none; the opener of minds, not the closer of issues; the place where all things can begin—and where all things are possible—and where even the vitality of youth can exult without bumping against the walls.

We have a busy time ahead. I hope we can keep contact. I am certain that the coming crises would be best served by our cooperative effort. I know it will be a lot more interesting if we keep in touch.

We elders do find it hard sometimes to stand aside and play the role of "square-old-man." We think we have insights you might like to try. And we are so truly concerned with your future—with your world—and with the ultimate awareness of mankind—that we are willing to hazard your scorn.

What kind of children will you have, we wonder? What patterns will you teach them? What will you ask of them? How easily will you stand aside when your inheritors say "begone!"

May we part today—pointed toward this institution's second century and toward our several destinies—on a note of mutual anticipation and hope. The sinewy optimism of Carl Sandburg, perhaps, is right for singing on this October wind:

"Man is a long time coming.

Man will yet win.

Brother may yet line up with brother;

This old anvil laughs at many broken hammers.

There are men who can't be bought."

JACKSONVILLE JOURNAL CONGRATULATED

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Jacksonville Journal for

its editorial comments upon the tempest which has arisen in some areas about speeches made by the Vice President. While some of the press and news media have gnashed teeth about the Vice President's criticism of portions of the news media, the Jacksonville Journal has found it to be in keeping with fairplay for the Vice President to express his opinions, too. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial dated November 24, 1969.

JOINING THE DEBATE

Vice President Spiro Agnew shows no signs of relenting in his one-man crusade against what he considers to be biased reporting by some of the nation's news media.

Far from it; he has now expanded upon his original charges and extended them to include some previously unmentioned areas—newspapers and news magazines. His comments at first were restricted to television networks.

It is not at all improbable that the vice president has been greatly encouraged in this by the whirlwind generated among some of those targeted by his first remarks.

Agnew, in fact, may have stumbled onto the magic formula for winning television time and news space that some others before him have discovered: criticize them; wade into them; accuse them of discrimination. In their effort to prove—both to the public and to themselves—that they are honest, many of the victims will overreact, bestowing upon their accuser heaps of precious exposure.

This, of course, is a defense mechanism, and it works equally well with individuals or institutions. Accuse a man of being a bigot, and he will go out of his way to establish just how extremely tolerant he is.

At the same time, many react with intemperate attacks upon their attacker, which may then easily be shown to be the foolishness that they are, to the distinct advantage of the adversary.

This is what has happened in Agnew's case, and he seized upon the opportunity presented him in his Montgomery address Thursday night, citing such venomous, unreasoned attacks by his foes as the best evidence of just how one-sided they really are.

It is unresponsive, as the vice president himself gleefully pointed out, to say that the Des Moines speech that contained the original charges was "disgraceful, ignorant and base."

The vice president is none of these, and neither was his address. But even if it and he were all of those things, it would have nothing to do with judging the validity of the charges he made, that is, that much of the television reporting to which the nation is exposed is unfairly weighed in favor of one viewpoint to the disadvantage of a contending one.

And it is a gross misconstruction of what Agnew said to interpret it, as some have, as suggesting that the federal government take over control of the news media and censor any expressions it finds not to its liking.

The vice president has said no such thing. He has not even hinted at any such thing. He has gone out of his way on both occasions, in fact, to make it crystal clear that nothing could be less to his liking.

But this, again, is beside the point. What is at issue is whether it is true that there is bias in news reporting.

This is a legitimate question—one deserving of a close examination.

It is not, moreover, an entirely new one. It has been asked—is constantly being asked—by every conscientious practitioner of the news craft. And those who care for their own integrity and that of their profession will continue to ask it, of themselves and others.

Most of those who are well informed on the subject, we believe, would be willing to concede that some of the attitudes to which Agnew objects do exist here and there. But they are the exception; they are certainly not the rule. If the vice president believes otherwise, he is simply in error.

As far as we are concerned, however, he is completely welcome to join the discussion. So is anyone else. He is entitled to his viewpoint and he is entitled to express it, publicly or not, as he chooses.

But he must not think that we will remain silent. We also have a viewpoint and the right to express it. If this sometimes involves criticism of the vice president or of a position he has taken, so be it.

What we are saying, in effect, is that we are perfectly willing to accept the vice president's invitation to "enjoy the rough and tumble of the public debate," ivory tower or no ivory tower.

FOR EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal or federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs.

With each passing year the accelerating demands for public services of all kinds and the attendant growth in population, particularly in urban areas, have had a shattering effect on people displaced from their homes, their neighborhoods and their businesses to make way for public projects.

The 1964 report of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee documented the inequities and hardships suffered by people forced to pack up their possessions and relocate for the sake of projects intended to benefit the public as a whole.

Yet the problems persist. There are now more than 50 Federal programs which result in the condemnation of land and, literally, the bulldozing of hundreds of thousands of people from their homes and businesses each year. It is estimated that over 1 million families, 180,000 businesses and 40,000 farms will suffer displacement over the next 10 years.

A large number of these people are low-income families. They are elderly. They are small farmers and small businessmen. Most of their lives and economic well-being have centered around the property and neighborhoods which are being uprooted.

We know what we are doing to these people, but what are we doing for them? The record is clear. Nearly all federally assisted programs have differing and conflicting provisions for helping those displaced. When NASA, the Federal Highway Administration, and the De-

fense Department demolish homes and businesses, relocation assistance is provided. However, when the Post Office uproots families, no assistance is given. The only constant involved in the taking of property for public uses is the displacement of people.

The uprooting of an individual, his family, his business, or farm and the taking of his land is a very personal matter. We cannot make the process painless, but we can insure fair and evenhanded administration consistent with protection of individual rights and community needs, no matter what agency is involved.

Much of this problem will be relieved by the present relocation and acquisition programs set forth in the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act and the 1968 Federal Aid Highway Act. There still is lacking, however, a system for applying relocation assistance uniformly in all programs.

My bill seeks to achieve the desperately needed uniformity and equity of treatment for displaced persons. It provides that assurances must be given in advance that suitable housing will be available for relocation of families and individuals. It directs that advisory assistance be given to all displaced persons in finding new homes or places of business. It establishes schedules of relocation payments geared to the actual cost of moving and economic adjustment.

The legislation gives particular attention to the need for consistency and evenhandedness in dealings with property owners and displaced persons. It places responsibility for coordinating all Federal operations where it belongs—in the Executive Office of the President. To reduce conflict and confusion in the federally aided programs, the bill provides that one State or local agency may make relocation payments and provide relocation assistance for all federally connected programs causing displacements in the locality.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of America's own displaced persons have been documented in reports and in hearing after hearing. We must act now to assure uniform and equitable assistance for these displaced persons.

THE INEVITABLE SHAME OF WAR

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible not to feel shame for our country as the revelations of deliberate civilian killings in Vietnam accumulate. And we cannot escape the blame by castigating and punishing a few individual soldiers. We all have to share the responsibility for what happened and for the long coverup.

But what we also have to realize is that this kind of thing is inevitable in war, that the stresses and distortions of war can make monsters of decent human beings.

The only slight gleam of silver lining I can see in the dark cloud of our shame is that perhaps these sickening disclosures will help to bring home to the American people the nature of our involvement in Vietnam and to reinforce the growing desire to end it, even at some cost and at some risk.

The following is a thoughtful editorial on the subject which appeared in today's Washington Post:

MYLAI 4

"You have to have been there to know how it is," said an Army rifleman who was there at Mylai 4 hamlet in South Vietnam when it happened—when an undetermined number of civilians, old men, women, infants, perhaps as many as three or four hundred, were apparently shot to death by American troops in March of 1968. We who were not there can only absorb slowly, and perhaps partially, the full horror of it, let alone comprehend how this could happen. Our guess is that Peter Braestrup, who was also not at Mylai, but who has been there in Vietnam, covering the war the hard way, close up, for this newspaper, probably has it about right in a story in last Sunday's Washington Post:

"The tentative picture that emerges indicates that under stress, in a particularly vicious corner of the war, the officers of a tired, understrength rifle company, at the very least, allegedly failed to prevent many of their men from slaughtering hostile but unarmed peasants in revenge for the deaths of some of their comrades."

Stress? Particularly vicious corner of the war? Tired? Understrength? Revenge? Can these words, put together, explain the horror of American soldiers shooting helpless civilians, point-blank? The appalling account offered by Infantryman Paul Meadlo, one who was there, in an interview with Mike Wallace of CBS, suggests that, in a certain sense they can, that decent men can crack under the strain and the frustration of a brutal and brutalizing war. The Captain was there, Mr. Meadlo said "Why didn't he put a stop to it, he knew what was going . . . he was right there . . . at the time I felt like I was doing the right thing . . . I lost buddies . . . I lost a damn good buddy Bobby Wilson and it was on my conscience . . ."

Perhaps it can happen; perhaps it happens more than we know, though probably not on the scale of Mylai. It is hard to say because there is still so much we do not know. What seems clear, however, is that it will never be enough to understand Mylai if one ever can, for this is not simply a matter of a court-martial of one lieutenant, or of whatever number of men in his command who may be under investigation now. This is not just something to do with Company C, 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry, 11th Brigade, Americal Division. This, in the most extreme form, is the story of the Vietnam war, and it seems safe to say that when we know as much as we can know of this event the American public's perception of the war rightly or wrongly, will never be the same again.

For the questions that are going to have to be answered merely begin with Lt. William L. Calley Jr.'s guilt or innocence. There are more terrible questions that have to do with a system and a state of mind that can allow nearly 20 months to elapse before so monstrous an event is even brought to light, let alone to trial. We need to know how, in a system which positively thrives on operations reports and progress reports, no honest report of this "incident," as the Army calls it, apparently ever reached the high command. And how, according to reports in this newspaper, the regimental commander could develop strong suspicions that something had gone wrong and then make only the

most cursory investigation. The suspicion arises that the Army really didn't want to know, that somehow an atmosphere has developed in which the unthinkable atrocity is of no great matter—until some conscience-stricken enlisted man talks and it comes time to find a scapegoat well down the chain of command. This is what we need to know more about—the system and the state of mind. For Mylai even at best, cannot be written off as an exception that proves the rule, as some isolated aberration. For all its horror, in a certain sense it is part and parcel of the war, removed only in degree from what is known to be commonplace: the indiscriminate killing of South Vietnamese civilians by American saturation bombing, by American artillery fire, by isolated infantry skirmishing. So there is no way that it can be ignored, even without the worldwide uproar it has produced. We can perhaps weather that. What remains to be seen is whether we can withstand the outcry at home, for the massacre at Mylai 4 can only make more anguishing the central question of our capacity in good conscience to wage this war.

ORGANIZING—ANARCHY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my remarks, "Anarchy Does Not Just Happen—It Is Planned," I commented on the subsidized agitation being provoked in our Nation to stir up the "have-nots" in the never-ending recruitment of an American proletariat to man the barricades for the long-sought class war in our country.

Today we learn that the administration plans to tap the wealthy foundations of our country to finance his White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health with "tax-free" funds.

From New York City, we learn that Robert W. Sarnoff, president of RCA, disapproves of the time-honored and proven American concept of individual liberty and free enterprise. Like self-promoted leaders he seeks to promote his own comprehensive and systematic approach on how to harness taxpayers, funds to recruit and control the poor, the unfortunate, and the dissident.

As with all social schemes the grandiose share-the-wealth ideas remain always to be paid for out of other people's money.

Both programs will be thoroughly sold to the American taxpayers through the TV media—Mr. Sarnoff being the head of NBC and the President having announced his movement is to be publicized through WNET, the national educational television system.

In the meantime the vast overwhelming silent America, who pays the taxes and wonders where it will all end, grows more frustrated and intemperate in his attitude.

Too many remember the last utopian programs promising to make the Nation's Capital a model city—even the news media cannot hide the failure.

I include several news clippings:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1969]

WHITE HOUSE NUTRITION UNIT TAPS FOUNDATIONS FOR FUNDS

(By Judith Randal)

At a time when their tax-exempt status is being reviewed by Congress, three major foundations have been asked by the Nixon administration to underwrite the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health at the Sheraton-Park Hotel next week.

The requests were made in letters dated Nov. 17 and 18 and signed by Dr. Jean Mayer, the President's consultant on nutrition who is organizing the conference.

They have resulted in awards of \$500,000—\$300,000 from the Ford Foundation and \$100,000 each from the Rockefeller and Kellogg foundations. All three organizations have offices in New York City. The total cost of the conference is expected to exceed \$850,000.

Dr. George J. Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, in a statement yesterday said that "the Rockefeller Foundation is particularly privileged to assist in supporting the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health, as its goals coincide with the foundation's ongoing work to overcome hunger and malnutrition in this country or wherever it exists."

BUNDY WITHHOLDS COMMENT

A spokesman for the Ford Foundation said that its president, McGeorge Bundy, wished to make no comment on its contribution to the conference. No immediate reaction was available from the Kellogg Foundation.

None of the money has yet been received here or is to be paid directly to the federal government.

Instead, it is to be funneled through a nonprofit corporation called Food, Nutrition and Health, Inc., which was chartered Oct. 28 in the District of Columbia and is headed by an attorney, Henry Roemer McPhee.

McPhee, a member of the White House staff during the Eisenhower administration and now a senior partner in Hamel, Morgan, Park and Saunders at 888 17th St. NW, said last night that he, too, has made proposals to the foundations involved on behalf of the forthcoming conference and that "we hope to see the money momentarily."

He stressed, however, that the nonprofit corporation which he heads was organized for "purposes . . . relating to the elimination of malnutrition and hunger wherever they may afflict United States citizens" and that it plans to pursue these aims long after the conference ends.

PURPOSE OF FUNDS

According to Mayer, most of the money to be provided by the foundations will be spent to enable about 500 poor people—some from as far away as California—to participate in the conference. They are being forwarded funds to cover their travel and hotel expenses and in some cases to pay for babysitters in their absence, he said last night.

Others who will be subsidized by the newly promised funds, according to Mayer, are students, ministers, and college instructors not yet at the level of professor who could not otherwise afford to come. In general, industry representatives and senior university faculty members will be expected to pay their own way, he said.

Not all the money supporting the conference, which runs Tuesday through Thursday, is coming from foundations. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is investing \$250,000, the Department of Agriculture \$100,000 and if a deficit develops, the Office of Economic Opportunity will be asked to contribute, too.

OEO SHARE CITED

OEO's share, Mayer said, will probably not exceed \$100,000 and very possibly will be a good deal less.

Meanwhile, the Agriculture Department is paying the salaries of some of the conference staff, while OEO and HEW have assisted by temporarily assigning personnel to the White House.

In addition to paying the expenses directly connected with the conference, the funds contributed by foundations and the federal government will cover the costs of filming the proceedings by WNET, the National Educational Television.

Some money, too, will be needed, Mayer said, to support the staff which will be retained after the conference ends to help implement its recommendations. This staff is expected to be at work at least until June 30, the end of the fiscal year, he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 21, 1969]

REVITALIZING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: RCA'S SARNOFF PROPOSES HUGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT HERE

(By Philip Greer)

NEW YORK, November 20.—Washington and the capital region should be used as a demonstration project in a massive test of computer technology for solving the urban crisis, Robert W. Sarnoff said today.

The president of RCA Corp., addressing the National Industrial Conference Board's fourth annual computer age conference, said that the national capital "belongs to all our people" and that a comprehensive effort to revitalize the city and its environs should evoke a nationwide response—"a response as broad and enthusiastic as that inspired by the Apollo moon landing."

Sarnoff said that "there is a growing awareness of the promise of systems planning as a social implement." He noted that the federal government has encouraged the use of computer technology in the model cities program. He said that the State of California has conducted studies of crime control, information processing, transportation and waste control and that New York City has the Rand Corp. working on systems studies of operations in the housing, health, police and fire departments.

"To date, however, such efforts have been too incomplete in concept, too limited in scope, to prove much beyond the fact that systems planning is a complicated and costly enterprise," he said. "We have yet to see a demonstration project of sufficient scale to create a critical mass for real social improvement."

"I propose a complete and systematic rehabilitation of Washington, D.C., and the national capital region as a most logical choice," he said.

Sarnoff said Washington was conceived as a planned city, "but has long since fallen heir to all the ills of our unplanned society." In recent years, he said, "more thought has been devoted to the physical planning of the capital—including a regional plan for the year 2000—than to any other American city."

"Thus," he said, "the capital not only faces the need but has laid some of the groundwork for a comprehensive and systematic approach to the urban crisis. It now stands ready for a large-scale program of regeneration that would go beyond physical planning and cut through the whole tangled maze of interacting problems in housing, transportation, race relations, employment, health, welfare, education, communications, law enforcement, air and water pollution. Such a project would draw on all the most advanced techniques of operations research, systems

analysis, model-building, simulation and long-range planning."

Sarnoff said the project could be given added emphasis if the first phase were scheduled for completion in 1976, to coincide with the country's 200th anniversary.

Although he said the time needed for the project—and its cost—could be determined only after study, Sarnoff proposed that Congress allocate all the funds needed at the outset, and phase the funding over the years. The plan, he said, should be put under the administration of existing agencies, especially the National Capital Planning Commission and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, which would draw on the services of managers and specialists from government, universities and industry.

DMSO REMAINS THE PERSECUTED DRUG

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, for 5 long years I have fought for relaxation of restrictions on the use of the drug DMSO but thus far the Food and Drug Administration has refused to permit its use under a doctor's prescription despite the fact that it is a prescriptive item in Europe and has been for several years.

A brilliant Portland, Oreg., surgeon, Dr. Stanley W. Jacob, one of the discoverers of this wonder drug, discussed recent developments in connection with the drug. I am presenting to my colleagues herewith a news account of his report as published in the Portland Oregonian November 11, 1969:

SCAR TISSUE REDUCED: DOCTOR HAILS DMSO PROPERTIES

(By Ann Sullivan)

LOS ANGELES.—The lessening of scar tissue with dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) after artificially induced coronary attacks in rats was described here by the Portland surgeon, Dr. Stanley W. Jacob, who first noticed its medical properties in 1963.

Dr. Jacob, associate professor of surgery at the University of Oregon Medical School, told the Research to Prevent Blindness Inc. about several new therapeutic "leads" of DMSO.

The meeting, at the Beverly Hilton Hotel, was the third biennial session for science writers, and DMSO discussion came into the session because of its value in treating some kinds of eye diseases.

It was also of interest because the only major difficulty to come from use of the Crown Zellerbach Corp. drug, a solvent long used in industry, has been the finding of some lens myopia—nearsightedness—in rabbit and other lower animals' eyes.

But this was only with 10 times the dosage ever given humans, said Dr. Jacob, and it doesn't occur in primates—including monkeys and man.

The New York ophthalmologist who first tested DMSO on many hundreds of stubborn eye inflammations and other problems, Dr. Dan M. Gordon, of Cornell University, joined Dr. Jacob in declaring it safe. He found no evidences of toxicity.

"We know it does not cause increased intraocular pressure in the human eye," said Dr. Gordon. "Nor do we have any evidence that it causes harm in humans. We could not prove it was anti-allergic, but it was anti-

inflammatory in 157 eyes—before we were cut off (from using it) by the Food and Drug Administration."

Dr. Gordon said that in addition to reduction of eye inflammations, the two most important things he noted was "a dramatic lessening" of lesions of herpes zoster (shingles) on the face and body.

He also said he has observed dramatic reduction of corneal edema—"waterlogged cornea" in a dozen cases. He also found it gave excellent relief to swelling and hemorrhage caused by traumatic injuries to the eye.

STUDIES LIMITED

Dr. Jacob said that although American clinical studies on human beings are still hampered by FDA restrictions, they are continuing elsewhere, even in Russia. There have been more than 1,000 scientific papers on DMSO so far, he said, reflecting work on 15 different animal species, including monkeys, by every known method of application—injection, intramuscularly, on the skin, by mouth, in the bladder, etc.

Recounting results of the Walter Reed Medical Center study on rats, Dr. Jacob said that the scientists found DMSO was shown to have a medical benefit on the heart muscle scarring.

With chemical injections, all the rats were given "heart attacks." The heart muscle affected would ordinarily thicken and die.

One third of the rats received daily injections of water under the skin; one third received a DMSO solution; one third, the controls, nothing.

The animals were killed after three and 30 days and pathologists were given microscopic sections of the affected heart muscle, but not told which was which.

"The conclusion reached," said Dr. Jacob, "was that the administration of DMSO following heart attacks in rats resulted in distinctly less damage to the heart muscle and a reduced area of scar tissue in the heart muscle. The animals receiving DMSO showed neither rupture of the heart muscle nor any aneurysm formation within the heart muscle."

Dr. Jacob also revealed that chronic cystic and mastitis (painful but benign cysts in the breasts of women) also respond well to DMSO, according to findings in Germany.

Fifty women were evaluated with a placebo (dummy "medicine") and 50 with DMSO.

The disease is cyclic, believed to respond somewhat to hormone and menstrual changes. The German scientists, he said, found 16 of the 50 women receiving the placebo showed pain relief, and 10 had some reduction in size of the cyst when examined by the physician, and two had improvement on X-ray.

PAIN REDUCED

In the DMSO group of 50, 42 had diminution in pain, 43 had a reduction in size of the cyst on physical examination and 21 exhibited a reduction in size of the cyst on X-ray examination.

Dr. Jacob also recounted a new Polish study which revealed it required half the time—with use of DMSO—for patients to be free of symptoms from disc disease of the neck and lower back.

It continues to be an excellent treatment for sprains, bruises and bursitis, yet in the United States, clinical studies, with rare exceptions, are only permitted to use it for maximum of 14 days.

Because DMSO evaluations reveal it to be a new therapeutic principle, he said, "it may indeed be foreign to our way of thinking. This could be one of the major reasons DMSO has encountered problems."

"On the other hand, the potential benefit to mankind is such that it deserves the serious attention of basic scientists and physicians in every specialty of medicine."

CONGRESSMAN HORTON CITES MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF NIXON ADMINISTRATION; ASKS ADHERENCE TO INAUGURAL PLEA FOR LOWERING OF VOICES SO PROGRESS CAN CONTINUE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Nixon administration ended its 10th month in office. In this relatively brief period of time, it has made many substantial accomplishments.

In an address last Friday, our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), offered what I believe is a fair appraisal of the accomplishments of this administration. Speaking to the Rochester, N.Y., Chapter of the National Tool and Die and Precision Machining Association, Congressman HORTON outlined an impressive list of administration achievements, both domestic and international.

Citing the advances that have been made since President Nixon's inaugural address on January 20, Congressman HORTON also points out that the President's plea for an end to the shouting and polarization in America has not been answered.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I share the full text of Congressman HORTON's November 21 address with our colleagues:

TEXT OF REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN FRANK HORTON AT A DINNER IN HIS HONOR GIVEN BY THE NATIONAL TOOL AND DIE AND PRECISION MACHINING ASSOCIATION, SHERATON HOTEL, ROCHESTER, N.Y., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1969

"We find ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit; reaching with magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord on earth.

"We are caught in war, wanting peace. We're torn by division, wanting unity. We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment. We see tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them.

"To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit.

"And to find that answer, we need only look within ourselves.

"When we listen to 'the better angels of our nature,' we find that they celebrate the simple things, the basic things—such as goodness, decency, love, kindness.

"Greatness comes in simple trappings.

"The simple things are the ones most needed today if we are to surmount what divides us and cement what unites us. To lower our voices would be a simple thing.

"In these difficult years, America has suffered from a fever of words: from inflated rhetoric that promises more than it can deliver; from angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds; from bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuading.

"We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices.

"For its part, Government will listen. We will strive to listen in new ways—to the voices of quiet anguish, the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart—to the injured voices, the anxious voices, the voices that have despaired of being heard.

"Those who have been left out we will try to bring in. Those left behind, we will help to catch up."

With these words, President Nixon in his inaugural address let us know that he was keenly aware of the single most serious threat to our Nation today—a polarized American people, communicating with each other only through confrontation and dissent.

On January 20, America was a haven of unsolved crises and uneased frustration for growing numbers of our people. We are still plodding uphill toward the solution of many of our problems, but I think a good start has been made.

In foreign affairs, the administration can boast a number of considerable accomplishments. A year ago, the Vietnam debate still raged over whether we should stay in Vietnam to the finish or withdraw. Today, the whole basis of debate has been transformed.

Now it concerns not whether, but how fast we should bring our ground troops home from Vietnam—whether we should pull out immediately or gradually, in order to leave a strengthened South Vietnam better able to defend itself.

Even more significant than the troop withdrawals and de-escalation in Vietnam is the announcement of the new Nixon Doctrine of foreign policy. In a television program I taped earlier this week for showing in Rochester Sunday, Counselor to the President, Bryce Harlow, said the President believes threatened countries should furnish their own manpower to wage these struggles, drawing on substantial economic help and military equipment from the United States where necessary.

Mr. Harlow said, and I quote: "The United States should not be furnishing combat manpower but should be furnishing these countries other kinds of help . . ."

This new doctrine means that continued containment of communism and other threats to free world countries can no longer and will no longer depend solely on the willingness of America to spill its blood on foreign shores.

It also means that while they can rely heavily on our dollar and equipment aid, our allies will have to prepare themselves to meet threats in their own regions of the world. To me, this updating of our post-World War II containment policy is long overdue, and I congratulate the President on his foresight and courage in announcing the Nixon Doctrine.

The list of accomplishments in foreign affairs goes on. At this moment, representatives of the world's two super-powers are meeting in Helsinki to work to end the headlong rush into new and expensive nuclear weapons and delivery systems that could be added to those now deployed, which already could destroy the world hundreds of times over. These talks are not designed to weaken one side and strengthen the other. Rather, we will try to mutually agree on a level of strategic strength which provides both sides an acceptable balance of power, without continuing the painful, dangerous and expensive process of inventing new tools of world terror. I pray that these Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (S.A.L.T.) will be successful. These talks are a direct result of President Nixon's pledge to change the basis of our foreign policy from one of confrontation, to one of negotiation from strength.

In addition to progress in Vietnam, the Nixon Doctrine and the S.A.L.T. talks, the Administration, with the help of our own Governor Rockefeller, has begun to restructure our policy toward the vital nations of Latin America, and to replace the largely unsuccessful Alliance for Progress. Also, instead of goading the two nuclear-tipped giants of China and Russia into war with each other—a war whose literal and political fallout could

ignite the world—the President has made deliberate but cautious moves toward re-opening communications with the Red Chinese, as we have with the Russians.

I believe these steps constitute more progress in foreign policy than our nation has seen in any five year period since World War II—and all this has been done since January 20th.

There have also been some very promising, but less substantial accomplishments on the domestic front.

For years, the young people of America have lived under the yoke of an unfair and undemocratic system of military manpower procurement. Early in this decade, commissions and study groups were named to suggest draft changes. All of their reports have been gathering dust.

Finally, this year, President Nixon announced his support for establishing an all-Volunteer Army after Vietnam, and he named the first Presidential Commission on an All-Volunteer Army. But he emphasized that we could not wait for the post-Vietnam era to eliminate the worst injustices of the draft—so he proposed a series of reforms to the Congress which would enable him to set up a lottery and shorten the period of prime eligibility to one year, instead of eight years.

Two days ago, this draft reform bill cleared its last hurdle in Congress. It will be implemented in January. Despite the intolerable length of time it took to get any Congressional action on draft reform, we finally have some meaningful reform—and I must credit the President's efforts with winning the battle in Congress.

Victories against other serious domestic problems are still in the works—but they are further along than ever before in recent history.

Our intolerable welfare system, which breeds repeated generations of poverty and dependency and hopelessness, was the subject of a major Presidential address last August, and his bold family assistance program, which I have co-sponsored, is now being aired before the Ways and Means Committee along with reforms in our outdated Social Security System.

After public muttering about needed reforms in our electoral college system every four years for nearly a century, the President and congressional leaders this year announced support for sweeping electoral reforms, and the House has already sent a proposed constitutional amendment to the Senate for action.

The Federal income tax burden has fallen unfairly on the shoulders of middle-income and working Americans, including most small businessmen. The most sweeping, and most controversial tax reform bill in history was passed by the House last summer, and Senate action is likely early next year. There are some sticky provisions in the House bill, but the main thrust of the bill—to redistribute the tax burden on an equitable basis among all Americans—is a move that is long overdue.

American science and industry have completed this year a decade-long giant step into space exploration. Only a few hours ago, our fourth manned flight into lunar orbit, and second venture to the moon's surface, fired its engines to return to mother earth. We cannot even dream of all of the changes and the progress that this new knowledge will mean for man and his society. But every American can be proud of the precision and the courage of those who have helped accomplish this feat—including the contribution of our strong tool and die industry.

I have often spoken out on policies and crises where progress and accomplishment have been lacking. We are not fulfilling our promise of better schooling, better housing and better jobs for all those Americans who are in need of these opportunities. There can be no compromise with these goals—which

I have put first on my list of Federal and national priorities. And I was very, very proud today to help you dedicate a very significant step forward in the field of vocational education and job development.

The Rochester Tool and Die and Precision Machining Institute is a model of cooperation between government and private industry in developing the skills we need to provide manpower for our technical industries. I am not only proud that this facility is in Rochester, but doubly proud as a member of the Small Business Committee, that a group of independent, small businessmen have banded together to provide this skills center for youth in our area.

We need to see repetition of this kind of project a thousand times over in America if we are to meet the crisis in skills and jobs. But this institute and its staff, its apprentices and its programs give me hope that we will get this job done.

I have spoken at length about accomplishments, about progress and about a lot of hard work that has been done in foreign and domestic policies since January 20th. Thinking back to the President's words on Inauguration Day, asking Americans to lower their voices so they can hear each other's words, one would think that these accomplishments would help to narrow the polarization and division in our country.

You and I know that this has not happened. If anything, the gap between generations, between the races, between the conservative and the liberal, and between those who support and oppose our peace plans for Vietnam has grown dangerously wider since January 20th.

I have spent some time listening since January, and I have not sensed a lowering of voices or an end to the shouting of one group of Americans against another. If anything, the fever pitch of dissent, of charges, and of counter-charges is higher than it was last winter.

I will not add to the polarization by blaming only the hippies, the black militants and youthful protesters for this failure. For they must share the blame with government and the so-called establishment. Neither side has made any reasonable attempt to see the point of view of the other, or to lower its voice long enough to hear the meanings of both sides.

First, we must fault a large body of Americans who seem to be lying in wait for the Administration to make a mis-step—so they can pounce on a new slogan or symbol for the anti-establishment cause. The Administration has made its share of mis-steps, but the public reprimands have been characterized by over-reactions which have had the effect of deliberately widening the credibility gap beyond what it is.

An example is the President's ABM proposal. I, for one, felt that \$6 billion or more was a lot of money to spend on an untried and possibly unnecessary new missile. I studied both sides carefully and finally decided to vote against the fiscal year 1970 appropriation for the ABM system. I do not deny that the Nixon ABM proposal is a considerable improvement and paring down over what the last President proposed—an anti-missile system that would have ringed many American cities with rocket sites. That proposal was provocative, not defensive. President Nixon offered this plan in the sincere belief that it was needed. I voted "no" in the sincere belief that its costs did not justify the prospects for its benefits or effectiveness.

But thinking through this decision was not an easy task in the midst of the shouting that both sides carried on. Opponents and potential opponents of the President immediately launched a frontal attack on the Administration, labeling the President and his advisers as militarists and warmongers. The inevitable slogans and bumper

stickers came out on both sides. One said, "ABM is an Edsel." Another boasted: "Missile Defense Makes Sense." Defenders of the Administration proposal somehow saw a need to join the shouting match full blast. They pronounced shadowy warnings of new Russian militarism. Some publications labeled ABM opponents as unpatriotic or even as "communist sympathizers" dangerously tampering with our national security.

None of this shouting from either side was necessary. All of it contributed to a new bandwagon of anti-establishment sentiment, and a new onslaught of opinion against all protesters.

The Vietnam debate is, of course, the center of the polarization in America. The cause of peace—defined as immediate and unilateral withdrawal—is one which unites many groups within American society which otherwise do not always agree. Young people want an immediate end to the war—at least the American portion of it—because they abhor killing and they cannot bear any further deaths of their classmates and friends—they do not want to have to fight for a policy which they see even the government is slowly closing down. They want it closed down before it involves them—Now. Blacks want the war to end because they know that needed federal funds for urban renewal, housing, education, jobs, health and new welfare programs will not be forthcoming in sufficient amount until the war is over. Those who see the impracticality of an outdated policy which has America policing the world want an end to the war. These people are not all young, or black or liberal. They just do not see Vietnam as a moral cause worth dying for. So together, these Americans, all sincere and all united in their cause, march against death and rally for immediate withdrawal in Washington.

I did not participate in the moratorium events, because I believe the President is on the right track in his fixed withdrawal timetable, designed to strengthen the South Vietnamese for the struggle that will continue after we leave. The process of Vietnamization has been going on for a year, and I do not think it should take another full year to complete this process and withdraw our ground combat troops.

Although I do not agree with those whose frustration with the war has grown to the point where they can ignore the consequences of total, immediate withdrawal, I see no need to belittle them, or to characterize them as something they are not. The demonstrations in Washington last weekend were by and large peaceful and sincere. Except for a few groups of hard-core anarchists who seek violence as a means of attracting attention and TV cameras, and as a means of destroying America, the hundreds of thousands of people who journeyed to the Capital were well-behaved. They came to express disagreement with government policies in a dignified way. Over 95 per cent of them did just that.

I was very disturbed to see attempts by Administration officials to downgrade the numbers and the behavior of the demonstrators. The government was right to prepare for the worst, and to insure the presence of sufficient manpower to handle a riot. It was wrong to deny the decorum of those who came in peace.

I agree fully with the President that policy decisions must not be made in the streets in our democracy, which has adequate channels for protest and reform of policies. But I do not think it was necessary to appear to ignore the voices of the peace marchers. That is the other extreme. When there are responsive channels of government—and I believe that there are in America—then decisions should be made through those channels: through Congress, through the White House, through orderly petitioning and in

the voting booth. A peaceful demonstration designed to petition the government, and to influence its policies is at home in a democracy. But demands shouted from the sidewalks in disrespect of our system of government have no place here.

The result is more shouting, and a wider gulf between the demonstrators and their elected officials whose policies they wish to change.

You can no more characterize all of the marchers of the Moratorium as "impudent snobs" than you can call every public official or policeman a "fascist pig." Both are wrong. Both are provocative. Both contribute to division and polarization. Both widen the dangerous gulf which has Americans shouting at other Americans, instead of reasoning together.

I say, let us stop the shouting on both sides. If, truly, we are to follow the President's words on January 20, and if the government as well as the people is to follow them, we had better begin now.

The shouting has grown so thick and so loud that neither side can see that both share a common goal in Vietnam, a prompt end to the bloody and costly presence of American troops. The ABM is a subject about which reasonable men can differ—but the shouting prevents either side from hearing or recognizing anything reasonable about their adversaries.

I think the President has the first responsibility to implement his own words. If Administration attacks on demonstrators will soften and those Americans who delight in pouncing on the mistakes of their leaders will stop and think before they dream up a new bumper sticker, or a new slogan—then we can get down to the business of listening to each other. The only shouts that remain would be the shouts of the true anarchists, those who are really impudent enough to want to destroy America any way they can. If only we would isolate their shouts, I think we would see their apparent numbers shrink, and I think we could deal properly and forcefully with them.

We have a great deal to be proud of in America. I have listed what I think are the significant accomplishments of our Nation in the past 10 months.

We have much to be thankful for on Thanksgiving Day.

We must remember how far we have come as a Nation in the last 200 years, and in the last 300 days, and must work feverishly to build on our accomplishments. The building we dedicated today is one of which you should be proud. I hope that this accomplishment is given as much public attention as the unsolved problems are given this weekend.

The President paid a surprise visit to the Congress last week. He said one thing that I wish to leave you with tonight. He said we must remember that we are all Americans. Whatever our political, or racial, or economic differences—we are Americans. That is the most important fact about every one of us. With that thought, we are united in spirit, in purpose and in nationhood. Without it, we risk permanent polarization. As Lincoln said a century ago: "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Somerset, Pa.,

American, the Pittsburgh Press, the Corry, Pa., Journal, and WSBA radio station editorial of September 9, 1969, in the State of Pennsylvania. The editorials follow:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Sept. 7, 1969]

SAFETY AND BIGGER TRUCKS

The reported smiles on the faces of members of the House Public Works subcommittee who favor bigger, longer, wider, heavier trucks must have given Federal Highway Administrator F. C. Turner some inkling of what his "inability" to make a recommendation on the issue meant.

Mr. Turner said he did not have "sufficiently reliable evidence" to say whether interstate highway safety would be adversely affected by raising allowable truck weights from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds; allowable width from eight feet to 8½, and setting the maximum length at 70 feet.

For obvious reasons, the trucking industry has long been advocating these increases—the big economy package gets bigger and more economical all the time, so far as their interests are concerned. And those smiling committee members seem to indicate the truckers may be on the way to having their way.

But it is also of some small interest to tax-paying motorists and the American Automobile Association has fought valiantly against letting trucks, which already clog many of the public's roads, be extended to infinity. We think the AAA has made a good case; trucks are already big enough, and the way truck lines whipsaw the states to gain advantages must seem to many drivers (even some truck drivers) to be close to the proportions of a scandal.

We know industry must move the goods, and the more pounds of cargo you can put in the hands of one team of drivers, the lower the unit costs.

But there has to be a limit or there will be nothing but trucks on our major highways. Though they pay more taxes individually, they certainly don't pay more than the mass of ordinary drivers—and even if they did, John Q. Public has never, that we know of, proposed to build roads exclusively for their use.

Although the legislation in question deals only with interstate highways, it is no secret that the supertrucks have to come down to state and local roads somewhere, so the legislation, in effect, is for smaller roads (and bridges and tunnels) too.

It seems to us the national legislation is desirable, but modest, rather than extreme, limits are required. We regret that the Highway Administrator has "copped out" on this question, but we hope Congress will have the intestinal fortitude to stand up to a formidable lobbying interest and set a "thus far and no farther" rule the journeying layman can live with, too.

[From the Somerset (Pa.) American, Sept. 17, 1969]

BIG TRUCK BILL

Legislation before Congress permitting bigger, heavier trucks on interstate highways should be run right off the road.

A similar type measure was killed last year and it is a tribute to the power of the trucking interests that a new bill of this type can be revived and built into a formidable threat in just a year's time.

The big truck bill now being considered would raise federal limits on the interstate system from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds.

If the bill passes Congress and is signed into law it will be up to the states to determine what weights they will permit, up to the federal maximum. The spectacle in

Harrisburg as the lobbyists swing into action is not difficult to picture, providing Congress acts, which we hope it doesn't.

Testimony before the House Public Works Committee of George Kachlein of the American Automobile Association should be sufficient in itself to defeat the big truck bill.

According to Kachlein, a quarter of federally regulated inter-city trucks and more than half of inter-city buses were involved in accidents in fiscal 1967.

Kachlein used Federal Bureau of Motor Carrier safety reports and a truck accident study done in 1968 for the Automobile Manufacturers Association to show that most of those killed in truck-auto collisions were auto occupants.

The manufacturers' study showed there were 0.3 fatal injuries per 100 persons in collisions between autos and pickup trucks.

"The rate jumps to 7.1 per 100 when the collision is between a passenger car and a tractor-trailer combination," Kachlein said. When the collision is between a passenger car and a tractor-two-trailers combination, the rate increases to 13.3—A 173 per cent increase in severity.

Bigger, heavier trucks also constitute a threat to public property.

*** has estimated that bigger trucks would add \$8.5 billion in repair and construction costs to the interstate systems in 10 years.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, June 8, 1969]
BIGGER AND BIGGER?

Once again, Rep. Frank M. Clark has revealed himself as a champion of those who hope to burden our highways with giant trucks and giant buses.

Last year the Lawrence County Democrat was a co-sponsor of a bill which would have permitted almost a doubling of the 73,280-pound truck-weight limit on Interstate highways. Motorists became so enraged by this highway-boxcar proposal that the House wisely buried the bill.

Rep. Clark doesn't give up easily, however. Now he has introduced a bill which would authorize widening buses from 96 to 102 inches.

This measure, regarded as the opening shot in a new battle for bigger buses and bigger trucks, also would permit side-view mirrors on buses to extend outward without limit—even beyond the 102-inch width.

Although these elongated mirrors would protrude above auto roofs, some highway experts fear they could force oncoming trucks to swerve in order to avoid them. And if any autos should happen to be in the way then—well, that's just too bad.

After Mr. Clark got his big-vehicle steamroller under way, another bill was introduced by an Illinois Congressman with the enthusiastic endorsement of the American Trucking Assn. This measure would permit longer, wider and heavier rigs on Interstate Highways.

The proposed dimensions—70 feet long, 102 inches wide and 92,500 pounds would hardly contribute to highway safety. Trucks in Pennsylvania now are limited to a maximum length of 55 feet; width, 96 inches; weight, 73,280 pounds. And they are big enough!

It may be interesting to note that the so-called Truck Operators Non-Partisan Committee distributed thousands of dollars in campaign contributions between 1966 and 1968 to 15 members of the House Public Works Committee, which approved the ill-fated big-truck bill last year. Mr. Clark, a member of this committee, received \$500 himself.

Now, according to records of the House clerk, a new group formed by bus operators—The Bus Industry Public Affairs Committee—has passed out several thousand dollars in contributions to key congressmen.

Mr. Clark was re-elected last year. He will be up for election again next year.

Perhaps it's time for his constituents in Beaver, Butler and Lawrence Counties who oppose Big Trucks and Big Buses to get ready to give Mr. Clark the Big Boot.

[From the Corry (Pa.) Journal, Sept. 20, 1969]
THE "BIG RIG" BILL SHOULD BE FLAGGED DOWN

Any Corry motorist who has tried in vain to pass a tractor-trailer rig on one of our lesser and thus more dangerous highways will frown on the bill now before Congress to allow an increase in the size of the behemoths.

We are doing our share of frowning too. The big truck bill now being considered would raise federal limits on the Interstate system from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds.

If the bill passes Congress and is signed into law it will be up to the states to determine what weights they will permit, up to the federal maximum. The spectacle in Harrisburg as the lobbyists swing into action is not difficult to picture, providing Congress acts, which we hope it doesn't.

Testimony before the House Public Works Committee of George Kachlein of the American Automobile Association should be sufficient in itself to defeat the big truck bill.

According to Kachlein, a quarter of federally regulated inter-city trucks and more than half of inter-city buses were involved in accidents in fiscal 1967.

Kachlein used Federal Bureau of Motor Carrier safety reports and a truck accident study done in 1968 for the Automobile Manufacturers Association to show that most of those killed in truck-auto collisions were auto occupants.

The manufacturers' study showed there were 0.3 fatal injuries per 100 persons in collisions between autos and pickup trucks.

"The rate jumps to 7.1 per 100 when the collision is between a passenger car and a tractor-trailer combination," Kachlein said. When the collision is between a passenger car and a tractor-two-trailers combination, the rate increases to 13.3—A 173 per cent increase in severity.

Bigger, heavier trucks also constitute a threat to public property.

Experts have testified that the life expectancy of interstate highway pavements and bridges would be reduced by the weightier vehicles permitted under the bill now before Congress. The Bureau of Public Roads has estimated that bigger trucks would add \$8.5 billion in repair and construction costs to the Interstate system in 10 years.

Congressmen Joseph P. Vigorito and Sens. Hugh Scott and Richard Schweiker should vote against the big truck bill.

[A WSBA radio editorial, Sept. 9, 1969]
THE RIGS ARE TOO BIG

Do you want bigger and heavier trucks on the highways? After all, in truck-car accidents, automobile occupants are the ones most likely to be killed. Research shows in these truck-car wrecks, only 2% of deaths were drivers of heavy trucks... while 98% were passenger car drivers and occupants! Would you like to see your odds in such accidents get worse? Then be sure to stand by while pending legislation, H.R. 11870, passes in Washington. This bill would permit the operation of bigger trucks on our roads. If enacted this legislation would guarantee premature cracking of pavements, causing expensive repairs, or worse—rebuilding entirely. And, guess who will pay the largest share for such repairs? If you enjoy paying these extra taxes then, by all means, see that house bill 11870 is enacted! If, on the other hand, you are fed up with the hazard of big trucks on the highways, and don't want even bigger rigs allowed—urge Congressmen Eshleman,

Goodling and Schneebeli to vote against House bill 11870. If you're debating writing your man in Washington, ponder this sobering evidence... In a collision between a pickup truck and a passenger car, there are three-tenths fatal injuries per 100 persons. When you collide with a tractor-trailer, the rate goes up to 7.1. In wrecks with tractor-two-trailer outfits—rigs encouraged by House bill 11870—the death rate increases to 13.3 deaths per 100 people.

COOPERATION SPEEDS SOLUTION TO DESALINATION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that during the next 30 years the water needs of this Nation will increase some 300 percent. Based on the most recent figures that I have available to me, this means that the water consumption throughout the Nation by the year 2000 will reach approximately 1 trillion gallons per day; or to bring this figure down to a more personal standpoint, the consumption of water for commerce, industry, irrigation, livestock, and simple drinking water will total nearly 5,000 gallons per day per person.

Where will we get this water? There are many answers, not the least of which is the augmentation of our natural sources of ground and surface water by the conversion of saline water.

I am pleased to advise that the Federal Government is looking today for ways of meeting this challenge. This goal can only be achieved by the close cooperation between Federal agencies and private industry. For this reason, it is most commendable that the Department of the Interior has embarked upon a program of Government and industry cooperation on saline water conversion.

On behalf of the Federal Government, this effort is being guided by the Honorable Carl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research. In view of this challenge which faces this Nation and the responsibility which this Congress has in meeting this challenge, I thought it appropriate that Assistant Secretary Klein's remarks before the Government-Industry Conference on Saline Water Conversion, October 29, 1969, be shared with my colleagues. Accordingly, I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE CARL L. KLEIN

This Government-Industry Conference on Saline Water Conversion marks a fitting conclusion to a month of unprecedented activity by the Interior Department in leading this Nation toward improved water quality.

Just last Friday, we wound up a two-day conference of industry executives like yourselves who came to Washington to exchange views on what was being done by industry about water pollution abatement and to learn what the Government was doing to encourage their efforts.

Six of the top executives of this Nation and six from abroad presented their companies' plans. They revealed a growing aware-

ness of the pollution problems throughout the industrialized Western World. They also showed industry was accepting responsibility for cleaning up its own mess and for preventing or minimizing water pollution in the future.

This, perhaps, was the most rewarding aspect of the conference from the point of view of the Federal Government and the public interest. The recognition of responsibility for water pollution by executives from such industrial giants as United States Steel Corporation, du Pont de Nemours and Consolidated Edison Company of New York means that abatement efforts are at last getting the attention they deserve.

It also means that our children and grandchildren will have the chance after all to enjoy cleaner streams and lakes instead of facing the prospect of continually shrinking sources of quality water for drinking, fishing and recreational purposes.

The exchange of ideas which proved so mutually rewarding was shared by more than 750 representatives of a wide variety of industries. By helping to clear the air of uncertainty and to clarify the position of the Interior Department in the campaign for clean water, the conference established a framework for future cooperation in a struggle in which we can all be victors.

Earlier this month we held hearings on one of the most notorious pollution situations of our times—Lake Erie. On October 7 and 8 in Cleveland, and the following day in Toledo, our people met with municipal, state and industry officials to determine how we might speed up the pollution abatement programs that are needed to save Lake Erie from a premature death.

Secretary Hickel called these hearings "just a beginning" of this Department's efforts to identify major polluters all across the Nation and to set enforcement schedules for a prompt cleanup directed toward the complete elimination of pollution.

And the Secretary said at the time that if those found violating water quality standards have not taken steps to eliminate pollution within 180 days after hearings have been held, he has the authority to go directly to the Attorney General for the filing of court actions by the U.S. Justice Department.

We're just now in the process of announcing a follow-up meeting November 6 and 7 to examine the progress made during the first six months of the Potomac River cleanup program that was agreed to in May by Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia. Representatives of each of the water pollution control agencies involved will report on the activities now under way to comply with each of the 14 specific actions required by the program.

The Potomac situation naturally has a high priority because it concerns the Nation's River here in the Nation's Capital, and the people expect us to make sure the quality of its water meets national standards. Unfortunately, years of inadequate pollution abatement efforts have made it unsuitable for swimming and fishing and scarcely usable for boating.

We have a long way to go on the Potomac, but we've already come a long way—just in the past month.

On October 8, Secretary Hickel authorized an engineering study of a pollution control program for another river here in Washington—the Anacostia—which may help solve water problems faced by a number of other cities. The preliminary engineering plans foresee the creation of two 40-acre artificial lakes for recreational purposes which would also be used to halt pollution caused by overflows from combined storm and sanitary sewers.

If successful, this plan would not only provide swimming or boating facilities for thou-

sands of District residents, but would also result in a major step toward cleaning up the Potomac.

The Anacostia is a tributary of the Potomac, and during heavy rains, combined outfall from storm and sanitary sewers in the Northeast section of the city are discharged directly into the river in order to avoid the risk of flooding waste treatment plants. According to the new plan, storm water overflows would be stored and treated in a 15-acre artificial lake before being discharged into the two proposed recreational lakes for community use.

There is nothing new in the concept of purifying waste water to such a degree that it can be used again for recreational purposes. But this is the first time such an approach has been applied to the problems of combined storm water discharges.

To speed the cleanup of the Potomac, a contract for almost \$750,000 was announced October 12 for a pilot waste treatment project which promises to eliminate pollutants faster and more cheaply and reliably than any method previously employed. The physical-chemical plant now under construction at Blue Plains will treat 100,000 gallons of raw sewage a day and will remove 99 per cent of contaminants.

The process relies heavily on chemicals to remove impurities. Lime is added to remove solids, phosphorous and other waste material. And before the effluent is discharged into the river, it is stripped of its ammonia content, filtered through a combination of sand and coal, passed through activated carbon absorption units and, finally, chlorinated.

Still another milestone was reached by Interior just 10 days ago when the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration announced its intention to revise its regulations so municipalities and other agencies would have to provide secondary sewage treatment in order to qualify for Federal construction grants.

As you probably know, secondary treatment eliminates between 85 and 95 per cent of contaminants in effluent. At present, however, only primary treatment is required for a grant. Since primary removes only from 35 to 45 per cent of pollutants, it has long been considered inadequate by most health officials.

Our efforts to reduce and eliminate water pollution are by no means confined to pressing the states to crack down harder on their own offenders. Another step that was taken by Secretary Hickel this month was the initiation of an inquiry to determine the need for water quality standards on non-Federal properties that are located on Federal lands.

There are a number of areas—notably Indian reservations, public lands, national parks and certain sections of seacoast—that are not now subject to the water standards of the states where they are located. It will be the aim of this study to make certain water quality standards are broadly applied in these places.

But today is your day. . . .

With all that has gone on already this month in the field of water quality, I believe that what you have assembled for here today may well prove the most significant occasion of the month.

That is because our expanding population and agricultural and industrial output will be placing the severest strain on our existing freshwater resources in the years ahead. And aside from developing methods to treat our waste water for eventual reuse, it appears almost certain that we will have to look to the sea to supplement our needs in this area.

It has been some time now since the Office of Saline Water and industry representatives teamed up for a series of exploratory meetings leading to this one here today. Out of

these meetings came a decision to seek out areas of mutual interest to OSW and those of you in the desalting industry.

The areas which you will hear much more about later in this conference include: (1) the role of OSW and industry; (2) patents; (3) markets for desalting; (4) general contractual policies, procurement practices and procedures, and (5) dissemination of information.

For each of these areas, committees were assigned the job of refining the issues for future discussion—in open forum. The committees were made up of industry representatives active in the desalting field and familiar with its problems.

In all, more than 60 representatives of some 30 U.S. industries and institutions have given generously of their time and capabilities in preparing items for your consideration. The committee members, along with key personnel of OSW, worked long and hard to make these two days a success. And I want to thank each one of you for your devotion to this task . . . especially our new Director, Dr. Chung-ming Wong.

We already have under review some of the committee recommendations. At the conclusion of this conference, and after some study, we expect to implement those proposals which would help us achieve our mutual goal of low-cost fresh water from the sea.

At this point, though, I would like to talk about some of the recommendations made by the committee on the role of OSW and industry, and cover a few points that bear on policy.

The committee recommends the creation of a standing advisory group that would give considered views relative to master plans, future plans, programs and schedules. I agree with this to the point of a master plan review, but specific programs or task plans should be an in-house matter.

The major thrust of where we are going is a valid topic. But any lower-level cut may start to impinge on specific company interests, and we must keep ourselves flexible in such areas.

In regard to OSW's patent policy, it is my understanding that there has been considerable difficulty with many of our contractors and grantees in this matter. The result has been delays in contracting and prolonged patent negotiations.

I was pleased to see that the patent committee raised several questions about OSW's policy, and many of their points were well taken. We will work with the Solicitor to review present policies to determine if new interpretations can be developed under existing laws.

I have spoken of the desire for improved cooperation between OSW and industry in the future. In the past, OSW and industry team-work accounted for some outstanding advancements in desalting technology. Today I would like to discuss some of the more recent examples which you may or may not know about.

We have received preliminary results of a study (Aqua-Chem) that presents some exciting possibilities for the use of desalting. The study deals with the potential use of desalting equipment to recover valuable products from industrial wastes. It would reduce stream pollution and create a new market for desalination equipment. In fact, the proper application of this technology could provide hundreds of millions of dollars of business in food and other by-products.

The dairy industry offers just one example of the potential in this field. From about two gallons of milk, the dairy industry presently obtains about one pound of cheese and one pound of whey solids. About 70 per cent of the whey is now being wasted, imposing a severe added burden upon sewage treatment facilities if it is not being discharged directly into streams, rivers or lakes.

By treating whey with a combination of distillation and membrane desalting processes, the study shows a high protein food supplement can be produced which would have a market value of about 25 cents a pound. This represents a sales potential of more than \$200 million per year for upgraded whey products.

The recovery and reuse of dairy wastes alone is believed capable of generating a U.S. market for desalting equipment of around \$250 million. Just as important, it would remove a sizeable pollution problem on a profitable basis. You might say fighting pollution can make you rich.

The findings thus far show that some 8,000 industrial plants could use some form of desalting to recover commercially valuable contents in their liquid wastes. This is particularly true of certain metalplating plants using copper, cadmium, zinc or nickel. About 2,000 of these can use desalination units averaging 25,000 gallons per day and costing around \$25,000 apiece, for a total market of \$50 million.

These are impressive figures, and from them we can get an insight into what appears to be an unlimited and unending role for desalting in the not-too-distant future.

In the area of pollution abatement, there are a number of problems—and opportunities—involving salts. Remember that dissolved salts are pollutants, and that we must control their entry into our usable aquifers, streams and lakes.

The Colorado River is one of those being studied by OSW in connection with this problem. As you know, the salinity of this river is increasing, with detrimental results to water users. To develop data for further investigations, OSW is now testing reverse osmosis desalting processes at three sites on the river: Grand Junction, Colorado; La-Verkin Springs, Utah, and Las Vegas Wash in Nevada.

The tests are being conducted on three basic types of waters which are the main causes of the salinity problem. These are irrigation return flows, mineral springs and highly saline surface streams. With the information obtained from these tests, we will have a baseline from which we will be able to determine what part desalting may play in cleaning up our streams.

Also in Colorado, at Fort Morgan, OSW has been conducting intensive studies of the potential of desalting processes for improving the quality of a city's water supply. Fort Morgan's local water supply gradually has been increasing and now contains approximately 1800 parts of dissolved solids per million parts of water. Therefore, the problem is not one of being short of water, but simply of water quality.

More and more communities are learning that the salinity of their available water is increasing due to over-pumping or because man-made pollutants are finding their way into fresh water aquifers.

Several mobile brackish water pilot desalting plants were used for the test operations at Fort Morgan. Data from the tests is still being evaluated to determine the best solution to the specific water quality problems involved. This information is expected to be useful in assisting cities and other communities facing similar situations.

Another problem confronting the Interior Department is what to do about the pollution problem caused by the release—from the Solvay process—of calcium and sodium chloride into surface streams. OSW recently completed a preliminary study of this situation which found that basic desalting technology, combined with the use of commercial methods of crystallization, can result in the production of salts in solid form.

It also found that a significant portion of the waste water from this process could be recovered in distilled form. The reclaimed

sodium chloride could then be reused in the process.

Since it may not be possible to market all the calcium chloride, the remainder—in solid form—could possibly be placed in depleted limestone galleries. The point is that you would not have to market a large percentage of the calcium chloride to pay off the investment in the solid waste process.

I have touched on only a few of the many activities which concern our Interior agencies, but we can pursue our goals as a cohesive group in a climate of understanding.

We have every expectation that the results of this meeting will be mutually beneficial. I can assure you that all of your recommendations will receive careful consideration. We want a dynamic saline water conversion program and we also want a strong desalting industry.

Cooperation is the key means of achieving this goal—and of hastening the day when desalination will provide mankind's supplementary source of water.

Conferences such as this will bring us all a lot closer to that reality in the shortest possible time.

I thank you all for providing the interest and imagination needed to achieve success that is demonstrated by your presence here today.

ANNIVERSARY OF PLYMOUTH AND PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I am today filing a bill to provide for the establishment of a special commission, to plan for the observance of the 350th anniversary of Plymouth and Provincetown, Mass.

This is an especially appropriate time, I feel, to introduce this measure, on the eve of Thanksgiving Day. For it was at Plymouth, 349 years ago, that the small band of intrepid Pilgrims first gathered together with their Indian neighbors to give thanks for their survival in a hostile, unknown land. This tradition has continued and spread, until tomorrow it will be celebrated in every corner of this Nation.

Three hundred fifty years have passed since the landing of the Pilgrims. In those years, the Nation they helped to found has become the leader of the free world. And much of what makes this Nation what it is today is a direct result of the heritage of the Pilgrim fathers.

Our tradition of religious freedom, almost unique in the world, is a natural outgrowth of the Pilgrim's search for a land where they could practice their religious beliefs without fear of persecution.

Our tradition of constitutional government can be traced in part to the Mayflower Compact, which established the principle that government exists at the consent of the governed. And the spirit of overcoming adversity and hardship that moved the Pilgrims has become a part of the American tradition, and their example is still an inspiration to us today.

So the Pilgrim legend is an integral part of the American heritage. And I

think it altogether appropriate that the Congress should involve the resources and imagination of the entire Nation in the planning of this 350th anniversary celebration.

For this reason, I am joining the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, in filing this bill, which will create a 15-member commission for the purpose of developing suitable plans for the 1970 celebration.

It is my hope that both the House and the Senate will take swift action on this proposal, so that plans for this most significant celebration can begin in the near future.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ENVIRONMENT—THE STRUGGLE TO ESCAPE A MODEL CITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the schools of the District of Columbia now have 94.3 percent Negro students, an increase over last year.

The unelected bureaucrats of HEW and the Supreme Court must enjoy with a deep feeling of satisfaction their coercive efforts to overcome racial imbalance in Southern States while in their own bailiwick, here in the Nation's Capital, racial proportions continue to become more and more out of balance.

White parents, still having freedom to choose to do so, continue to escape. Regardless of the self-imposed blindness of the communications people and bureaucrats, the truth of the situation remains—the people are not buying socialism—not even when labeled "brotherhood," "charity," or "equality."

In neighboring Maryland, high schools are discontinuing football games because of violence. In another nearby community, white parents—many of whom have already suffered financial loss and experienced firsthand the bitterness of their lives being disrupted in having to relocate for the safety of their children—announce they will spend additional moneys from their own pockets to seek prohibitions against further injustices—sacrificial busing of their children as offerings to pacify the racial obsession of politicians and social experimenters.

Little do these hopeful parents realize that by living in Virginia or Maryland, they fall into a separate region of the United States governed by special edicts and guidelines which deny them full citizenship and are intended to compel them to accept the rigors of the unwholesome environment from which they have sought to escape.

I include several local news clippings: [From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1969]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEGRO ENROLLMENT IN SCHOOLS UP SLIGHTLY (By John Mathews)

Student enrollment in Washington schools is virtually static this year, with small increases in the number of Negro students

balanced off by continued decreases in the number of white students.

The annual enrollment count by race taken Oct. 17 shows that city schools now have 94.3 percent Negro students, an increase of 0.8 percent over last year. The school system has 140,667 Negro students, 1,155 more than last year, and 8,449 white students, 1,102 less.

Over-all, the declining birthrate and the inability of local schools to increase significantly the number of pupils in preschool and kindergarten classes because of lack of funds and space resulted in a net gain of only 53 students over last year. At the elementary school level, there are 1,567 fewer students than last year.

WHITE DEPARTURE SLOWS

Of 190 schools in Washington, only nine elementary schools, plus Deal Junior High School and Wilson High School, all west of Rock Creek Park, have majority white enrollments. Only about a half dozen other schools have any meaningful racial integration.

In the dozen elementary schools west of the park, there was a sharp increase last year in the exodus of white students. This year the departure of white students has slowed with 170 fewer white students, compared to a 400-student decrease between October 1967 and 1968.

Deal Junior High and Wilson High, which three years ago had only a handful of Negro students, both now have over 35 percent Negro enrollments.

RESULT OF WRIGHT RULING

The integration of schools west of the park was a direct result of the June 1967 de facto school segregation decision of Judge J. Skelly Wright. The judge ordered voluntary busing of Negro students from overcrowded schools to the below-capacity largely white schools.

The dozen elementary schools west of the park are about 80 percent white, the same percentage as last year. The number of white students, Negro students and the over-all enrollment has dropped in the schools.

In other areas of the city, integrated schools continue to become less integrated.

NEIGHBORS INC. AREA

Shepherd, Brightwood and Takoma Schools in the Neighbors Inc. area, a section of Northwest with active efforts to maintain residential integration, are still integrated, but continue to lose white children.

The Tri-School Project in the new Southwest area, which had a degree of integration three years ago, now has only 81 white children out of a total enrollment of 1,963 students.

On Capitol Hill, Brent Elementary School has gained some white children, but proportionately more black children since its new and larger building opened last year. The school has 85 white children and 289 Negro children.

Citywide elementary schools have 93,270 students; Junior high schools, 33,250; senior high schools, 19,571 and vocational high schools, 2,963. The Capitol Page School with 62 students, four of them Negro, is also counted with city schools.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1969]

COUNTY MAY END GAMES BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOLS

(By Thomas Love)

Athletic events between Prince Georges County public high schools may have to be eliminated because of violence at the games, the board of education was told yesterday.

Deputy Superintendent George A. Robinson raised the possibility of dropping all interschool athletics as he gave a report on a disturbance following a football game between two schools on Nov. 15.

He also criticized Hyattsville city police at the scene, they made no attempt to quell the trouble when it started at the Northwestern High School Stadium.

The fighting, during which he said white High Point High School students were beaten by unidentified black Northwestern High School supporters, was "a racial incident" without question, Robinson declared.

BOTH SCHOOLS INTEGRATED

Both schools are integrated, and both blacks and whites played on the High Point team, but only white students were attacked, he said.

Following his report to the board, he said that the incident was only the latest in a continuing series of violent disturbances following high school athletic events.

The Northwestern-High Point game, which Northwestern won 7-6, decided the county Class AA football championship, so emotions were unusually high, Robinson said.

EIGHT POLICEMEN HIRED

At halftime, he said, spectators from the Northwestern stands poured onto the field. He said that eight Hyattsville policemen, hired to keep order, made no attempt to stop them. They disrupted ceremonies and "monkeyed around with the goal posts," Robinson said.

After the game, spectators from the same stands "swarmed over the fence" onto the playing field "like a wave of water," he said. "I don't know if the police could have done anything at this time," he said, "but they didn't even try."

As spectators were trying to leave the stadium through a single gate, he reported, "fists flew and a few people were hurt."

A mob set upon the High Point players with lead pipes, hoses and empty machine gun cartridge cases sharpened and swung at the end of leather thongs, Robinson said.

PRETTY BADLY BEATEN

Some of the students were "pretty badly beaten up," he told the board. One team member had his nose broken even though he was still wearing his football helmet with face guard.

Since the game, he said, some of the coaches who tried to help the visiting team have received threatening phone calls.

During the entire event, "the police just didn't seem to be around," he charged.

The violence continued as white High Point students who were leaving the stadium were pulled from their cars and beaten by blacks, he said.

Robinson told the board that "more things like this seem to happen at Northwestern," which uses the old County Memorial Stadium for games.

Many non-students take part in the trouble, Robinson said. He added that violence following athletic events is not limited to Northwestern.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1969]

CHEVERLY PARENTS BACK SUIT TO BAR PUPIL BUSING

(By Stephen Neary)

An all-white group of more than 200 Cheverly parents gave overwhelming endorsement last night to taking the Prince Georges County school desegregation plan into court.

After only about 45 minutes of discussion, almost all opposed to cross-district busing of white and black students, the group voted to send a delegate to the Coalition of Concerned Citizens "for the purpose of determining the legality of the . . . redistricting plan."

ONE "NO" VOTE

A statement by one parent, who said "I've got a daughter affected by this, and she'll never spend a day in Fairmont Heights, not even if I go to jail," won applause from the

audience and a call from one member: "Well, it'll be full."

The meeting was called by the Cheverly Citizens Association. While only one member stood up to vote "no" on the resolution, only about two-thirds of the remaining audience stood up to approve it. The remaining third apparently abstained, or was made up of nonmembers.

Two other motions, on stating the association's opposition to busing of children just to achieve racial balance and another "advising" the Cheverly mayor and town council that they too should oppose it, also passed at the association's special meeting.

Association members working at the door to sign up newcomers told them they would not * * * members. They reported they enlisted 55 new members last night.

Association President Arthur Sands said the last regular meeting drew 36 persons.

OTHER GROUPS REPRESENTED

The large turnout for last night's meeting apparently was due at least partially to circulation of leaflets through the northern Prince Georges municipality by order of the association's executive board. No Negro residents (who live in the town's 4th Ward, attended the meeting).

In addition to the Coalition of Concerned Citizens an amalgam of established civic groups, representatives were present from the Citizens for Action, which has threatened to file suit against the desegregation plan and to petition the governor to throw out the plan and remove the five school board members who voted to pass it.

The board's plan, which has been accepted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, will integrate Fairmont Heights Senior and Mary Bethune Junior High Schools, both of which are all Negro, by busing about 700 students from the Bladensburg Senior and Kent Junior High schools.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 26, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the week of November 9-15, we observed American Education Week in this country. Dr. Harold M. Kaiser, superintendent of the Davenport Community School District, wrote a guest editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat to mark the occasion. I would like to share his excellent editorial with my colleagues:

BETTER EDUCATION: YOUR JOB

(EDITOR'S NOTE:—The following is by Dr. Harold M. Kaiser, superintendent of the Davenport Community School District, in connection with American Education week, which begins Sunday.)

The theme for American Education Week this year is "Better Education: Your Job." During this week, every parent or other interested person has a special invitation to visit the schools and to become better acquainted with the total school program.

The teachers and other school personnel welcome this opportunity to acquaint the parents with the school situation and to focus interest on the main objective of educational concern: The individual student and his welfare.

The week is an appropriate time to express appreciation for commendable factors at work in the total school situation. The community has a sincere interest in the welfare of the public schools. This was clearly demonstrated

recently in the successful bond issue for additional school facilities.

The Board of Education has shown high integrity and a real devotion to the cause of education. The staff members have demonstrated competence and skill in their individual fields, and most of all, a genuine interest in the welfare of young people.

Staff members have recently increased their efforts toward involving the community in school and community problems. Saturday parent coffee hours, joint efforts in the surveillance of problems of young people off school property, the formation of student and parent human relation committees are examples of these innovations.

In addition, staff members are active in efforts to provide an enriched program for our school. This program includes orchestra, band and choral concerts, science fairs, athletic events, plays, school parties and dances, field trips, art exhibits, speech contests, school newspapers and other related school activities.

The large majority of our students make good use of the opportunities offered by our schools and they stand high in scholastic achievement. In comparison with schools in other large cities, our schools have a small number of disciplinary problems. This is probably due to a cooperative effort by students, parents, school staff and other community agencies.

A few of our students need increased efforts to become better school citizens. Recently, parents and community leaders did respond to a request for more help in protection of the right of students going to and from school. As a result of this joint effort, the situation has improved.

There will still be increased efforts to continue to provide an atmosphere at school in which students can learn and increased efforts to protect the rights and safety of all individuals. Parents must continue to encourage students to work up to their ability and develop traits of good citizenship in school and in the community.

While there always is a "generation gap," certain standards should prevail for all generations. High moral values, good conduct, fairness and concern and respect for others—these never go "out of style."

Those of us who work with youth know that they have high ideals and want to have an opportunity to explore—to find new solutions to old problems.

The schools make a strong effort to provide means by which students, under faculty guidance, can direct their concerns into wholesome activities and outlets which should make a better community.

The community must continue to help youth find better jobs, to aspire to better living conditions, and to provide for education of the individual to the maximum of his potential.

It takes the total cooperation of the school, the community, the home, the church, civil authorities and other community agencies to provide youth the best education and opportunities for using skills and talents.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, December 1, 1969

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

The Lord will give strength unto His people; the Lord will bless His people with peace.—Psalm 29: 11.

O Thou whose mercy is everlasting and whose truth endureth forever, direct us, we pray Thee, as we face the duties of another week. Grant unto us the wisdom of Thy wise spirit and the confidence of Thy creative mind that we may eagerly seek the best and the noblest in all things. Help us to be courageous when courage is needed, strong when strength is demanded, patient when patience is necessary, and kind when kindness is essential.

Bless our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and all who work with them. May they be strengthened by the assurance that Thy hand supports them as they endeavor to lead our country in the paths of righteousness and peace.

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 26, 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 19. An act to reimburse certain persons for amounts contributed to the Department of the Interior.

S. 497. An act for the relief of the estate of Capt. John N. Laycock, U.S. Navy (retired);

S. 1678. An act for the relief of Robert C. Szabo; and

S. 3180. An act to adjust the salaries of judges in the government of the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME PACKAGE

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about one aspect of the administration's District of Columbia crime package—the proposed changes in the laws relating to juveniles.

The administration's basic court reorganization bill, which has been pending before this body for 3 months, would establish a new family division with jurisdiction, among other things, over delinquents. There would be no size limit to this division, as there is for the present juvenile court, so that the chief judge of the new superior court could assign as many judges as necessary to see that delinquents are tried promptly. This should take care of problems like the recent instance where four juveniles, still waiting for trial for armed robbery and out on release, committed another armed robbery while waiting for the juvenile court to act.

Even more important is the proposed change in the waiver law—useless under present court of appeals decisions. The new waiver provision would require the family division to waive any youth over 15 charged with a felony unless it affirmatively finds he can be rehabilitated in the juvenile system before the age of 21.

I am sure my colleagues are aware that juvenile crime is increasing throughout this country, but I wonder if they realize how bad it is in this city. In the last fiscal year there were 22 homicides committed by youths over 15 and 24 rapes. In the last 6 years robberies by those over 16 have increased 258 percent, grand larcenies by 106 percent, aggravated assaults by 91 percent. It is time we wake up to the fact that these are criminals, not children, and should be treated as such.

The problem is acute, Mr. Speaker. We must act in this session of Congress.

We must pass the court reorganization and juvenile code now.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

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

NEW PROGRAM FOR STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to increase the funds available to commercial lenders who make insured student loans under such act to students throughout the country.

A critical need for such loans has arisen, but the commercial lenders have been unable to meet this need because of the long-term nature of the loans. Under the present law, students can borrow from banks a limited sum to assist in their educational expense. After graduation, these loans are repaid.

The measure I propose would set up a central fund, created by the sale of bonds, from which banks may borrow up to 80 percent of the total amount of funds they have loaned to students under the insured student loan program of the Higher Education Act. The result would be twofold: First, it would make more money from more banks available to more de-