

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have an amendment which we could dispose of this afternoon. I would be willing to agree to a time limitation if the leadership wants to act on it, with no vote today. I will be guided entirely by their reasoning.

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) has indicated he would have no objection, with the understanding that we would be able to dispose of the amendment this afternoon.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yesterday the Senator submitted the amendment. He indicated that he was willing to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator's amendment would strike at the heart of the bill itself. The Cooper-Church amendment which is now pending, is one of the most important and basic amendments that could come up. Although the leadership is in favor of an early vote on the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Delaware, since it is such a basic and fundamental amendment there are those who have indicated that they need time to study the Senator's proposal and objection would be made if a unanimous-consent agreement were to be propounded to vote this afternoon.

Since the Senator from Delaware's amendment is so basic and fundamental, I know that Senators would be interested in studying it first. I am sure that if the Senator wanted to comment on it today and put information in the Record on it, it would be helpful to those who wish to give it serious consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I discussed this amendment at some length the other day. I understand there is some agreement as to what comes after the vote on the Dole amendment on tomorrow. The Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Michigan have joined in an amendment, and after that is disposed of, perhaps we could have an agreement that my amendment would be taken up in order at that time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, it is my understanding, in conversation with the Senator from West Virginia, that he expects it would take some time for disposition of his amendment. I would feel at least that we should get started on that.

There are a number of other amendments that I am aware of. There are at least 12 to 15. A number of them which have been introduced will be called up.

I suggest we follow the usual procedure. I do not feel that tonight we could enter into any additional unanimous-consent agreement. Certainly, not without the Senator in charge of the bill being present in the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will not press the amendment. I merely am trying to expedite the business of the Senate. We have been here for 2 days now with no action taken on any amendments. I was hoping, and other Senators were hoping, that we could have a vote on this and clear up the amendments. I shall be guided by the desires of the leadership, if he wishes to carry it over another day with no votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON). What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we had hoped we could accept the committee amendments first which is the regular order. This was originally proposed by the leadership, but it was objected to. So we voted separately on the first two sections and are now considering the third. Disposing of the committee amendments in an orderly fashion is the best procedure to be followed. The leadership on this side has been hoping that we could get early action on the Church-Cooper amendment—on the whole bill, for that matter, and we will take every step we can to bring about early action.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall cooperate with the leadership. I realize, since the amendment I have deals with the major bill itself that, generally speaking, the committee amendments take priority and that it would take unanimous consent to proceed out of order. I would hope that such unanimous consent would be granted so that we could expedite the business of the Senate. However, we will proceed later.

I will say now to the acting majority leader that the rules of the Senate do provide many ways to accomplish our objective. There is a way I can get this to vote even before the committee amendments, although it would be more orderly to do it the other way. But we are going to vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. The rules are available, certainly, to the distinguished Senator from Delaware as they are to all Senators. There has been objection filed. Since there has been objection filed I

would have to object to a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed now to consideration of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to read the record of the proposed measure my friend from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) will offer, and I would suggest that he make his statement at the time we meet here on tomorrow and perhaps after the vote is taken.

A great many Members are away. Some of them are away in their States, where they are candidates for reelection. I know that the distinguished majority leader, who is a sponsor of the amendment, is away today, but he will be back tomorrow. The Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) is coming back from Vermont.

I, therefore, believe that tomorrow we will be able to have some debate on the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Kansas. As it is the first vote of significance, I believe it would be better if we used tomorrow morning for debate upon that subject. I say that with all deference to and with great respect for my good friend from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator. I was only suggesting that we bring it up this afternoon and dispose of it this afternoon. I will say that the amendment which I have offered, to make the record straight, does not in any way affect adversely, nor does it support the Cooper-Church amendment. It is nothing whatever to do with it. It does not deal with that subject at all.

I think that the leadership—some of it on the other side—I am not too sure—I understood that the Senator in charge of the bill would have no objection to doing this. But I will take this up tomorrow and see if we can reach agreement.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, June 3, 1970, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 2, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Gillies Kalaidjian, the Bedford Park Congregational Church, Bronx, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in our abundant and beautiful Nation, we pause in prayer to recognize Thy presence. We have so much to be grateful for and yet we have not shown enough respect for You nor enough reverence for life.

Recognizing that we are all made in Your image, we have not lived up to the trust and faith You placed in us, making us different from all other living things.

We have fallen short of the purpose of spiritual ecology. Failure to understand the relationship of the human soul to its spiritual environment and motivation has all but destroyed our national purpose.

We pray this House of Representatives will bring this Nation together in a new

unity of purpose, placing the total welfare of the Nation above each and every group that seeks a lesser purpose. We pray O God, that no man or group will be above the law nor beneath it. Help this Congress to recognize that our Nation's basic problem is conduct, not color, and it is seen in crime rates, the family life crisis, the educational crisis, the high death rate on our highways, the tragic problems of alcoholism, drug

abuse, and child abuse, and the dreadful failure of our correctional institutions to change lives.

Help Congress with Thy help O God, to heal America. Help them to work for unity, for mutual respect, for self-discipline, for respect of persons as well as respect for property, and above all, help the adult world of every race and creed to give our youth an example of good stewardship in a mature and responsible fashion. We ask this in the name of the Lord of life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On May 21, 1970:

H.R. 9477. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation;

H.R. 10106. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the definition of the term "child" to recognize an adopted child of a veteran as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to dependent children of deceased veterans, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15694. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

On May 22, 1970:

H.R. 4869. An act to further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona;

H.R. 10105. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15980. An act to make certain revisions in the retirement benefits of the District of Columbia public school teachers and other educational employees, and for other purposes.

THE REVEREND WILLIAM J. KALAJDZIAN, PASTOR OF THE BEDFORD PARK CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH IN THE BRONX

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer in the House was offered today by my close and highly respected friend, the Reverend William J. Kalaidjian, pastor of the Bedford Park Congregational Church located in my district in the Bronx.

I am particularly proud and happy that Reverend Kalaidjian accepted my invitation to come to our Capital on this occasion for several reasons.

First, I am proud because Bill Kalaidjian is a truly outstanding human being who is well known in New York for his sincere dedication to community civic and humane causes as well as for his spiritual guidance and leadership. For more than 13 years, while tending to the needs of his own congregation, he has served in the New York City Police Department as official chaplain with the rank of inspector.

Mr. Speaker, I need not repeat the enormous responsibility Reverend Kalaidjian assigned himself when, in 1957, he accepted this sensitive position. Ever since, the demands made upon a New York City Police Department chaplain have multiplied many times over. The spiritual drain on our policemen in New York City and, indeed, throughout the Nation, has been of serious concern to Reverend Kalaidjian.

He is devoting a good portion of his time maintaining the faith of our beleaguered policemen. While this is no small task, his inspiring efforts have been rewarded many times over by the spiritual and moral response of our police officers in New York City especially in times of serious crises. I am grateful to Reverend Kalaidjian for his dedication to the men who, of late I am sorry to say, have been looked upon by many as mere automatons in our society. As head of the National Association of Police Chaplains, he is promoting the same kind of spiritual leadership for police organizations across the Nation and the police institutions of America will be significantly enhanced by his influence.

Reverend Kalaidjian's civic involvement has also caused him to be an effective leader in the field of prevention of cruelty to children—an area that unfortunately must be maintained and strengthened in our modern yet sometimes morbid world. As the president of the Bronx County Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Reverend Kalaidjian has come to know the many numbers and kinds of child tragedies wrought by human frailties. His work with the society has earned him a reputation that exemplifies his deep concern for his fellow man. Programs developed under his strong guidance and direction have been tremendously effective in preventing child maltreatment and abuse from running rampant in our community. Because of his experience and expertise in this field, I personally welcome his counsel in the further development and refinement of my own child abuse legislation now before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. William J. Kalaidjian is not a newcomer to our House nor to the Senate. In 1967 he delivered the opening prayer here at the invitation of my colleague from New York City, Congressman BINGHAM. In 1968, Bill Kalaidjian delivered the prayer in the Senate at the invitation of the late Senator Robert Kennedy. Today, I am honored by Reverend Kalaidjian's appearance and I extend to him my own grateful thanks and the warm welcome of the New York City congressional delegation.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND WILLIAM G. KALAJDZIAN

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), in regard to the Reverend William J. Kalaidjian. He has been a constituent of mine, and I am sorry to lose him. My loss, however, is Congressman BIAGGI's gain.

Reverend Kalaidjian has indeed done great work for our city and many of its citizens, especially for our police and our children. It is a pleasure to have him with us here in the House once again.

TRIBUTE TO REV. WILLIAM G. KALAJDZIAN

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with my colleagues the gentlemen from New York, Mr. BIAGGI and Mr. BINGHAM, in welcoming the Reverend William G. Kalaidjian, pastor of the Bedford Park Congregational Church, who delivered the prayer this morning.

Reverend Kalaidjian is an outstanding citizen of our community in New York, and we are delighted to have him here.

Reverend Kalaidjian has served as a spiritual leader in the Bronx for many years and is presently pastor of the Bedford Park Congregational Church, United Church of Christ. In addition, he has been the chaplain of the New York City Police Department for the past 13 years.

In addition to his religious activities, Reverend Kalaidjian has made a major humanitarian contribution to New York City through his social service activities. At this time he is serving as president of the Bronx County Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

The Reverend Kalaidjian is an example of an involved American, campaigning against social ills, and active in community affairs. I hope he will visit us again in the future.

THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTION OF LESLIE C. ARENDS AS HOUSE REPUBLICAN WHIP

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the most capable men ever to occupy a seat in this Chamber, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, Representative of the 17th Congressional District of Illinois.

Today, Mr. Speaker, marks an anniversary for LES ARENDS for it was exactly 27 years ago, June 2, 1943, that LES was first elected House Republican whip.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that LES

ARENDS has been a party whip longer than any other Member of the Congress—of either party.

This is not surprising when we consider the great talents that LES ARENDS has brought to the job of whip and the magnificent record he has compiled in achieving party unity among House Republicans during the 27 years that he has headed up the House Republican whip organization. I would particularly call attention to his accomplishments during the 87th through 90th Congresses. He is, of course, continuing his stellar performance as whip in the present Congress.

I would like to mention at this point that LES has always shown me, personally, tremendous loyalty in his role of party whip during my tenure as House Republican leader, and for that demonstration of loyalty I am truly grateful.

But we honor LES ARENDS for far more than his ability and his long service as a party whip.

We all know him to be an exceptionally skillful legislator as well, an ability he has demonstrated ever since he first came to Congress in 1934. LES was named to the House Committee on Military Affairs, which was merged with the House Committee on Naval Affairs in 1946 to become the House Armed Services Committee. From 1957 through 1964 and again from August 11, 1969, to the present time, LES served as senior Republican on the Armed Services Committee and showed himself to be one of the most knowledgeable men in the House on military matters and national security questions.

Mr. Speaker, the good people of the 17th District of Illinois have repeatedly shown good sense and have thus far elected LES ARENDS to 18 terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. For that I congratulate them and him. Only four other men now serving in this House have been here longer than LES ARENDS. It is fitting that we join today in saluting a man we all love and respect, our capable, articulate and witty friend, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS of Illinois.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I can say without equivocation that the minority leader has spoken for me in every sentiment he has expressed about a very great Member of the House, a warm personal friend of mine, an outstanding leader, and a great American, LES ARENDS. He is, of course, one of our most distinguished Members. He has set high standards of leadership for 27 years. He fights hard for what he believes is right, but he is always a gentleman. We all love LES ARENDS.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my dear friends, the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), and the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), in paying my respects to one of the most dedicated Members I have ever served with, and

one who has been a bulwark of strength in the support of our country's national defense and of a firm foreign policy, on the occasion today of his length of service as whip of the minority party, my dear and valued friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

LES ARENDS is one of the most highly respected Members of the House, a respect which he has earned because of his dedication to his duties and also because of his wonderful personality and because of his broad and understanding mind.

I could not let this occasion pass without taking the floor to convey to this close and valued friend of mine and my colleague of many years, the profound respect and friendship I have for him.

You have heard me say repeatedly that the middle aisle means nothing where friendship is concerned. That has been a fundamental thought of mine not only during my service here but throughout my life, and the friendship that exists between LES ARENDS of Illinois and JOHN McCORMACK of Massachusetts is one I have always valued and which I shall always treasure.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware until I reached the floor a moment ago that we were celebrating what is truly a momentous occasion in the history of the House of Representatives.

I would certainly not want this opportunity to pass without also adding my congratulations to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the minority whip, Mr. ARENDS.

I was present at the White House the other day when the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives who is now in the well was honored, and when comments were made that upon his retirement he will have achieved the very enviable distinction of having served longer for a consecutive number of years than any other Speaker in the history of our Republic.

I feel equally sure that no one will ever equal the record that has been compiled in this respect by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) and I congratulate our colleague and hope he will continue to serve us for a long time to come.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the tributes being paid to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. LESLIE ARENDS, for the long service, with a distinguished record, he has rendered in this House. He has always been a gracious gentleman. While dedicated to his party and his principles, he has never treated with disrespect or disdain the honest views which have been entertained by other Members of the House while he has adorned the House with his presence here. He is a fine gentleman, respected for his intellectual and political astuteness by all Members of this House, and he is one who can always be depended upon to be a gracious and a kind friend.

I would like to wish him many, many more years of successful performance of his important duties in this House.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the fine remarks of my col-

league and all the other remarks that have been made here today about our great friend, a wonderful gentleman, and a fine legislator, LES ARENDS.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I have served under LES ARENDS as regional whip and I can testify to all the fine things the minority leader has said about him.

To observe LES in his position as minority whip is to see a dedicated, hard-working, conscientious servant of his party and his country. The many years in which he has served in this capacity are an indication of the effective work he has done.

LES is admired and respected not only by those who serve under him but also by the Members of the minority who have felt the lash of his whip which has always been applied firmly but fairly and in an understanding manner.

I associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished leader and congratulate and extend best wishes to LES ARENDS.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues in congratulating our friend and colleague, LES ARENDS, on the 27th anniversary of his service as Republican whip. This is a record unmatched by any other Member of the House of Representatives of either party and it is not likely soon to be matched again.

During this period, he has served efficiently and well yet with an everready friendly smile which contributed to his success.

I wish him many more years of service to our party and to the Nation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES TO ATTEND ILO CONFERENCE IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1033, 91st Congress, the Chair appoints as delegates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, between June 3, 1970, and June 25, 1970, the following members of the Committee on Education and Labor:

Mr. DENT, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. AYRES, of Ohio.

And as alternates to attend said conference the following members of the Committee on Education and Labor: Mrs. GREEN, of Oregon; Mr. DANIELS, of New Jersey; Mr. ASHBROOK, of Ohio; and Mr. ERLBORN, of Illinois.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 2, 1970.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

FRANZ CHARLES FELDMER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 614) for the relief of Franz Charles Feldmeier.

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

S. 614

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Franz Charles Feldmeier may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Feldmeier, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: Provided, That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act: And provided further, That the provisions of section 245(c) shall not be applicable in this case.

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

JOSE LUIS CALLEJA-PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1747) for the relief of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. ANTHONY S. MASTRIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15760) for the relief of Dr. Anthony S. Mastrian.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unani-

mous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARGARET M. McNELLIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8573) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. McNellis.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ATKINSON, HASERICK & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10534) for the relief of Atkinson, Haserick & Co., Inc.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM HEIDMAN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12128) for the relief of William Heidman, Jr.

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

H.R. 12128

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Heidman, Junior, of Grand Rapids, Michigan, the sum of \$25,000 in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States arising in connection with the infringement, by the United States Air Force, of his patent (United States Patent Numbered 2,693,980) covering an automatic parachute cargo disconnect.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike "\$25,000" and insert "\$15,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. FRANCINE M. WELCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12173) for the relief of Mrs. Francine M. Welch.

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

H.R. 12173

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Francine M. Welch, Torrejon Air Base, Spain, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$5,561.32, representing the total amount of living quarters allowance paid to her by the Department of the Air Force during the period of July 1964, through March 9, 1969, as a result of erroneous payment without fault on her part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Francine M. Welch, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by her, or withheld from sums otherwise due her, on account of the liability to the United States referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$5,561.32" and insert "\$5,568.74".

Page 1, line 7, strike "July 1964" and insert "July 20, 1964".

Page 1, line 7, strike "March 9, 1969" and insert "March 8, 1969".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13676) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

CLAUDE G. HANSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13807) for the relief of Claude G. Hansen.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. ROBERT L. POEHLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13810) for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. Poehlein.

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

H.R. 13810

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Robert L. Poehlein (Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force, serial number XXXXXXXX) of Alexandria, Virginia, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$4,852.70, representing per diem payments made by the said Robert L. Poehlein during October and November 1962, pursuant to his duties as the Accounting and Finance Officer at Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, to military personnel involved in the relocation of aircraft from Ellsworth Air Force Base while runway repairs were being made at the base. The said Robert L. Poehlein made such payments, to which the Comptroller General of the United States has taken exception, only after being advised at intermediate, command, and departmental levels that such payments were properly payable.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Robert L. Poehlein an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, at the end of the sentence, add the following: "The relief herein authorized shall not bar recovery from the payees of the amounts improperly received by them."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JAMES HARRY MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1786) for the relief of James Harry Martin.

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

S. 1786

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any provision of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, approved May 19, 1924, as amended, limiting the period within which claims may be filed thereunder, the Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed—

(1) to receive and consider any application of James Harry Martin, of Phoenix, Arizona, filed within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, for benefits under the adjusted compensation program, the said James Harry Martin having served honorably in the United States Army during World War I while he was under age, but not having been eligible to file for benefits under the original World War Adjusted Compensation Act because he had concealed his minor age when he had enlisted for military service; and

(2) to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury his determination as to the amount of any such benefits to which the said James Harry Martin would have been entitled on the basis of such application if it had been filed within the time and in the manner provided in the World War Adjusted Compensation Act.

SEC. 2. Upon receipt by the Secretary of the Treasury of the certification described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary shall pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said James Harry Martin, the amount of any benefits so certified by the Secretary of Defense. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim referred to in the first section of this Act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

MRS. ELEANOR D. MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9497) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN R. GOSNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13469) for the relief of John R. Gosnell.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 969 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 969

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 746) to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five minute

rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 969 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of House Joint Resolution 746 authorizing appropriations for the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

The Institute is one of the six specialized organizations of the Organization of American States and is composed of 21 member countries of the OAS and Canada. The Institute operates through a general secretariat, three commissions, and a number of committees and working groups, and draws together the efforts of over 400 geographers, cartographers, and historians in the Western Hemisphere. At the present time the chief geographer of the U.S. Geological Survey is president.

In 1965 the Institute's annual budget was increased and a formula for payment was adopted, based on ability to pay, calculated on the basis of net national income statistics. Under that formula the U.S. share of the budget is 66 percent. Thus, in the 89th Congress the dollar ceiling on U.S. contributions was raised from \$50,000 to \$90,300. Under the Institute's new budget authorization, however, this increase was insufficient to meet the full U.S. assessment of \$151,350 and by the end of fiscal year 1969, the United States was in arrears in the amount of \$386,050.

In order to meet the obligations of the United States as a member of the Institute, House Joint Resolution 746 authorizes to the Department of State not to exceed \$200,000 annually, as may be required for payment of its share of expenses; such additional sums as needed for payment of necessary expenses incident to U.S. participation in the Institute; and \$386,050 for payment of its assessed annual contributions for the period beginning July 1, 1964, through fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say that the increased assessment is based upon the ability of the United States to pay?

Mr. PEPPER. Not necessarily on the ability of the United States, but it would take into account the income of the United States as compared, I believe, to other countries. My able colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL)

will go more into detail into this matter when the bill comes up for consideration if the rule is adopted.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered what is the ability of the United States to pay.

I understand we have a bill coming up this week to further increase the Federal debt ceiling by \$15 billion. I am just wondering if the gentleman can give us some indication about ability to pay, as he calls it. I question our ability to pay.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would say that a country that has a gross national product of about a trillion dollars a year is pretty well able to pay this kind of money. A few hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman has gotten into the subject of the phoney gross national product, does the gentleman know what the public and private debt of the country is at this time?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know the exact figures. I imagine it is considerable, but it is very much less than our ability to pay in terms of the value of all the assets of this country, and its people, and the gross national product of this country.

And, incidentally, the relationship of the national debt to our gross national product from the 1950's through the 1960's on percent has been reduced to 29 percent at the present time as compared to 69 percent in the early fifties.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have had an occasion to look into the question of the total debt recently, and the best estimate that we can get is that it was about \$1,650,000,000,000 as of January 1, 1970. We also looked into it on June 9, 1969, was when one of the large banks, Bankers Trust Co. of New York announced that hereafter the prime rate would be, not 7.5 percent, but 8.5 percent. The debt at that time was about \$1.5 trillion; so that that 1 percent increase meant that the increased interest on the total debt was \$15 billion per year. A \$15 billion increase because of the prime rate increase. That is the reason we looked into the function of the total debt at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida yield to me?

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

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that the public and private debt of this country as of January 1, this year, according to the President's economic report to the Nation, was \$1,568,500,000,000.

That was for calendar year 1968. For the first time in many years the figure for the last full year is not shown; that is, the estimated figure, for the year 1969. Therefore I called the Treasury Department. They were reluctant to give me the figure for 1969, but they said they would estimate the increase in the public and private debt of this country in 1969 at \$100 billion. If this figure is correct, on January 1, 1970, this country had a public and private debt of \$1,668,500,000,000.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, may I just say to the able gentleman from Iowa that if he could induce his administration to roll the interest rate back to where it was when that administration took office in January of last year, we would save from \$9 to \$10 billion a year in the current national debt. I would ask the gentleman from Texas if that is not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. I would not know about the exact amount, but we would save a considerable sum.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. If from 1961 to 1969 we had not rolled up so much debt in this country under the gentleman from Florida's Democrat administrations, we would not be confronted with the interest rates we now have.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you very much. I believe that if it were not for the inheritance of the great depression under the gentleman's party, conditions would have been very much less exacting under the subsequent democratic administrations.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 969, provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of the joint resolution, House Journal Resolution 746, the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation and the rule have been adequately explained by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

The purpose of the resolution is to increase the ceiling on U.S. contributions to the Pan American Institute and also to provide payment of U.S. arrears over the past few years.

The Institute was created in 1928. It draws together the efforts of over 400 geographers, cartographers, and historians in the Western Hemisphere. It does not duplicate the work of any other body.

At its 1965 meeting, the Institute determined that the budget needed to be increased in order to continue its operations. The budget figure was set at \$250,000 per year, with the U.S. share set at 66 percent based on a formula of net national income. The 89th Congress increased the ceiling on U.S. contributions from \$50,000 to \$90,000. However, our budget share per year is actually \$151,350. As of the end of 1969 the United States is in arrears in the amount of \$386,050.

The joint resolution authorizes a new U.S. ceiling on contributions of \$200,000 annually, and also authorizes the payment of U.S. back-due obligations.

The legislation is supported by the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 148]

Addabbo	Fallon	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Farbstein	Olsen
Andrews, Ala.	Feighan	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashbrook	Fisher	Ottinger
Aspinall	Flowers	Patten
Baring	Ford	Pelly
Bell, Calif.	William D.	Pettis
Berry	Fuqua	Pickle
Bevill	Gallagher	Podell
Blatnik	Garmatz	Powell
Brasco	Gaydos	Price, Tex.
Bray	Gilbert	Rees
Brock	Goldwater	Reid, N.Y.
Broomfield	Gray	Reifel
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Riegler
Byrne, Pa.	Hanna	Rogers, Colo.
Cabell	Hansen, Idaho	Rooney, N.Y.
Camp	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Carey	Hawkins	Royal
Casey	Helstoski	Sandman
Celler	Hollifield	Scherle
Chisholm	Hosmer	Scheuer
Clark	Howard	Schwengel
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Iowa
Clawson, Del	Keith	Stuckey
Clay	Kirwan	Thompson, N.J.
Cohelan	Leggett	Thorn
Conyers	Long, La.	Tunney
Corman	Lujan	Udall
Cunningham	Lukens	Van Deerlin
Daddario	McCarthy	Waldie
Daniels, N.J.	McCloskey	Watson
Dawson	McCulloch	Whitten
de la Garza	McEwen	Wiggins
Delaney	McMillan	Wilson, Bob
Dent	Mann	Wilson,
Dorn	Mikva	Charles H.
Dowdy	Miller, Calif.	Wolf
Eshleman	Mizell	Wylder
Evins, Tenn.	Morton	Young
	Nichols	Zablocki
	Nix	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 309 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 746) to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 746) with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

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

Mr. Chairman, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 746, proposes to amend the statute which governs U.S. participation in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

It would amend the statute in two respects:

First, it would increase from \$90,300 to \$200,000 the ceiling on assessed annual U.S. contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. The new ceiling represents a maximum that could be appropriated and is intended to provide room for orderly and moderate growth within the organization's budget for the next 4 to 5 years. The U.S. assessed annual contribution to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History amounts to \$151,350.

The second proposal embodied in House Joint Resolution 746 is an authorization of an appropriation in the amount of \$386,050 for payment by the United States of the arrears in its contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

I should like to mention that these arrearages arose during the period beginning July 1, 1964. They represent a cumulative deficit in the discharge of U.S. obligations to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

Mr. Chairman, the Pan American Institute of Geography and History is a small but very important member of the Inter-American system. It is the inter-hemispheric instrument which is concerned with international collaboration in the fields of cartography, geography, history, and in the geophysical sciences. The Institute does not duplicate the work of any other agency and U.S. membership in this organization has been acknowledged to be in the interest of U.S. foreign policy over the period of some 35 years.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs and the full Committee on Foreign Affairs have considered this legislation very carefully. The printed volume of the hearings held before our subcommittee supplies in detail the past activities of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, the proposed use of the arrears owed by the United States and the key projects which loom in the Institute's program horizon.

In concluding these introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Congress of the United States frequently expresses its concern when other countries, members of international organizations, fall behind in their dues to such multilateral institutions. That is only proper. I would

be remiss, however, if I did not point out that the United States has been negligent in failing to pay its assessed contributions to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History for something like 6 years. I would hope, therefore, that the resolution before the House would be adopted promptly so that that deficiency could be rectified.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I think I understand his statement.

I am a little bit chagrined that we should "poor mouth" or whip ourselves—the U.S.A.—about being in arrears in our dues assessed by someone else, even though we assisted in its creation, and do perhaps profit from its findings, teachings, or actions.

I am fully aware of the PAIGH and its prior existence including IAGS, and so forth. I am fully aware of the value of the coastline geodetic survey work and the cartography and the value of sharing this information with our sister nations of the OAS.

I notice that this assessment or budgetary formula that is applied, just as in some of the other international organizations, is more or less mandatory, and I question very much in view of Public Law 89-646, and others, whether we should even at this stage admit that we are in arrears. In fact, I noticed in the hearings that an exception was taken by some of the members of the subcommittee to the fact that we were in arrears, and at least for a legislative record, I wonder if we are doing the right thing, first, in raising the ceiling in the amount that we can participate each year, other than letting that be a matter of negotiation, and, second, in picking up the so-called arrearage in one fell swoop. I fail to see that there is an obligation or an indebtedness or any pressure on the part of the United States of America in this regard. I wonder if the gentleman would enlarge upon his statement and his personal feeling, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, with regard to these two vital items affecting the U.S. taxpayers' pocketbooks.

Mr. FASCELL. I shall be very happy to do so. The fact is that we are behind in our assessment. I do not particularly want to whip it. I am not castigating the United States one way or the other; I am only endeavoring to be objective. The fact is we owe the money based on the vote of a governing body of which the United States is a member. While I agree with the gentleman about differences of opinion that may exist, the fact is that starting with the fiscal year 1965, the United States has not paid any money into this organization, regardless of how you characterize it, and it is an obligation. We are a member of the OAS, and this is a specialized agency.

We are always faced with this question with U.S. participation in many organizations. I might say to the distinguished gentleman this is in the nature of a treaty obligation. You can vote against this measure, I suppose, with a

clear conscience, but it seems to me that the basic issue really is: Do we want to belong to the OAS? If we do, then do we want to meet the obligations that are incurred through the regular processes of the OAS? That seems to me to be fundamental. You might consider PAIGH individually or any other special agency, and you can make a case for or against any one of them. But the fact is that the United States is a member of the OAS and we do participate, and as long as we do, we should pay our share.

The assessments are fixed according to rules to which we have agreed. That is what has happened here in the case of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

The Congress has not in the past 6 years acted on an authorization bill. We have therefore built up this—call it a deficit or arrearage or whatever you want to call it. We just have not attended to it. That is all. And the Institute has just barely managed to stay alive.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this so-called assessment is fixed by the Organization much like the assessment of the U.N. is fixed upon us. But it is 66 percent, and if I understand correctly the gentleman's own committee hearings, page 33, there are many of these countries which are also in arrears. Finally, this limitation on U.S. participation was established in Public Law 89-465 as having a top limit. Is that not correct?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct on these counts: One is that the U.S. assessment is approximately 61 percent. It is actually 60.5 percent. In other OAS activities it is 66 percent, but with Canada joining in PAIGH, U.S. assessment has dropped to approximately 61 percent.

There are other countries in arrears, as shown on page 33 of the hearings. As of that date, January 1, 1969, there was \$137,179 of other arrearages. We would hope that we could make a strong effort to get those arrearages in also and continue the effective work of this Institute.

Now, the other question. This bill is a limitation by way of authorization beyond which the appropriation cannot go. We did fix it above the estimated budget simply to provide for orderly increases over the next several years.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I presume when we placed that ceiling on the limitation, it was after due debate, and it was the will of the House as expressed, but in spite of that, this organization went ahead and increased the assessment based on this formula.

My real question is, Was proper representation made by the U.S. delegation that we had a limitation placed by this sovereign body of this sovereign Nation, before those burdens were placed by assessment on the U.S. taxpayer?

Mr. FASCELL. As the gentleman has pointed out—and the gentleman is probably correct in making the distinction about the arrearage. We had a discussion in the subcommittee on this very point. The fact is that the U.S. member did

not vote on the increased budget because he could not, but nevertheless the governing body did approve it, and it is binding on the United States and we should approve this authorization or get out of the organization.

Technically I think the gentleman is correct, and we could say that this is not in arrearage, because we had made no specific commitment on amount, but it is an arrearage in the sense that it is a general commitment, because we do belong to the OAS. It is a technical difference, but we just called it an arrearage.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. It is simply more of the same old story where we get caught and get the business put to us. It seems to happen regularly to Uncle Sam.

In order to change the subject, I wonder if the gentleman would comment to the Members about the arrearage of \$33 million by the Communist country of Cuba. Is there any effort being made to obtain that arrearage payment and update it? And, if not, is it expected we will ever do anything about it? And again, if not, do they participate in the benefits and the largesse of those who pay?

Mr. FASCELL. First of all, it is \$32,000, and, second, Cuba does not participate and gets no benefit.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD).

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my friend from Florida in support of House Joint Resolution 746, which would authorize appropriations for the U.S. share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

This resolution would authorize an annual appropriation of up to \$200,000 for the Institute. It also would authorize the sum of \$386,050 for payment of arrearages that have accumulated since 1965, when the budget was increased and the U.S. assessment was raised to bring it in line with the system of assessments of the Organization of American States.

As noted in the committee report, the United States has played a leading role in the Institute since joining in 1935. The current President of the Institute is the Chief Geographer of the U.S. Geological Survey.

The Institute's activities encompass the Western Hemisphere, and many of the technical projects have been of direct value to the United States. Various U.S. agencies, with responsibility for topographic maps, air navigation charts and hydrographic charts, have found the Institute to be especially helpful in facilitating the exchange of information.

For example, the Institute served as the vehicle through which Argentina provided the United States with geodetic data that makes it possible, for the first time, to establish a Datum Point to serve as the point of origin for all the geodetic triangulations of the continent. This work provides information on the shape of the earth of direct value to our space program.

The Institute also initiated creation of, and has facilitated operations of the Inter American Geodetic Survey, which has expedited cooperative mapping of 18 of the Institute's member countries, much to the benefit of hemispheric defense plans of the United States.

The Hispanic Foundation in the Library of Congress has also found publications issued by the Institute to be extremely useful to the reference services provided by the Library.

Of course, much of the Institute's work concerns projects in which the Institute works directly with countries of Latin America, such as the geodetic network tie between Argentina and Chile described in the committee report.

While the results of its work extend throughout the Western Hemisphere, the Institute operates with a small staff of only 19 in the headquarters in Mexico City plus 17 people—some of whom are part time—in three Commission offices. Its General Secretary's salary of only \$12,000 per year is typical of its modest budget.

Mr. Chairman, the Institute is carrying forward its work in a quiet and effective manner. The authorization request is modest and well justified. I urge approval of this resolution.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 746

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 89-846, Eighty-ninth Congress, approved October 13, 1966, is amended by striking out "\$90,300" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200,000" in section (1), and adding "(3) the sum of \$386,050 for payment by the United States of its assessed annual contributions for the period beginning July 1, 1964, and extending through the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1969."

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"That Public Resolution 42, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 2, 1935 (22 U.S.C. 273), is amended as follows:

"(1) In paragraph (1)—
"(A) strike out '\$90,300' and insert in lieu thereof '\$200,000'; and

"(B) strike out 'and' at the end thereof.

"(2) Strike out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and insert in lieu thereof '; and' and immediately after paragraph (2) add the following new paragraph:

"(3) the sum of \$386,050 for payment by the United States of its assessed annual contributions for the period beginning July 1, 1964, and extending through the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1969."

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this Pan American Institute cannot be a very important operation, since this Government was not concerned enough to meet its obligations to it for 5 or 6 years. I wonder why we continue in this? What benefits have we obtained from this organization through the years? What are the benefits? Does anyone care to answer that question?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; of course I yield to the gentleman from California. I am trying to get some information as to the value of this outfit.

Mr. MAILLIARD. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee, and heard the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, that I was too busy in another committee trying to head off a postal corporation bill to attend the hearings on this resolution.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I am sorry about that.

My recollection is that for many years this was basically a clearinghouse for information, so that all members of the OAS plus Canada, and including the United States, would have available the technical information in this survey type of work that has been carried out. More recently they have gone into some projects to fill in some blank spaces in our knowledge of geography in certain parts of the hemisphere. All of this is useful information not only to us but I would think to the world in general.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I shall be glad to yield in a minute.

I imagine we have all kinds of commissions, councils, advisory boards and anything we want to name dealing with the geography of the Western Hemisphere. We undoubtedly have books and publications, studies and reviews in unlimited quantities. I imagine we have hired consultants and researchers for the past 50 years to look over the geography of the Western Hemisphere.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I will say that the subcommittee in the consideration of this particular authorization, under all the circumstances involved, probably went into this more thoroughly than any other I can recall recently, and I am speaking specifically in terms of budget, line items, and so forth.

On page 41 of the hearings is a rather detailed listing of the accomplishments of the Institute, the projects and the programs.

I must say that some of the interrogation was rather sharp in the subcommittee with respect to the very ques-

tion the gentleman has raised as to duplication. Like the gentleman, we were rather amazed to find out this is a unique organization. In fact, there is very little duplication, if any, with respect to the work it carries out in this particular field of geography and history.

Some of the recent accomplishments are the completion of the geodetic network between Argentina and Chile, and advisory service to the Dominican Republic on resources development. We could go on and on.

Mr. GROSS. The answer to the gentleman is, why not let the Latins take care of the Latins for a little while? Why do we not save the taxpayers in this country just a little of money and let them take care of their own geography? Could they not do that?

Mr. FASCELL. I suppose they could. The gentleman from Iowa knows that international cooperation is always subject to various interpretations. One might say that everybody could take care of himself. The truth of the matter is it is a kind of two-edged sword.

As the gentleman knows, for example, in promulgating standards of accuracy with respect to mapping and geodetic work, and other work of that kind, it is as much in our interests as it is in their interest. Perhaps one could make a case even more for our side, so to speak, than for the Latins, in respect to trying to get uniform standards worked out with respect to mapping and geodetic work. It is because we seek to stimulate this kind of activity on a professional level, both academically and professionally, that we belong to the Institute. Otherwise, in the normal course of events, we might never get standardized measurements, standardized rules, or anything we could understand that would be useful to us.

Mr. GROSS. So a group of these people went down to Guatemala and raised our dues to the club from some \$90,300 a year to \$200,000. Is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes. But I must remind the gentleman of something.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. I would say this: This organization, in our examination of their budget, showed it was very, very careful and scrupulous particularly in the sums of money it spends. For example, the Secretary General only gets \$12,000 a year and their personnel are kept to a very bare minimum. Administrative costs and facilities for the Secretariat are provided in Mexico by the Mexican Government. Its functional commissions operate at a minimum cost to the organization. The travel of delegates and members who participate in meetings and conferences is paid for by the participating countries.

Mr. GROSS. Let me stop the gentleman right there. He says the Secretary General gets only \$12,000 a year. Could

the gentleman tell me what the \$11,000 annual family allowance might represent? Why is there a \$11,000 annual family allowance in among the disbursements?

Also, I would ask the gentleman why are income taxes paid for some people out of this fund? Do you suppose that an employee getting \$12,000 a year has his income taxes paid and does he also get a family allowance of \$11,000 a year?

I had time to examine only a few of the expenditures that they have listed in the hearings.

Does he get his income tax paid along with the \$12,000 a year?

Mr. FASCELL. The secretary general is a Chilean and is stationed in Mexico. He is not an American, and the institute is not an American institute. Therefore, it is not subject to the rules and regulations of the United States as such. That answers one of the questions of the gentleman.

The other question he raises, regarding the family allowance, it is my understanding that it is an acceptable practice in Latin America and Europe to pay a differential to employees on the basis of the number of their family members. This is what is done in this case.

Mr. GROSS. I note the spending of some \$3,000 a year for representation allowances. My friend from New York, Mr. ROONEY, calls that the "tools of the trade." I assume it is the same old wine-and-dine operation. How are these meetings of this institute? Are they pretty lively?

Mr. FASCELL. I am not sure that geographers and historians have a swinging time on \$3,000 a year where there are 400 members of the organization.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman at some time in the future would join me in abolishing a few of these miscast institutes, because I cannot find where they make any contribution at all to this country. We are putting up 60 percent and better—60 percent and better—of the support for this organization.

I would not find it possible to go out and explain that kind of business to the taxpayers I represent. Perhaps, some of the rest of you can, but I could not explain why we put up 60 percent, and better, of the contribution to this of any other international organization.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman but first let me say that it might be done in California but not in Iowa.

Mr. MAILLIARD. The input from this organization to both the Army, the Navy and, well, the Air Force, to our defense and to our civil aviation charting services, I suspect that the input from this organization is a relatively small amount of money compared to what it would cost us if we had to do it ourselves, possibly millions of dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Well, on the score I would like to hear some testimony from the Defense Department as to the great benefits they receive from this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired. (By unanimous consent Mr. GROSS was

allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. I think we ought to get before the subcommittee some of our military representatives to tell us—in view of the fact that we have not contributed anything for 5 or 6 years to the support of this organization—we ought to get representatives of the Department of Defense over to tell us how important it is that this Institute provide the United States with information concerning Latin America.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we have paid over the years but have not met our full contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it has been insufficient; has it not? That is what the Latins say. It has been insufficient and you cannot do the kind of job the gentleman seems to want to tell us we are doing down there with less money. If so, why do we neglect to these people and give them this arrearage, plus an increase from \$90,000 to \$200,000?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I think the gentleman will find that figure to be \$151,000.

Mr. GROSS. I am taking the figures from your hearing record. If they are incorrect, then the hearings are incorrect.

Mr. Chairman, this is but one more instance of representatives of foreign countries meeting somewhere in the world—in this case Guatemala—and telling the taxpayers of the United States what they must contribute to an international organization.

I am fed up with this procedure as well as contributing anything at all to international outfits that contribute nothing to the general welfare of this country.

If there is not to be a rollcall vote on the resolution, let the record show that I am oppsed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair. Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 746) to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, pursuant to House Resolution 969, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INQUIRY INTO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT AND FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT SECURITY PROGRAM

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that the Committee on Internal Security which I chair has undertaken a broad inquiry into the operation and administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and the operation and administration of laws and procedures relating to Federal employment security. These will be oversight hearings. We propose to inquire particularly into the present status of the Subversive Activities Control Board and Federal employee "loyalty oaths" program.

Faced with a host of problems, including those created by adverse court decisions, it is apparent that the operation of the Subversive Activities Control Board has been brought virtually to a halt. The question arises as to the advisability of the further maintenance and funding of a board which has little or no work to do. The Federal employee security program has likewise experienced a number of difficulties, including constitutional and procedural problems, which have impaired its operation in certain aspects. Even upon cursory examination it must appear that the time has come for the Congress to take another look at the operation of these programs and to determine whether the underlying statutes have continuing vitality and validity, or whether there is a need to amend or repeal pertinent laws, or to take other remedial measures.

Recent court decisions have brought these matters to a head. On December 12, 1969, in the case of *Boorda* and others against Subversive Activities Control Board, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit invalidated important provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act.

This court held that the provisions of the act authorizing determinations with respect to membership of individuals in Communist-action organizations was unconstitutional on the basis that the disclosure of Communist Party membership is "constitutionally protected" by the first amendment, "except for those who join with the 'specific intent' to further illegal action." An application for certiorari to the Supreme Court to review this decision was denied on April 20, 1970. Since the major business before the Board within recent years has been precisely the determination of membership of individuals in the Communist Party, an organization previously determined to be a "Communist-action" organization, the effect of the decision has been seriously to undercut the juris-

dition of the Attorney General and the Board under the act.

On June 4, 1969, in the case of *Stewart v. Washington* (301 F. Supp. 601), a three-judge Federal District Court for the District of Columbia invalidated those provisions of the Federal loyalty oath statute—5 United States Code, sections 3333 and 7311—which required that an individual be denied office or employment in the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia unless he executes an affidavit that: First, he does not advocate "the overthrow of our constitutional form of government," and second, is not "a member of an organization that he knows advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government." The court so held on the ground that clause (1) was not limited to "violent overthrow," and clause (2) applies to "passive and inert" members and even to members who may not share the views of the group on this advocacy. No appeal was taken from this decision.

These decisions obviously raise some serious questions. What is the consequence of the impairment of the operation of these statutes in relation to the congressional program to protect this Nation and its Government against internal subversion? Is the legislation vital and essential? Are the assumptions underlying these statutes still valid? What should we do about it? What can we do?

In enacting the Subversive Activities Control Act, the Congress proceeded on the basic and, I believe, valid premise that an informed public is essential to the "effective, free functioning of our national institutions"—Mr. Justice Frankfurter, *Communist Party v. SACB*, 367 U.S. 1, at 97. Specifically, the act was adopted to counter Communist techniques of deceit and concealment. It sought to do so by establishing a system of public disclosure and identification of Communist organizations, characterized as "action," "front," and "infiltrated," and of membership in Communist-action organizations. By the terms of the act, the Subversive Activities Control Board is established as a quasi-judicial agency for the purpose of making determinations, on petition of the Attorney General, of the character of Communist organizations—whether action, front, or infiltrated—and for determining the membership of individuals in Communist-action organizations. The hearings and determinations of the Board are incorporated in records maintained by it which are open to public inspection.

In addition to the bare disclosure purposes of the act, determinations with respect to organizations and individuals have certain collateral consequences set forth more fully in other sections of the act, including sections 4, certain prohibited acts; 5, employment in Government, defense facilities, and labor organizations; 6, denial of passports; 10, use of mails and other instrumentalities in commerce; and 11, denial of tax deductions and exemptions. Some of these provisions have likewise been voided by decisions of the courts. Section 5(a)(1)(D), making it unlawful for members of Communist-action organizations to engage in employment in any defense fa-

cility, was voided in *U.S. v. Robel*, 389 U.S. 258 (1967), as "an unconstitutional abridgment of the right of association protected by the first amendment."

This decision has also had the effect of casting serious doubts on the validity of other provisions of section 5, including those related to the Federal employee security program, which prohibit a member of a Communist-action organization from seeking or holding non-elective office or employment under the United States. Section 6, making it unlawful for a member of a Communist-action organization to apply for or to use a passport, was voided in *Aptheker v. Secretary of State*, 378 U.S. 500 (1964), on the ground of overbreadth. It was said that the section unduly restricted the right to travel and thereby abridged the liberty guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

In other respects as well, the constitutionality and procedures of the act have been extensively litigated over the years by organizations and individuals brought within its purview. Much of this history is considered in House Report No. 733 of the 90th Congress which formed the basis for the January 2, 1968, amendments—Public Law 90-237—to the act which was the latest occasion on which the Congress endeavored to relieve the act of major deficiencies which had appeared in its administration. It was evidently the hope of the Congress that with those amendments the Attorney General and the Board could proceed with their mandated business. However, this expectation has not been fulfilled.

In the period following the enactment of Public Law 90-237 on January 2, 1968, and the Board's decision of December 12, 1969—a period of approximately 2 years—only 22 petitions were filed by the Attorney General for determinations of individual membership in the Communist Party. Of these, seven were filed in 1968 by Attorney General Clark, and 15 in 1969 by Attorney General Mitchell. Board has now foreclosed any further exercise of jurisdiction on this subject. Nevertheless, for the period of 20 years during which the act has been in effect, a total of only 66 petitions have been filed for determinations of individual membership in the Communist Party, a party whose membership numbers in the several thousands, presently estimated at 15,000.

Nor has the act proved effective with respect to the disclosure of those Communist organizations—action, front, and infiltrated—which were within its scope. In the years of the existence of the act only one organization, the Communist Party of the United States, has been determined to be a Communist-action organization. Moreover, in reaching this single, although important, determination the Attorney General was involved in 10 years of litigation. *Communist Party v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, 361 U.S. 1 (1961). Likewise during this period, of the hundreds of Communist-front and infiltrated organizations which we have reason to believe were in existence, only 26 petitions for their determination were brought before the Board. Following the 1961 determi-

nation of the Supreme Court, that the Communist Party was a Communist-action organization, only three petitions have been filed by the Attorney General for determinations of Communist-front and infiltrated organizations, and no single petition on this subject has been filed since the 1968 amendments.

The fact that the disclosure purposes of the act have not been effectively fulfilled seems apparent on the face of the record. We are thus bound to inquire whether the amounts being expended in the administration of the act can continue to be justified in the light of its limited product. What are the reasons for such obvious failures in accomplishing the disclosure objectives of the act? Can these failures be remedied? Are the underlying assumptions of the act still valid? Should we adopt a new approach to the problem? We expect to find at least some of the answers to these questions in the course of the committee's investigation.

As indicated, there is also the related problem of deficiencies in the execution of the Federal employee security program, particularly that aspect of the program which is directed toward preserving and maintaining the integrity and efficiency of the Government itself against the damaging infiltration of subversive elements. The Federal employee loyalty oath statute, to which I have adverted, had undoubtedly formed an integral part of the congressional program. The invalidation of important provisions of this statute in the Stewart case has stimulated a great deal of public interest and concern. This has been reflected in the large and growing correspondence on this subject received by Members of Congress.

It was 15 years ago when the Congress initiated its last comprehensive study of this subject. Then, in 1955, the 84th Congress by Public Law 786 established the Commission on Government Security, also known as the Wright Commission. This Commission was established to fill what was then felt as an urgent need for an objective, nonpolitical and independent study of the innumerable laws, executive orders, regulations, programs, practices and procedures for the protection of the national security. It made its report to the Congress in 1957. A great deal of water has flowed under the bridge since that time. It may be that much of what was then said continues to be valid. However, a host of subsequent and novel decisions revising the boundaries of appropriate congressional action and further practical experience have raised more questions than were then thought to be answered.

As was then said, the concept that the Government should employ no disloyal citizen was thought to be universally accepted, although then—as now—the methods and standards used by the Government to rid itself of these persons had raised some of the most controversial issues of the times. Since that statement was made, I am impelled to add that even that basic concept may now be questioned. Are we still agreed that disloyalty should bar employment in the

Government of the United States? Surely, we are not all in agreement as to precisely what that term means. Moreover, as we examine recent decisions of the court on this subject, as well as the administration of employment policies and practices, it is evident that the former concept of loyalty has been limited and refined, if not abandoned.

The civilian employee loyalty-security program is generally considered to have begun with the Hatch Act, enacted August 2, 1939, which made it unlawful for a Federal employee to have membership in an organization advocating overthrow of our constitutional form of Government and penalized such misconduct by removal from service. This act was subsequently revised and ultimately re-enacted in the act of 1968, 5 U.S.C. sections 3333 and 7311, the provisions of which were invalidated in the Stewart case as hereinbefore noted. Prior to 1939, Civil Service investigations were limited to questions of character and general suitability. Although during World War I, pursuant to Executive order, the heads of departments and agencies were authorized to remove any employee believed to be "inimical to the public welfare by reason of his conduct, sympathies, or utterances, or because of other reasons growing out of the war," questions of "political" beliefs and activities were generally considered outside the legal competence of the Civil Service Commission. Following the end of World War I, the loyalty issue became dormant until the 1930's when the dangers posed by the Fascist and Communist movements became apparent. Thus, in 1939 the Hatch Act was passed. In February 1940, for the first time, an application for Government employment embodied the language of the Hatch Act.

During World War II, President Roosevelt by Executive order instituted War Services regulation II which disqualified for civil service examination or appointment any person whose loyalty to the U.S. Government was in reasonable doubt. Under this regulation, preappointment investigations of applicants for the classified civil service employment were made, and the Civil Service Commission refused employment to people actively associated with Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese groups, or who were members of the Communist Party. Applications for employment contained an inquiry specifically mentioning Communist and Fascist organizations.

In light of the fact that the standards and procedures of the Government were not uniform in the conduct of the loyalty program, President Truman, in 1946, appointed a Temporary Commission on Loyalty to make a study of the problem. The Temporary Commission reported a wide disparity in standards for judgment of employee loyalty in both preemployment and removal procedures, and as to the character and scope of desirable administrative or legislative remedies. Moreover, several agencies in their replies had indeed stated that they had no established procedure designed to substantiate allegations of disloyalty. In view of the fact that the Civil Service Commission could investigate only a

limited number of the thousands of applicants for Government employment, the Commission found that the agencies had relied almost exclusively on the veracity attributed to the oath of office and affidavit executed by the new appointees, and signature to these two instruments was taken as prima facie evidence of loyalty.

Following the Temporary Commission's study, President Truman on March 21, 1947, promulgated Executive Order 9835 which substantially embodied the Commission's recommendations. It required "a loyalty investigation" of every person entering civilian employment in the executive branch. The investigation of those entering the competitive service was to be conducted by the Civil Service Commission and of other persons by the employing agency. The order placed responsibility for a program of dismissal of disloyal employees upon the head of each agency, and for this purpose provided for the creation of a Loyalty Board in each agency to make recommendations with respect to the removal of any officer or employee on grounds relating to loyalty. A Loyalty Review Board was established in the Civil Service Commission with authority to review cases involving persons recommended for dismissal by the Loyalty Boards of the agencies, and to make advisory recommendations thereon to the head of the employing agency.

The standard for refusal of employment, or the removal from employment, on grounds relating to loyalty was that "on all of the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States." In view of the fact that this standard required proof of actual disloyalty, the President, in 1951, amended it to a standard of "reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved." It should be noted, however, that the terms "loyalty" and "disloyalty" are nowhere specifically and directly defined in the provisions of the order. The content of these terms must be inferred from the context in which they appear. Activities set forth in the order which may be considered in connection with the determination of disloyalty are related principally to sabotage, espionage, treason, sedition, "advocacy of revolution or force or violence to alter the constitutional form of Government of the United States," and membership in, affiliation, or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization "designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive," or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

To assist the Loyalty Review Board in the performance of its function, a duty was imposed upon the Department of Justice to furnish the Board with information—and the Board, in turn, was required to disseminate such information to the agencies—with respect to the name

of each foreign or domestic organization which the Attorney General, after appropriate investigation and determination, designates as above. For the period following the promulgation of the order until its revocation on April 27, 1953, approximately 192 organizations were, without hearings, thus designated by the Attorney General.

It is evident that in this period the governmental interest focused principally on the question of employee "loyalty," a subject embraced within—but not coextensive with—the broader concept of "security" and, as we can see, often not clearly distinguished from the latter, or from the related concept of "suitability." Nor was the area to be embraced within the concept of "loyalty" clearly defined. In contrast, the framers of the Constitution, by article VI, required that "all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution." This, of course, is a type of "loyalty oath," but one which is limited to affirmation of loyalty to "the Constitution" and, by reason of article V, which permits amendments to the Constitution, thereby necessarily and consistently with its terms renders permissible advocacy by lawful means of its abolition as well, which is something less than an affirmation of loyalty "to the country" or to the Executive.

This is a matter, I believe, of some significance to the issues before us. Testimony before President Truman's Temporary Commission on Loyalty indicated general agreement that investigations intended to exclude advocates of "violent revolution" from employment by a government they would overthrow are essential, but nevertheless, there were cautioning voices heard which pointed out that such investigations must be conducted "with extreme care and wisdom" less they should bar employment to those who "conscientiously" advocate constitutional and peaceful changes in forms and methods of government. Surely, however, the Government may be "overthrown" by other than violent or forceful means—as, for example, by deceit, treachery, or even indifference—and perhaps just as effectively. Moreover, such means may in certain instances be contrary to law, although not violent or forceful, and other means may be adopted which the law may declare unlawful but which have not been expressly proscribed.

But this is not an end to the problem. The question of the propriety of barring government employment on the basis of "peaceful" advocacy in relation to the loyalty concept must also be distinguished from, and is perhaps offset by, the concept that a reasonable freedom naturally belongs to the Executive and heads of departments and agencies to select employees sympathetic to, and zealous for, the ideals and plans of the existing administration. This is not a question of loyalty or attachment to the "Constitution" or "country," but of administrative efficiency and of freedom of political expression by the party in power which is wholly consistent with our con-

cept of the democratic process. This does not necessarily mean that the Congress can constitutionally require an affidavit of loyalty to a particular administration and its policies, but it is a question of tenure and congressional policy in the maintenance of a civil service program.

It is no wonder that some considerable confusion existed in this period and even now. Indeed, following the promulgation of Executive Order 9835, a number of unhappy reports were brought to the attention of President Truman with respect to the lack of uniform standards and procedures followed by the different departments and agencies in the administration of the order. As a consequence, the President asked that the interdepartmental Committee on Internal Security of the National Security Council, with the participation of the Civil Service Commission, investigate the way in which the program was being administered, and to advise him what changes were believed to be required. The committee recommended a consolidation of the loyalty, security, and suitability programs, and in 1952 the President directed the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to take necessary steps to provide him with a plan for combining them. Pursuant to this request, the Chairman established a committee to study the matter, but it was disbanded in February 1953, its work unfinished because of the change in administration. It did, however, draft a proposed Executive order which to some extent formed the basis of Executive Order 10450 promulgated by President Eisenhower on April 27, 1953, by which he revoked Executive Order 9835 and established the program presently in effect.

Meanwhile, along with expressions of executive concern, the Congress likewise applied itself to the question of employment security. The 81st Congress, on August 26, 1950, enacted Public Law 733 (5 U.S.C. 7532, as revised). At the time of its enactment, this statute gave to the heads of certain specified agencies directly concerned with the national defense summary suspension and unreviewable dismissal powers over their civilian employees when deemed necessary "in the interest of national security," and further provided that its provisions shall apply to such other departments and agencies as the President may, from time to time, deem necessary "in the best interests of national security." General personnel laws, the Lloyd-LaFollette Act (37 Stat. 55, as amended), and the Veterans' Preference Act (58 Stat. 390, as amended), which provided that preference eligibles may be discharged only "for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service," and among other procedural rights granted the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission, were thus directly affected by Public Law 733.

Moreover, it is to be observed that in this case the Congress abandoned the use of the expression "loyalty" and applied in lieu thereof the concept of "national security." To this extent it departed from the narrower loyalty concept which formed the basis of Executive Order 9835 promulgated by Presi-

dent Truman in 1947. In utilizing the concept of "national security," it appears that the Congress was influenced by testimony received by it which emphasized that security risks are not necessarily disloyal and that the procedures of Executive Order 9835 were often ineffective in removing employees who were a potential danger to the national security, but who could not necessarily be proved disloyal. This included such persons as alcoholics, those with unsatisfactory associations and subject to blackmail, and others who were simply overly loquacious. On the other hand, it was agreed that those who are disloyal are of necessity security risks.

This public law formed, at least in part, a statutory basis for Executive Order 10450 which, as noted above, was promulgated by President Eisenhower on April 27, 1953, and by which he sought to combine loyalty and security programs in accordance with a recommendation made by the Truman committee prior to its disbandment in 1953. Indeed, President Eisenhower adopted much of the language of the committee's recommended order as to subjects for investigation and factors to be considered in determining eligibility for employment and retention in employment. However, he did not adopt the precise language of the standard recommended by it; namely, that denial or removal from employment should rest on grounds of fitness or suitability to promote the efficiency of the service. Instead, he employed a standard of "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security." However, although both Public Law 733 and Executive Order 10450 departed from the limited concept of "loyalty," neither defined the precise sense in which the term "national security" was employed. Nevertheless, it was not long before the concept, as applied in the act, was given content by the courts in a case which arose on the dismissal of a preference eligible who held a position in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to which the act had been extended by the President in the provisions of Executive Order 10450. That was *Cole v. Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (1956).

Cole was dismissed in proceedings pursuant to the act on the grounds of alleged close associations with Communists. In holding his dismissal improper, the court concluded that while the term "national security" is not defined in the act, they thought it clear from the statute as a whole that the term was intended to comprehend only those activities of the Government that are directly concerned with the protection of the Nation from internal subversion or foreign aggression, and not those which contribute to the strength of the Nation only through their impact on the general welfare.

Hence, it was required that a determination should have been made that Cole's position was affected with the national security as that term was used in the act. The court was of the view that had the Congress considered the objective of insuring the unswerving loyalty of all employees, regardless of position, as a matter of "national security" to be ef-

fectuated by the summary procedures authorized by the act, rather than simply a desirable personnel policy to be implemented under the normal civil service procedures, it surely would not have limited the act to selected agencies. Noting that dismissals under the Lloyd-LaFollette and Veterans' Preference Act for "such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service" permitted dismissals on grounds of reasonable doubt as to loyalty, the court held that the act of 1950 must be limited in its application to employees who are in "sensitive" positions.

This decision, of course, had the effect of defining the term "national security" as used in the act, but not as used in the order. It is evident, however, that in the context of Executive Order 10450 the term is clearly meant to embrace the concept of loyalty within the comprehensive concept of security, and to form the basis for employment and retention in employment of all civilian officers and employees in all agencies. While requiring the designation of "sensitive positions," the order does so only as a basis for determining the scope of investigation of persons seeking Government employment. The effect of the construction given to Public Law 733 in *Cole* against Young is thus only to limit the procedures for dismissal but not the right to dismiss on loyalty grounds from all positions in Government irrespective of their alleged sensitivity.

The order likewise continued the duties of the Attorney General to supply the heads of departments and agencies with information necessary to the maintenance of the loyalty-security program. Under this provision of the order, the Attorney General continued to furnish information concerning "totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive" organizations. The list of organizations previously designated under Executive Order 9835 were redesignated and consolidated with other organizations pursuant to Executive Order 10450. However, the last designation was made on October 20, 1955. Since that date no organizations have been designated pursuant to the order and this aspect of the program appears to have been abandoned.

In the designation of organizations under executive order and the determination of Communist organizations under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, the Attorney General was obviously involved in some overlapping of functions. It is also apparent that in recent years some reliance was placed on the determinations of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the listing of subversive organizations, not only in relation to the Federal employee security program, but likewise in relation to other security programs, including the port security program, hitherto maintained under the Magnuson Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 191), and the industrial security program, maintained pursuant to Executive Order 10865. In light of the at least partial overlapping of functions and duties imposed upon the Attorney General by Executive Order 10450 and the Subversive Activities Control Act,

it is evident that these relationships must be clarified.

Moreover, the ultimate failures of the Attorney General under both procedures undoubtedly rest on similar causes. The program under Executive Order 9835, after an apparently successful beginning, subsequently deteriorated following a decision of the Supreme Court in *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123 (1951), which enjoined the Attorney General from designating relevant organizations without hearings. On the other hand, at its inception, the program under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 required full trial-type proceedings in the determination of Communist organizations, and little progress was made in its execution. It has been indicated that the problem of exposing FBI informants to be used as witnesses has been a principal, but not sole, obstacle to the effective administration of pertinent provisions of the executive orders and of the act.

In short, we are faced with the fact that two related programs having differing objectives—the one serving a disclosure purpose ancillary to the administration of an employment security program, and the other a disclosure purpose serving broader aspects of the national interest—have been brought virtually to a halt. We thus have not only the question of the necessity for the revival and maintenance of these programs, but whether, in light of the weaknesses in the program, either or both should be maintained at all.

With this introduction, I shall not further prolong my remarks I have endeavored only to give the Members some statement of the nature of the present inquiry and the issues to which we shall necessarily direct our attention. It is apparent that there are many practical problems which will be difficult to resolve. Moreover, in the balancing of the ostensible requirements of national security with individual liberties, particularly in the context of the ideals and basic premises of a libertarian society, we shall be faced with issues of profound constitutional and philosophical import. We shall need, and we shall seek, the assistance of our best minds and most informed experts in fulfilling the urgent task before us. I hope that the Members interested in the difficult problems in this field will give us the benefit of their views.

COMPROMISE VIETNAM-CAMBODIA RESOLUTION AIMED AT RE-ESTABLISHING CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) and I are introducing a compromise Vietnam-Cambodia resolution aimed at reestablishing congressional responsibility in the determination of U.S. war policy without unalterably tying the hands of the President.

This resolution would, consistent with

the establishment of satisfactory arrangements for the release of American prisoners of war, establish a deadline of April 30, 1971, for the removal from Vietnam of all combat troops, and October 31, 1971, for the removal of all support and advisory personnel unless both Houses of Congress by joint resolution grant a Presidential request for a specific extension of time.

It would limit the expenditure of funds in South Vietnam to only that amount required for:

First, financing such release and return of American prisoners of war;

Second, the provision of assistance to South Vietnam in amounts and for purposes specifically authorized by the Congress; and

Third, carrying out the safe and orderly withdrawal of American military personnel from South Vietnam by the specified dates.

The resolution also provides for an end to American involvement in Cambodia and Laos by June 30 of this year, unless an extension is specifically approved by the Congress. It is an attempt to end the impasse between supporters of the administration and sponsors of House Resolution 1000, the House resolution similar to the McGovern-Hatfield amendment which would impose a June 30, 1971, withdrawal deadline for all U.S. military personnel from South Vietnam.

We believe it is important to restore public confidence in the Congress as an institution capable of asserting its appropriate responsibilities in the conduct of international affairs. But we believe it is possible to do so without irrevocably tying the hands of the President in the process.

This resolution is an attempt to strike a compromise in two broad areas of disagreement:

First. The administration prefers the establishment of no congressionally imposed deadline for American military withdrawal from Vietnam and Cambodia. The authors of House Resolution 1000 propose a withdrawal deadline of June 30, 1971, from Vietnam and June 30, 1970, from Cambodia.

This resolution proposes a withdrawal deadline from Vietnam of April 30, 1971, for combat troops and October 31, 1971, for support and advisory personnel, and an end to American involvement in Cambodia and Laos by June 30, 1970.

Second. The administration opposes having its hands tied by the congressional imposition of any definite deadline for American withdrawal.

The sponsors of House Resolution 1000 feel the imposition of a definite deadline is necessary to reestablish congressional authority over war policy.

This resolution establishes congressionally imposed deadlines but spells out the willingness of the Congress to consider establishing new deadlines if the President at some future time finds them to be too restrictive. By so doing, it clearly establishes the principle of congressional authority on a continuing rather than a one-shot basis, and that is as it should be.

Some honest and thoughtful people will question establishing a definite dead-

line for American withdrawal, fearing that it will provide disincentive for Hanoi to engage in serious negotiations. It should be apparent, however, that Hanoi at the present time, in the face of present policy, sees no incentive to negotiate.

It is our belief that the most direct American interest in this conflict is in obtaining the release of American prisoners of war. We feel the establishment of a definite plan for an end to American involvement should and could be used as a basis for obtaining an arrangement for the release of American prisoners.

And we further believe that when it becomes unmistakably clear that America intends to end its involvement in Vietnam, all contending political factions in South Vietnam will have great incentive to make the accommodations necessary for negotiating a political compromise.

For too long the office of the Presidency has had to bear the full burden of the conduct of this war. That is not good for the Congress. It is not good for the Presidency, and it most certainly is not good for the country.

This resolution is an attempt to again establish the principle of cooperative responsibility between two branches of government, and, it is hoped, in the process, suggest a way to obtain release of American prisoners of war, end American involvement in the Indochina war, and provide incentives for a compromise settlement by all parties within South Vietnam.

The text of the resolution appears below:

H. Res. 1056

Resolved, That in the absence of a declaration of war, it is the policy of the House of Representatives that, consistent with the establishment of satisfactory arrangements for the release of American prisoners of war, defense expenditures in South Vietnam should be limited to only that amount required for such release and return of prisoners of war, the provision of assistance to South Vietnam in amounts and for purposes specifically authorized by the Congress, and the carrying out of the safe and orderly withdrawal of all American combat troops from South Vietnam by the end of April 30, 1971, and all support and advisory personnel by October 31, 1971, unless the Congress by joint resolution approves a finding by the President that an additional stated period of time is required.

Resolved, That in the absence of a declaration of war, no funds in the Fiscal Year 1971 defense budget are to be used to finance the operation of any American combat or support troops in Cambodia or Laos, unless the Congress by joint resolution approves a finding of the President that such operations are necessary.

PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is primary election day in California and many other States. As we think about free elections in an open society in compliance with law under a written constitution which provides a representative parliamentary system of government

under God with certain inalienable rights, we should also think about our prisoners of war, our fellow citizens who are missing in action and either mercifully dead or languishing in Communist prisons. We should think about their families and the torment of their separation. We should think about our obligation to these men and their families.

Recently at the annual convention of the American National Red Cross at Chicago, Ill., the chapters of the Red Cross reaffirmed the resolution of the board of governors by the following "Resolution II, Prisoners of War."

RESOLUTION II—PRISONERS OF WAR

Whereas, civilized decency and international law embodied in the Geneva Convention for the Protection of Prisoners of War demand that captives in armed conflicts be identified and accounted for, humanely treated, permitted to communicate and, if seriously sick or wounded, repatriated or placed in neutral hands, and

Whereas, the fate of hundreds of American servicemen captured in the Southeast Asian war is unknown except to their captors, and

Whereas, some of these helpless men have been held captive more than five years, some may be seriously sick, wounded or deceased, without the knowledge of their loved ones, and

Whereas, this cruel, intolerable and prohibited secrecy serves no purpose but to increase the revulsion felt for it by millions of people the world over who understand the grief of parents, wives and children of those imprisoned or whose fate is unknown, and

Whereas, the XXIst International Conference of the Red Cross at Istanbul in September 1969, after noting the historic role of the Red Cross as a protector of victims of war, adopted, without dissent, a resolution calling upon all countries involved in armed conflict to ensure that all prisoners of war be afforded the treatment and full measure of protection prescribed by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, and

Whereas, in the realization that the Red Cross has the potential to arouse the conscience of humanity on behalf of these prisoners, the Board of Governors on February 16, 1970 reaffirmed the resolve of The American National Red Cross to pursue every effort to assure their humane treatment and has urged similar action by every other member of the International Red Cross,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the chapters of The American National Red Cross, united in the resolve to do all in their power to promote respect for the rights of prisoners of war, do hereby endorse the February 16, 1970 resolution of the Board of Governors, and

Be it further resolved that each chapter should accept the continuing commitment within its own community to mobilize ever-increasing support in the demand for the identification and humane treatment of the prisoners, the fulfillment of their right to communicate, the repatriation of the sick and wounded, the accounting for any who may be deceased and ultimately the freedom of all of the prisoners.

Messages were received at the Red Cross convention from President Nixon, every Governor of every State and territory, and several other national organizations.

I include these messages in the RECORD at this time:

MESSAGES

President Richard M. Nixon: Along with all other Americans I have noted with pride and with confidence the dedication of your

Convention to unremitting efforts to obtain for American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia the humane treatment of which they are entitled under the dictates of decency and which their captors are obligated to provide under the Geneva Conventions. You have the support and the prayerful hopes for success from all men of goodwill.

EASTERN AREA

Governor of Connecticut, John Dempsey: Continued efforts by American Red Cross to secure improved treatment our prisoners of war in North Vietnam heartening and commendable. People of this State one of whose citizens interned many years in Red China, keenly aware protection given him and his family by adherence to articles of Geneva Conventions. Speaking their behalf and my own, I urge delegates to annual meeting of American National Red Cross now in session, take every appropriate step to demand the adherence signified by Government of Democratic Republic of Vietnam when signing these Conventions. All future actions initiated by your organization to bring about humane treatment of prisoners of war have my full support.

Governor of Delaware, Russell W. Peterson: I am writing to commend the American Red Cross and its efforts in encouraging Americans to write to the President of North Vietnam on behalf of American prisoners of war. These efforts are proving effective, and I urge the American Red Cross to continue supporting this program. On behalf of all Delawareans, especially those who have kin and friends in POW camps, I thank the American Red Cross for its work to promote humane treatment of those prisoners.

Governor of Maine, Kenneth M. Curtis: I strongly endorse the "Write Hanoi" Campaign of the American Red Cross. We must do everything possible to insure the humane treatment of United States prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I share your hope that letters from thousands of concerned citizens in this country will touch the conscience of Hanoi and move them to honor the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

Governor of Maryland, Marvin Mandel: As Governor of the free State of Maryland, may I commend the American National Red Cross for its continuing efforts to obtain more humane treatment for U.S. prisoners held by North Vietnam, it is my hope that every citizen of Maryland will participate in the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign by letters calling upon the President of North Vietnam to adhere to the Geneva POW Treaty. Best wishes to you and Convention delegates for success in this humanitarian endeavor.

Governor of Massachusetts, Francis W. Sargent: As Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am pleased to endorse the American National Red Cross "Write Hanoi Campaign" and urge the people of Massachusetts and all Americans to cooperate in this effort to write the North Vietnamese Government regarding the treatment of prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Conventions. My hopes for the success of this project.

Governor of New Hampshire, Walter R. Peterson: Strongly endorse continuing efforts of American National Red Cross to obtain humane treatment of the United States prisoners of war held by Government of North Vietnam; am encouraging citizens of New Hampshire to support the Red Cross "Write North Vietnam" Program to prevail on the President, Democratic Republic of Vietnam to honor his nation's signature to the 1949 Geneva Convention.

Governor of New Jersey, William T. Cahill: On behalf of the citizens of the State of New Jersey, I want to express deep concern and wholehearted support for the humanitarian efforts of the American Red Cross in its campaign to impress upon the Government of North Vietnam its responsibility for the welfare and treatment of American serv-

icemen held prisoner by Hanoi. In your role as a non-partisan organization, committed to the service of all in need, we sincerely hope that Red Cross will succeed in arousing the world's conscience and stirring it into action so that sensitive, justice seeking people of every race will influence the North Vietnamese to abide by the Geneva Conventions.

Governor of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller: The American National Red Cross drive to urge Americans to write to Hanoi to secure humane treatment of prisoners of war as guaranteed by the 1949 Geneva Convention has my wholehearted support. I am pleased to join in endorsing this all-out effort to assure that war prisoners in North Vietnam receive all rights and privileges to which they are entitled. The commendable work you and your associates are doing in behalf of prisoners of war and their families merits the widest appreciation.

Governor of Ohio, James A. Rhodes: As Governor of Ohio, I endorse the "Write Hanoi" Campaign being sponsored by the American Red Cross.

Governor of Pennsylvania, Raymond P. Shafer: Strongly endorse efforts of American Red Cross in attempting to encourage expressions to Hanoi urging their compliance with Geneva Conventions with respect to persons held as prisoners of war. I am urging local citizens and groups in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to join in this effort being promoted by the 94 local Red Cross Chapters in Pennsylvania and implore your continued efforts.

Governor of Rhode Island, Frank Licht: I heartily support the efforts of the ARC in its activities in behalf of American prisoners of war. As a result of ARC initiative, coordinated attempts to increase communication to and from prisoners, and to encourage adherence by the Hanoi Government to the terms of the Geneva Convention have been effective. It is my hope that during these difficult days, the ARC will continue its actions, will receive the support of all the people, and will be successful in achieving positive results.

Governor of Vermont, Deane C. Davis: I wish to voice my strong endorsement of the continuing efforts of the American Red Cross in opening the channels of communications regarding the treatment of the POW's held by North Vietnam. I share with you the humane concern for the welfare of the men and urge intensified efforts to prevail upon North Vietnam to honor its signature to the Geneva Conventions.

Governor of Virginia, Linwood Holton: As Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I wish to express my support of the efforts being made by the American National Red Cross to effect compliance of the Geneva Conventions, in the treatment of prisoners of war in North Vietnam. Regardless of political views, all Virginians are united in concern for humane treatment of American captives in Southeast Asia. Our wholehearted support goes to the efforts of all concerned citizens and to the endeavors of the American Red Cross in your "Write Hanoi" Campaign.

Governor of West Virginia, Arch A. Moore, Jr.: I have issued an official proclamation requesting West Virginians to write North Vietnam urging Hanoi to comply with the Geneva Convention pertaining to the treatment of prisoners of war. I commend the Red Cross for its stand in this matter and assure you I am solidly behind your efforts to gain humane treatment for Americans being held as prisoners of war by North Vietnam and to gain entry for ICRC representatives to inspect prisoner of war facilities and prompt repatriation of sick and wounded prisoners.

SOUTHEASTERN AREA

Governor of Alabama, Albert P. Brewer: Please be assured of my deepest appreciation of your actions to secure humane treat-

ment for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I am personally urging the citizens of Alabama to join in the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign to show North Vietnam that Americans are united in their efforts to insure that their sons and husbands in North Vietnam prisons will be treated like human beings and their families here at home will be able to hear from them.

Governor of Arkansas, Winthrop Rockefeller: Please be assured of my deepest appreciation of your actions to secure humane treatment for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I am personally urging the citizens of Arkansas to join in the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign to show North Vietnam that Americans are united in their efforts to insure that their sons and husbands in North Vietnam prisons will be treated like human beings and that their families here at home will be able to hear from them.

Governor of Florida, Claude R. Kirk, Jr.: Floridians appreciate your efforts to secure humane treatment for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I am urging the people of Florida to join in the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign to demonstrate to North Vietnam that we are united in our efforts to insure that our fighting men in North Vietnam prisons will be treated like human beings and that their families here at home will be able to hear from them.

Governor of Georgia, Lester Maddox: This is to assure you that I sincerely endorse the actions taken by the American Red Cross in support of humane treatment of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. As Governor of the State of Georgia, I am personally urging all citizens of this State, irrespective of individual feelings regarding the conflict in Southeast Asia, to join together unanimously in the "Write Hanoi" Campaign. This effort is to let North Vietnam know that Americans are united in their pleas to treat their sons and husbands in North Vietnam like human beings and to live up to the Geneva Conventions signed by that Government.

Governor of North Carolina, Bob Scott: I express my appreciation to American Red Cross for its actions to secure humane treatment for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I urged citizens of North Carolina to join the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign to show North Vietnam Americans are united in their effort seeking treatment for their sons and husbands that is consistent with the Geneva Conventions and seeking contact with them.

Governor of Kentucky, Louis B. Nunn: Please be assured of my deepest sympathy of your actions to secure humane treatment for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I am personally urging the citizens of Kentucky to join in the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign to show North Vietnam that Americans are united in their efforts to insure that their sons and husbands in North Vietnam prisons will be treated like human beings and that their families here at home will be able to hear from them.

Governor of Louisiana, John J. McKeithen: As a Veteran of World War II, I can sincerely appreciate the actions of the American Red Cross in their efforts to secure humane treatment for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. The results to date on this campaign are worth the effort put forth thus far, and to attempt to obtain further results, I am urging the citizens of Louisiana to join the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign to show North Vietnam that our people from Louisiana and America are united in our efforts to insure that our fellow Americans being held prisoners in North Vietnam are treated like human beings and that their families here at home will be able to hear from them. Two young ladies here in Baton Rouge just received letters from their husbands who are prisoners of war. This campaign is picking up momentum and seems to

be reaping the desired results. Keep up the good work.

Governor of Mississippi, John Bell Williams: I wish to express my appreciation for and support of your efforts in attempting to secure humane treatment for American prisoners of war being held captive in North Vietnam. I have personally appealed to the people of Mississippi to participate in a letter writing campaign to convince North Vietnam that the American people stand united in their determination that their husbands and sons be treated as human beings while held as prisoners in North Vietnam and that these Americans be accorded the privilege to communicate with their loved ones.

Governor of South Carolina, Robert E. McNair: I am pleased to indicate by this correspondence that I am personally urging all South Carolina residents to join in the project of the American Red Cross, "Write Hanoi". We feel it is necessary for the Government of North Vietnam to know that all Americans are at war and that we stand firm in our insistence that they be allowed to communicate with their families at home.

Governor of Tennessee, Buford Ellington: Please be assured that we in Tennessee are deeply appreciative of the Red Cross actions to secure humane treatment for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I am personally urging the citizens of Tennessee to continue their support in the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Campaign to show North Vietnam that Americans are united in their efforts to insure that their sons and husbands in North Vietnam prisons will be treated like human beings and that their families here at home will be able to communicate with them.

MIDWESTERN AREA

Proclamation by Governor Richard Ogilvie of Illinois:

More than 1700 United States servicemen are missing in action or detained as prisoners of war as a result of the armed conflict in Southeast Asia.

Each of the governments with armed forces involved in the conflict are signatories to the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of August 12, 1949.

Nevertheless, the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has refused to observe the terms of the Convention and abrogated its obligation under the agreement.

The American Red Cross, which has been striving to ensure that the government of North Vietnam affords prisoners of war the protection and benefits to which they are entitled under international law and the dictates of human decency, is meeting in Chicago May 18-20.

Therefore, I, Richard B. Ogilvie, Governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim May 20, 1970, as a Day of Dedication for the relief of American prisoners of war and their families, and urge all Illinoisans to join in the humanitarian efforts to guarantee our imprisoned servicemen and their families the protection and the benefits to which they are entitled under international law and the dictates of human decency.

Governor of Indiana, Edgar D. Whitcomb: I wholeheartedly endorse the actions of the American Red Cross in behalf of the American prisoners of war being held captive by the North Vietnamese. I commend your organization for its efforts in this regard and urge that you continue despite whatever roadblocks may be encountered. In accordance with the Red Cross "Write Hanoi" Program, I call upon Hoosiers to send a letter to the President of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam and urge to: (1) Identify the prisoners being held, (2) allow regular mail between prisoners and their families and (3) admit International Committee Red Cross representatives to inspect prisoner of war facilities and allow prompt repatriation of sick and wounded prisoners. I believe as

do all Americans that prisoners should be afforded the treatment and protection that North Vietnam is obligated to extend under the prisoners of war Convention. I realize the urgency of this effort and its importance not only to the captured American soldier, but also to his family.

Governor of Iowa, Robert D. Ray: As Governor of the State of Iowa, I am especially concerned about Iowans presently being held captive by the forces of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam and would encourage the efforts of the American National Red Cross in its letter writing campaign to encourage the other side to observe the Geneva Conventions concerning the treatment of prisoners of war.

Governor of Kansas, Robert Docking: In behalf of all Kansans and personally, I join those governors of all States and all Americans in urging the Government of North Vietnam to adhere to the Geneva Conference in their treatment of American men who have become prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, we pray they will be treated fairly and humanely.

Governor of Michigan, William G. Milliken: As Governor of the State of Michigan I endorse the efforts of the American National Red Cross to influence the Hanoi Government to identify the American prisoners. To accept an exchange of mail between the prisoners and their families and to accept representatives of the International Red Cross into their prison camps.

Governor of Minnesota, Harold Levander: I respectfully request you to continue expending maximum effort on behalf of the American prisoners of war being held in North Vietnam and commend you for your past efforts in this regard.

Governor of Missouri, Warren E. Hearnes: I am pleased to urge public support for the Red Cross program of having individual Americans write letters to the officials of North Vietnam requesting humane treatment of prisoners. The release of names of prisoners and the granting of permission for them to receive mail and parcels from their families. Such a campaign at least offers hope of obtaining more information about American prisoners and better treatment for them as was promised by North Vietnam in signing the Geneva Accords.

Governor of Nebraska, Norbert T. Tiemann: I hereby endorse the actions taken by the American Red Cross in their effort to encourage expressions to Hanoi, urging their compliance with the Geneva Convention with respect to persons held as prisoners of war. We in Nebraska are taking up this campaign and I will personally be encouraging Nebraska citizens and groups within our state to write the President of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam, urging compliance.

Governor of North Dakota, William L. Guy: I heartily endorse the "Write Hanoi" Campaign of the American National Red Cross and your organization efforts to secure more humane treatment for the U.S. prisoners of war in Vietnam. North Dakota citizens will make a concerted effort through letter writing to assist you in this current drive to persuade the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam to adhere to the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention which they signed in 1949.

Governor of Oklahoma, Dewey F. Bartlett: Dear Mr. Harriman: As Governor of Oklahoma, I endorse actions taken by the American Red Cross in calling on all Americans and all nations to write Hanoi and demand that prisoners of war be afforded the treatment and protection as agreed to at the Geneva Conventions. Regardless of a persons feelings about the war, the treatment of prisoners of war should be uniform as provided for under the Prisoners of War Convention.

Governor of South Dakota, Frank L. Far-

rar: Mr. Harriman: I endorse your "Write Hanoi" Campaign for the benefit to not only our men who are prisoners of war, but for all their loved ones in the free world. It is time that North Vietnam Government identify all prisoners of war; allow mail between families and prisoners, allow the International Red Cross to inspect the prisoners of war facilities; and allow the sick and injured prisoners to return to their families. Let us all pray for humane treatment of American prisoners of war and for peace.

Governor of Texas, Preston Smith: As Governor of Texas I congratulate the American Red Cross for undertaking another "Write Hanoi" in continuation of your outright efforts to gain more humane treatment for the United States prisoners of war and the missing in action in Southeast Asia. All Americans are concerned about the failure of the North Vietnamese to honor the provisions of the Geneva POW Conventions. I know citizens of Texas will join in support of your campaign.

Governor of Wisconsin, Warren P. Knowles: Urge strongly continuing all-out effort to gain more humane treatment for United States prisoners of war in Vietnam and "Write Hanoi" Campaign.

WESTERN AREA

Governor of Alaska: I would like to take this means of expressing my wholehearted support of American Red Cross efforts to obtain humane treatment of American personnel imprisoned by the North Vietnamese, Americans are unified in their belief that prisoners held in North Vietnam should be afforded the treatment and protection that North Vietnam is obligated to extend under the Geneva Convention provisions and the American Red Cross to continue its splendid efforts.

Governor Arizona, Jack Williams: A number of Arizonians are being held prisoner by North Vietnam. Please accept my thanks and congratulations for your efforts to get North Vietnam to observe the Geneva Conventions. We endorse your actions and urge you to continue your efforts which seem to be having some impact.

Governor of California, Ronald Reagan: Early this month I urged all Californians to join in the observance of a national day of prayer on Sunday, May 3, for the humane treatment and safe return of American prisoners of war and servicemen missing in action in the Southeast Asia. I heartily commend the American Red Cross for its actions to encourage all Americans to write Hanoi to express indignation at their failure to adhere to the Geneva Conventions. I am hopeful your efforts on behalf of our men being held prisoner will provide the impetus that is needed to focus worldwide attention of this matter.

Governor of Colorado, John Love: Governor John Love, State of Colorado, wholeheartedly endorses the American Red Cross resolution and urges the leaders of Hanoi abide by the Geneva Convention.

Governor of Idaho, Don Samuelson: I am vigorously in support of the American Red Cross effort to encourage Hanoi to comply with the Geneva Convention with respect to persons held as prisoners of war. We are deeply concerned about the treatment of these persons who include Idahoans in the military service. My office extends strongest hopes for your early success in this endeavor. Best wishes for a productive Convention.

Governor of Montana, Forrest H. Anderson: I fully support the humanitarian objectives of the "Write Hanoi" Campaign being sponsored presently by the American Red Cross. Humane treatment of American prisoners in Vietnam under the provisions of the Geneva Convention is something that all Americans must work to achieve. Moral pressure must be brought to bear upon the leaders of North

Vietnam to convince them of their responsibilities under the Convention. American must not forget these men. I only hope that this campaign is successful in easing some of the hardships these men and their families are enduring.

Governor of Nevada, Paul Laxalt: I would like to commend the American National Red Cross for their program in calling upon all nations to treat prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Convention. We must continue to encourage everyone to subscribe to your efforts by participating in the "Write Hanoi" Campaign. The success of this endeavor rests with the American people.

Governor of New Mexico, David F. Cargo: Please add my endorsement to the American National Red Cross effort toward freeing American prisoners of war in Vietnam.

Governor of Oregon, Tom McCall: Greetings to you from the State of Oregon. On the occasion of your National Convention, I commend the American National Red Cross on their efforts they have made toward asking Americans to protest to Hanoi on the treatment of U.S. prisoners held by North Vietnam. As you map your reactions for the ensuing year, May I encourage continuation of such efforts. Irrespective of individual feelings about the Vietnamese conflict, I believe there is an absolutely unanimous opinion in Oregon, as there must be throughout the nation, that prisoners should be afforded the treatment and protection that North Vietnam is obligated to extend under the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention. Evidence of such unanimity of opinion, as can be accomplished by a massive compliance with your "Write Hanoi" Campaign, may influence North Vietnam. Last month, Captain James Sehorn of Forest Grove, Oregon, who was shot down in Northern North Vietnam 16 months ago, was finally identified as a prisoner of war. Mrs. Sehorn attributes this notification to the efforts made by fellow Oregonians and others who "Write Hanoi."

Governor of Washington, Daniel J. Evans: I support the efforts of the American National Red Cross to gain more humane treatment for the release of the U.S. prisoners in Vietnam. These prisoners of war are entitled to humane treatment under the statutes of international law and the dictates of moral decency. I hope that the following provision of prisoner of war Convention will be honored by North Vietnam: Prompt identification of prisoners; adequate food and clothing and medical care, communication with other prisoners and their families at home. Prompt repatriation of seriously sick or wounded prisoners; protection from abuse or reprisals and free access to prisoners and their place of detention, by such a neutral intermediary as the All-Swiss International Committee of Red Cross.

Governor of Utah, Calvin L. Rampton: Please accept my endorsement of ARC efforts to obtain humane treatment of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I add my voice to those urging Hanoi to follow strictly the standards set by the Geneva Convention.

State of Wyoming, Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway: Proclamation:

Whereas, Red Cross has become the traditional neutral intermediary in time of conflict; and

Whereas, the American Red Cross has asked the world Red Cross Societies and the American people to form a solid front in demanding that the North Vietnamese meet humanitarian standards in the treatment of American prisoners; and

Whereas, the United States Senate and House of Representatives have passed a resolution demanding compliance with the Geneva Conventions on treatment of prisoners of war and calling for the United Nations and the International Red Cross to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners; and

Whereas, the American Red Cross is asking the American people to exert more pressure on the North Vietnamese by increasing participation in its "Write Hanoi" campaign;

Now, therefore, I, Stanley K. Hathaway, Governor of the State of Wyoming, do hereby proclaim the month beginning May 17, 1970, as "Support our Prisoners in Vietnam Month," and urge the citizens of the state to participate in the "Write Hanoi" campaign to demand that the North Vietnamese honor the Prisoner of War provisions of the Geneva Conventions.

State of Hawaii, Gov. John A. Burns: As Governor of the State of Hawaii, whose spirit of aloha is often the last contact that our servicemen have with their country before giving honorable military service in Southeast Asia, and which, through its vast military resources gives support to those operations, I offer my full endorsement of the efforts of the American Red Cross in seeking humane treatment for American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam, the Viet Cong and Laotian forces. Irrespective of any personal feeling about the Vietnam conflict, it is God's will and the heartfelt desire of all Americans that prisoners of war be afforded the treatment and protection that North Vietnam is obligated to extend under the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention. In Hawaii, Sunday, May 24 will be recognized in churches throughout the State as Prisoner of War Prayer Day with the attendant request that our citizens participate in the National Write Hanoi Campaign initiated by the American Red Cross. With our previous similar effort having its effect with some easing by North Vietnam of its stand, I support your continued dedication of this worthy task. May God be with you in your earnest endeavors in behalf of all American prisoners of war. Aloha.

TERRITORIES

Mr. Leber, Governor of the Canal Zone: I sincerely endorse the resolution adopted at the 21st International Conference of the Red Cross calling on all nations to ensure humane treatment of prisoners of war and fully support the American Red Cross in its continuing world-wide efforts to encourage compliance with the Geneva Conventions extending protection to such prisoners.

Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis A. Ferre: The people of Puerto Rico join me to express our support of the action taken by the American Red Cross on behalf of prisoners of war in North Vietnam and willfully cooperate with the Write Hanoi Campaign the continuation of these efforts is the responsibility of all nations.

Governor of American Samoa, John M. Hayden: Please be advised that I as Governor and the people of American Samoa wholeheartedly support and appreciate Red Cross efforts to encourage humane treatment of Prisoners of War. A good number of our young men are involved in the Vietnam conflict, and several have lost their lives in support of our countries' principles. We recognize diversifications of nationalities, cultures, and customs in the world, but we believe that kindness and decency unite or should unite all men and it is incumbent on the United States and Allied countries and likewise the Government of North Vietnam to treat their prisoners of war with humane decency. Your efforts toward the accomplishment of this objective will continue to encourage better treatment of prisoners regardless of race, color, or creed and will in the long run help to bring all men together in a spirit of harmony and love. Again our sincere appreciation.

Governor of Virgin Islands, Melvin H. Evans: People in government of Virgin Islands highly endorse the role and activities of the American Red Cross on behalf of prisoners of war. Your write Hanoi campaign

carried out by via Red Cross Chapters. Sincere wish for success this and similar projects.

ORGANIZATIONS

Mrs. James B. Stockdale, National Coordinator for the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia: Please extend to every delegate at your Convention the heartfelt gratitude of the wives and families of captured and missing American servicemen for the help you have given our men in the past. We deeply appreciate your continuing interest and efforts toward insuring humane treatment for our loved ones and wholeheartedly support and encourage renewed appeals for your "Write Hanoi" Campaign. Our burden seems lighter knowing you are continually increasing your efforts to get help to our men. We thank you most sincerely.

Mrs. Erwin Frees Seimes, President General, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution—Dear Mr. Collins: Your letter of May 13 has been read with interest and appreciation. We are enclosing a copy of the resolution adopted at the 79th Continental Congress entitled "Prisoners of War," which we feel is in line with your "Concurrent Resolution."

Also, for your information, the following paragraph appeared in the last Circular Letter sent by me to my National Board: "We have been asked by the Committee of United We Stand, Inc. (H. Ross Perot's Mission to bring relief to POW's in Vietnam) to write as individuals to express their concern to H. Ross Perot, Post Office Box 100,000, Dallas, Texas 75222." Please transmit this word to your Chapters in order that they may express their feelings on this subject."

Best wishes for a most successful Convention.

Prisoners of War Resolution, 79th Continental Congress, April 1970:

Whereas unknown numbers of servicemen have suffered long terms of imprisonment or the ambiguous status of "missing in action" in North Viet Nam; and

Whereas apparently nothing stronger than the usual words and platitudes from responsible United States officials and United Nations headquarters have led Hanoi to the belief that they have nothing to fear from the United States of America in their treatment of American prisoners; and

Whereas it is known that numbers of the Armed Forces of the United States of America have been murdered or allowed to die from malnutrition, disease or wounds; and

Whereas the North Vietnamese have stated that all captured Americans are regarded as war criminals and they will be tried by the "People's Court"; and

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution express grave concern for the treatment and fate of United States prisoners of war and other Americans wrongfully held;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution believe that we must take all necessary steps to obtain the release of these American prisoners of war and in no circumstances abandon these brave men.

The American Legion, national headquarters, J. Milton Patrick, National Commander:

The American Legion shares your concern for the well being of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam. Our resolution No. 8, adopted May 6-7, 1970, joins with you in assuring the compliance with the Geneva Convention regarding the treatment of prisoners of war and cooperates with you in your "Write Hanoi" campaign.

Ex Prisoners of War, Stalag Luft III: Strongly applaud your Red Cross National Convention's commitment unrelentingly to pursue every possible course to ensure that American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia

be afforded all the protection and benefits to which they are entitled and their captors are obligated to extend under the Geneva convention. Our organization which consists exclusively of former American prisoners of war, many of whose lives were saved by Red Cross efforts on their behalf, has unanimously endorsed your efforts and assures you of our unqualified support.

Every Red Cross chapter in the United States and throughout the world, every individual citizen of this country and all free countries of the earth, should accept a continuing commitment to mobilize world opinion to obtain humane treatment for all prisoners of war.

Please join your President, your Governor, your Red Cross and your fellow citizens in helping to arouse the conscience of humanity on behalf of these prisoners.

PRESIDENT URGED TO CALL UPON SOVIET UNION TO WITHDRAW RUSSIAN PERSONNEL FROM MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, on behalf of myself and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), as well as 55 other Members of the House of Representatives of both parties, the following resolution, which is identical to a resolution being introduced today in the other body:

Resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the introduction of Russian pilots and the manning of missile sites by Russian technicians in the United Arab Republic is contributing to the increasing tension in the Middle East and the President is strongly urged to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw all Russian personnel as a major step toward encouragement of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of Russian pilots, missile bases, and technicians into Egypt, the Soviet Union has dangerously escalated the Middle East crisis.

This ominous development seriously jeopardizes our hopes for stabilizing the Middle East situation, and may well undermine any prospect of securing an effective cease-fire. It was a cease-fire which President Nixon stated on March 21 as his "first" goal for the Middle East.

The step-up of Soviet military aid threatens both United States security interests in the Middle East and the very survival of Israel, the area's only genuine democracy.

The actions of the Soviet Union represent a significant shift in the balance of power in the Middle East, a balance necessary for a final settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

Rather than exercising reciprocal restraint when President Nixon in March deferred the sale of additional jet combat aircraft to Israel, the Soviet Union has taken a step unprecedented in the Middle East crisis—overtly involving an increasing number of its own military personnel in Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, I urge President Nixon to press the Soviet Union to reconsider this highly dangerous action and to urge the Soviet Union to withdraw its military personnel from Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, I was privileged to chair a bipartisan congressional subcommittee visiting Israel to study the Israeli educational system. While in Israel, our subcommittee had an interview with Foreign Minister Abba Eban.

During our interview, Mr. Evan said:

It is . . . unrealistic to think that Israel is going to move one inch except with a negotiated settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli crisis remains the only way to peace and stability in the Middle East. The involvement of Russian military personnel there is a grave setback to reaching such a settlement.

I hope this resolution will win wide support from Members of the House on both sides of the aisle.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWIN CARL JOHNSON

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Nation lost one of its most distinguished elder statesmen—Edwin Carl Johnson, Member of the U.S. Senate from 1937 through 1954 and three times Governor of my State.

"Big Ed," as he was affectionately called, is being buried today near the Rocky Mountains which he loved so much.

The passing of Ed Johnson saddens me in the sense that I have lost a close, personal friend who has given me the benefit of wise counsel for nearly two decades.

However, my sense of loss is tempered by the knowledge that this was one of the most complete men who ever lived—a man who, during his lifetime, served in the highest councils of his State and his Nation and yet who somehow found the time to live a full life as an individual human being.

This is a rare achievement.

I first met Ed Johnson as a teenager in Sterling, Colo. He was Governor of our State at that time. I was mightily impressed.

Later, I was to get to know this man very well, indeed, when he returned from the Halls of Congress for his valedictory political campaign for a third term as Governor. That was 1956.

We became good friends and—until his doctor finally intervened—he frequently came to my office in Washington to discuss western water problems and a hundred other matters which were of concern to his beloved Colorado.

He was the very essence of the elder statesman. There will not soon be another like him.

THE BLACK PANTHERS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, a valid measure of a legal system is the manner in

which it treats its unpopular minorities. In recent years, largely through the good work of the Warren Court, the United States has had an improving record. The recent revelations concerning the Chicago Police raid on the Black Panthers on the night of December 4, 1969, are therefore all the more disturbing, and I wish to express my deep concern.

It will be recalled that on the night in question a squad of police engaged in what was called a gun battle with Black Panthers in their Chicago headquarters. Two Panthers were killed, and at least one officer wounded. The official version was that the Panthers fired first, and that the police acted in self-defense. We were assured by Illinois State's Attorney Edward V. Hanrahan and others that public criticism of the police represented "an orgy of sensationalism in the press and on TV" and that the police had acted responsibly in the face of a brutal Panther attack.

We now know that this version is false. Although the Illinois authorities made a full investigation, they could not find sufficient evidence to bring charges against the surviving Panthers. And a U.S. grand jury, which has made the fullest investigation to date, sharply criticized the Chicago police and suggested that they had falsified evidence. According to some observers one reason that no policemen were indicted was that Panther leaders, scornful of our criminal justice, refused to appear before the grand jury.

In the past I have criticized the Panthers for their violent rhetoric, and if proof reveals Panther violence I shall immediately condemn it. Accordingly, I feel an obligation in all fairness to protest against what now appears to be police violence and official coverups. The American system cannot survive if such machinations are permitted by those sworn to uphold the law.

We are now in a period of public crisis. It is therefore vital that public servants, perhaps even more than private citizens, act with responsibility and restraint, and above all with fidelity to the rule of law. It appears that this high standard was not met by the Chicago authorities in this case.

NEWER MEMBERS SHOULD JOIN IN CRUSADE FOR LOWER INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months many of the newer Members have indicated a desire to participate more fully in the major programs and decisionmaking processes of the House of Representatives. A new Member of Congress, either of the House of Representatives or of the U.S. Senate, should not feel deterred in his efforts to help his constituents and the Nation because of the seniority system.

A new Member can be useful commencing the very first day of his service. Let me urge to you newer Members, who

desire more action, to join a crusade that can do more than anything else for all the American people, of all income groups and of all political persuasions.

That crusade, Mr. Speaker, is for a monetary reform and lower interest rates.

The person who desires to buy a house now that costs \$20,000 will be required to sign papers calling for an effective 9 percent interest.

The interest rates over a period of 30 years on the mortgage will amount to \$38,000, on the \$20,000 home.

So that means that one purchasing a home under the present interest rates and terms is required to pay \$58,000 in order to get a \$20,000 home . . . \$38,000 in interest.

Now just these facts alone are sufficient to indicate that there is something wrong in our country when a person must pay almost twice as much interest as the cost of a house. It just does not make good sense.

I would like to see 100 Members of the House join in a firm alliance behind programs to bring about lower interest rates and an allocation—and this is very important—an allocation of the Nation's credit resources to the areas where this credit is needed the most.

I can give you a very simple illustration of what I mean. During World War II there was a scarcity of steel and in order to make steel available only for the most needed purposes, laws were passed that you could not use steel for certain purposes which were not considered the most useful. For instance, it was considered illegal to use steel to make a slot machine or a gambling device because we needed steel for wheel bearings and machines and things like that.

Today we need a priority system that will put housing right up at the top. There is a scarcity of adequate homes. We are behind in our residential construction—way behind.

Mr. Speaker, many individual Members of the House have done an excellent job on the monetary issue of the past 30 years, but more help and broader help is needed if we are to overcome the great pressure to maintain the status quo in monetary affairs.

The reason I suggested 100 Members out of 535 Members of the House and Senate is that at least 100 Members should be working just on this one subject of monetary affairs and lower interest rates. It is to my mind the most important area in our entire economy.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the younger Members of the House who are sincere—and I know that they are all sincere in their desire to do something for the American people—to get behind these efforts to bring about lower interest rates. This must be a day to day fight, a day to day effort to get the facts over to the other Members of the Congress and the American public. It must be undertaken with the full realization that Members will come under attack by the giant lobbying and pressure groups who profit so greatly from the present, business as usual monetary policies. By joining this

crusade the newer Members can strike a blow for decent housing, small businessmen, the consumer, the farmer, as well as others, and he can strike a blow for lower prices and for a stable economy without rising unemployment.

High on the agenda of this crusade must be the critical problem of housing, particularly housing for the low- and moderate-income families, who have been priced out of the market by the Nixon administration's high-interest, tight-money policies.

When Mr. Nixon was elected President of the United States in November 1968, less than 2 years ago, the prime interest rate was then 6 percent. Now it is 8½ percent. On June 9, 1969, one of the biggest bankers in the United States, on Wall Street in New York, came out on the front steps of his great institution and announced that the interest rate, at that time 7½-percent prime rate, is hereby raised by his declaration to 8½ percent. He is not a member of the Government. He was never elected by the people. He was never appointed by anybody as a part of our democracy or our Government, as a part of this great Republic—I choose to say a democracy in a republic.

But under an agreement—it is bound to be an agreement over a long period of time, 40 years or longer—the bankers have all agreed, all big bankers, that if a big banker like a Wall Street banker announces that the prime rate is raised, they all follow, and it is raised immediately.

In this case the big bank raised the prime rate 1 percent.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) asked the question before about the national debt and all debts, public and private, and we had a colloquy. I am glad he raised the question. At the time the prime rate was raised, 1 percent, never before had it been raised that much before. Theretofore it had always been raised, except in two instances, one-half percent—it had always been raised one-quarter of 1 percent, but for some reason it was raised a whole 1 percent at that time. That whole percentage point means this: You can take your book and pencil and figure it out for yourself. At the time, net public and private debt was about \$1,500,000,000,000, and a 1 percent increase on this debt would amount to \$15 billion a year—\$15 billion a year.

That action meant that the 55 million families in this country would have to pay \$15 billion a year every year hereafter as interest on their borrowed money, just because that banker said so. Well, the prime rate has been raised 2.5 percent since Mr. Nixon came into office, so that means the people are paying \$37.5 billion a year in extra interest over and above what they were paying.

It was arbitrarily raised. Does it not seem unusual that anybody could raise the rates that way?

I asked the Attorney General of the United States to investigate it. It appears to be an agreement or a conspiracy against the people, using power that for the purpose of making more money for the banks at the expense of the poorest

and most deserving people of this entire Nation.

I suggested to the Attorney General that many people believe—and I was one of them—that anybody who could track an elephant in the snow could prove an agreement of conspiracy in this particular case, because it has been done for 50 years.

One time I was investigating, as district attorney in the State where I live, an increase in the gasoline rates. They went up an abnormal amount. I was investigating it through a grand jury. Nobody seemed to know how the agreement was arranged. They all just raised the rate at one time. Finally one person told me:

Well, we did not have any actual agreement. We just had what was known as an unconvictional understanding that when so-and-so raised the rates, all the rest of us would raise the rates.

That is being done on Wall Street, and nothing is being done about it.

Therefore, we should do something to lower these interest rates, and 100 Members of Congress are not too many. We ought to have that number working on this important thing all the time.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman's committee making any effort or any study to ascertain what has been the increase in profits and the increase in earnings of the banks of this country in 1969?

For the first 6 months of 1969, I have placed in the RECORD of last year an analysis which showed that the increase in earnings across the board from coast to coast, from water to water, for all the banks of the country was 20 percent over last year. We took 50 banks which we selected at random around the country and found that for the first 6 months of 1969 the increase in these 50 banks ranged from 49 percent for one bank in Detroit to 11 percent for one bank in Chicago.

It seems to me we hear a great deal of talk about price controls and wage controls, but I have not heard anybody in the White House or in the Treasury Department or in the Federal Reserve or any place else suggest that perhaps the time has come to put some kind of ceiling on the profits of the moneylenders of this country.

The statement the gentleman is making here is most astonishing. Here is the distinguished chairman of one of the most important committees of this Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is suggesting that some sort of conspiracy exists. I am sure that warning is going to fall on deaf ears, just as did the warning on the increase in profits which I raised last year.

If the average businessman could increase his earnings by 6 percent or 8 percent a year, he would be happy, but here we see the banks registering the huge increases in earnings when everybody else is registering losses or decreases in earnings. Yet I do not see any-

one suggesting that in this great effort to do something about inflation we address ourselves to the problem of the runaway interest rates and the runaway profits in the banking community.

I ask the gentleman in the well who is making the statement today, if he could venture a guess as to how wide attention his statement will receive among the American people.

Does the gentleman have any statistics or figures to indicate what is the earning picture for the whole year of 1969?

I addressed myself to the first 6 months, because that was the only figure we had, but does the gentleman know the earnings of the banks of this country for the whole year 1969, and does the gentleman have those figures now?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. We have those figures.

I commend the gentleman for placing in the RECORD the figures for the 6 months. I observed them. They are most impressive. I hope the gentleman keeps up that information for the Members.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is always working in the public interest and for the middle- and lower-income groups, and the poorer people.

I am not against the big, rich people. I am not against the big corporations. They just do not need me. They have the very best lawyers in the world. They have the finest public relations men.

There is not a floor in the House Office Building or in the U.S. Capitol today that is not just covered with lobbyists from the big banking interests, for instance. They have plenty of people to represent them. They do not need me.

But the poor people do, and the middle-income groups and the people who are disadvantaged do. Therefore, I am trying to do something I believe will be in their direction.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman.

I also do not have anything against the banks or lending institutions. We need them. They are an integral part of our economy. They are the backbone of the American economy. Without these people this country could not survive.

But I believe there should be tremendous concern, enormous concern by every American when we ponder what the gentleman said here the other day, when he pointed out to this House that it is costing an American today \$58,000 to buy a \$20,000 house. It seems to me that kind of situation is absolutely incredible and indefensible.

So when we talk about high interest rates we look at these figures, and then we see the enormity of the problem.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman. I hope that he becomes a member of this group, and I am sure he will. We should have a group like a steering committee to elect its own officers to serve a certain length of time, and to take issue with certain programs and to do certain things. I know the gentleman would be one of the most useful members.

Today the Nation is building houses at an annual rate of 1.1 million units. That is 1.5 million below the minimum goal set by the U.S. Congress. Why? High

interest. Extortionate interest. Usurious interest. Interest that almost would be considered robbery. That is what has caused these housing unit numbers to go down.

We are way below what is necessary to furnish a decent home for every family.

We hear people talk about environmental quality. I am strong for the phrase "environmental quality."

Today our country has more than 55 million families. They are our principal obligation. Whatever we do in the Congress by way of making laws and policies that will make it better for these families to exist, to educate their children, to have a good living with proper food, clothing and shelter, the better off the country will be. And we will have the satisfaction of doing something to perform this kind of service that will help our constituents the most.

In order to have environmental quality one must have not only proper food for those families but also proper clothing and shelter. We must provide a house that is a decent house, that is satisfactory for the children of the family to be reared in and educated. That being true, we will have good environmental quality.

Today we are going down the road toward less housing and less environmental quality instead of going up the road toward better environmental quality. Millions of American families are going without decent housing and millions of others are paying fantastic prices for inadequate dwellings.

Our housing situation is a national disgrace and all of it can be traced back to high interest rates and sadly-mistaken monetary policies. We must deal with the current housing crisis on an emergency basis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in an effort to keep title 5 in H.R. 17495 the Emergency Home Financing Act—which will be coming to the floor in the near future. This provision was stricken from the bill on a close vote in the Banking and Currency Committee 2 weeks ago.

The committee's action was a serious mistake and it is one which must be corrected on the floor of the House of Representatives.

DEVELOPMENT BANK FOR HOUSING

Title 5 of this bill provides for the establishment of a National Development Bank which would provide home loans to low- and moderate-income families. The loans would be at an interest rate not exceeding 6½ percent to families with incomes below the median level in their local communities.

Loan funds for the bank could be provided from a number of sources. Congress could appropriate funds. The Treasury could purchase bank obligations. Obligations of the bank could be sold in the open market. When necessary to achieve adequate loan fund levels, tax-exempt private pension funds and virtually tax-exempt privately controlled foundations having assets of \$4 million or more could be required to purchase bank obligations in annual amounts not exceeding 2.5 percent of the total value

of such assets. Obligations of the bank would be negotiable, fully and unconditionally guaranteed by the Government, and have yields comparable to similar obligations marketed by Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the beauty of this approach is that it need not rely on appropriations for loan funds. It could be financed solely on investments by pension funds and foundations. Thus it would not require the Congress to appropriate huge additional sums to provide housing. It does not impose any risk or require any sacrifice on the part of the pension funds and foundations since the obligations of the National Development Bank would be fully backed by the U.S. Government. The pension funds and foundations would be paid the market rate for their investments in the bank.

The National Development Bank would be funded at a \$4 billion level immediately and would provide funds sufficient for home buyers to purchase a minimum of 200,000 housing units each year.

Mr. Speaker, the National Development Bank provides the only ingredient which will bring about more housing—a new source of funds. Without a new source of funds, we are just deluding the American public about Congress' willingness to do something about the housing crisis. A new source of funds is the answer; it is the only answer which will build housing.

The National Development Bank represents an allocation of credit resources into an area of great need. We must insist, as Members of Congress with a public responsibility, that the people's credit resources be allocated in areas that will reach and aid the people.

Mr. Speaker, we face the housing crisis as an emergency, but this does not mean that there are not other areas which are also in great despair because of high interest rates and tight money and mistaken monetary policies.

ALLOCATION OF CREDIT

Mr. Speaker, the solving of our credit crisis in the housing field should be considered as a first step—an opening shot—in the fight to bring about better monetary policies and a more equitable allocation of credit in the economy at reasonable interest rates.

It is unfortunate that the Federal Reserve System, as the Federal Government's principal monetary mechanism, has not seen fit to allocate credit and to take steps which would bring about lower interest rates. The Federal Reserve is the root of the problem. It is the nerve center around which our monetary problems move. And as a result, any suggestions for a change in the System's operations invariably bring a hue and cry from the bank and big business lobby.

But any crusade to do something about housing, small business, agriculture, or the consumer, must include a firm resolve to do something about the mismanagement of our present Federal Reserve System.

Most other industrialized nations, directly or indirectly, require that its central banks allocate funds to useful purposes. Only the Federal Reserve Sys-

tem of the United States refuses to operate in accord with the economic needs of the people who created it.

In the country of Mexico to the south of us, across the Rio Grande, their central bank requires commercial banks who have this great responsibility of issuing money upon the sovereignty of the country of Mexico, to make at least 30 percent of their loans for housing to the low-income people, to the people in the low-income group. That is a wonderful thing. That example is in existence in other countries of the world but in a different form. Mexico, our neighbor, is doing that. It is a success. They are getting a lot of houses for the low-income groups. It is a very commendable step.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a major country in the world with a central bank that does not require that central bank to have a social responsibility as well, except the United States where it is not required. The earnings of the banks, of course, are tremendous. I want to see them make money because that is the way that they can better serve their areas that they represent, they being profitmaking institutions and I am all for that—but I am against more than a fair profit. I am against these exorbitant interest rates or excessive interest rates. They are not necessary. The banks are making plenty of money. I am not objecting to them making plenty of money, but I want them to help serve the public interest too as well as their own interest. That is their obligation. But, we should at least follow the policy set by Mexico or some similar policy to require a certain amount of bank loans be used for housing for the low-income groups. This is not unreasonable.

The Federal Reserve System has the power to peg the rates at any level that it so desires. There is no free market in interest rates as many claim. It is administered—listen to this, my friends—it is an administered market, administered by the money managers of the Federal Reserve System operating in conjunction with a handful of bond dealers appointed by the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Speaker, time after time I have questioned Federal Reserve officials and time after time they have agreed with me that interest rates are fixed. They are pegged because of the massive national debt and control, therefore, the Federal Reserve purchases the sales of Government securities in the open market.

Mr. Allen Sproul, a former president of one of the biggest of the 12 banks in the United States—the Federal Reserve System—and that is the Bank of New York, made a comment and let me quote to you a comment from Mr. Sproul's statement. This is, of course, what the Federal Reserve believes. He said:

So far as "free markets" are concerned, I think we are all attracted by the phrase. It suits our habit of mind. But we haven't had a free market in money and credit, at least since the Federal Reserve System was established, and we haven't had a free market in Government securities, and therefore a wholly free securities market, since the Government debt climbed to the higher magnitudes, and open market operations by the

Federal Reserve System came to be used as a principal instrument of credit policy.

Now, take it from the mouth of the person who knew and knows what the Federal Reserve is. He says interest rates are fixed. Of course they are fixed. They are fixed by the people who have the power, who run the big banks, and who can make more money by fixing them higher. It is certainly not understandable to people, and not to me, that we would even permit people who are able to make a profit themselves on manipulating the money and credit and interest rates to have anything to do with the fixing of rates.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished and illustrious chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House for yielding to me.

The gentleman comes from Texas, and those of us coming from Texas have learned over the course of the years to respect and be very grateful to the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN). His has been a very lonely voice over the course of the years on this most vital subject. I have a question to direct to the chairman.

Is it true that the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System actually has the power to determine the fate of any administration in power through its control of the prices that it will dictate to be paid for Treasury bills and the like?

Could the chairman enlighten me on that?

Mr. PATMAN. I can say this: That the Government bond dealers—and there are 21 dealers in the whole country located mostly within a rock's throw from the Federal Reserve Bank in New York. Just recently they have permitted one dealer in Chicago and one in Boston, which is beyond a rock's throw—but they are all on the same telephone line; just like an old-fashioned telephone, every one of them is on that same telephone line, and they fix rates that way. I do not think it takes much imagination to come to a conclusion as to what they will do.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Now, the Federal Reserve open market committee is really the reverse of what goes on. It is a closed operation, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. It is a closed operation. They are not even audited by the General Accounting Office. The books of the Federal Reserve have never been audited by the General Accounting Office.

Now, the General Accounting Office, of course, is an agency of the Congress, charged with the duties of auditing all the agencies of the Government, but for some strange reason the Federal Reserve has been exempted. The Comptroller of the Currency, the Administrator of the National Bank is exempt, so in large part is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Administrator of the other banks is exempt; they are not subject to being audited, and have not been audited.

Now, the Federal Reserve should come before the Congress to get their appropriation, but one of the first things they did was to find a way to get around that, and here is the way they did it—you see, if they were to come before a congressional committee, Members of Congress would find out what they are using the money for.

Now, it would be very embarrassing for the Federal Reserve to tell the Congress they are contributing over \$100,000 a year to the biggest banking lobby in the United States, the American Bankers' Association. So they have become dues-paying, card-carrying members of the biggest banking lobby in the world.

Do you expect them to do anything for the poor people and the moderate-income group under those circumstances and conditions?

Furthermore, let me say to the gentleman that it certainly is not fair to say to the poor man who wants to buy a home—and there are many people in this country, hundreds of thousands of them, who are saving their pennies and their quarters and dollars, saving their money every month hoping for the day when they will have enough to make a downpayment on a home.

Then about the time that many of these couples have enough money and they are able to make a contract to buy a home, then the announcement is made that the interest rates are raised.

They have to tear up the contracts and start all over again. Then they build up again and get more money and finally make a contract for a home and an announcement comes out that interest rates are raised again.

They have been doing that for years and it is a terrible thing, but it actually happens in broad daylight here in the United States of America by the fixing of interest rates and, I can charge, by conspiracy—yes, by conspiracy against the public interest.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would like to bring out this matter which is of deep concern to me.

In connection with this interest rate business, I notice in your newsletter where you report that \$112 billion was paid in interest; is that figure correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it is understated just a little bit—it is \$120 billion a year now.

Mr. GONZALEZ. \$120 billion?

Mr. PATMAN. \$120 billion, that the American people are paying every year or at least last year, for interest alone. It has not been long since a lot of people believe that you should not pay any interest at all. Nobody objects to paying reasonable interest, but I think everybody objects to paying extortionate and usurious interest rates. But that is the amount.

If you would compare that with what the Government has traditionally paid for interest over a long period of time commencing before World War II and during World War II and during the Korean War and after it—if you com-

pared the rates we paid during the most trying times in our country—during that 14-year period and compare it with now, instead of the Federal Government paying \$20 billion a year interest on the national debt, we would only be paying \$7 billion a year.

Now when you can point out such things as that, you know that there is something wrong. It ought to be corrected and it ought to be corrected now.

We ought to have people talking about that every day on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other body. We should have 100 Members to put on this crusade. They have to remember that there is going to be an attack and they have to have the courage and stand up and fight although there are attacks.

I know the gentleman from San Antonio, Tex., is of that type and I know he stands up and fights under similar and like circumstances.

Mr. GONZALEZ. May I say one thing further. I certainly am enlisted in the good fight under the great leadership of my chairman, the gentleman from Texas, the honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

I want you to know I am enlisted right there as a private in the ranks and I will do anything that is possible within my capacity to back you up.

I will conclude my statement by saying that everyone of us has a deep obligation to you, Mr. Chairman, for this very lonely but what I consider to be inevitably successful fight. Certainly, the least anyone of us can do is to join you in this fight.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank my colleague.

Then with reference to this section, title V of the Emergency Financing Act that we will attempt to restore here, that will really be something that could be called a reconstruction finance corporation for housing. That is what it could be. It would be using pension funds and foundation funds. But you cannot take property without just compensation, even for the public interest. But this title provides that they receive as compensation the going rate of interest on comparable Government securities. So that is not taking anything away from them. It is helping the beneficiaries of those funds.

It is a wonderful deal, and it is the only way we can get a source of funds right now. We have not been able to get a source of funds in any other way. You can talk until doomsday about housing, but unless you can get a source of funds at reasonable rates you are just wasting your time. We have suggested a source of funds here, and we hope the House will approve the bill when it comes up with that title V that provides a source of funds.

Mr. Speaker, we will never have a monetary policy in the public interest until the Federal Reserve System is required, without any if's, and's, and but's, to comply with the directives of the elected Representatives of the people. We really have two governments in the U.S. Government. We have one government that is elected by the people, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, 100 U.S. Senators, and we have the President of the United States in the execu-

tive branch. Under the Constitution, which I think is the finest and best Constitution in the world, it is the duty of the Congress to make the laws and it is the duty of the Executive to enforce the laws.

But I think that the people of this country expect their Representatives who are elected, like those of us here today, to represent them and to stand up for them and to do what is necessary and proper. I think every Member accepts that duty and wants to carry it out. I have never served among more honorable people in my life than those in the Congress of the United States. I know oftentimes different things in a Member's district among his constituents influence him. Of course, they influence me. Naturally they would, just like they would anyone else. Sometimes those cross currents interfere. But we should have our laws made and executed by Representatives of the people, elected by the people, like the President and the Members of the Congress.

But we for some unknown reason—it is not unknown to me and it is not unknown to some others—but generally it is unknown, that we have an unelected government in this country that has just taken over, just like Castro took over Cuba, in some way. I am not saying it is comparable, but they are doing what they want to do to help their own private selfish, greedy interests, irrespective of and regardless of the interests of the people of the country. That should not be permitted. But there are people making the main decisions in this country on monetary matters and interest rates who have no power on earth to do so. They have assumed the power and they have not been challenged by those in trusted positions, placed there by the people's votes at the election box at election time.

We have got to correct this. We will never have a decent monetary policy until the Federal Reserve has been required to come to Congress for appropriations and an annual review and to face a full audit by the GAO.

Let me tell Members how the Federal Reserve got around this coming before the Congress. That is rather a cute way and rather a meaningful way that they had of making an end run around that provision in the Constitution. But the Federal Reserve found out that in the original act they could create money. Nobody doubts that they can. The banks create money and I am not opposed to it if they keep in mind the public interest and do it for the public interest. But if they do it for some sordid reason, we would be opposed to it.

First, the Federal Reserve bought some Government bonds using the country's credit. Their first open market transaction in the history of this Nation was with the city of New York. They bought city of New York bonds and created some credit to do it. They created the credit to buy those New York bonds and received interest on them. That was a sweet deal for them, because why should they not use that method to stay away from Congress? They did not want to

come before Congress and explain their activities. So they began to buy Government bonds by the millions, and they would clip the coupons, and they had enough money to operate so they did not have to come before Congress. They did not have to. They have never to this good day come before Congress. They get their money another way.

At first it was only a few million dollars, which was enough to keep them going, and they did not have to assess the banks. That was a sweet deal from their standpoint. Then they began to accumulate more. In 1959 they had about \$30 billion in Government bonds. They tried to get a law through here that would enable them to let the commercial banks buy these bonds from the Federal Reserve, using a low reserve fund which was given to them too, and it would not cost them a penny.

I discovered it, and other members of our committee discovered it, although it passed the other body unanimously. We found out what was in it, and we stopped it. But in their report they said the commercial banks need these bonds, and they need the revenue from them, and the Federal Reserve does not. They were recommending that the bonds be transferred without cost to the commercial banking system. We stopped it. But remember now, that is not just \$30 billion in those bonds. It is \$57,300,000,000 in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and every one of the bonds has been paid for once.

If Members want some documentation on that, I have interrogated the principal officials of the Federal Reserve System over a period of 40 years. I do know a little something about what their answers will have to be. If we were to ask any of them today, they would have to tell us the bonds have been paid for with good old coin of the realm, with Bureau of Printing and Engraving money that is issued and with credit.

My friends, this is a subject that demands the constant attention of 100 Members of the U.S. Congress all the time. The banks who have such wonderful privileges of manufacturing money and credit and raising rates and charging every kind of fee for services they do not deserve sometimes, must have our attention—although I am for their earning everything they can honorably and legitimately earn.

I am not opposed to the profit system. I am all for it. At the same time, when they go beyond that they should be stopped, and we should build some houses in this country.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming days I shall speak more fully on ways in which the Federal Reserve can and should be changed to bring it in accord with the wishes of the American public. In the meantime, I hope that the newer Members of the House will give consideration to joining in this effort on a full-time basis.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that nothing could bring broader benefits to the American public than a top-to-bottom reform of our monetary policies and a lowering of the present usurious interest rates.

LEGISLATION TO PARTIALLY REPEAL THE GUN CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PRICE, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to remove the statutory restrictions on the sale of .22-caliber ammunition.

As will be remembered, last fall Congress repealed the burdensome and ill-conceived registration requirements for shotgun and rifle ammunition appearing in the Gun Control Act of 1968. The bill I am introducing today would remove the remaining vestiges of Federal control over this type of ammunition.

I have long been opposed to Federal gun regulation. Early in this Congress, I introduced H.R. 9766, a bill to repeal the Gun Control Act in its entirety. In addition, I tried to whittle away at some of the most objectionable features of the act by introducing H.R. 8628, a bill to eliminate the recordkeeping requirements for shotgun and rifle ammunition. It was this proposal that was enacted into law during the first session of the 91st Congress.

While this congressional action did not go far enough, it certainly marked the beginning of a process which I fervently hope will culminate in the repeal of the Gun Control Act. This act was ill conceived. It was passed in the heat of national passion and sorrow of a rash of fatal shootings. Insufficient attention was paid to the workings of the act and its implications, a fact that subsequent events have borne out quite clearly.

Mr. Speaker, while I look forward with great anticipation to the day when the Gun Control Act is finally repealed, I am realistic in my knowledge that Congress will not probably act with dispatch on this matter. Consequently, I believe a productive approach is to move on the most objectionable portions of the act, a piece at a time. This is why I am introducing legislation to remove the statutory restrictions on .22-caliber ammunition—it would free millions of law-abiding Americans who enjoy shooting .22-caliber weapons from a particularly burdensome bit of Federal regulation.

SGT. STEPHEN VELTRI—HE WAS THERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with all the division and turmoil that has resulted from the Vietnam war and the emotion and demands that have been made because of President Nixon's commitment of troops to Cambodia, it seems only fair that we listen to those who are in the know.

Mrs. Frank Veltri, who is a resident of Plantation, Fla., which is in the 10th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent, is like so many other American mothers. She is a war mother; and she, like all of us, must make a choice between protest and responsibility.

ity. She does not like war, nor does her son, who is an American soldier presently in Cambodia, like war. Her son, Stephen, does not especially like the Army. He is 24 and a sergeant in the Green Berets in the Fishhook area of Cambodia. He is not a "career killer." He is not what you would call too young, nor is he too old to die. He does not feel that he is too old to serve his country, and he admits to being scared to be where the action is.

His mother, too, has her fears. For she realizes that if one is in an area where danger exists one can easily be hurt, and she knows that her son could easily be a casualty in the war today. However, she felt, nevertheless, the need to have the benefit of her son's feelings known and she sent me a copy of her son's letter, which I have not only sent to President Nixon, but which I would like to share with my colleagues in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Stephen Veltri has written home indicating support for our President's decision in moving U.S. troops into Cambodia in an effort to save American lives. He gives a firsthand view of the supplies and the materiel that was captured, and he gives his views of what might happen if these supplies had not been captured. We in America should be proud of Sgt. Stephen Veltri and we should be proud of all of his fellow soldiers who are standing up before the enemy in Asia while facing those at home—no matter how well meaning they may be—who are demanding his surrender in Vietnam.

Incidentally, I want to take this opportunity of expressing with pride the conversation and the manner of so many of the young people, including college students, who have visited with me in my office in recent weeks to express their views—whether pro or con—concerning Vietnam. The great majority have indicated to me, and I am convinced they are well meaning and we can say Thank God, that while they may protest the war in Vietnam they do not condone the anarchist element who would tear our country asunder with false promises.

Certainly patriotism is something all of us in America need just a little more of. Patriotism, however, does not mean the blind following of those that would destroy our country, be they on the campus or be they in government.

It is true that none of us have a crystal ball but in completely reviewing the big picture I have confidence that the President's move in Cambodia was a wise one and that history will show that this decision may well have been the turning point in the road to peace with honor in Vietnam.

It is, indeed, with sincere pride that I offer Sgt. Veltri's letter to his mother and dad, which I hope that my colleagues here in the House as well as in the other body, will take the time to read—I am sure the President will be proud when he reads the letter, if he has the opportunity of receiving in person, the letter I forwarded to the White House over my signature.

The letter of Sgt. Stephen Veltri reads as follows:

SOMEWHERE IN VIETNAM,
May 18, 1970.

DEAR MOM AND DAD, like I told you before the letters might get erratic. I just got back from a week and a half in Cambodia a few days ago. We did real fine. Four of the team members took 140 of our troops in. Once there, we split up into two 70-man groups. In the week and a half there, we made the Americano Units look kind of bad. In 10 days, our CIDG killed more NVA and VC than an American Battalion has done in three weeks. We also found quite a few caches and three anti-aircraft machine guns of a new type. Turned out that they are the first ones of that type ever found in the war. We did all this without taking a casualty until three days before we left and then it wasn't Charley that did it. The other unit had gotten into a fight with a platoon and helicopter gunships were called in to help. On one of his rocket runs, something went wrong, either pilot error or erratic rockets, but two rockets landed in the middle of our people. It killed two CIDG, wounded nine more plus both of our team members were wounded. They weren't too bad, though, and one is already back out here. I guess it's one of those things that happen and we are just glad that the Americans weren't more seriously wounded.

I can't understand the way the students and even the Senate is thinking over the move to Cambodia. By doing that we will save a lot of lives. We have really hurt Charlie. In our area that we were in we have gotten enough arms and materiel to outfit a unit that could overrun any installation in Vietnam. We got this stuff with only light resistance which is a lot better than waiting on Charlie to use the stuff against you at his convenience.

The more that Fulbright and Mansfield say the madder I get. It's almost to the point where I am getting ready to write them a letter telling them where to go. I am glad Nixon had the guts to give the okay and I hope he sticks by it although I don't like seeing him persecuted for making what most everyone that is involved directly in the fighting here thinks is the right move.

You know it's really ironic about my feelings. Here I sit in a country that is not ours and watch how everyone works together and looks out for each other because they are fellow Americans. Personal feelings or opinions are expressed and like everywhere else, everyone does not agree on things or get along, but still everyone works together when someone needs help against the people who are out to get you.

Then I look at the situation in the States where there is no common foe so everyone has time to start trouble with anyone who disagrees with them. I don't like to say it, but what the U.S. people need is a good slap in the face by someone to bring them around. Let some fear and terror involve the protestors directly and they would probably be the first ones screaming for the U.S. to stick up for them. I only hope that when I get home I can manage to avoid any encounters with the trouble-makers. I don't know the answer to the problem but I guess if I did I would be the smartest or luckiest person on earth.

I go to Australia the 26th. In some ways I don't want to go but I can't seem to pass it up. It's going to seem funny walking around where nobody is trying to shoot you. Incidentally, while in Cambodia an Australian news team filmed us and our CIDG and interviewed us for a special on the work we are doing here, so maybe I'll be a TV star by the time I get there. It ought to be good for a few laughs anyhow.

Well, I have about exhausted my knowledge

for the present. I am sorry I forgot Mother's Day but I have been here and there running around and it slipped my mind.

Give everyone my regards and tell them to watch out for the kid is going to be home in 57 days. Hope you are feeling better.

Love,

STEPHEN.

A FACT SHEET ON AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives' commitment to doing something about air pollution will receive its first real test when H.R. 17255, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, reaches the floor of the House in the next week or two.

I intend to introduce a package of five amendments to the bill, which if adopted will demonstrate that the Congress's commitment to the environment goes beyond Earth Day speeches and establishing joint committee and new Presidential boards. This package of amendments enjoys strong bipartisan support.

Among the most far reaching of the amendments is one that would establish automotive emission standards beginning in 1975 based on the cleanest feasible propulsion system, and leave it to the auto industry to carry out these standards with the internal combustion—IC—engine or any other engine.

The automobile is responsible for over 60 percent of all air pollution in this country. It thus stands as the logical target of those who would like to be able to breathe fresh air.

An excellent and very revealing article on the internal combustion engine written by John Wicklein, a former reporter for the New York Times and a producer of television public affairs documentaries, appears in the June issue of the Washington Monthly.

In the article, Mr. Wicklein explores the capability of the internal combustion engine to be cleaned up. Some of his observations are most interesting and pinpoint avenues which will and will not lead to cleaner air.

First. The auto industry he says has decided to attempt to save the IC engine, and will rely on devices attachable to the IC engine to clean up the pollution the engine emits. The result, he quotes a General Motors lab supervisor as saying is that each year a new valve or device is added which makes the engine more and more complicated with more and more gadgets to go wrong. The GM supervisor goes on to suggest that developing a simpler engine which does not pollute would be far better.

Second. While the auto industry claims these devices are effective in reducing pollution, Wicklein suggests the technical experts outside of Detroit are extremely skeptical.

They find that anti-emission attachments haven't been living up to their promise, and there's no evidence that they will do so in the future.

National Air Pollution Control Administration tests of 600 Hertz and Avis 1968 cars with mileage ranging from 2,800 to 16,000 miles found that between 75 and 80 percent of these cars released more pollutants than permitted under the regulations.

Third. Since these devices are ineffective, Wicklein suggests that the industry needed to demonstrate a scientific breakthrough, and thus has hit upon catalytic devices, which can only operate if lead is removed. This permits them to shift the blame from themselves to the oil industry and to preserve the IC engine unscratched for several more years.

They have put the onus on the back of the oil industry to give them the time to accomplish what apparently they haven't accomplished today in the area of the catalytic muffler.

Fourth. Even with all of these add-on devices and the added cost to the consumer involved, the IC engine cannot be appreciably cleaned up much beyond the level of the 1975 emission standards recommended by the administration.

Wicklein quotes John Maga, head of the California Air Resources Board as saying that there will be a point beyond which the IC engine will no longer be able to meet increasingly strict standards.

Wicklein also quotes Dr. Lee DuBridg, the President's Science Advisor as concurring:

We know the auto manufacturers can't clean up auto pollution without going to an alternative engine, and that they are lying when they say they can clean up the IC engine. And they know we know, and we know they know we know.

Fifth. Current air pollution laws are not designed to insure that the auto pollution laws are being observed; they are designed so they do not offend the auto industry.

Wicklein quotes S. Smith Griswold, HEW pollution control officer between 1965 and 1967 that to be effective the air pollution laws presuppose effective enforcement which is not now or in the future likely to be achieved. He says:

HEW has a phony industry oriented program from the word go. The standards are phony because the federal government doesn't enforce them.

Griswold wonders "if they can't make—a relatively low-quality—attach-on—device work, one that doesn't have to meet any severe standards now, then how do you expect them to make a device that will work when the standards get tough?"

Sixth. "Expert after expert tells you the same thing—piecemeal, gimmicky half-measures will fail; what is needed is a new start, with an inherently clean engine."

Seventh. The auto industry has a vested interest in maintaining the IC engine—an investment of around \$5 billion; in know-how, tooling, facilities, and so forth in the IC engine—which means it will attempt to stay with it as long as it can.

Eighth. The technology exists to produce a pollution free engine. He says:

Steam and Gas turbines have been the chief alternatives considered as the search

progresses. They seem to promise the performance the industry has educated the public to demand in its individual transportation, speed, power acceleration, ability to drive long periods without refueling, ability to run auxiliary equipment such as heaters, radios and air conditioners.

Wicklein cites the 1969 staff report of the Senate Commerce committee that a steam engine is feasible now and is a far superior system in terms of emissions:

It gets better gas mileage, using less expensive fuels, and its acceleration, auxiliary operation and braking character are superior to those of the IC engine.

Wicklein also cites inventor William Lear's assessment of the gas turbine as cheaper to build than an internal combustion engine. Developing such an engine, he said, would cost about \$25 million. Retooling to market a million a year, the number necessary to make it economically feasible, would cost \$300 million, he estimated.

Ninth. Wicklein says that the auto industry's excuses for not switching to alternative pollution free alternatives just do not make sense.

Chrysler officials in analyzing why they did not want to go into production of gas turbine cars, estimated it would cost the entire auto industry \$5 billion to retool all its production lines to produce the gas turbine. The figure looks tremendous until you discover from other industry figures that Detroit normally spends about \$2 billion each time it accomplishes a complete model changeover. Ralph Nader reported to a Congressional committee that GM spent \$250 million to change its advertising sign to read "GM—Mark of Excellence"—yet spent only \$8 million the same year for pollution control research. Still other figures indicate that the industry will charge customers \$2.64 billion over the next five years to install emission-control devices without any guarantee of their effect on air pollution.

Tenth. Change in this case, Wicklein concludes will come only through governmental action. He agrees with William Lear that "Congress should set a goal for the return of pure air, then decree standards and enforcement to insure that return. Such a standard cannot be met by the present engine with tack-on control devices; therefore, the industry would have to come up with the alternative nonpollution power source."

I insert at this point in the RECORD the full text of this article and articles describing a foreign car firms development and possible marketing of pollution-free alternatives to the IC engine, and former Justice Arthur Goldberg's endorsement yesterday of a legislation ban of the IC engine:

[From the Washington Monthly, June 1970]

WHITEWASHING DETROIT'S DIRTY ENGINE

(By John Wicklein)

Three little models in miniskirts, dancing around a Camaro. It's opening day at the 1970 International Automobile Show in the New York Coliseum. A girl in a deep-veed, Grecian gown coos into a microphone. "Beauty is an expression of the truth, in a woman, in an automobile. Beauty is integrity . . . beauty is character . . . beauty is that unique, one-of-a-kind quality, and the Monte Carlo is like no other car Chevrolet makes."

Women shrouded in black, marching silently by in gas masks. Behind them, strung out from the General Motors building to

the Coliseum, thousands of men and women, carrying signs, protesting pollution from auto exhausts: "Cars Cause Cancer . . . The Internal Combustion Engine Kills . . . Make GM Responsible . . . Ban the IC Engine."

Inside the show, a commercial television crew interviews Edward N. Cole, president of General Motors, on the merits of the new cars. From a loudspeaker, the bouncy voice of the Escape Girl, a go-go in her cage: "Escape from the ordinary . . . Get away in an Oldsmobile Escape Machine."

In the protest march outside, a Congressman tells a reporter, "It's basically a dirty engine . . . there's no way to clean it up. . . . You've got to get rid of it."

Auto buffs, queued up at the entrance, surge into the show and mill around the cars. Chromium-plated, enameled in green and orange and red and gold, power-packed internal combustion engines turn on their display stands.

Across the way in Central Park, Bess Myerson Grant, Mayor John V. Lindsay's adviser on consumer affairs, tells the auto pollution rally:

"The auto makers, the worst offenders, continue to roll merrily along . . . dirty business as usual, profits without honor. Declare another dividend and bury the dead, and why don't those trouble-making consumers patriotically shut up? Obviously, obviously, we are on a collision course."

Between the auto promoters inside and the protesters outside, there was no communication opening day of the Auto Show. But symbolically, the national battle to eliminate the internal combustion engine had been joined.

The battle has been brewing 20 years—since the day in 1950 that Dr. A. J. Haagen-Smit, professor of biochemistry at California Institute of Technology, announced his discovery that the main ingredients of Los Angeles's smog were exhaust gases from automobiles. Until Haagen-Smit, Angelenos had thought stationary polluters were the chief culprits. But the biochemist, testing the polluted air, showed that when hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen are mixed in the presence of sunlight, irritating compounds are formed to cause photochemical smog. The chief source of hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides in the air, he found, is the auto exhaust pipe. Two other poisons, carbon monoxide and lead, are also discharged into the air by the explosion of gasoline in an internal combustion engine.

Since the discovery, medical researchers have found that lung cancer, heart ailments, respiratory diseases, and eye infections increase in proportion to the increase of automobiles. Smog causes death to plant life, too. Last year the United States Forest Service estimated that 1,300,000 trees in the San Bernadino National Forest near Los Angeles will die in the next five years, because of smog on the freeways.

The health problem, it's coming to be realized, is no longer a phenomenon peculiar to Southern California. Researchers find auto pollution a growing menace in every city with a population of 50,000 or more. Air pollution caused by cars ranges from 60 per cent in the small cities to 90 per cent in the large. Compared to the complexities of water pollution, the problem of air pollution from this source is fairly easy to solve; but so far, government and industry have refused to interrupt business-as-usual to get it done. The lesson to environmentalists is simply this: as of today, the movement does not have enough power to win even the easy battles.

Until very recently, the auto industry was unperturbed. In 1953, a Ford Motor Company executive told Los Angeles pollution control officials "these vapors are dissipated in the atmosphere quickly, and do not produce an air pollution problem." GM assured them that carbon monoxide was not present in harmful amounts in the L.A. area, "and

so we have not been concerned with the imminence of a serious health problem from this source."

S. Smith Griswold, who served many years as director of air pollution control in L.A. and later in the equivalent federal office, says that until the evidence became inescapable, the auto industry was unwilling to admit it was responsible for air pollution. Griswold, now a pollution control consultant in Washington, D.C., told me:

"We had to clean up every other source to the limit of engineering science—and still have a smog problem—before the industry would concede that their product was responsible. We decided we had to make the manufacturers control emissions. The companies said it couldn't be done. So we got independent companies to design emission control devices and ordered the auto makers to put them on their cars. Then we discovered the auto makers had the devices, and finally, when they were forced to, they put them on."

This was the basis of a court suit against the auto industry brought by Griswold and the Justice Department in the Johnson Administration. Instituted in the U.S. District Court in Los Angeles January 10, 1969, the suit charged the Automobile Manufacturers Association and the four largest auto makers—General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors—with conspiring for 15 years to limit the development and installation of auto-exhaust pollution control devices. Privately, industry people had expressed reluctance about installing the devices because they raised the cost of cars and reduced gas mileage—they were something of a drag.

To the disgust of Griswold and others fighting auto pollution, the Nixon Justice Department decided not to take the case to trial. They let the industry off the hook with a consent decree signed September 1, 1969. In the agreement, the manufacturers neither admitted nor denied the allegations, but agreed not to engage in the future in the practices specified in the suit.

California, exasperated by the industry's foot-dragging, became the first state to adopt legislation requiring controls on exhaust emissions. The legislature has now set standards at a level which it hopes will drastically reduce pollution from exhausts by the middle of this decade. Early in the '60's the state set a goal of 80 per cent reduction in the average emissions from motor vehicles. But it was not until 1966 that it was able to get the manufacturers to attach devices that brought about such a reduction and then only for hydrocarbons. Standards have since been set for carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen, but only for new cars sold in the state. No practical way has been found to control emissions from cars marketed before the devices became mandatory. So there is a built-in time lag before even the partial clean-up provided by the current standards can be achieved. It will be about 10 years before pre-control cars drop off the roads. After California, the federal government, acting under the Clean Air Act of 1967, began setting emission control standards. They were not, however, as rigid as California's.

Once the auto industry accepted the fact of control devices, it began crowing about their benefits to the public. In April, 1969, Charles M. Heinen, Chrysler's Chief Engineer for Emission Control, told the Society of Automotive Engineers: "We've done the job—the main battle against automotive air pollution has been won." Other industry executives have become loud in their praise of emission control devices.

The reason is that today a far more drastic remedy to the air pollution problem—it hasn't been solved yet—is being proposed, and it is scaring the auto makers silly. While the hullabaloo over control devices for the internal combustion engine was rising in California, other scientists, government agencies, and legislators began looking into

the promised benefits of this "new" technology. They found that on every projection of pollution drawn by someone outside the auto industry, an ominous curve appears. As devices are installed on new cars, air pollution begins to level off. That would seem logical, because, with effective devices, emissions from individual cars should drop off 40 to 60 per cent. But the fact glossed over by the industry is that the number of cars in the country is increasing rapidly—by the end of the decade, there will be twice as many on the roads. At that point, the pollution line takes a sharp turn upward once more.

But, as the technology improves, won't we have better and better control over emissions from conventional engines? Apparently not. The opinion of almost every researcher outside the auto industry is that the standards being promulgated for 1975 by California and HEW represent the technical outer limits for cleaning up the IC engine. After that, improvements are small, and methods of accomplishing them extremely costly. To many scientists, and one legislator, the remedy was obvious—force the automobile industry to give up its internal combustion engine and adopt another, nonpolluting means of propulsion for its cars.

The legislator was state senator Nicholas Petris of Alameda, California. Petris, a vigorous, gray-haired man with a penchant for bright shirts and colorful ties, had spent years advocating electric cars as an answer to California's smog problem.

In 1965, he became fed up with the industry's lack of concern and launched a head-on attack. He introduced a bill to ban the sale of cars with internal combustion engines. The legislators laughed. He introduced it again in 1967 and 1968. The auto industry laughed. But smog kept getting worse, and that was not funny. Last year, Petris tried again. His bill passed the senate, 26 to 5. If approved by the assembly, the new law would have ended the sale of conventionally powered cars in California by 1975. California buys 10 per cent of Detroit's output. The auto industry stopped laughing. It sent in money and lobbyists. The bill was referred to the assembly's Transportation Committee, usually friendly to the manufacturers. An industry spokesman told the committee that Detroit had no alternative available, so they would be, in effect, banning the sale of cars in a car-dependent state. "The know-how isn't there to do the job," he said. And so the committee killed the bill—by one vote. A week afterward, a reporter asked the same industry spokesman if Detroit would have been able to market a car with another type of engine by 1975 if the IC engine had been banned. "We would have complied," he said, "and of course we would have remained in the business of producing automobiles."

Senator Petris feels he has made a point. "There's a remarkable change from ridicule to belief," he told me. On the walls of his office are several mea culpa bumper stickers:

"This car may be a hazard to your health."
"See it like it is—fight air pollution, quit smoking—walk."

"I'm determined to continue the fight until the IC engine is eliminated. The industry has never volunteered to do anything that will favorably affect the health of the people. You have to club them with governmental action. I'm sorry to say this. I'd much rather go to them and say, 'Look, fellas, you're ruining our health and you are going to kill us off—would you mind changing that internal combustion engine?'"

People in other states are beginning to agree with Petris. A bill in Hawaii would ban the engine by 1974, one in Washington state by 1980. ("I think that's quite late," Petris says.) In New York state, a bill introduced this year with bipartisan sponsorship would provide a flat ban on sales by 1975. "We want to scare hell out of the industry," a Republican pushing the legislation told me

over the phone. "We want them to come up with a clean alternative, now." Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Delaware, New Mexico, Arizona, Connecticut, and Illinois also have "ban" bills in their hoppers.

In Congress, legislation to get rid of the IC engine was introduced by Representative Leonard Farbstein, a Democrat whose polluted district in Manhattan has a large stake in the outcome. The ban is also backed by Representative Alfonso Bell, Republican of California. In the Senate, Gaylord Nelson, a Wisconsin Democrat active in the pollution fight, has sponsored a similar proposal.

The Farbstein bill doesn't propose a flat ban, but the intent is the same. It starts with the premise that exhausts should be virtually free from pollutants. Rather than key the standards to the best the IC engine can achieve, it sets limits on emissions that can be met only by engines that are inherently clean—steam, gas turbine, or electric. These standards, in effect eliminating the conventional engine, would go into full force by 1978. IC engines would be phased out over four years, dropping the largest in 1975 and all by the end of 1977. The plant would permit the industry to introduce cars with alternative engines a few lines at a time.

Public support for a ban is building across the country. In California, the People's Lobby, headed by Ed Koupel of Los Angeles, has collected 425,000 signatures to put a referendum phasing out the engine on the ballot this fall. Koupel was the man who led the petition drive to recall Ronald Reagan as governor. Reagan's attorney general has challenged the validity of a third of the auto referendum signatures, in an effort to keep the question off the ballot. Nationally, the ban got a boost from environmental activists working toward Earth Day demonstrations. The Nader-sanctioned "Campaign GM" has made the elimination of the IC engine one of its aims.

But the industry tide is still running against the air pollution activists. "The Industry" is 50 per cent General Motors, and this one company, according to Nader, contributes 35 per cent of the nation's air pollution, by tonnage. In an interview at the General Motors Technical Center in Warren, Michigan, GM President Edward Cole told me his company has no intention of abandoning the internal combustion engine. "We believe that the internal combustion can be made more pollution-free than any of the alternative power sources that we are working with," he said. "And so we are betting heavily that as far as the public good is concerned—that is being able to own and operate individual transportation—we can do it most easily at the lowest possible cost by the employment of an internal combustion engine."

I must have struck Cole as overly concerned. After several questions about GM's efforts to stop pollution, he took me by the arm and said, "John, what I am saying is that it is going to be all right. We are going to take the automobile out of the pollution problem, and we expect to do it by 1975."

William G. Agnew of the GM Research Laboratories told me GM thought it was more productive to refine the IC engine by adding emission control devices than to go to an alternative "for the foreseeable future." Still, an executive who supervises this refinement at the labs was clearly pained that so much effort must go into tinkering with the standard engine to improve its pollution characteristics. Every year, he said, a new valve or device is added, making the engine more and more complicated, with more and more gadgets to go wrong. "You need a simpler engine, really," he said.

I talked to Herbert Misch, vice president—engineering, of Ford Motor Company, after he had testified at a hearing of the California Air Resources Board in Sacramento. I asked him if Ford thought the best way to meet the public demand for an end to pollution from

automobiles was by trying to clean up the IC engine. "Look where we are spending our money—that's the answer to that," he said. "If we didn't think the IC engine was a better bet, we wouldn't be doing that."

Charles Heinen of Chrysler told the Air Resources Board the same thing. The Chrysler Corporation had developed and tested a gas turbine for cars over an 11-year period, from 1954 to 1966. It proved practical to build, and virtually pollution-free. It rated high with 203 users who tested it under normal driving conditions. But Chrysler decided against marketing it. The cost of the changeover was considered too great, and the chief reward—less poison—not enough to justify the cost.

In sum, the Big Three said, stop worrying; we can clean up our mess with the very engine that made it. True, the IC engine does dump poisons into the air you breathe, but now we will sanitize it by attaching catalytic mufflers to the exhaust pipe to catch the poisons before they can get out.

Technical experts outside the industry are extremely skeptical. They find that anti-emission attachments haven't been living up to their promise, and there's no evidence that they will do so in the future. Since 1967, the National Air Pollution Control Administration (NAPCA) of HEW has been issuing standards for emissions that are supposed to be met by prototypes of vehicles to be marketed by the auto makers. The cars have control devices, put on at a cost of \$50 to each purchaser. Not surprisingly, the prototypes offered to NAPCA for certification have met the standards, which aren't too rigid in any case. But recently NAPCA made tests on 600 Hertz and Avis 1968 cars with mileage ranging from 3,800 to 16,000. Although they had the devices, between 75 and 80 per cent of these cars released more carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons than permitted under the regulations. (Another dangerous component, oxides of nitrogen, is not yet covered by HEW.)

Now it was time for the industry to make its own scientific discovery. You are right, says its spokesman. Our catalytic mufflers do get clogged up after they have been in use for 8,000 to 10,000 miles. But that's because there is lead in the gasoline! If you take the lead out of gasoline, we can provide our IC engine with an emission control device that will function properly for 50,000 miles!

Early last year, when environmentalists began pressing to take lead out of gas because lead spewed into the atmosphere is a deadly poison, as well as a hindrance to controlling other poisons, the auto manufacturers had stood staunchly beside their allies, the oil companies. They could never agree to move away from lead in gasoline because it would cost the users \$2 billion a year for a gas without lead in it. Lead, they asserted, was put into gasoline originally to increase its octane—or power—rating. The public will never stand for a reduction in power of its automobiles, the industry spokesmen said.

But now the situation is changed. California has adopted standards calling for a drastic reduction in emissions of the three main pollutants by the 1975 model year. Lead, however, is not included. In February, HEW announced it intended to set new standards for 1975 that will be essentially the same as those for California:

	Grams per mile
Carbon monoxide.....	11.0
Hydrocarbons.....	.5
Oxides of nitrogen.....	.9

(An internal combustion engine, uncontrolled, puts out 80 grams of carbon monoxide, 11 grams of hydrocarbons and four grams of nitrogen oxides per mile. In grams, this seems small, but in gross tonnage of poisons, it bulks large. Estimates for Los Angeles, in ton per day are: hydrocarbons, 1,800 tons; carbon monoxide, 10,000 tons; oxides of nitrogen, 570 tons.)

The auto industry executives took a look at the 1975 standards, consulted their technical research people, and decided they could not meet them without removing the lead that clogs control devices. So, to save their technology, they jettisoned the oil industry. "Besides, that gets the monkey off our backs," one auto executive remarked to a reporter. The oil industry, which would have to revise its technology, understood what was happening. In March, at a hearing of the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to consider removing lead from gasoline, one of its spokesmen remarked that the oil industry was being asked to eliminate lead to accommodate the auto industry. "They have put the onus on the back of the oil industry to give them the time to accomplish what apparently they haven't accomplished today in the area of the catalytic muffler." It's the only way we have to meet your requirements, Detroit's Big Three told the ARB. The board bought the argument, and recommended to the legislature that lead be banned from gasoline by 1977.

The Nixon Administration, apparently, has also bought the argument. It has asked Congress for legislation to set control of additives, such as lead, in gasoline. Now this has a good image with the public. The appearance is: We are getting tough; auto pollution is being solved. But what it does, in essence, is give the industry more time to delay the drastic step that inevitably will be needed: abandonment of its pride and joy of 60 years and the technology and tooling that goes with it.

The 1975 standards mark the best that can be expected of that engine, and yet, when you project the rise in cars at 10 million a year, they are not good enough. Gnawing at the minds of politicians, even those inclined to go along with industry as far as they can, is the feeling that, by the end of the decade, we will have to be doing something else. John Maga, head of the California ARB, while saying that the technology might still be found to get very low emissions from the IC engine, concedes "there will obviously be some point at which they won't be able to meet the standards if they are made increasingly strict."

California air pollution officials, smog projection chart in hand, are already calculating even more rigid standards to be met by 1980; so are air pollution researchers at HEW. But the Nixon Administration is not ready to face the issue. The pressures from its constituency aren't strong enough yet. The people most harmed by air pollution—city dwellers who tend to be poorer and blacker than the Silent Majority—are not part of its constituency. However, even some suburbanites are breaking silence to complain about being gassed to death by Detroit.

Such expressions of concern are causing the President to move forward slowly. Last September he and his science adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge, were saying that obtaining a low-pollution vehicle was a job that would take well into the 1990's to achieve. But recently, as the environment took on more political importance, DuBridge and the Administration said change might have to come about in the '80's. In February, the President included in his message on the environment the proposals to set stricter HEW standards for 1975 cars: require the testing of assembly-line models, rather than prototypes, for compliance with these standards, and authorize HEW to regulate polluting additives in gasoline. He praised the auto industry for developing emission control devices and for preparing "on its own initiative" to put on the market by 1972 automobiles that will not use leaded gasoline.

He then made a bow to the projection that shows pollution rising again by 1980: "I hope that the auto industry's present determined effort to make the IC engine sufficiently pollution-free succeeds. But if it does not, then unless motor vehicles with an alternative,

low-pollution power source are available, vehicle-caused pollution will once again begin an inexorable increase."

If that's the case, what should the federal government do? I asked this of a Presidential assistant who helped draft the pollution message. Would President Nixon support setting emission standards so low that the industry would be forced to go to an alternative engine? "I know what the President would say to that—that's absurd," he replied. "We know the auto manufacturers can't clean up auto pollution without going to an alternative engine, and that they are lying when they say they can clean up the IC engine. And they know we know, and we know they know we know. But we don't think we should tell the industry they have to get rid of the IC engine and go to an alternate source."

Then how are you going to make it happen? I asked him.

"We think the best way to do it is to produce one of these alternate engines publicly. Then if we find it is practical and that we have a perfect engine, we think the public pressure is going to be impossible for the manufacturers to resist, and they will have to start marketing a nonpolluting car."

To carry out this line of reasoning, the President asked funds for an extensive research and development program in unconventional vehicles, to be conducted by public and private agencies over the next five years. He proposed spending \$9 million the first year. He also backed a bill, now passed by the Senate, that would authorize the federal government to offer premium prices for purchasing low-emission vehicles for its own use, thus creating a potential market for cars with unconventional engines. When the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously reported out the bill, introduced by Chairman Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.) it commented:

"The federal government's policy of adopting national hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emission standards for automobiles and light trucks is inadequate. Nor will the present industry approach of adding emission-control devices to the internal combustion engine solve the air pollution "epidemic." The best solution is to develop a new propulsion system which produces few pollutants, and which performs at least as well as present propulsion systems."

When I mentioned the Nixon approach to bringing about a change in engines to Nick Petris, he snorted. "I think this shows the kind of thinking which places danger to the public behind the desire not to offend industry. Now, we've done that too many times. We've had the public pay the bill to repair damage that's been done by some element in private industry." Industry has made its money on a polluting machine, he said, and it should be made to use this money in producing a nonpolluting machine.

Which of course is far from the Nixon thinking, and, for that matter, the thinking of most of those in Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike—who feel constrained to deal with pollution. Congress is concentrating on legislation that falls well short of the Farbstein-Nelson proposal. Senator Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), for example, is pressing to extend Section 104 of the 1967 Clean Air Act to increase research and development on emission controls and to authorize HEW to set emission standards for production-line vehicles.

To have any effect in cleaning up the air we breathe, these legislative proposals presuppose effective enforcement of their provisions by the federal government. Smith Griswold thinks this is a forlorn hope. From 1965 to 1967 he served as control chief at HEW's Office for Air Pollution Control, and resigned when he found his program for enforcement of the federal standards was being ignored. "I think HEW has a phony, industry-oriented program from the word go," he

said. "The standards are phony, because the federal government doesn't enforce them."

Griswold hoots at auto industry claims for attach-on devices. "On the basis of past performance, with General Motors or any of the others, I think this is so much hot air," he remarks. "If they can't make this relatively low-quality device work, one that doesn't have to meet any severe standards, then how do you expect them to make a device that will work when the standards get tough?"

Expert after expert tells you the same thing—piecemeal, gimmicky half-measures will fail; what is needed is a new start, with an inherently clean engine.

One engineer planning to develop such an engine is William Lear, the entrepreneur who had a great success in developing the Lear Jet airplane a few years back. He has taken over an abandoned Air Force base outside Reno and set up Lear Motors to try to bring it off. I asked him what he thought about the assertion by auto executives that they could clean up the IC engine.

"Well," Lear said, "I think the nicest thing to say is, that's fantastic." (Later he remarked that "fantastic" was the word he learned in Sunday school to replace the word "——.")

The auto companies know they will ultimately have to go to a different engine, he said. "I think they all will admit, probably not publicly, but secretly, that the gas turbine engine is the ultimate engine they will have to go to. But in the meantime, they have an investment of somewhere around \$5 billion, in know-how, tooling, facilities, and so forth, for manufacturing the IC engine, and come hell or high water, they're going to stay with that engine as long as they can."

They will go to an alternate engine only when they are forced to do it by the government, Lear said. "The government will have to take a very stiff attitude and say 'Believe me, you will not be able to deliver cars unless you make a low-emission car; if you don't, you go out of business.' Now, they won't go out of business. They will then decide to quickly get into gas turbines. And it will take them six years, if they decided today to go into gas turbines, before cars came rolling off the lines."

When I asked Edward Cole what alternatives GM would go to if the government did ban the conventional engine, he said, first, that he didn't think the government would ever do such a thing, because it would not be in the public interest—but that if it did happen, "probably down the road the best alternative would be the gas turbine engine." Lear, on the other hand, is betting the government will do it, and wants to be there first with a marketable engine when it does. It could be a good race, should the government insist it be run. Both GM and Ford intend to come out next year with gas turbine engines for trucks. Although they say now the engine is not commercially feasible for cars, their experience with the larger engines should bring them within striking distance of the technological capability Chrysler developed while testing out a gas turbine for passenger cars.

Lear first placed his own chips on the steam—or Rankine cycle—engine. He spent several million dollars developing a steam engine for a car to be tested out by the California Highway Patrol, and a larger engine for a bus to be tried out by the city of Oakland. Both experiments are being conducted by the state of California with funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation. In doing this, Lear proved to himself that a steam engine could provide very low emissions, but also that it had too many complications to make it practical in the family car. Now, although he intends to complete the California contracts, he has shifted his plans for the future to the gas turbine.

"The gas turbine is such a simple device," he said. "By comparison with the steam engine or the IC engine, it has about 15 per cent of the parts. It really has only one moving part, and that's the turbine." The advantage of the gas turbine, from an anti-pollution standpoint, is that it is by its nature a clean-burning mechanism that needs no afterthought attachments to its exhausts. The gas turbine burns its fuel—kerosene—evenly in the air, outside the engine. External burning provides much more complete combustion, and fewer emissions, than burning gasoline vapors inside a cylinder. In internal combustion, the exploding gases burn unevenly, and the resulting poisonous residue must be dumped out of the cylinder into the air.

Steam and gas turbines have been the chief alternatives considered as the search progresses. They seem to promise the performance the industry has educated the public to demand in its individual transportation; speed, power, acceleration, ability to drive for long periods without refueling, ability to run auxiliary equipment such as heaters, radios, and air conditioners. There are two other alternatives which are talked about but appear to have greater drawbacks: (1) Modifying the present IC engine to burn natural gas. This can be done fairly easily—in fact, it has been done for some gas utility fleet cars and for a number of California state vehicles. Emissions from natural gas are very low. The drawback here is that such cars can drive only 40 to 60 miles on gas cylinders equal to the size of a conventional gas tank. (2) Electric—battery-powered—cars. They have no emissions but, to date, provide very limited range and speed.

Other technical researchers are not yet ready to write off the steam engine as the car engine of the future. It burns its fuel externally, too, and it has been under development by a number of experimenters for a longer period than the gas turbine engine—though not nearly so intensively. After studying various alternatives last year, the staff of the Senate Commerce Committee concluded in a report that "the Rankine cycle (steam) propulsion system is a satisfactory alternative to the present internal combustion engine in terms of performance and a far superior engine in terms of emissions." It gets better gas mileage using less expensive fuels, the report asserts, and its acceleration, auxiliary operation, and braking characteristics are superior to those of the internal combustion engine. The report, called "The Search for a Low-Emission Vehicle," criticized HEW for spending most of its research funds on IC engine emission control studies and very little on researching alternatives.

Among the alternatives, the gas turbine seems to be swinging into the lead as the system closest to being perfected for assembly-line production. William Lear concludes that, once in production, this engine would be cheaper to build than an internal combustion engine including the clean air devices that must now be added to the exhaust side. Developing such an engine would cost about \$25 million, he believes. Retooling to market a million a year, the number necessary to make it economically feasible, would cost about \$300 million, he estimates.

"I think," he said with a wily smile, "that if the government would underwrite our research and development, it would be the greatest catalyst the government could use to get Detroit off its tall and going."

There are probably more direct ways to accomplish it. The toughest, but most effective, would be for Congress to set a goal for return to pure air, then decree standards and enforcement to insure that return. Such a standard cannot be met by the present engine with tack-on control devices; therefore, the industry would have to come up with the alternative, nonpolluting power source. The

manufacturers could be required to provide such an engine on an increasing percentage of cars produced, reaching 100 per cent by the end of the 1970's. Meantime, the lame duck IC engines being marketed during the phase-out period should be made to meet, through emission-control devices, standards that approach the technological limits of their capabilities.

Federal funds should be provided for assembly-line testing of these vehicles and for states to conduct spot checks of private cars to see that the certified vehicles meet the standards after prolonged use on the highways. Increased research funds should be provided to the National Air Pollution Control Administration to develop alternate engines on its own, as a check on the industry's effort to comply with the tough standards set in the basic legislation.

It is reasonable to goad Detroit into the change, considering the costs involved, just to make certain the pollution curve will not begin to rise again? That's like asking, "How much is the quality of life worth?" If we look at some industry figures, we may not have to ask the big question.

Chrysler officials, in analyzing why they did not want to go into production of gas turbine cars, estimated it would cost the entire automobile industry \$5 billion to retool all its production lines to produce the gas turbine. The figure looks tremendous until you discover from other industry figures that Detroit normally spends about \$2 billion each time it accomplishes a complete model changeover. Ralph Nader reported to a Congressional committee that GM spent \$250 million to change its advertising signs to read "GM—Mark of Excellence"—yet spent only \$8 million the same year for pollution control research. Still other figures indicate that the industry will charge customers \$2.64 billion over the next five years to install emission-control devices without any guarantee of their effect on air pollution.

Representative Farbstein, in a report on an ad hoc hearing he and other New York Congressmen held on the question, said the costs of changing to an alternative engine are manageable, and could be made even more so if the industry changed over a line at a time. Compared to the cost of cleaning up water pollution, he pointed out, cleaning up air pollution is relatively cheap.

By any logic, the costs of the change would be small compared to the costs to society of continuing or increasing pollution caused by the present engine. Polluted air is estimated to cost the American people \$20 billion annually in cleanup and material repairs. In the Los Angeles area alone, studies show pollution from exhausts is costing \$132 million a year in damage to crops. The money costs of medical bills and days lost from work are difficult to estimate, although guesses put these in the billions. The cost in anguish—from sickness and premature death—should alone be enough to force a change.

I agree with Lear that change, in this case, will come only through governmental action. And in our free enterprise society, the government itself must be prodded to resist its natural inclinations to ride along with the industrial managers and their money, status, and technological "know-how." It's hard to tell whether the people have become worried enough to make them want to apply the goad. The generation that has arrived at an age of political clout grew up with the idea that the smells from auto exhausts were inevitable. Except when we took in a lung-cutting whiff from a bus we got caught behind, the nuisance seemed tolerable, considering the benefits gained from having our individual transportation. Can the promoters of change whip up the public to take on an industry that provides an Escape Machine for so many? Or will it take a health crisis, with people clearly dying from atmospheric inversions caused by auto exhausts?

If we don't start now to force the change, we are doomed to live, at the end of this decade, in a world of increasingly foul air. With no measures beyond those envisaged for 1975, the amount of poisons in the air will double within the next 30 years.

But suppose we do force a technological change. Won't the dislocations in the auto industry and the oil industry and the garage industry be too much for our economy to bear? Nick Petris has an interesting answer to that:

"People are going to insist on being dislocated when they realize it's a matter of life or death. Who's going to be dislocated—the man who sells IC engines? Even if we adopt a rubber band and wind it up behind the car, he's going to sell it. Now, the service station operator? Okay—he's going to have to do somewhat of a different kind of service. But he'll be alive to do it."

[From Ideas, May 1970]

KINETICS CORP. INSTALLING RANKINE ENGINE IN DATSUN

As a further development of their previous work, Kinetics Corp. of Sarasota, Florida (Wallace Minto, president) has been installing a screw-type ion entropy expansion engine in a Datsun station wagon. The engine has been used previously as an air compressor, but is now being used as an external combustion engine for vehicular propulsion. It burns kerosene, and is using Freon 113 as the working fluid. (The company has been experimenting with F-113 and with F-114 and F-216, and has found these three to be the best fluids in terms of their thermal characteristics.) The engine for the Datsun has been tested with a dynamometer, and has achieved a 70 bhp at 5000 rpm and also has run at 12,000 rpm producing 140 hp. Emissions from the vehicle are claimed to be extremely low: less than 1 ppm CO, less than 0.1 ppm HC, less than 0.01 ppm NOx, and less than 0.01 ppm particulates.

The developers at Kinetics expect to have the car ready for road testing in September of this year. They have had "serious discussions" with a Japanese automotive firm concerning more widespread production of such vehicles. Under mass production, they estimate that the cost of the car would run \$125 to \$130 less than the comparable ICE version. The car will be a general purpose vehicle, with less noise and higher performance than the conventional Datsun. Since the engine has only two moving parts, the maintenance and fabrication costs are expected to be considerably less than average. (For previous stories on Kinetics Corp, see Ideas 1, 1, 4 October 1968, and 1, 6, 39 March 1969.)

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1970]

CAR POLLUTION SCORED—GOLDBERG ASKS BAN ON SOME ENGINES

(By William E. Farrell)

Arthur J. Goldberg, who is seeking the Democratic nomination for Governor, said yesterday that if at least 90 per cent of the air pollution caused by automobiles was not eliminated by 1975, the state should ban the internal combustion engine.

"Removing 90 per cent of the pollution is within the scope of what the Detroit automakers can achieve," Mr. Goldberg said in proposing an 11-point air-pollution control program. "What we need to do is to nudge them along. We have to be prepared to back up the nudge we give with the full authority of the State of New York."

He termed the proposed ban "the ultimate weapon," but added that "to call for a ban and to do nothing else would be meaningless demagoguery."

Mr. Goldberg's position paper on air pollution was a companion to one he issued Sunday on water pollution. In the earlier one he proposed a \$1.6-billion clean-waters

bond issue and controls on atomic power plants stricter than those currently enforced by the Federal Government.

BILL GAINING IN CALIFORNIA

One house of the California Legislature has already passed a bill banning the internal combustion engine by 1975. A similar bill was introduced in the 1970 New York Legislature but never got out of committee.

Mr. Goldberg said that such a prohibition was "a drastic action."

"Leadership means that New York will not make a threat to ban the internal combustion engine—and do nothing else," the paper read.

Contending that Governor Rockefeller had "come as close as possible to total lack of action on the problem of auto pollution as is humanly possible," Mr. Goldberg offered a series of proposals "to create alternatives, to establish markets and to enforce standards that will have the effect of getting the job done."

PROGRAM DETAILED

They included the following things:

A requirement that the state purchase "low-emission vehicles for up to 25 per cent more than regular-emission vehicles" for use in high pollution areas. Such a state program, he said, "could add several thousand additional vehicles, each year, creating a powerful incentive for the automotive manufacturers to create a pollution-free vehicle to supply this market."

The establishment of a State Pollution Research Institute to find ways of eliminating or reducing pollution caused by motor vehicles.

A concerted attempt by the state to strictly enforce Federal antipollution standards. He suggested that after Jan. 1, 1972, the State Department of Motor Vehicles be required to refuse to register vehicles unless they had "a valid certification" indicating compliance with Federal norms.

The banning of the sale of leaded gas in the state by Jan. 1, 1972, and a requirement that all new gasoline stations offer unleaded gasoline for sale by Jan. 1, 1971.

Pressuring the Federal Government to require airplane manufacturers to reduce noise.

Greater control of the use of sulphur in fuels and the phasing out by 1973 of "on-site incinerators," which Mr. Goldberg said were "small, obsolete and dirty."

Mr. Goldberg also announced yesterday the formation of a Citizens Committee for Goldberg-Paterson. State Senator Basil A. Paterson, a Manhattan Democrat, is seeking the nomination for Lieutenant Governor.

The members include former Gov. W. Averell Harriman, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, Lena Horne, the entertainer; Theodore W. Kheel, the labor mediator; Bayard Rustin, the civil rights and labor leader; Victor Gotbaum, the labor leader, and Arthur Schlesinger Jr., the historian.

Mr. Goldberg did not campaign yesterday but today he begins a two-and-a-half-day tour upstate that will take him to Binghamton, Elmira, Olean, Salamanca, Jamestown, Buffalo and Niagara Falls.

THE COPPER INDUSTRY'S TWO-TIER PRICING SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, a few large copper companies with mining interests today wield a disproportionate influence within that industry. The net effect has been to place the independent copper fabricators at a competitive disadvantage, and indeed to force them out of business.

Three such firms in my congressional district, employing some one thousand workers, have been adversely affected by this intolerable situation. The large companies control nearly all of the virgin refined copper coming from mines in the United States. They process most of this copper through their own fabricating subsidiaries, setting prices the independent fabricators simply cannot afford.

The flow of South American copper to other markets has produced a severe shortage in the United States. To complicate this problem, the large American copper companies are profiting handsomely from these foreign sales and in effect have vested interest in perpetuating the domestic shortage.

In addition, some large producers have entered the scrap market, bidding up the price to a point that the independents can no longer afford to purchase even scrap copper. Thus the monopolistic cycle is completed, and the independent finds himself in an untenable position.

Several months ago, the President appointed a Cabinet Committee to study the copper situation. This group in turn selected Hendrik S. Houthakker, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, to chair its investigative subcommittee.

On March 22, the Houthakker panel released its report. Although the committee rejected several courses of action—such as a pool of domestic copper to be distributed to hardship cases by the Government, a requirement that domestic producers make tonnages available to competitive bidding, Government subsidies for expansion programs, and tax incentives—it did seem amenable to a proposal to relax copper export quotas so that ore concentrates could be shipped abroad for processing to help relieve a shortage of American smelting capacity. It also left open the possibility of antitrust prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to accept Chairman Houthakker's explanation of why his subcommittee failed to propose any remedial action. He seems to feel that the situation will correct itself, since the gap is narrowing between the American producer price and the world price and the supply appears to be expanding.

I wish I could share Dr. Houthakker's optimism, but from my perspective the situation remains essentially unchanged and the problem unsolved. I seriously doubt whether market conditions will be able to correct themselves when in fact the dynamics of free enterprise have not been permitted to operate. Can we reasonably expect a monopoly to yield to the legitimate needs of the independent fabricators without Government action?

The distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and my able colleague from Tennessee (Mr. BLANTON) have introduced legislation to restrict the copper industry's two-tier pricing system. Under their bill, H.R. 17657, the Federal Trade Commission would prohibit the sale of refined copper "at a price which the Commission determines is significantly below the world market price."

I would like to commend the sponsors of the vitally important legislation and

associate myself with the philosophy embodied in their bill.

I sincerely hope that Congress will act favorably upon the Blanton-Moss plan. In addition, I urge the Department of Justice to study carefully the two-tier pricing system and the applicability of the antitrust laws. If the large copper companies are acting in restraint of trade, I would expect swift and vigorous enforcement of these statutes.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF DOMESTIC COPPER INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BLANTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, several times during this session I have made statements in this Chamber concerning the critical problems facing the domestic copper industry. Many of my colleagues have expressed an interest in the situation, and I am pleased with the support shown for my most recent piece of copper legislation, H.R. 17657, which was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 18. I am hopeful that we will move to consideration of this bill in August.

Of prime importance at this time is a continuation of the suspension of certain import duties on certain items of copper. We have had a suspension of duties on certain items since February, 1966, under Public Law 89-468, and it was continued under Public Law 90-615. Unless the new legislation embodied in H.R. 17241 is passed by the Senate before June 30 of this year, a 1.1 cents per pound duty will be reimposed on a number of copper items which could seriously affect the domestic copper market, and could cause critical problems to independent fabricators and small businesses who have been forced to buy off the world market or scrap market by the virtually monopolistic control a few domestic producers exert over the domestic production and sale of the metal.

The United States has been in recent years a net importer of copper, and this suspension of duties is absolutely necessary.

The House passed H.R. 17241, introduced by my esteemed colleague from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) on May 19. It is now in the Senate Finance Committee. I urge all my colleagues, and especially the many who have contacted me in support of my previous interest in copper matters, to contact members of the Senate Finance Committee and stress the importance of the passage of this bill.

A list of the duty on certain copper items which will be reimposed if this law is not renewed is as follows:

Item No. 612.10.—Copper waste and scrap: Duty 1.1 cent per pound on 99.6 percent of copper content.

Item No. 612.02.—Copper precipitate, cement copper: Duty 1.1 cents per pound.

Item No. 612.03.—Black copper, blister copper anode copper: Duty 1.1 cents per pound on 99.6 percent of copper content.

Item No. 612.06.—Other unwrought copper: Duty 1.1 cents per pound on copper content.

Item No. 602.30.—Copper bearing ores and materials: Duty 1.1 cents per pound on copper content.

Item No. 603.50.—Other metal bearing materials other than foregoing, over 10 percent copper content: 1.1 cents per pound on copper content.

CAMBODIA—THE ARROGANCE OF IGNORANCE

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, I have been receiving a good deal of mail and many visitors concerning the Presidential decision to enter Cambodia. At the present time my mail count is 376 in favor of the decision and 1189 in opposition. Most of the more than 400 people who have visited me, either singly or in groups, to voice their opinions on President Nixon's decision have been in violent opposition.

Much of my mail and many of my visitors have been constructive. Some however, have impressed me as being excessively emotional and featured by "arrogance founded on ignorance," as described with refreshing perspective by C. L. Sulzberger in last Sunday's New York Times.

Because I am sure that many of my colleagues have been receiving similar mail and visitors, I would like to share with them and other readers of the RECORD, Mr. Sulzberger's very pertinent and refreshingly candid comments.

I hope that people who have found themselves in sharp disagreement with the President will read this article and heed Mr. Sulzberger's suggestion that Hanoi may well be counting heavily on vociferous U.S. opinion swayed by emotion. The attitude of many Americans in opposition to President Nixon's decision to attack the Cambodia sanctuaries is in interesting contrast to foreign reaction. As one who has supported the Presidential decision to attack the sanctuaries, I of course take considerable comfort from Mr. Sulzberger's comments. I have read my mail carefully and have listened with much interest and patience as time permitted to those who have visited me. Mr. Sulzberger's observation that the general level of debate has often been more marked by fevered vituperation than by cool intellectuality or exactitude is in my opinion well founded and distressingly so.

His article follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: THE ARROGANCE OF IGNORANCE—I

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PART 1—Just a month ago the President announced that American ground forces had been ordered into Cambodia. At that time I wrote: "If Nixon can swiftly smash the sanctuaries outside Vietnam without dangerous escalation or confrontations elsewhere, he will ultimately emerge triumphant at home as well as overseas. Nothing succeeds like success but, if he fails; nothing fails like failure."

It is too soon to assay this move but, half

way to the June 30 terminal date, it seems that from an Indochina battlefield viewpoint the President's decision was sound but from an internal American viewpoint unsound. Hanoi aims its most crucial thrust of American public opinion rather than territorial South Vietnam. Nixon's primordial problem therefore has been at home, not abroad.

NO ASIATIC BELGIUM

Outside the United States there is little fevered contention that Cambodia was an Asiatic Belgium whose independence was violated by Uncle Sam. Even the French, who aren't with us on the war, remember that forty thousand Communist Vietnamese were based in Cambodian safe havens. Public opinion has excoriated the American move in line with fundamental disapproval of the entire war but President Pompidou hasn't allowed his ministers to go overboard publicly.

China has shown circumspection. Chou En-lai said his people would be "modest and prudent and guard against arrogance." Prince Souphanouvong, head of the pro-Communist Laotians, paid tribute to China's "disinterested" support, "both morally and materially."

Likewise, Moscow has decided to adopt a wait-and-see attitude. Kosygin reportedly listened sympathetically to Prince Sihanouk's complaints but advised him to do nothing until the Indochina war is over.

BRITISH OPINIONS

K. S. Karol wrote in London's New Statesman on May 22: "The Russians obviously saw the Cambodian coup as something irreversible, like the military putsch in Indonesia five years ago." One might append to this comment that of the London Economist's "Foreign Report."

"Although men like Senator Fulbright and Senator Kennedy have predictably denounced the Cambodian operation as a folly and a failure, the Russian leaders seem to take a different view. They fear that the operations will be all too successful (from the Americans' standpoint) and be a turning-point in the Indochina war. . . ."

"The Russians never want to back a loser; and they are deeply afraid that in both Vietnam and Cambodia the Vietcong—and by extension Prince Sihanouk, who is now totally committed to the Communist side—are going to prove the losers. Militarily, the Russians attach the greatest importance to the Cambodian sanctuaries."

There is obviously no doubt that the attack against the Vietnamese Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia ruined Hanoi's plans for any imminent military initiative. Brigadier W. F. K. Thompson, military correspondent of the London Daily Telegraph, writes:

"The American and South Vietnamese operations in Cambodia have certainly achieved their primary aim—to destroy the Communist ability to open a general autumn offensive against Saigon and the Mekong Delta."

These are cold, factual analyses. Of course, they have nothing to do with the main "front" as defined by Hanoi's strategy—U.S. public and political opinion. This area, clearly misjudged by the President and Kissinger's White House staff, produced enormous uproar.

Nevertheless, one must question the basis of this violent objurgation. There is a manifest trend to decry anything advocated by Saigon as evil and to imply goodness to anything advocated by Hanoi. President Thieu of South Vietnam is lambasted as wholly nondemocratic in blissful unawareness of the fact that there has never been a democratic government in all East Asia since the dawn of time—least of all in Hanoi.

Many pontificators on these issues have

taken little trouble to check their opinions against the facts, much less to think dispassionately. The general level of debate has often been more marked by fevered vituperation than by cool intellectuality or exactitude.

CABALISTIC CATCH-ALL

Clearly "Indochina" has come to symbolize some cabalistic catch-all which transcends anything involved in the horrid war and which was unhappily minimized by Nixon's personal staff. Internal U.S. opposition includes those obsessed with questions only tangentially related to Vietnam and going from race to pollution in illogical progression.

One cannot forget that Euripides cautioned: "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad." The essence of the American problem, on which Hanoi counts so heavily, is this vocative U.S. opinion swayed by emotion. Much of this emotion is featured by arrogance founded on ignorance.

THE ECONOMY MUST BE PROTECTED

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the time has long since passed for this administration to stop issuing reassuring statements about the economy and to start taking action to halt inflation, the drop in real production and rising unemployment.

In April alone, cost of living rose six-tenths of 1 percent. This amounts to 6 percent annually on a seasonably adjusted basis. In the same month industrial production fell eight-tenths of 1 percent. Unemployment rose four-tenths of 1 percent to a new high of 4.8 percent.

While the economy declines and prices and unemployment continue their upward spiral, the President recommends a continuance of the same old policies which are described as a mixture of monetary and fiscal restraint.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is all too much monetary restraint and all too little fiscal restraint. Since mid-April, interest rates have risen sharply despite predictions to the contrary. These high interest rates are continuing the depression in the housing market and depriving thousands of American families of the opportunity to own their own homes. In the last 4 weeks, the stock market has hit a new 7-year low and in the last 4 weeks the administration admitted that it will not have a balanced budget this fiscal year. Instead, there will be a \$1.8 billion deficit, an amount equal to \$11 billion on the budget basis used until a few years ago. Clearly, the President's policies are not working.

Mr. Speaker, on May 28, the Miami Herald, in an editorial entitled "Time To Be a Leader and Protect Economy" issued a call for Presidential action. I support that call and I urge the President to immediately take two steps which at least in the short run, will help prevent our financial crisis from becoming an economic crisis.

First, the President should utilize the authority given him in Public Law 91-151, to impose selective credit controls. Use of this authority would permit the channeling of credit into activities which national policy requires such as the con-

struction of low- and moderate-income housing. Further, it would permit a sharp curtailment of other forms of credit, such as commercial paper, which are far more inflationary. This measure received almost unanimous approval in the House by vote of 358 to 4, yet the President, when signing the legislation, stated he would never exercise the authority. Surely the time has now come to change that decision.

Second, the President should at once abandon his opposition to so-called jawboning and establish national wage price guidelines. At a time when demand inflation is changing to cost push inflation, such guidelines could be particularly useful.

Over the long run, there can be no substitute in the fight against inflation for a responsible fiscal policy. Both the President and the Congress will have to face up to this problem. Either we must reduce expenditures, particularly military expenditures, or we will have to increase taxes. Mr. Speaker, to date there has been a basic failure to achieve a proper balance between fiscal and monetary policies. We must change these policies if we are to avoid economic chaos. Because of its timeliness, I recommend to my colleagues the Miami Herald editorial of May 26, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

TIME TO BE A LEADER AND PROTECT ECONOMY

Weeks of stop-and-go negotiation and production slowdowns have ended for the nation's third largest and best known newspaper, The New York Times. It has come to terms with its printers' union calling for wage and benefit increases of 41.6 per cent over a three-year period.

The settlement is not distinctive of newspaper journalism but rather of much of American industry. The construction workers got even more. It is hard, then, to regard these excessive arrangements, most of which do not concern a justifying boost in productivity, as anything but inflationary—and dangerously so.

What many are now calling a mini- to mid-recession is one consequence.

The stock market, which appears to lack confidence in the economy, is off nearly 300 points. Unemployment is spiraling. Prices rose 0.6 per cent for consumers in April. Profit levels for American corporations fell more than 10 per cent for the first quarter of the year as compared with 1969. Money is at the dearest point in a century. Budget surpluses, once full of bright promise in stabilizing private investment, are lost for 1970 and 1971.

These are dreary facts underscored by yet another inflationary wage settlement. While they concern the Nixon administration, which has a proper reluctance to indulge in severe corrective measures, there is still no evidence that, thoroughly concerned, the administration will as concernedly act.

Perhaps this will appear in Mr. Nixon's forthcoming address on the nation's economy.

If so, we urge the President to go the full limits of public acceptance in measures to combat recession. No "guidelines" remain to instill restraint. The public simply must sit and watch while the value of its spendable dollar is pared by seven cents every year.

We hope that the President will not be loath to turn to the "jawboning" used effectively by John F. Kennedy (who had a recession of his own.) Aimed at both labor and management, it could decry if it did not eradicate the greed which has gripped the marketplace.

All the polls indicate that the public is impressed with Mr. Nixon's domestic performance. He has avenues which he may safely follow if lecturing the economic antagonists does not work.

Recessions eat away at the economy and erode confidence in the most successful of all economic systems. It is President Nixon's time to lead, and he is well equipped for leadership. The hour has come to hear from him.

VOTING AGE—A COMMENTARY ON REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT BY THE CONCORD MONITOR

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an active advocate of lowering the voting age by State action. Last year, in fact, I was on record as having disagreed with the majority of those people who answered my annual questionnaire on the question of the 18-year-old vote. Presumably, on the basis of the attached editorial, at least one editorial writer of the Concord Monitor was among the majority which then opposed a lower voting age.

However, on May 18, 1970, the Concord Monitor, a major newspaper in my district, printed an eloquent editorial advocating enfranchisement of 18-year-olds. This statement is one of the more reasoned and logical that I have seen on the subject. I particularly agree with the Monitor's belief that the capacity for responsive change is a necessary and vital part of our system. Our Government was founded with the premise that sound, necessary, and even revolutionary change should be permitted to occur within its framework. It must continue to reflect changes in our society if it truly is to remain a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

As the editorial points out, and as I have long maintained, our Government was designed to be responsive to ideas, movements, and pressures—and to contain, absorb, and reflect changes in society, both good and bad. This is something that all too few of the student and intellectual protesters seem to understand. Our Government truly is responsive. Because the Government has not adopted the viewpoint of its critics, it is accused of being unrepresentative of the views of the people. This is just not so. The greatest strength of our system is that it is able to change, and does change.

It is unfortunate that so few seem to have been taught this truth. They also have not been taught to understand that change takes time and may not, and indeed cannot, always be in exact conformity to their precise wishes of the moment.

The editorial follows:

[From the Concord Monitor, May 18, 1970]

RIGHT TO VOTE SHOULD BE EXTENDED

At least as far back as World War II, there have been periodic appeals that 18-year-olds be permitted to vote in national elections.

Arguments supporting the appeals generally have begun with the contention that someone old enough to die for his country is old enough to vote for its leaders.

So basic to the drive is this argument that fresh efforts always erupt when we are at war, first in Korea and now in Indochina.

We long have opposed giving the vote to 18-year-olds, even when we ourselves were 18.

The connection between dying for the United States and voting always seemed a specious one. Though its emotional appeal was undeniable, we never have been able to accept its logic.

Our opposition to extending suffrage was based on some of the following beliefs:

An 18-year-old is immature intellectually and practically. He has lived under the protective wings of parents and schools all his life. The world at large assumes a benevolent attitude toward youth that it does not apply to all mankind.

The 18-year-old has not supported himself or someone else; he has not provided clothing or shelter for anyone. His dealings with money have been limited and simplistic.

His understanding of this society and of the world is superficial, narrow and tentative.

The 18-year-old is idealistic to a fault and his mind, still at a formative stage, can more easily be seized by passion and by concepts that are nice only in the abstraction.

Most seriously, the 18-year-old is free. With no one's welfare but his own dependent on his judgment, it lacks the discipline of responsibility. Moderation is an abstract value, not a daily necessity.

Moreover, because of his freedom, he would not immediately shoulder the consequences of his vote. Higher taxes would be paid by others; economic or industrial disruption would affect others disproportionately. He would influence the workings of a community in which he is neither prepared nor willing to take a full role.

We still believe these and other reasons for denying 18-year-olds the vote have merit, in varying degrees.

But, we have come to believe that despite the profound consequences for our nation, 18-year-olds should vote in national elections.

Our republic has endured unchanged longer than any other not because the Founding Fathers were more God-fearing or penned more inspiring documents, but for one simple and basic reason: The structure of our government was so contrived as to permit revolutionary change to occur within the framework of that structure.

It was designed to be responsive to ideas, movements and pressures—to contain, absorb and reflect changes in society, both good and bad.

The system works so long as it has the capacity for change. It fails when widely-supported pressures for change are thwarted, when a large segment of the population is denied its voice within the system.

Today's youth speaks with a uniformity and an awareness unknown in the past. To deny youth a hearing within the system is to drive it into the streets.

We believe enfranchisement of young adults is crucial to the continued viability of our democracy.

THE SISTER CITY PROGRAM

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years it has become more and more obvious that the concept of "traditional diplomacy" is not always the most successful in establishing a broad base of support for friendly relations among foreign nations.

With this in mind, the people-to-people program was established in 1956. Of the original committees established in that year, the principal purpose of the civic committee of people-to-people was to establish town affiliation relationships. The town affiliation—or sister city—program has proved to be one of the most viable, far-reaching and effective in its impact.

In 1957, the U.S. Information Agency asked the National League of Cities, because of its broad-based membership throughout the United States, to serve as a clearinghouse and in an administrative capacity to help expand the program. Today, more than 300 American communities maintain affiliations with cities spread through five continents.

Mr. George G. Wynne, Public Affairs Advisor at the U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Geneva has written an outstanding account of the role the sister-city program plays today. In his article, Mr. Wynne also outlines the role foreign service officers can play in U.S. communities as advisors to sister city committees.

Mr. Speaker, in 1968, as chairman of the International Organizations and Movements Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I held hearings on the future of U.S. public diplomacy. In the report issued last year the subcommittee made the following observation:

Today, the success or failure of foreign policy undertakings may be affected more profoundly by what particular groups of people think and say than by the workings of traditional diplomacy.

The town affiliation program establishes the greatly needed lines of communication with individuals and groups of people. This program deserves the strong support of the Congress and I commend Mr. Wynne's article to the attention of all Members of the House:

URBAN(E) DIPLOMATS JOIN CITY HALL

(By George C. Wynne)

"If war is too important to be left to the generals then peace is too important to be left to the diplomats," a saying used to run that was popular ten years ago among the pioneers of "People to People" diplomacy. After considerable trial and error, the People to People concept launched in 1955 by the late President Eisenhower, has now found its most organized form in the sister city program sponsored by the National League of Cities.

Some 300 American communities are already maintaining affiliations with cities spread through five continents in direct exchanges of ideas, goods and visits that focus local interest and goodwill on a clearly-defined foreign group. These experiments in urban diplomacy offer residents of American communities the most direct participation yet in foreign affairs—because they bring continuing contacts with visitors and ideas from the same foreign city. While many commendable activities in foreign affairs compete for active and passive participation of internationally-minded Americans—from the Peace Corps to membership in the UN Association—sister city programs focus goodwill in a manageable and meaningful way on one palpable group of people and institutions who are likely to devote comparable enthusiasm to cultivating their American relations.

Foreign Service officers on home leave or those who have retired from the service can lend a helping hand by talking to U.S. sister city audiences about the country in which their overseas sister city is located. If their retirement location or a nearby city happens to have a foreign affiliation, all the better.

They could use their tact and experience acquired abroad to insure that the local affiliation goes beyond an occasional handshake between mayors and a willingness to entertain or be entertained by quaint people from halfway around the world. To this end the Town Affiliation Department of the National League of Cities could put to good use the retired address list of the Foreign Service Association with the retired officers' last post of assignment. At the same time the current Foreign Service list broken down and distributed according to countries to the pertinent sister city committees could help local planners in keeping track of home leave plans to invite some returning officers for speaking engagements.

Conversely, Foreign Service officers should keep a benign eye on the list of currently active affiliations which follows this article. A few of these are mentioned below to illustrate the more popular types:

The oldest might well be the sporadic relationship, more active in recent days, that has existed for about 250 years between Bern, the capital of Switzerland, and the township of New Bern, N.C. Baron Christopher de Graffenried, with a party of his compatriots principally from the Canton of Bern, founded New Bern in 1710 but there was relatively little organized contact until the 1960s when New Bern celebrated the 250th anniversary of its founding. Correspondence established that a direct descendant of the city's founder, Baron Roland de Graffenried, lived in Lausanne. Relations between the old world capital and N.C. center received a new impetus when Roland de Graffenried attended the anniversary ceremonies. There are now frequent exchanges of letters and New Bern citizens make it a point to stop off in Bern where they are assured a specially hearty welcome during a trip to Europe. A direct result of the re-activated contact is the adoption of the walking bear, traditional symbol of the Swiss capital, by the North Carolina township. The Bern Bear now appears on all items of city equipment, on letterheads, buildings and the signboards of local business concerns.

Not quite as venerable, though dating back well over a hundred years, are the relations of prosperous agricultural centers in Michigan, Minnesota, and Texas settled by German immigrants early in the last century with their home communities in the old country. Citizens of Frankenmuth, (Mich.), founded in 1845 by 15 German settlers from Franconia, led by Rev. August Craemer, sponsor exchange students from southern Germany, annually celebrate a Bavarian Festival, carry on the old customs and costumes and stage group visits to their sister city with whose people they are in active and continuing contact. The same is true of New Ulm (Minn.) and its historic mother city on the banks of the Danube in Bavaria (Germany). Ulm's cathedral is one of the wonders of the medieval world. It was already several hundred years old when a group of young men who grew up figuratively in the shadow of its spires set out to make their fortune in the new world and founded New Ulm.

Personal contact maintained in one form or another by succeeding generations has lately been formalized in a going affiliation with committees appointed in both cities to select exchange students, arrange group visits and carry an active correspondence. The German influence is also cultivated assiduously in New Braunfels (Texas), founded on Good Friday 1845 by an eccentric German nobleman, Prince Carl zu Solms-Braunfels,

leading a group of 200 immigrants. The swashbuckling prince, who held court in a hilltop fortress and received Indians in a fancy full-dress uniform of his own design, lasted only a year. When the annexation of Texas foiled his plan to make parts of Sam Houston's young republic the private reserve of European aristocrats, he returned to Germany, but the community he founded survived bouts with disease and the elements to become a thriving city of 12,000. To this day, lively relations are being maintained with Braunfels near Frankfurt, home of some of the original settlers. German is still taught alongside of English in the public schools and German signs are common on shops and billboards.

Three more examples from different parts of the world bring evidence that relations founded merely on namesake can bring two-way rewards and genuine friendship even without the cement of ethnic ties such as prevail in the German and Swiss cases cited earlier:

The schoolchildren of Southampton, (England) collected and handcrafted a large assortment of gifts, packed them in a chest handtooled in their vocational school and sent them to the children of Hampton, (Virginia) aboard the Mayflower II which duplicated her predecessor's 1620 voyage. The chest reached Hampton safely and the gifts were displayed throughout the city's school system, then were placed on permanent exhibit in the municipal museum. In 1959, as Hampton prepared to celebrate its 350th anniversary as America's oldest continuous English-speaking settlement, it received a visit from Southampton's Alderman Ronald Pugh which led to an exchange of resolutions and the formal initiation of a sister city program which has since seen a frequent exchange of visits by city officials and businessmen and the exchange of local products flown across the Atlantic by an Air Force jet from Hampton's Langley Air Base.

The sister city link between Toledo (Ohio) and Toledo (Spain) dates from 1934 when the municipal government of the Spanish Toledo, aided by provincial and central governments invited a delegation from Toledo (Ohio) to spend a week as official guests of the Spanish city. Committees set up in both Toledos to maintain the friendly inter-city contact established by the visit foundered after 1936 when unsettled international conditions including the Spanish Civil War and World War II interrupted the work of the two groups. Contact was tentatively resumed in the early fifties and in 1958 both committees were formally re-activated to carry out exchanges of exhibits, student art work and products of local industry. The most ambitious recent project of the Toledo (Ohio) committee was the financing of a reciprocal visit by a nine man delegation from the Spanish Toledo, headed by Don Luis Montemayor Mateo, mayor of the Spanish city. The visitors spent two weeks in this country including eight days in Toledo where they took part in the 125th anniversary observance of the city's founding and represented the Spanish Toledo on the traditional "Day of the Two Toledos," celebrated annually on May 25th. The formal and official part of their visit included a gala banquet attended by the Governor of Ohio and some 200 local civic and cultural leaders at which gifts were exchanged between the two cities. But beyond the formal and symbolic, the delegation had plenty of time to exchange ideas and make plans in working meetings with the Toledo (Ohio) committee for exchange projects that have now reached the young people in both cities and have built up interest in continuing contacts. To this end student and teacher exchanges are already in progress between the two Toledos.

In the case of Montevideo (Minn.) and its big sister, Montevideo, the capital of Uru-

guay, it was the initiative of the two mayors that lighted the spark back in 1946. The fire is still going and every year it creates more warmth and friendship. This despite a difference in size that would have doomed most similar projects. The Uruguayan capital has more than a million, the Minnesota community barely 7000 people. But by concentrating on one big event a year which mobilizes the city's entire resources, the Montevideo committee has been able to bridge the 7000 mile gap between the two cities effectively. Every year in June the "Montevideo Fiesta Days," saluting the sister city, serve as a community celebration that has attracted national and international attention. Dozens of Uruguay's leading citizens, informed by an active exchange of newspaper articles of happenings in their distant sister city have made it a point to visit Montevideo (Minn.), usually during the Fiesta Days. But friendship between the cities is not a one week a year affair. Throughout the year the welcome sign is out in Montevideo (Minn.) homes for exchange students and visitors from Uruguay. Former mayor Ronald Aaker, who started the exchange while in office and is now the committee's honorary chairman writes about Uruguay's response: "One year in the early fifties, the Uruguayan generosity went so far as to have the school children collect pennies and metals from which was cast a large statue of the nation's hero Jose Artigas, which was shipped up to us and today overlooks our busiest square."

Bruyeres, in the North of France, was liberated October 18, 1944 after several days of heavy fighting by the 100th Infantry Battalion of the 442nd Infantry Regiment, the first Hawaiian Nisei unit to fight in Europe. The famous "Go for Broke" outfit suffered 2600 casualties in the battle for control of an important communications center. Every year since the war Bruyeres citizens conduct memorial services for the men of the 442nd who are buried in the U.S. cemetery just outside town.

With this background, Honolulu, home town of many of the soldiers who fought and died at Bruyeres, entered into an affiliation with the French city several years ago. A Hawaiian-born serviceman stationed in France started the ball rolling by calling Honolulu Mayor William Blaisdell's attention to the annual memorial services. By the time Mayor Blaisdell and Councilman Yoshiro Makamura arrived to take part in the observances, Master Sergeant Wilbert Holck had brought together a group of Hawaiian musicians stationed in Germany to entertain the townspeople. Bruyeres reciprocated with a program of local songs and dances. A pen pal program and exchanges of exhibits are now in full swing.

When Sacramento (Calif.) negotiated its sister city link with Manila capital of the Philippines, a logical choice because of the ten thousand Americans of Philippine origin living and farming in the Sacramento valley, a little research established:

1. that Dr. Jose Rizal, national hero of the Philippines visited Sacramento in 1888 while in exile from his homeland then under Spanish rule. Rizal was impressed by the harmony that existed among national groups in Sacramento and later referred to American democracy as practiced in that city as ideally suited to the Filipino people.

2. that in 1938 Sacramento was the site of a Philippine National Convention which brought together Americans of Filipino origin from all over the United States.

The affiliation established in mid-1961 has grown into one of the most active and imaginative on the roster of the NLC.

New Haven's association with Madras (India) is a practical matter stemming from a desire of Madras officials to exchange information on town planning and municipal problems. But by a quirk of history, Madras, now linked with Connecticut's famous uni-

versity town, was once governed by a man named Eli Yale.

Captain Matthew Perry of Newport (Rhode Island) landed at Shimoda (Japan) in 1853 ending the isolation of the island Empire from the nations of the west. Today Newport and Shimoda are sister cities.

Besides historical ties, similarities and opposites in climate or location sometimes make effective points or departure for sister city programs. The two Glastonburys in Connecticut and old England not only share a name, they're both health spas. For centuries the reputed curative waters of the Chalice Well Spring have been prized highly in the English countryside. Legend has it that Joseph of Arimethia and his followers settled there during the first century AD to bring Christianity to England. On the other hand Trondheim, the sister city to sunny Vallejo (Calif.), is located in North Norway just below the arctic circle.

The best insurance for an active program are existing trade ties between local firms and business contacts in the sister city. Where there is a natural traffic of goods, people and services, sister city efforts are likely to have smooth sailing and the benefits of the relation are easily seen and appreciated in both cities. Some good examples are provided by the linking of Japanese ports with coastal cities in California and the State of Washington, San Diego (Calif.) and Yokohama (Japan), pioneer cities of the affiliation movement are terminal points of ocean traffic between the two countries as are Stockton and Shimizu, another effective affiliation. The port director of Stockton notes that all of the iron ore and most of the bulk grain shipped from Stockton is destined for Japan. Public relations and commercial interest combine to make port authorities bring about the active participation of port authorities in sister city activities. Material assistance and valuable shipping services ranging in order of magnitude from packages of greeting cards to twenty ton statutes have been the result. The Japanese Trade Center in San Francisco is partly the result of that city's affiliation with Osaka, site of the 1970 Worlds Fair, and it holds the branch offices of numerous Osaka firms together with an Osaka information center.

To date foreign relations have been almost the exclusive preserve of national governments, but recent history bears witness to the fact that traditional diplomacy has not always excelled at the task of winning and keeping friends abroad.

It may be time for cities to get into the act. As they set about to solve their problems, other cities, especially their affiliates abroad, may engage a helpful and mutually-stimulating dialogue.

With more people traveling more widely, more often, more quickly than ever before in human history, the world is gradually turning into a city. The sister movement might help turn it into a better city.

THE MIDDLE EAST ARMS IMBALANCE

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining 51 of my colleagues in the House in making yet another appeal to the President to honor America's long-standing policy of support for Israel and peace in the Middle East. The resolution we are introducing urges the President to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw all Russian personnel from the Middle East as a major step toward peace in the area.

Mr. Speaker, such action by the President has been needed for a long time. On August 3, 1967, I initiated a bipartisan effort urging the President to seek United Nations agreements to restrict the sales of armaments to developing nations and to establish a procedure for full public registration of all transactions of this character. This action is still needed.

However, faced with the reality of expanding Soviet involvement in support of the announced Arab goal of wiping Israel off the map, the President must reconsider his decision not to send jet planes to Israel. I called upon the President to reverse his decision in a statement issued immediately after he made his decision known. Again, on April 30, after it became known that Soviet pilots were flying Russian Mig's in the service of the Egyptian air force, I sent a telegram to the Secretary of State urging that the United States see to it that Israel has the means for her own defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the vital interest of the United States to do all in its power to maintain peace in the Middle East. We will greatly endanger that peace if we allow the military balance to swing in favor of the Arab nations who openly seek a military victory over their neighbor.

FEEDING THE MILITARY PROPAGANDA MACHINE: HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some time about spending by the military for "public relations" and "public information." The military's own figures indicate that expenditures to "inform" the public of military actions and activities have recently increased out of all proportion to increases in the total military budget, and I have obtained new information which suggests that total public relations and public information spending by the military may be much higher than the Pentagon has ever admitted.

According to DOD figures, which I placed in the RECORD during debate last December on the fiscal year 1970 defense appropriation bill, the amount of military spending on public information and relations over the last decade increased by about 1,000 percent—from \$2,755,000 to \$29 million—as compared with a 65-percent increase over the same time span in the Defense Department's total budget—from \$43 billion to \$76 billion.

Just recently the Department of Defense revised its procedures for computing expenditures in this area. As a result of this revision, the Department now admits it spent \$40.447 million on public affairs in fiscal year 1970 and is proposing to spend \$37.675 million during fiscal year 1971. These amounts are reported on page 65 of volume III—Operation and maintenance—of the hearings before the Defense Subcommittee,

House Committee on Appropriations, on the fiscal year 1971 defense appropriation bill.

These figures alone indicate that this situation is out of hand. I recognize that the military must maintain a sufficient public relations and information program, but when the amount for that purpose has increased at almost 20 times the rate of the total military budget, it is clear that something must be done.

Last December, I proposed an amendment to the Defense Department appropriation bill which would have limited spending for public affairs to \$10 million. Although that amendment was defeated, it attracted substantial support. Concern was expressed by a number of Members over the DOD's burgeoning public relation activities. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will insist on extensive reductions in the \$37.675 million the Defense Department proposes to spend on public affairs in fiscal year 1971. If the committee does not do so, I shall at the appropriate time offer an amendment to set a limit on expenditures for this purpose comparable to the amendment I offered last year.

Even in light of the revised DOD figures, the magnitude of the total problem is not clear from the amounts the DOD admits are being spent for public information purposes. In the course of

my continuing investigation of this matter, I requested budget figures of certain Defense agencies which were not included by DOD as public relations and information agencies, but which appear to have responsibilities in this area. I submit herewith for the RECORD a fact sheet supplied by Assistant Secretary Moot in response to a letter from me. This fact sheet shows a breakdown of the expenditures of those specific agencies about which I inquired, together with the official responsibilities of each:

FACT SHEET

In response to your request for information concerning DoD Public Information functions, the following data is submitted:

Public information, estimated fiscal year 1970 level of funding:

Army	\$4,931
Navy and Marine Corps.....	12,064
Air Force.....	9,000
Defense agencies.....	3,443
Total	29,438

It should be pointed out that none of the Departments accounting systems record costs in these categories; the above figures represent a headquarters' estimate of the amounts.

Data on the following items are provided in response to your specific mention of them. The Department of Defense does not consider them to be public information activities.

	Army	Navy and Marine Corps	Air Force	Defense agencies	Total
Legislative liaison.....	244	242	376	218	1,080
Legislative affairs.....	1,095	684	1,442	284	3,505
Office of Information; director's office, information program and media operations.....				12,144	2,144
American forces radio and TV services.....	7,955	1,484	5,036	4,498	18,973
USAFI.....				6,522	6,522
Aerospace audio-visual services.....			24,504		24,504
Total.....	9,294	2,410	31,358	13,666	56,728

¹ The term Armed Forces information and education includes the U.S. Armed Forces Institute (\$6,522,000) and the Office of Information for the Armed Forces (\$6,642,000) of which the American Forces Radio and Television Service (\$4,498) is a part.

FUNCTIONS OF THE AEROSPACE AUDIO VISUAL SERVICE—AAVS

The AAVS is a motion picture still photograph production agency. If the Air Force requires a film, it is the responsibility of this organization to produce it. For example, if the Strategic Air Command needs a film to explain its mission, AAVS will be contacted. These are used by the Air Force only; however, should a Congressman or a qualified civic organization (such as the Kiwanis Club) desire to show a particular film which has been cleared for public exhibition, a request may be made through Air Force Headquarters to the Office, Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Security Review. The AAVS has no authority to release materials to the national press or public media.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION FOR THE ARMED FORCES

MISSION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The basic mission of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces (IAF) is to provide:

1. An Armed Forces Information Program (AFIP) in support of the Military Services and their internal information functions. This program provides information products of common usage by the Services so that U.S. military personnel:

Comprehend the values of our Government and our National Heritage;

Understand both the freedoms they are called upon to defend, and other ideologies

inimical to the free institutions upon which the U.S. is founded;

Are fully aware of the threat of Communism;

Realize the responsibilities and objectives of the individual military citizen through the use of all communications media, including the production and distribution of motion pictures, publications, posters and support materials for Armed Forces newspapers for use by the Military Departments in their respective internal information programs. This program is developed in conjunction with the Military Departments and includes such areas as Democracy/Communism, World Affairs, U.S. and Friendly Military Forces, Citizenship (including voting), Code of Conduct, Orientation for Overseas Duty, and Personal Affairs.

2. Continuous coverage of international, national and local U.S. news, seat of government, military and sports news and special events to U.S. military personnel overseas.

3. General radio and television program materials for use by American Forces Radio and Television stations representing the best from American networks and industry.

4. Policy and technical guidance governing Armed Forces newspapers, Civilian Enterprise publications and American Forces Radio and Television outlets and networks.

5. For the evaluation of information materials for use in, and support of, the Military Departments' internal information programs.

6. Policy and operational guidance to all components of the Department of Defense to assure a free flow of information to military personnel.

7. For the development of long-range plans supporting the objectives of the Armed Forces Information Program.

OPERATIONAL ELEMENTS AND SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES

A. American forces radio and television service

1. AFRTS—Los Angeles—Provides the basic program materials which are used by the AFRTS outlets overseas. The weekly AM program packages provide 80 hours of music, drama, fine arts, and information material, and a five-hour library of latest hits and specials. A 12-hour package is produced for FM stereo automated outlets. The weekly 55-hour television package contains programming received from the major commercial broadcast networks, feature films, film syndicators, and filler materials. The activity annually produces 1,000 radio and 300 television spot announcements supporting military information themes. Over 50,000 slides and 50 filler programs are produced annually for television outlets. The worldwide AFRT system includes approximately 350 radio and 90 television overseas stations.

2. AFRTS—Washington—Provides continuous transmittal of international, national, seat of government, military and sports news and special events. This news, gathered from the major U.S. commercial networks, wire services and military correspondents, is transmitted 24 hours a day, seven days a week, by shortwave, direct voice cable and teletype to all American Forces Radio and Television networks and outlets worldwide. Provides facsimile photo service to American Forces Television stations worldwide.

B. Armed forces information programs and media operations

1. *American Forces Press Service* produces the following publications for the Armed Forces newspapers:

(a) *Commanders Digest* distributed weekly to military commanders of all the Services, the Reserves, and ROTC components. It is designed to provide commanders and their staffs with authoritative information of National and Department of Defense policies and goals and other events of significance.

(b) *American Forces Press File* distributed weekly to military editors in the field to assist in publishing their newspapers. Copy and photographs are sent to all Armed Forces newspapers throughout the world. Currently these number more than 1,800.

(c) *Galley Guide*. A monthly four-page publication of instruction and professional comments advising newspaper editors and military journalists on how to write, edit, print and publish their newspapers.

2. *Armed Forces Motion Pictures Service* includes the annual production and distribution of films for Service information programs, distributed in quantities of up to 1,000 prints, depending on Service requirements. In the production of films, this office works with commercial film companies and service production agencies.

3. *Armed Forces Publications Service* provides for the editing and preparation of information publications printed by the Government Printing Office and used by all Military Departments. Approximately 100 publications a year are produced; half of these are contracted and half produced in-house. These materials take the form of pamphlets, fact sheets, pocket guides, brochures and similar printed materials.

4. *Visual Communications Service* produces 12 or more original posters annually; produces 4 or more *Art Files* annually for use by Service newspaper editors; provides art support—including design, layout and original

art for all IAF publications printed by GPO—and monitors GPO for printing phase; supports Production Service's twice-weekly programming; provides support for briefings; and handles the reprint program of the Military Services.

5. *Armed Forces Production Service* produces and distributes approximately 100 video taped programs for dissemination to American Forces Television stations and other Military Services for direct viewing. These include *Television Journal*, a half-hour news program produced weekly on activities in Vietnam and other areas around the world of general interest to military audiences; *Pentagon Forum*, a discussion series covering topics of general military and command interest such as drugs, Cost Reduction, Military Compensation, and Medical Programs, also produced weekly in a half-hour format; and selected variable length *Television Journal* "Special Reports" produced as sound-on-film interviews.

ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE—LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

The Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs) is the principal staff assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Department of Defense relations with the Congress. He performs functions in his assigned fields of responsibility such as: (1) advising and assisting the Secretary of Defense and other officials of the Department on congressional aspects of Department of Defense policies, plans, and programs; (2) coordinating Department of Defense actions relating to congressional consideration of the legislative program of the Department; (3) coordinating the development, clearance, and furnishing of information in response to requests received in the Defense Staff Offices from members of Congress and the committees of Congress and their staffs; (4) arranging for the designation and appearance of witnesses from the Department of Defense at congressional hearings on Defense matters; and (5) maintaining direct liaison with the Congress, the Executive Office of the President, and other Government agencies with regard to legislative investigations and other pertinent matters affecting relations of the Department of Defense with the Congress.

These agencies account for \$56.728 million in expenditures. Of that amount \$48.062 million—the fiscal year 1970 expenditures for legislative liaison, legislative affairs, the Armed Forces radio and TV services, and the aerospace audio visual services—is not reflected in the \$37.675 million the Pentagon is now requesting for spending in this area. While it is clear that not all the expenditures of these agencies are devoted to public information and relations, an examination of the official descriptions of their responsibilities, and the types of materials they produce, make it clear that a significant portion of the funds they expend are, in fact, used for public information and public relations.

From this information, it appears that the figure of \$37 million stated by the Defense Department as the level of its public information and public relations expenditure is far too low. The true figure could run as high as twice that amount.

Accordingly, I am asking the General Accounting Office to investigate the expenditures of these agencies in question and determine exactly how much is being used for public information. I hope to have this material available when the defense appropriation bill comes before the House.

Last year the Congress expressly prohibited DOD propaganda unless specifically authorized by Congress. However, it appears that more stringent restrictions will have to be placed on the Pentagon's tendency to advertise its own actions and to promote its own causes.

WILMINGTON, N.C.

(Mr. LENNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the All-American and port city of Wilmington, N.C., was recently featured in an article appearing in *Generator*, an employee publication of the Babcock & Wilcox Co.

I am proud of the history, progressive development, and attractions offered by my hometown, and I wish to share the article with our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

WILMINGTON, N.C.: ALL-AMERICAN CITY

Midway between New York and Florida on a peninsula bounded by the Atlantic Ocean and the Cape Fear River sits Wilmington, N.C. Population: 75,000. Climate: mild. Industry: diversified. Seaport: fastest growing in the East. Historical sites: respectfully maintained. Parks and gardens: literally flourishing. Tourism: naturally. Way of life: relaxed and gracious.

If this sounds like an ideal All-American city, that's just what *Look* magazine decided when it awarded Wilmington that coveted title. *Look* bestows its "All-America" honor on cities which "have made notable improvements in community living, brought about by civic action." Wilmington shares the title with such cities as Seattle, Wash.; San Diego and Fresno, Calif.; Detroit, Mich.; and Louisville, Ky.

Water is a source of enjoyment as well as an important economic factor to Wilmington residents—among them 756 Power Generation division employees. When not turning out package boilers at the rate of about one a day in addition to other steam generating equipment, the B&W people can take a short ride to some of the best beaches on the East Coast, or enjoy water activities along the Cape Fear River. Just behind the ocean beaches lies the Interoceanic Waterway which stretches from New York to Florida. Pleasure yachts are seen daily stopping at the area's many marinas.

The city's economics are also closely related to the river. Through the Port of Wilmington pass ships of almost every nation, carrying to the city and the entire region raw chemicals for growing industries, wood-pulp, paper products, and other materials. On their departure, the ships transport Wilmington-made goods around the world. B&W's package boilers destined for foreign ports account for part of the 857,000 tons of goods that pass through the port each year.

Wilmington lays claim to an extremely mild climate, with winter months that are the sunniest of any location along the Atlantic coast, except for southern Florida. Good weather contributes to the area's long growing season and famous flower gardens, and also enables the Wilmington works to carry on some of its activities, such as painting, in the open air at the facility.

Because of the moderate climate, golf, fishing, tennis, sailing, motorboating, hunting and other outdoor sports are enjoyed almost all year round. Tourists are attracted to these activities, as well as to the carefully maintained relics of the southern, pre-Civil War way of life. Settled in 1732 as New Liverpool, the town was later renamed for the Earl of Wilmington. The city boasts its own "tea

party," the result of armed resistance to the British which began more than eight years before the Boston affair. In the 19th century Wilmington became the most populous and commercial town in North Carolina, and was the last surviving port of the Confederacy. The fall of Fort Fisher, now a national monument, helped seal the Civil War fate of the South.

Today, for visitors, Wilmington has a well-defined historic section and has officially preserved an area rich in architecturally and historically distinctive homes and pre-Civil War churches. The Cornwallis House, which served as Lord Cornwallis' headquarters during the Revolutionary War, is open to visitors. Equally noteworthy are St. John's Art Gallery and the gracious ante-bellum home known as the Bellamy Mansion. Two fine old churches in the historic area are St. James Episcopal and First Baptist Church.

The U.S.S. North Carolina, a World War II battleship, is a reminder of more recent history. It is permanently berthed at the port of Wilmington, and each summer evening is the scene of a sound and light production which recreates the ship's eventful past.

Wilmington is famous for its Greenfield Gardens, with its moss-laden cypress trees and five mile Lakeshore Drive, and for its annual Azalea Festival. In the realm of sports, Wilmington is proud of its two professional quarterbacks—Roman Gabriel of the Los Angeles Rams and Sonny Jurgensen of the Washington Redskins. The city's PGA-sanctioned Azalea Open Golf Tournament adds to the long list of attractions for tourists. They come all year to enjoy the beaches, the city and surrounding countryside, and along the way discover what citizen action can accomplish. They find an area with fully developed educational and medical resources and a progressive attitude. When they leave, they have a better idea of what an All-American city is like.

STATEMENT ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES OF CHARLES L. SCHULTZE, SENIOR FELLOW, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION, BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, JUNE 1, 1970

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and thoughtful analysts of public policy in the country is the distinguished former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, now a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Charles L. Schultze.

Mr. Schultze, together with Edward K. Hamilton and Allen Schick, has recently authored a most valuable book entitled, "Setting National Priorities: The 1971 Budget," which was published by the Brookings Institution.

On June 1, 1960, Mr. Schultze testified before the Joint Economic Committee on the general subject of national priorities.

Because I believe Mr. Schultze's analysis of this question, especially as it relates to the composition and determination of the Federal budget to be exceptionally useful, I insert the text of his testimony at this point in the RECORD.

I also call to the attention of Members of the House the recommendations of Mr. Schultze for improving the procedures of Congress in establishing priorities:

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES L. SCHULTZE, SENIOR FELLOW, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION¹ BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, JUNE 1, 1970

The term "priorities" has become, in the last year or so, an "in" word. Calling for a reallocation of national priorities is now a standard theme in the rhetoric of both the establishment and the student activists. What is often forgotten is that the term "priority" implies a choice. To have more of one thing, we must give up something else. If we could achieve all our objectives simultaneously, there would be no need to set priorities, no need to make difficult choices. Reallocating national priorities, therefore, is a double-edged concept—it not only involves a decision about what we want most, it also involves a decision about what we want least.

Insofar as the public sector of the economy is concerned, setting priorities has two aspects: *First*, we must decide between public goods and private goods. To increase the share of national income going to public purposes—education, pollution control, income maintenance and the like—we must decrease the share going to private purposes. In turn this involves a decision about taxes; it is through tax policy that we make a choice between public and private goods. *Second*, within the public sector we must choose among alternative patterns of public spending, among agricultural subsidies, military budgets, aid to education, SST's, manpower training, and so on. The more we devote to meeting one objective, the less we have to meet others.

Establishing national priorities, therefore, is a painful exercise, for it requires us not only to determine those things we need and want as a nation, but what we must do without to get them.

There are several different ways in which we can set national priorities, one clearly superior to the other. The patterns of public spending can grow like Topsy, as the unintended result of individual decisions taken piecemeal. Most decisions in the area of public spending have their major budgetary consequences long after the decisions themselves are taken. As a consequence, we can vote \$100 million for the nuclear reactors of an attack carrier without realizing that this decision carries with it more than \$1½ billion of additional future outlays for the carrier itself, the planes on its deck and the escorts to protect it. We can begin new public works projects, paying attention only to the minuscule first year costs and ignoring the much larger costs in future years. More generally, the way we set priorities in 1975 will be partly determined by what we do in 1970 and 1971. And without a major effort to develop proper information and analysis, we can unconsciously preempt our future freedom of action and set priorities we do not really wish to live with.

The alternative means of setting priorities involves a deliberate attempt to inform ourselves of the future consequences of current decisions, to act in full knowledge of the fact that choosing one course of action today forecloses other possibilities tomorrow. More specifically, this form of priority setting requires that we estimate the future resources available to the public sector under current tax laws and the expenditures we are already committed to under current policies and programs. Each new proposal would also be accompanied by an estimate of its future costs. We could then explicitly compare alternative courses of action and make explicit rather than implicit priority decisions. We could review alternative changes in current policies—for example, in military posture or in agricultural price supports—

¹ The views expressed in this testimony do not necessarily represent the views of the trustees, officers or other staff members of the Brookings Institution.

in the context of how such changes would affect the resources available for other programs. We could similarly evaluate long-term changes in the tax laws. Had it been quite clear in 1969, for example, that the so-called tax reform bill would preempt some 40 percent of the free budgetary resources otherwise available in 1975 for expanding public education, pollution control, health services, and similar programs, I suspect the final action of the Congress may have been quite different.

Making decisions with full information about their long-term budgetary consequences, and with full knowledge of how one choice forecloses others, will not necessarily guarantee that decisions will be wise or just or rational. But at least it would mean that national priorities could be established consciously and explicitly rather than growing randomly and inconsistently out of piecemeal actions.

Some beginnings have been made recently in providing the framework of information within which explicit priority decisions can be made by the Executive and the Congress. The 1970 Report of the Council of Economic Advisers and the 1971 Budget document contained, for the first time, a five-year projection of budgetary resources and claims upon those resources. About a month ago, several of us at the Brookings Institution made a similar projection, in somewhat more detail, and accompanied by some examples of how the projection would be affected by the adoption of alternative military postures and agricultural price support policies. In this testimony I should like to summarize briefly the results of that projection and then suggest, a bit presumptuously perhaps, several ways in which the Congress might improve upon and utilize such projections as an aid towards a more conscious establishment of national priorities.

PROJECTION OF FUTURE BUDGETARY CONDITIONS

The first step in creating a framework within which to make priority judgments consists in estimating the free budgetary resources becoming available for discretionary use in future years under current tax laws and expenditure policies. More specifically, this requires a projection of (1) federal revenues under current tax laws and (2) the expenditures which would be forthcoming under current and Administration-proposed programs, allowing for increases in prices, wages, workloads, rising numbers of people statutorily eligible for benefits under social security and other programs, and similar relatively "built-in" elements making for changes in expenditures. The difference between the revenues and expenditures so projected is the *fiscal dividend*, the amount available for discretionary use in expanding existing federal programs, creating new ones, retiring the debt, or reducing taxes.

In these projections the following assumptions were made:

1. Economic growth would resume at a 4 to 4½ percent annual rate after the present pause, with the unemployment rate returning to slightly below 4 percent sometime in 1972. Inflation would continue but at a moderated pace, tapering off gradually from the current 5 to 6 percent to 2 to 2½ percent in 1972 or 1973.

2. Current tax laws would not be changed.

3. All major Administration-proposed programs (family assistance, revenue sharing, urban mass transit, etc.) would be adopted.

4. The Vietnam war would be terminated, so that by fiscal 1975 the only expenditures would be some \$1 billion for economic aid or a combination of economic and military assistance.

5. The armed forces would return to their basic pre-Vietnam level of 2.7 million men.

The budgetary consequences of these assumptions are shown in Table 1.

Revenues under existing tax laws would have risen to about \$284 billion by 1975. However, the tax reform bill of 1969 provided for a host of tax cuts, scheduled to phase in over the next several years. By fiscal 1975 the net revenue loss from that bill will be \$8 billion, leaving \$276 billion in revenues.

A return to the pre-Vietnam military structure and pace of modernization would mean a defense budget of about \$62 billion in today's prices and \$74 billion in the prices likely to prevail in 1975. (Rapidly rising numbers of retired military personnel will also add substantially to the budget over this period, a fact which has been taken into account in the estimates.) The projection also assumes a residual expenditure of \$1 billion in Southeast Asia.

On the civilian side the "built-in" growth of current and Administration-proposed federal programs would add some \$50 billion to federal outlays in the four-year period between 1971 and 1975—a rise of about \$12½ billion per year.

TABLE I.—THE FISCAL DIVIDEND

[Fiscal year; billions of dollars]

	1971	1975
Revenues: Before allowing for 1969 tax reform	202	284
Less cost of tax reform		-8
Total revenues	202	276
Expenditures (built-in):		
Military	72	75
Vietnam	(12)	(1)
Civilian	129	178
Total expenditures	201	253
Difference between revenues and expenditures	1	23
Less budget surplus needed to reach national housing goals		10
Fiscal dividend		13

Source: Adapted from Charles L. Schultze with Edward K. Hamilton and Allen Schick, "Setting National Priorities: The 1971 Budget" (Brookings Institution: 1970), table 6-5, p. 186.

There will be, then, on the basis of these projections, a residual of about \$23 billion—the gap between revenues and already committed expenditures. But not all of this will be freely available to pursue high priority domestic programs of the federal government or for tax reduction purposes. In 1968 the Congress, after examining the data on the rate of new family formation and on the condition of the housing stock, set out as a goal for the nation the construction of some 26 million housing units in the decade of the 1970's. The Nixon Administration has adopted the goal, with some modifications. But it is most unlikely that this goal of building 2.6 million housing units a year can be met unless the federal government, under conditions of high employment prosperity, runs a substantial budget surplus, which I have put conservatively at \$10 billion per year. Under economic circumstances likely to exist during prosperity in the next five years, failure to run a budget surplus would generate such tight money and high interest rates that housing construction would not reach the 2.6 million per year goal. On the basis of the projections in its latest Economic Report, President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers appears to agree with this conclusion.

Granted the need for a budgetary surplus of this rough magnitude, then, the fiscal dividend available to meet high priority domestic needs by 1975 will total only \$13 billion. This is less than one percent of the gross national product projected for that year. Or to put it another way, although the federal government disposes of 20 percent of the national income, built-in commitments and the cost of the defense program—assum-

ing a return to the pre-Vietnam pattern—will absorb 19 percent of that, leaving only 1 percent freely disposable by the President and the Congress. This is hardly a large sum to look forward to four years from now, even after assuming that Vietnam hostilities are ended.

ALTERNATIVE FISCAL DIVIDENDS

The conclusion that even by 1975 only 1 percent of the nation's income will be freely available for discretionary use by the federal government depends, of course, on the assumptions used in the projection, in particular the maintenance of existing tax laws and the inviolability of current programs and policies in both the defense and civilian sectors of the budget. Taking into account both the assumptions and the conclusions, the projection suggests three possible courses of action with respect to the establishment of national priorities.

First, we can accept the conclusion as it stands and carefully ration any expansion of existing social programs or initiation of new ones to the point where they fit into the slim resources available. This course of action would imply the view that all current spending programs have higher priority than potential new ones and that the priorities in the public sector are not high enough to warrant a shift of resources from private to public purposes.

Second, we can make the judgment that pressing social problems take priority, at the margin, over private spending. This judgment would call for an increase in tax rates. If taxes were increased sufficiently to raise the federal government's share of GNP from 20 to 21 percent, an additional \$14 billion would be added to the fiscal dividend in 1975, more than doubling it. This would not imply an absolute decline in private spending; it would simply grow a bit more slowly than would otherwise be the case. (In the original projection, federal revenues would absorb about \$70 billion of the \$350 billion rise in GNP from 1971 to 1975; the remaining \$280 billion would be available for private and state and local spending. With tax rates increased to raise the 1975 federal share to 21 percent of GNP, federal revenues would absorb \$84 billion of the \$350 billion increase, still leaving \$266 billion for other uses.)

Third, we can decide that some current programs serve lower priority needs or fulfill those needs inefficiently and reallocate budget resources from those programs to higher priority purposes.

As an illustration of this last possibility, the study we published last month included a number of alternative military budgets, based on several different sets of possible defense postures. I will not attempt to spell those out in detail but will summarize one particular alternative as an example of the way in which questions of priorities can be posed.

Given the price and wage assumptions included in the projection and assuming a complete phase-out of the U.S. military presence in Vietnam, the military budget in 1975 should be in the neighborhood of \$74 billion, barring major changes in strategy and force levels. This compares with a projected budget of \$72 billion for fiscal 1971. In other words, rising prices, wages and military retirement costs will roughly offset the decline in outlays due to a phase-out in Vietnam.

One set of alternative military policies could produce a reduction in the military budget of some \$14 billion in today's prices and \$17 billion in prices expected to prevail in 1975. There are two major elements of these changes:

1. The conventional forces of the United States were, pre-Vietnam, built to provide the capability of carrying on simultaneously the initial, pre-mobilization, stages of 2½ wars: a major NATO war, a Chinese attack on our allies in Asia, and a minor contingency in the Western hemisphere. The budgetary cost

of maintaining and modernizing those forces, excluding any costs attributable to Vietnam, is about \$44 billion per year. In recent months both President Nixon and Defense Secretary Laird have stated that future force planning would be based on the contingency of having to handle simultaneously only 1½ wars—we would not prepare in peacetime to fight simultaneously both a NATO war and an Asian war. If this change in planning assumptions is taken literally, it would imply the possibility of a \$10 billion reduction in the annual cost of our conventional forces, as we scaled them down from a 2½ war to 1½ war planning basis. The military will undoubtedly argue that our forces were never capable of handling the 2½ war contingency and that the new planning guidelines do not imply a reduction in forces or budgets. It seems to me, however, that at a minimum the burden of proof is on those who would maintain the budget in the face of a radical change in planning guidelines rather than vice-versa. A \$10 billion reduction is certainly a major possibility to be examined in any overall establishment of national priorities.

2. In the case of our strategic nuclear forces, the adoption of a more restrained, yet still awesomely powerful, posture could produce budgetary savings of perhaps \$4 billion per year, reducing the annual cost of those forces from \$18 to \$14 billion. Such a posture would accept assured destruction capability as the essential requirement that our forces must meet—the capability of absorbing a Soviet first strike and retaliating devastatingly against the Soviets. This is the essence of nuclear deterrence. But the more restrained posture would, unlike current policy, not seek to go beyond assured destruction capability and would estimate the forces needed for such capability in somewhat more reasonable terms. In particular the alternative posture would reduce the ABM to a research effort, stretch out but not cancel the deployment of MIRV's, postpone indefinitely the procurement of a new manned strategic bomber, and substantially reduce the continental air defense system as a weapon directed against a nonexistent threat. The United States would still be left with an awesome nuclear deterrent: more than 4,000 deliverable nuclear warheads, carried on three distinct delivery systems—1,054 perhaps vulnerable land-based missiles; 656 partially MIRV'd and invulnerable submarine systems; and 300 B-52 bombers.

These changes in defense posture represent only a few of the possibilities. But they illustrate the kind of tradeoffs between the defense and civilian budgets which are involved in the priority-setting problem. The particular changes, for example, would add \$17 billion, or 150 percent, to the fiscal dividend in 1975.

More generally, a projection of budget revenues, expenditures, and the fiscal dividend simply provides a framework within which the three basic types of priority decisions can be debated:

Deciding the division of national resources between the public and private sector, which basically comes down to making tax policy;

Comparing the merits of maintaining current spending programs against the potential expansion of selected social programs;

Making priority judgments about the use of the fiscal dividend which finally emerges from the first two sets of decisions are made.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES

In a democratic form of government, the setting of national priorities must always remain an essentially political process and emerge from the advocacy, bargaining, and compromise which characterize political decision-making. Choosing among alternative objectives and deciding how much of the na-

tion's resources to allocate to each is not something which can, or should, be done by formula or by consensus among experts. At the same time, however, the political bargaining process can either be an informed one, in which choices are hammered out with knowledge of their consequences, or it can operate in the dark, implicitly setting priorities which none of the participants consciously intended. The kind of budgetary projections and presentation of major alternatives which I have described can, I believe, contribute to a better informed, more conscious, and more explicit exercise of the political process in establishing national priorities. I should like to examine, therefore, some ways in which the Congress can itself provide and take advantage of this kind of information. Not having served in either body, my suggestions may seem presumptuous. Nevertheless, let me run that risk and plunge ahead.

In the first place, insofar as the consideration of particular issues is concerned—the development of a specific public program or the appropriation of funds to an individual activity—the committee system of the Congress has much to recommend it. Members become quite familiar with particular subject areas. Both formal hearings and informal contacts provide opportunity for experts and interested parties to be heard. In my own view, given the complexities of modern legislation, the staffing of individual committees is inadequate and increases in staff resources would improve the process. Nevertheless, this is an improvement which requires no fundamental restructuring or major innovation, but simply a decision on the part of the Congress to take action.

There is another large area, however, where congressional procedures are quite weak and indeed outmoded. There are no existing means of relating a wide range of individual decisions to each other in a consistent way. As I have repeatedly stressed, setting priorities is primarily a matter of making choices. And given limited resources, choosing one course of action precludes others. Each choice—including the choice of leaving existing programs and tax laws intact—has a cost in terms of opportunities foregone. Only in the light of overall resource availabilities and alternative patterns of resource use can individual decisions be interpreted from a priorities standpoint.

I believe there are a number of ways the Congress can provide an overall priorities-oriented information system, as an aid both to its individual committees and to itself when acting as a whole.

First, the Joint Economic Committee should undertake to develop its own long-run budgetary projections. These projections could be developed, in part at least, out of hearings devoted to the projections which have begun to be published in the Economic Report and the Budget. The Committee could also refer to outside projections, such as those I presented earlier in this testimony. While the Committee's projections would probably not, in the aggregate, differ sharply from those presented by the Administration, the Committee could provide for the Congress a critical review of the key assumptions being made. Even more importantly, the Committee could, in its projections, emphasize several points: (1) the five-year cost of the legislative package being presented by the President and its relationship to the overall totals; (2) an analysis of the priority evaluations implicit in the President's program, both in terms of areas he is stressing and those he is ignoring; and, (3) a presentation of alternative possibilities, including the impact of higher or lower tax rates and major changes in certain areas of spending policy, such as the military budget. In addition the Committee could incorporate into the projections and analyses, as the oppor-

tunity arose, the implications of some of its studies and hearings conducted during the prior year, insofar as they are related to matters of priorities in public spending.

I do not suggest that the development and presentation of alternative projections by the Committee would prove to be any panacea. But it would provide a much needed source of information and an overall framework for congressional committees in their work during the year.

Second, because the foreign policy commitments and military posture of the United States have such a major effect on the establishment of priorities, I would like to repeat a suggestion I made before this Committee in testimony a year ago. I believe there should be established within the Congress a non-legislative committee which, each year, would review the nation's basic military posture, force levels, and planning assumptions in the context of our evolving foreign policy interests and overseas commitments. This committee would not, by any means, be designed to absorb the work of the Armed Forces and Foreign Relations Committees of the two Houses of Congress. Rather, it would review the fundamental interrelationships of our foreign and defense policies, provide a critical analysis of these policies, and seek to present for the Congress the major alternative courses of action open to the nation. This new committee should also seek to translate the alternatives into budgetary terms, at least in rough orders of magnitude, and it works could form an input into the long-range budgetary projections which I have suggested that the Joint Economic Committee undertake.

Third, the Congress should require that Public Law 801 be more strictly observed and, if necessary, modified. Public Law 801 requires that each piece of new legislation be accompanied by a statement of its budgetary costs over a five-year period. In most cases, however, this information does not now accompany the submission of new legislation. To be sure, it is difficult to know on exactly what grounds the projection of five-year costs should be made. Basically, the cost estimate should indicate what level of outlays the government is committing itself to. It need not be a forecast of how the program might grow by future action of Congress. Only the future implications of current decisions are relevant. And, if the program is to be authorized for less than five years, the five-year projection can, barring specific reasons to the contrary, assume that the program will continue at the level reached in the last year of the authorization period.

If each new program were accompanied by a five-year estimate of budgetary costs, it would then be possible to relate those costs to the overall five-year projections prepared by the JEC. In this way the Congress would be in a better position to evaluate the impact of each of its actions on others and on the emerging patterns of public spending.

The suggestions I have made are in one sense quite limited. They do not provide a means for guaranteeing that priorities are wisely chosen. But they would, I believe, help to insure that decisions are taken with fuller knowledge of their consequences. And this is at least a small step toward more rational decision-making.

YOU BETTER BELIEVE IT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there are those who fail to see anything except the prestige of the accomplishment and the significant experience of our landing men on the moon and getting samples of

the moon and perhaps the intriguing interest of the earth from a distance in space, as benefits derived from our space program, which has cost many billions of dollars. Those who are informed know that, in addition to these and, to the gains which are well known from the space program, much other knowledge of immeasurable significance has been derived from our space efforts—knowledge which will be of incalculable value to our country and to mankind.

An interesting statement of such additional benefits was given in an address made to the Society of Technical Writers and Publishers and Artists at Huntsville, Ala., October 21, 1969, at their annual convention by a very capable and lovely lady, a devoted friend to Mrs. Pepper and me, Mrs. Ruth E. Giller of Cocoa, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, I include her speech, together with an excerpt from the Orlando Sentinel of May 3, 1970, in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

YOU BETTER BELIEVE IT

(By Ruth E. Giller)

Ladies and Gentlemen, you've heard the story about the doctors: they're always saying that whenever a woman who comes up to them tells them, "Oh, you know doctor, I would just love to have been a doctor, something I've always wanted to do all my life." Well, I'll tell you a secret, I would like to be a technical artist, but I've been thwarted in my ambitions. In fact the last time I tried, they told me they didn't have any money to pay me. Through the centuries man's greatest scientific efforts and advances have come through military means. We've responded to the pressures of war. World War I served to get aviation off the ground. World War II gave us the growth of electronic equipment, computers, radar, sonar. In fact, the only thing which comes to mind as not having needed wartime impetus is the development of the automobile industry, because they tell me that it was the necessity for a truck which could go faster than 10 miles per hour to outrun the revenue officers during prohibition which got the automobile industry off the ground. Another thing, penicillin—it had been gathering dust on the laboratory shelves for years until the necessity for something to control battle wounds, the infection from battle wounds in World War II. But, what has come from nonwarlike events? As a matter of fact the space effort is the only thing which has come to us in recent years that was promoted by neither war-making nor law breaking. And this is where we are today.

Thirty-two billion dollars and 42 pounds of rock—is that the sum total of the space program? Now I know there isn't one of you in the room who feels that way, but did you know that Mr. John Q. Public thinks so? The man in the street thinks that this is the case. Are you, even as professionals, involved with your own little slot in aerospace? Do you know what's happened to the thing that you produced for aerospace when it got down to the general public? This is where we have all been lacking. This is our biggest problem to date, telling the general public about the spinoffs of the space program. In fact one of the most popular games nowadays is the game of completing the following sentence: If we can put a man on the moon, why can't we? Did you ever do that? The answers range from "solve the problems of our cities" to "get my shirts back from the laundry on time." We can do both we can get everybody's shirts back from the laundry on time and we can solve the problems of our cities. And it's going to be the discipline of aerospace technology that is going to do both.

One of the greatest products that has come

out of the space program is the marrying of engineering, of medicine, of technology, and of management into a single working unit to produce the space program. And if we don't do something about it those teams which made up the space program are being broken up and they are going to be scattered into other industries, and heaven knows when we can put them together again. In the Cape Kennedy area alone, we are losing 5,000 jobs. And the general trend among those men is to say good-bye to aerospace and when we need them again, when there's some spectacular breakthrough, it's going to be hard.

This afternoon I am going to try and make you believe in the necessity of informing the public, to use your skills as writers and illustrators to get down to the man in the street—not just fellow engineers, because even though he may be a civil engineer working in your state road program, he is still an engineer and he is interested. I am talking about the man in the street, who's worried about where his tax dollar is going. Every morning and every evening I drove across the Indian River bridges, across the waterways, and looked across at the Vertical Assembly Building. The largest building in the world, and it is familiar to a lot of you who have passed through that area. That building symbolizes something of the space program, and is this type of endeavor to be allowed to just crumble away, and millions of dollars in installation and technology allowed just to rust under the Florida sun, Alabama sun, California sun; wherever you happen to be?

What Mr. Average Citizen does not realize is that this technology is the key to research for our cities and our social programs. Now it's quite understandable that while the job was being done, that there was not time for the aerospace companies to get out and inform the public. But that time has come now. What I will attempt to do, in the language of the modern television screen, is to tell you, "You'd better believe it" because this is the hour. There are innovations already in use that perhaps even you and certainly Mr. Average Citizen does not realize are a part of the space program.

Let's take Mr. Average Citizen to the hospital. He walks down the gleaming white corridor, he sees a nurse sitting at the console in the hall; she's playing with dials and there are flashing buttons, and in his mind, it looks surprisingly familiar and he realizes that the last time he saw this was in a television broadcast reporting on a manned space flight. So it is just that—by a system of sensors implanted first on the body of every patient on this floor—that a nurse sitting at her console in the hall can monitor the vital body functions of every single patient on the floor. In fact the very same apparatus that watched Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins in moon flight is watching Grandma as she lies on her hospital bed. And he feels quite a lot better about it, knowing that in any emergency a nurse can be there in two seconds. It has the very same blinking lights and same buttons as that equipment.

Mr. Average Citizen then saw a little boy playing in the hall wearing a space helmet. And he smiled and said to himself, "How nice of the hospital authorities to give him a real space helmet to play with, but isn't it a little extravagant?" Then he discovered that the helmet was actually in use and that instead of all that complicated equipment that one used to have to wear to get a basal metabolism test, this is now checked through an absolute replica of an astronaut helmet. And you can be certain that child who would have kicked and screamed and fussed about equipment being placed over his face is going to relax and be perfectly happy wearing a helmet with Glenn, or Aldrin, or Armstrong stenciled on the front of it—a good deal of psychological benefit about that one.

In medicine is where some of the most spectacular advances of the space program have come, not the least of which has been the benefit to doctors to study the healthy human body. How often did doctors in the past have the chance to see a normal excessively healthy human in his normal daily habits? We don't go to the doctor until we are pretty sick and if we go in for an insurance physical, the quicker we can get through the better; we don't say more than yes or no to the doctor when he asks us how we are feeling, you can be sure of that. But this opportunity to actually sit down and study has been tremendously important. And not the least discovery was the seasick remedy that didn't make you sleepy—a very small thing perhaps for you and for me. But imagine that you are an aircraft pilot who all of a sudden has developed air sickness. He certainly couldn't go around taking dramamine. Your job was finished, but the space program forced the necessity for the manufacture of a seasick remedy which didn't make you sleepy. It's on the market now, but it doesn't say on it anything about having come out of the space program, because I looked.

In fact perhaps you have been in your doctor's office, especially if your doctor happens to be an internist or cardiologist, and seen attached to his telephone a dial, rather like the things they record earthquakes on, and all of a sudden the bell rings and it starts writing. You know that he is recording a cardiograph that is being sent him by another doctor from miles across the country, perhaps, for his analysis. And this, too, is such a terribly important thing because it gives doctors the chance to tap the brains of the most eminent men in the field.

Have you, Mr. Parent, Average Citizen, tried to push a baby carriage through the sand, or across the sand lot to the play ground? It's quite a job. But you know that your child is going to grow up, that this is a temporary thing. But what of the parent of the invalid child, of the child who is condemned to a life in a wheelchair. Out in California now they are working with, and it is already in use in several crippled children's homes, a walking wheelchair. Now this chair does do just that—it walks. It has large flat feet and legs that walk and this thing can be operated by the most crippled child. It goes up and down flights of stairs; it walks on the beach; it can walk across rocks. The child becomes completely mobile, and the feet and legs for this equipment were developed for an unmanned lunar walker which carried instruments. It's a direct transposition from the space program to the public, and this is a tremendous breakthrough. The equipment can be operated by a chin strap, and also there is another type of equipment which came out of the space program and that is the sight switch. They decided, they being the aerospace powers that be, that there was a possibility that astronauts under the conditions of extremely high gravity would lose the power of their arms and legs and be flung backwards immobile, but switches were developed which are controlled by the voluntary muscles of the eye. If you want the details of how they work, ask someone more scientific than I. I just know that they work, and I've seen a demonstration of a man completely crippled, in a wheelchair, maneuvering this wheelchair around a course of obstacles controlled only by the muscles of his eye. Now it may be a small thing, but the mobility that it gives the crippled patient is tremendous. And think of the patient flat on his back in the hospital, who couldn't even turn the pages of his book. You know they have these overhead readers, but he can now turn pages, turn on switches, turn on the television; it puts mobility back into his life. These are small things but each individually is very important.

When the metallurgists were given the

challenge of finding new alloys for space capsules, they came up with these new metals. Then applying them to human medicine they found that they were better accepted by the human body for the replacement of parts than anything that has been used before. So the fact that Grandma is walking now after her broken hip, and that Mr. Average Citizen's son is playing football again without a limp, may in part be due to the space program.

There are those who predict that within our own lifetime our cities will be covered with a ton of rotting garbage; that our rivers and our ponds will be contaminated beyond belief; and that our air will be full of contamination. And they would direct space funds for this purpose. What they don't realize is that this challenge has already been met; the challenge of producing a clean environment for three men for 10 days in a space the size of an elevator, not a very large elevator, has already been done. It's a test which challenged the ingenuity of any sanitary engineer; and they did it. They did it with a system of filters and even produced water from the system by a combination of the battery water and by-products of the waste system, returning drinking water to the capsule. Now if they can do that, those men would just love to be let loose on city programs. And Mr. Average Citizen doesn't know it.

In a two-page ad in a national magazine recently, a company, not an aerospace company, indicated how they had solved the problem of a downtown motel in one of our industrial cities which was being put out of business by a chemical factory next door. They used the same kind of filters; the motel stayed in business and the chemical company stayed in business, and they both have a happy partnership today.

Mr. Average Citizen is seeing these items in action and he doesn't realize it. He doesn't realize the innovations and the details which have already come from the program. Miniaturization is not the least by any means of the products.

Does Mrs. Average Citizen realize when she takes her casserole straight from the freezer and puts it in the oven, without it cracking, does she realize that the product was developed for nose cones to take them from the tremendous cold of outer space through the searing heat of reentry and then to a splashdown in the temperate water? Of course she doesn't—she just thinks, "What a nice new product it is." And does she realize that when she fries eggs in her nice Teflon-lined frying pan, being careful not to scratch it, that this product was devised for sealing gaskets in the Titan missile? Of course she doesn't. And she doesn't know also that the next development of the same product was in remodeling the eardrums in surgery; that people who were completely deaf have had their hearing restored by a complete remodeling of the inner ear; that this was done with plastic teflon, which is not rejected by the human body.

Mr. Average Citizen doesn't know yet about the new silicone paints, the silicone-based paints, developed to coat aerospace equipment which are coming onto the market. They are still expensive but they are available and they will absolutely revolutionize the paint industry.

How many times have you bought a beautiful new refrigerator, new washing machine, or a dryer, and they worked perfectly in the store; perhaps a television set, and it was working beautifully and the color was magnificent, and you brought it home in the back of an open truck, dumped it in your living room, and of course, needless to say, it's fairly delicate equipment, and it didn't work. That's going to be past because in a very short time all equipment is going to be produced with an air pocket on the bottom, and this air pocket will be filled from

the back end of a normal vacuum cleaner and the stuff will ride in on a cushion of air; it will go into the truck on a cushion of air, come off on a cushion of air, it will be placed, and then the air will be let out. And this is a means which is used today for moving missiles around. You can't have delicate equipment traveling across the Alabama countryside or Florida countryside with its rocks and bumps—the air cushion is the answer.

Are any of you from the farm country? Well, I am originally and I've had my equipment stuck in the mud many a time and have had to get out and push. The aerospace industry has revolutionized the wheel with a type of plastic wheel which gives and flows with the travel, like something out of a Dalí painting. These new wheels will soon be available for tractors and go into production. I read that they were on the lunar crawler but fortunately I showed it to someone ahead of time and he said, "Oh dear, no dear, not the lunar crawler." So I still have to find out exactly what it is used on and I think it's lunar equipment, not the crawler itself.

In the National Geographic magazine in the October issue, there was a statement that I liked very much. They said, telling the story of the floods in the midwest, "Not since Noah has man had such authoritative warning of high waters to come." And I like that. The satellites watched the snow buildup, photography and meteorological service offered by the weather satellites. And in this the warning given to these areas of the midwest last year resulted in no deaths at all. The satellites watched the snow buildup, photographed, and sent the results back to computers which actually computed the damage to come. And as I said no deaths, compared to many deaths in previous years with similar floods, because they knew when they were coming and they were able to prepare against them.

The communication satellites are going to open up the world. They end the ages of isolation for many people and hopefully the dawning of the age of instant communications to produce world peace. Pope Paul has said that development is the new name for peace. Communications satellites have a role too in safety. Did you have any problem getting here from your home city, if you are from out of town? Did you have problems on the highway, delay in your plane taking off the ground; perhaps you did and the answer lies in communication satellites. Because in time to come, pilots will be able to radio through a communications satellite to the airport when they are hundreds of miles away and not just when they are coming into the approaches as they have to do today. This will create safer and better landing equipment and definitely better conditions for those who fly.

When I came to America close to 20 years ago, and I wanted to place a telephone call to Europe, I booked my call and I sat by the telephone and waited until it came through. And Heaven help me if I wasn't on the phone when it came through because I would have lost my turn. Nowadays if I want to make such a call, I make it as easily as if I were calling New York or California. That's a graphic demonstration of our communications age. It's not just for personal calls that is important; it's important for business, for industry, for science, for medicine, and for world peace just as much.

Satellites are also used for solving problems. As an example, in the case of the tuna in California. They knew that warm silted water flowed into the Gulf of Mexico from the mouth of the Colorado River and it was also known that tuna live in clear water but swim into the silted water to feed. But they were not quite sure where the shrimp were in the silted water and the tuna were swimming after. Aerial photographs from satel-

lites outlined the silted areas which couldn't be seen from above. Fishermen went into those areas and the catches have increased tremendously. Now this was great for the fishermen but hard on the tuna.

Manufacturers are excited about the possibility of making things in the weightless environment of the space station. I believe that Mr. Average Citizen fully believes that the Russian beginnings of a space platform were in the nature of some Buck Rogers science fantasy exploit; they were nothing of the sort. They are the beginnings of the setting up of space platforms. The idea to industry of making perfect ball bearings, perfect optical instruments, the use of totally clean environment these are things which fascinate them. Some time ago I heard Dr. Paine speak on this very subject with tremendous animation; the idea of being able to manufacture under these conditions is very very close to his heart.

Manned observations from outer space will offer major earthquake forecasts, weather forecasts two weeks in advance, precise gaging of agriculture inventory (this is the counting of diseased trees and things of this nature), global navigation and full traffic systems for ships at sea, and do away with the radio on ships. They radio and then they drift another hundred miles before anyone gets there and it's hard to find them. This way they would be precisely pinpointed.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, I feel as you should feel, that America is getting more than its money's worth. This investment pays dividends in national well-being and in security. If we heed history's lesson, we can learn that the nations that had ambition to develop their techniques were world leaders as long as they kept looking outward. When countries began to turn inward to their own problems, they let their technology slip. And these empires toppled. We can't even grasp the practical results of the expansion of knowledge. If you will recall, the ancient Greeks developed mathematics as an abstract intellectual exercise with no knowledge of what could come, and today we have an entire mechanical civilization founded on their mathematical theories—the same mathematical theories of Archimedes and of Euclid.

Who can dare to say that this is a waste of time or money to learn about the universe? The expansion of knowledge is the main product; the spinoffs are the benefits to justify the expense. Those well-meaning humanitarians who would sacrifice the space program for social justice on earth should be reminded over and over that it takes more than good intentions to bring about social reform. It's the hard cost, as the American taxpayer knows; it takes money, more and more dollars. And tax dollars in this country come from one source—gainfully employed American workers.

It isn't generally known how many companies up and down the United States are involved in the space program. For example, there's a tiny little factory in a barn, growing crystals, which is just as much a part of the space program as the giant aircraft companies of California. And the public doesn't know this. Many employees don't even know that their own companies are involved in the space race. I use the word race because it is a race; there's no getting away from the fact. How many workers at Ford, the automobile part of Ford, know that Ford is part of the space program. How many of Chrysler's automobile workers know that Chrysler is part of the space program. I venture to say not too many.

Ninety-nine percent of the space program money has been spent in the United States. And 93 percent of that went to private industry. This is the message that I want you to take back and tell America, including the poverty stricken, that employment and security and progress lie with the space pro-

gram. That space technology has forced the development of new devices, new materials, and new methods, because the space program forces the demand for the never-done-before.

I said before, "You better believe it." Do you? Please take it home with you for this is the age of the 70's, the space age is the age of the 70's, and communication is going to be the by-word. As we reach out into the vast distances of space we create a greater ability to do things here on earth. We are creating a competence which is essential if this country is to lead the world in human dignity and in human wealth. Please help us, for it's with your ability that we could all succeed.

Nearly 3,000 products, space technology innovations, have come out of the space program.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, May 3, 1970]

SPACE RESEARCH HELPS ALL

EDITOR: The lady who wrote from Daytona Beach, "Why won't our government spend just as much money on cancer research as it has on space research?" has not heard the latest news.

The head of NASA's Langley Research Center, Clarence Cone Jr., has made some important discoveries concerning the effects of radiation on abnormal cell division such as cancer. These discoveries, indicating the connection between the electrical voltage on the surface tissue of cells and the two pathological features of cancer—uncontrolled growth of cells and the spread of the disease in the body—may be the great breakthrough necessary in the development of a cure and treatment of this disease.

This discovery is a by-product of NASA's research on the effect of radiation in the Van Allen Belt in outer space on human beings. To all who question the value of money spent on space research, this discovery would not have been made if NASA had not been conducting research to determine the safety of astronauts in space exposed to radiation from the Van Allen Belt.

If a cancer cure comes from this, it will still be only one of many thousands of benefits already being enjoyed by humanity as a result of space research. There are other tremendous "spin-offs" already in use in medicine, in domestic use and in industry.

If clubs and organizations wish to know more about this subject, please call my office at the Cape Kennedy Area Chamber of Commerce, 632-1411, and the space education committee will endeavor to have a speaker available for you.

RUTH E. GILLER.

MERRITT ISLAND.

COST OF MEDICAL CARE

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the increasing cost of hospital and medical care and especially the manner in which these high costs affect the recipients of Medicare. While there are some doctors, as there are some in every profession, who sacrifice their principles to greed, the overwhelming number of the members of the medical profession faithfully observe the ethics of that profession and serve their patients, whether private or under some public program, faithfully.

We all realize that one of the challenging problems facing the country today is to find a way by which rising medi-

cal costs can be reduced or properly met. The high cost of hospital and medical care today is, without attaching fault to anyone, having the effect of denying proper health care to millions of our fellow countrymen.

The Florida Medical Association has prepared a position paper on the cost of medical care and Medicare which goes into this important subject from the viewpoint of the medical profession and, I believe, will be of interest to my colleagues and to my countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, I include this position paper in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

POSITION PAPER ON COST OF MEDICAL CARE AND MEDICARE FLORIDA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Trust is a vital element in the practice of medicine and a necessary adjunct to successful therapy. Trust is a relationship with patients held firm by confidence in the physician's abilities, honor and character in an environment of cordial relations. The physician who is unable to inspire trust on the part of his patient only rarely is able to help that patient.

Innuendoes of wrongdoing destroy trust. If the present program of vilifying the entire profession of medicine continues, leading people to believe their individual physician is not to be trusted, the misguided efforts of a few people will destroy not only the profession's reputation but also good medical care.

On the basis of the small number of proven cases, it appears inconceivable that the entire profession of medicine could be suspected of overcharging, even fraud and other abuses, in connection with publicly supported medical and health care programs. Yet, suspicion has been allowed to spread in a manner which condemns many for the misdeeds of a few. Physicians are said to be reaping rich rewards for administering care to older people—their patients who have felt pride, since advent of the programs, in being able to pay their way as far as their doctors were concerned.

COSTS AND THE PHYSICIAN'S INCOME

The cost of medical care, provided only by physicians, has been confused with total health care and the claim made that physicians caused increases in the cost of the Medicare program. The truth of the matter is that in Florida 13% of the Medicare dollar goes to the doctor; the remainder pays for hospitalization, dentists' services, fees and salaries for technologists, prescriptions, nursing homes and government health projects. In the three years since beginning of the program, the physicians' fees increased 21.5 per cent. For all practical purposes, a freeze has been in effect for fees under Medicare for more than a year.

The monetary rewards of practice can seldom make the physician a wealthy man. Out of each dollar he earns, 20 cents go for taxes, 5 cents for rent, 15 cents for office assistants, 5 cents for supplies and equipment and 17 cents for miscellaneous necessities. Only 38 cents remains; no more than for others engaged in the professions requiring similar expenses who devote a like number of hours each day to their vocations.

FEW PHYSICIANS SUSPECT

The overwhelming majority of physicians are honest and straightforward and are doing their best to make the medical and health programs work for their patients benefit. In Florida this encompasses a little more than 97 per cent of the 6,654 licensed Doctors of Medicine. Members of few professions have had their daily activities subjected to closer scrutiny within the past few months, and it is a source of pride that the

practice procedures for less than 3 per cent have come under review for even possible misuse of the Medicare program.

Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball has stated: "Medicare pays about 30 million doctors' bills and 12 million bills from institutional providers of services each year. It is clear from our investigations that the number of attempts at fraud or abuse is relatively very small." The profession deplores these isolated instances of misconduct and pledges itself to take every vigorous action within its power to remedy the situation.

The existence of government programs is not to blame for this dishonesty. Ethical physicians do not defraud patients; yet they, who form the core of the profession, have never maintained that all are above reproach. In organized medicine, there always have been a few who had to be dealt with by their colleagues; those outside the medical society's jurisdiction eventually face the appropriate legal authorities.

Since early in 1968 when accusations began coming from SSA, the American Medical Association requested the names of those physicians suspected of abusing the program. The requests were refused. Previously, leaders in government, at the policy-making level, had indicated that cooperation between persons responsible for implementing the publicly-financed programs and physicians would be necessary to make the programs workable. Yet, official actions have shown this statement to be unfounded. The present ethical powers vested in medical organizations are sufficient for adequate investigation of these physicians and their methods of practice, and subsequent discipline, if warranted.

EFFECTIVE, POSITIVE ACTION

The entire profession has been drawn into the present controversy due to the manner in which a few misdeeds were exposed. At the same time, it is admitted that "The key to making the present system workable and acceptable is the physician and his medical society."

The Senate Finance Committee staff report continues in the introduction of its report, "Medicare and Medicaid—Problems and Issues, and Alternatives:" "We are persuaded that at this point in time neither the Government nor its agents have the capacity for effective audit to assure that a given physician functions responsibly in dealing with the publicly financed programs.

"While there is growing awareness among many physicians of the need for the profession to effectively police and discipline itself, performance has been spotty and isolated so far. Prompt action is necessary by organized medicine (and other health care professions) to do what is required with respect to monitoring care provided and charges made for the care. In the absence of such constructive effort, we fear that virtually insurmountable pressures will develop for alternative control procedures which may be arbitrary, rigid and insensitive to the legitimate needs of both the patient and his physician."

The Committee is suggesting an action which already has been taken by organized medicine in Florida. The scarcely concealed threat contained in the statement has not been clarified.

Medical Peer Utilization Review Committees have been established at county and state levels to deal with these problems as they arise. The county medical societies were urged to appoint or designate an existing committee to serve in this capacity at the local level since only physicians practicing in the community can provide adequate peer review.

Questionable matters regarding the individual physician's practice patterns are carefully screened by a state utilization committee of physicians in private practice before

referral by the Florida Medical Association to the county committee. The local group reviews the profile and practice patterns and makes specific recommendations.

The most effective mediation is that between patient and physician, and this has been fostered and encouraged. When this negotiation fails, the patient has recourse in the mediation committees which have existed at county and state levels for more than three decades. Self-appraisal of professional activities in hospitals has long been an established procedure through audit committees of the medical staff of each hospital. This has helped insure the delivery of the highest type of medical care to all patients.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Thoughtful consideration of the data, documents and public statements arising from recent events in the controversy regarding overcharging by physicians leads to the conclusion that indiscretion of a few is being laid deliberately at the feet of the entire profession. At a time when his honesty and good faith are being challenged, the task of the individual physician is to maintain his reputation for providing the best medical care at fees that are fair to his patients.

THE ADMINISTRATION MUST RECOGNIZE ISRAEL'S NEED FOR AIRCRAFT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the administration has again an opportunity to face the realities of the situation in the Middle East and heed the urgings of the Congress of the United States by allowing Israel to purchase the military equipment, including Phantom and Skyhawk jets, she may need to deter aggression, to maintain a balance of power in the face of increased Soviet intervention, and to assure peace in the Middle East—all of which is in the best interests of the United States.

On the occasion of his visit here recently, Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban warned that the requested additional aircraft are "physically essential to our security—not just in a symbolic sense." I and many of my colleagues have repeatedly called for resuming sales to Israel of aircraft and defense equipment but our pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Even the confirmed reports of Soviet pilots in Egypt have not seemed to lessen the unbending line the administration has adopted toward Israel. After several days of talks, Mr. Eban went home with little to cheer beleaguered Israel.

A strong Israel is the only deterrent to full-scale war. If the President is not prepared for the eventuality that will ensue if he continues his present policy, if he is not prepared for another war in that part of the world, this time with Soviet involvement and perhaps with a different outcome, then he must reassess this policy.

I do not believe the President can continue to ignore the military buildup of the Arab countries, the increased Soviet intervention, and the continued hostilities of the Palestine guerrillas. He cannot ignore a schoolbus full of massacred children or a bomb in a marketplace. He cannot ignore our most staunch friend and ally. The time has come when he

must, in the interest of peace and in the best interests of the United States, allow Israel to purchase the military equipment necessary for her survival—now, before it is too late.

PROPOSAL TO CUT OFF ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES PRODUCING ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for sometime now I have been strongly advocating that the Federal Government face the agonizing facts that narcotic addiction has become a national epidemic and that strong measures are needed if this epidemic is to be abated.

One of the most effective means of dealing with the narcotic problem is to attack the problem at its source by drying up the supply of illegal narcotics entering the United States from abroad.

Today I am introducing a proposal which has been long overdue. For many years our Government, mostly through our State Department and through international organizations, has been attempting to persuade foreign governments to curb the illegal growing of opium poppies and the illegal production of heroin, morphine, and cocaine. The little progress that has been made has been more than offset by a rapidly growing increase in the flow of narcotics into the United States. In my judgment, humanitarian appeals for the cooperation of foreign governments simply do not suffice. It has become necessary for us, instead, to impose meaningful economic sanctions on governments that do not cooperate.

Under the bill which I am introducing, the President is directed to suspend economic and military assistance to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent the ingredients of such drugs as heroin, morphine, and cocaine produced in that country from entering the United States.

Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, we are now providing millions of dollars of assistance to foreign governments. Countries which receive this assistance should not be permitted to allow illegal narcotics production to grow unchecked. The American people cannot be expected to provide aid when, in return for American dollars, foreign narcotics producers reap vast profits by preying on America's youth.

One of the most outrageous examples involves the illegal growing of opium poppies in Turkey. About 80 percent of all the heroin smuggled into the United States is made from opium grown in Turkey, where farmers have been cultivating poppy fields for hundreds of years. According to reliable information, the illegal supply of opium is so plentiful in Turkey that the amount necessary to produce a kilo of heroin can be purchased for about \$350. The price to narcotic addicts in the United States purchasing 1 kilo of heroin is about \$225,000.

The only way in which we will be able to deal effectively with this problem is for the Congress to enact a law which will impose sanctions and which will have teeth. The bill that I am introducing today will provide such a law.

Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1970, I introduced another proposal which will also contribute to curbing the narcotic epidemic. That bill, H.R. 17269, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1970, permits Public Health authorities to initiate the medical commitment of any person known to be a narcotic addict. It also gives the President broad powers to utilize any facility of the Federal Government to deal with the narcotics problem. Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee will commence hearings on this proposal on June 17, 1970.

Each of these proposals is part of a three-pronged attack on the narcotic problem. First, by using Public Health authorities to remove addicts from the streets, we can dry up the demand for narcotics. Second, by placing the control of the addict in the hands of the public health officials, we can free law enforcement officials to concentrate on cracking down on the narcotic pusher. Third, by cutting off economic and military assistance to countries which do not control the illegal production of narcotics, we can reduce the supply of narcotics entering the United States.

I believe each of these steps are imperative and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to give these proposals prompt and favorable consideration.

HOW RELEVANT IS THE U.N.?

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Organization will celebrate its 25th birthday this year and many people are taking advantage of this occasion to take a fresh look at the Organization, its accomplishments and its prospects for the future.

A very thoughtful editorial on this subject entitled "How 'Relevant' is the U.N.?" appeared in a recent issue of Life magazine and I would like to place it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I should like to add that the need for reviewing the operations of the U.N. system and for making some basic decisions regarding future U.S. participation in the U.N., is most pressing.

Over the past quarter century, the U.N. system has grown tremendously and has accomplished many things. At the same time, the weaknesses of its present structure have become highlighted. In a report filed with the House after our service as members of the U.S. delegation to the 24th United Nations General Assembly, Congressman J. IRVING WHALLEY and I have attempted to identify some of the U.N.'s shortcomings and to suggest the direction of possible reforms.

Entitled "To Save Succeeding Gener-

ations," our report, House Report 91-837, 91st Congress, 2d session, has been made available to all Members of the Congress.

I would also like to mention that beginning on February 18 of this year, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, headed by the Honorable CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER of New Jersey, undertook a thorough review of U.S. participation in the United Nations.

During the first set of hearings, which have been published already—25th Anniversary of the United Nations, hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, 1970—the subcommittee received testimony from a distinguished group of witnesses which included all of the live past U.S. representatives to the U.N. as well as well as Ambassador Charles W. Yost, who is presently serving in that position.

The thoughtful appraisals of the United Nations, its past activities and its possible role in the future, provided by those witnesses deserve careful study from all Members of the Congress.

I am happy to say that the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements is continuing the hearings and has invited interested private individuals and organizations to present their views.

The Life editorial follows:

It's hard now to recall the high hopes that attended the United Nation's birth in San Francisco 25 years ago next month. The U.N. economic and social agencies plod earnestly through their good works, the Assembly suffers the annual fall rites of the East River Debating Society, the Security Council and Secretary-General await peacekeeping summons that somehow never come. Has the U.N. lost its relevance, has it no better future than that? The silver jubilee is a good time to assess the U.N.'s first quarter-century and what the prospects are for its second one.

Too much was always expected of it. Perhaps the "One World" mood of the 1945 San Francisco Conference—which the New York Post actually described as "the most important human gathering since the Last Supper"—was heady enough to create the illusion that peace and justice under international law was an ideal whose time had come. It wasn't, and still isn't. National self-interest is still the common denominator of international politics, and real power resides where it always has—with the governments and military forces of great powers.

There are important things wrong with the U.N., more than merely disappointed hopes; nonetheless, its accomplishments and assets at the end of 25 years are impressive indeed. The organization has directly touched the lives of millions, bringing them everything from literacy and decent health to political independence—and even, in a half dozen or more instances, peace. Though it can't be proved that the U.N. has prevented any wars, it did have a central role in shortening some, and in heading off some potential big-power confrontations. The U.N. acts as a decompression chamber for major disputes, provides face-saving neutrality for settlements of minor ones and maintains the most frequently used site for inconspicuous, high-level negotiation in the history of diplomacy.

Even those hortatory General Assembly debates have introduced a new element of accountability in the world. True, justice may sometimes suffer because dictatorships are less responsive to suasion than democracies.

But the U.N. "forum of world opinion" has influenced what nearly all nations say and—who knows?—ameliorated at least some of what they do. Perhaps the most impressive example of that has been the U.N.'s supporting role in the largely peaceful and surprisingly swift transformation of one third of the earth's population from colonial subjection to legal independence. Because there is a U.N., new nations have felt able to join the international community without joining (or getting swallowed by) the big-power blocs.

In recent years, the U.N. has been buffeted by assorted crises, its triumphs have grown fewer and farther between. Partly, this is because the most publicized conflicts of the day seem beyond the U.N.'s reach. Cambodia is the latest example. In Indochina and Czechoslovakia, we've been grimly reminded that the U.N. cannot act in major conflicts unless the major powers want it to; in Nigeria-Biafra, that member governments are more dedicated to "national sovereignty" than to human rights. (The Jews and Arabs, of course, seem beyond anyone's reach.)

But there is another source of malaise—within the U.N. The organization has not yet come to grips with fundamental developments of the past decade—the proliferation of relatively weak new nations and the fading of the cold war. Most reform proposals for the U.N.'s second quarter-century are not even effectively addressed to these key problems.

One frequent proposal is that the U.N. involve itself in "relevant" new international concerns such as space exploration and pollution control. But the U.N. is not an ideal vehicle for either of these complex and expensive tasks, where international cooperation is likely to be most fruitful among nations with sophisticated capacities in the fields concerned.

Some Western diplomats believe that the U.N.'s most urgent problem is to anticipate an expected "flood" of membership applications from 50 or so new or soon-to-be-independent. Third World ministates like Nauru (pop. 6,000) and Pitcairn Island (pop. 92). To make the U.N. more responsive to the realities of power in the world, it is argued, a system of weighted voting must be introduced, or new nations with populations of under one million must be excluded from voting membership altogether.

This is a highly unpromising idea for reform. Many of the new Lilliputian states are expected to seek nonvoting association with the U.N. But there already are 17 members with populations under one million and a solid Afro-Asian Assembly majority. Since the principle of universality of membership is on the whole a good one, the U.N. should be finding ways to get into the organization such divided but important nonmember states as Germany, Korea and Vietnam—to say nothing of mainland China.

The real "new-member problem," we suspect, has less to do with size than with older members' impatience with the ascendancy in the U.N. of Afro-Asian states—whatever their size. But it is not a bad thing to have a General Assembly where Dahomey theoretically has the same standing as the United States. The West should highly value rather than resent an international organization which manages to educate (however abrasively) old and new nations to each other's ways, and which tries to grapple (however falteringly) with such potentially explosive Third World grievances as white racism in southern Africa or international trade imbalances.

The real difficulty with the U.N.'s expanded membership is that the U.N. has not accommodated institutionally to the sheer number of new members. As Canadian External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp suggests, the U.N. is in danger of "drowning in a sea of words." In 1968 the organization and its

agencies held 2,580 meetings in New York and 4,137 abroad. It printed 739,507,676 pages of documents and speeches. There are simply so many committees with so many members presenting so much business that even the largest nations have difficulty consistently providing competent, responsible representation. The number, size and life span of U.N. committees has to be cut down, needless meetings weeded out, and streamlined procedures and perhaps new ground rules set to curb speechifying.

Only by such measures can the U.N. begin to take advantage of what seems to be a trend to relatively low profiles among the big powers. For example, President Nixon recently endorsed a White House study recommending that most aid be channeled abroad through multilateral organizations. But the U.N. development system, through rapid growth and administrative neglect, has become a tangled, monstrous nonsystem. It groups 30 politically competitive governing boards which lack any effective coordination, agreed priorities or sound evaluation procedures, and 90 client states scrambling to commandeer easy credit for often imprudent prestige projects. The U.S. and other donor nations simply will not be willing to channel more funds through the U.N. until this snakepit of a development system is cleaned out.

A new initiative is also needed to establish peacekeeping machinery on a permanent basis. The military units (25,000 troops have been suggested) should come from white and nonwhite "middle powers" experienced and trusted as U.N. peacekeepers. These nations—not the big powers—should have the major responsibility for planning and tactical command of the force.

With big-power agreement—and there are signs the U.S. and Russia seek accommodation in a number of areas—a small initial U.N. standby force in the next year is attainable. It would be a worthwhile improvement for a world organization which, liabilities notwithstanding, has proved itself consistently useful—and occasionally vital—in its first 25 years, and is well worth sticking with and strengthening now.

THE 24TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Italy celebrate the 24th anniversary of the founding of their Republic. Today they can look back on 24 years of unbroken progress and accomplishment. Today they can look forward to a future filled with promise.

On June 2, 1946, the Italian people went to the polls and voted out of existence the bankrupt Fascist regime which had led the country astray on the road to war and devastation. The war-weary Italians yearned for a new beginning, and on that day they expressed their faith in parliamentary democracy as the form of government best suited to lead Italy on the road to recovery, peace, and prosperity.

The remarkable achievements of the Italian Republic in the ensuing 24 years have amply demonstrated that the Italian people made the right choice. What had been in 1946 a backward, mainly agricultural country has been transformed into one of the world's leading industrial nations with the highest growth rate outside Japan over the past

decade. Fiat is one of Europe's largest automobile producers; the Italian electric appliance industry has outdistanced all its European rivals; Italy is one of the most outstanding and active members of the Common Market; booming exports give Italy a comfortable trade surplus; the lira is so strong that the Government is under some pressure from abroad to revalue the currency upward; and the economy is headed toward a 7-percent growth rate this year.

But the transformation from a basically agricultural country to a largely industrial nation has not been easy. The flight from farm to factory and from the impoverished South to the bustling North has taken place much faster than expected. The result has been high unemployment in the South and a housing shortage in the North—but great efforts are being made to close the gaps.

The Cast per il Mezzogiorno, or Fund for the South, was established 18 years ago to help remedy the disequilibrium between the North and the South, and aid in the billions has already been poured into the region to help finance public works and agrarian reform, establish new industries, and create vocational and technical schools. Much remains to be done, but the results already are impressive.

Italian vitality and ingenuity have not been confined to economic development and political reform. The postwar era was also a new beginning for the arts. The literary contributions of Ignazio Silone, Cesare Pavese, Salvatore Quasimodo, Carlo Levi, to name only a few writers, have been acclaimed around the world. In the field of music, such luminaries as Luigi Dallapiccola, Luciano Berio, Goffredo Tetrassi, and Luigi Nono immediately come to mind. Additionally, Italian movies have merited many prizes at international film festivals—and Rome and Florence rival Paris in the fashion world.

Mr. Speaker, not only since the birth of the Italian Republic, but through the centuries, Italy has maintained an advanced civilization and a magnificent culture. The contributions of the Roman Empire, the Italian Renaissance, and the Risorgimento have received worldwide recognition.

In recent years, the Congress of the United States has given special recognition to the contributions of the Italians by designating Columbus Day a national legal holiday; by placing a marble bust in the U.S. Capitol of Constantino Brumidi, the great Italian artist who labored for more than a quarter century to beautify our Capitol Building; and by the decision to name the nuclear accelerator at Weston, Ill., in honor of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi, one of the greatest physicists of our times who was responsible for the first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction ever to take place.

This special recognition of Italian contributions to the advancement of world culture which has been extended by our Congress has indeed enhanced the genuine feelings of affection and friendship that the people of America have for the people of Italy. I know that this friendship shall continue to flourish, and today

I want to congratulate His Excellency, Egidio Ortona, the Ambassador of Italy to the United States, for the part he has played in perpetuating the friendship which exists between Italy and America.

On this anniversary celebration, I commend the Italian people and their outstanding leaders for the unparalleled record of achievements they have compiled during the 24-year existence of the Republic of Italy. I want to extend my best wishes to the people of that great Republic, as well as to the Italian-Americans in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois and throughout America who are joining in celebration of this occasion. May the Republic of Italy continue to enjoy peace and prosperity in the years ahead.

FIGHTING POLLUTION—TWO VIEWS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the need to improve the environment is one subject on which there is general agreement in these times of controversy. Most of us are familiar with the administration's proposals but I would like to call the attention of our colleagues to the programs of two States which have not waited for the Congress to act on administration antipollution plans. These are California and New York, the Nation's most populous States.

I submit for your examination and study, two articles from the June 1 issue of the Republican Congressional Committee's weekly newsletter. The first is by Gov. Ronald Reagan of California and the second is by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York.

The articles follow:

CALIFORNIA'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM

(By Ronald Reagan, Governor of California)

Among the several domestic challenges facing America in the 1970s is the urgent need for environmental protection. Although it has taken decades to reach the present crisis point, we do not have that long to act. The time for decisions is now.

We are making those decisions in California.

We have enacted the strictest water and air pollution controls in the Nation. Last year, we adopted a pioneering program to control pollution from jet aircraft. We are putting into effect noise controls. California was ahead of the Federal Government in starting to phase out the use of DDT and in enacting tighter regulations on all potentially harmful pesticides.

The California Environmental Quality Study Council is looking into every aspect of environmental control.

Our automobile emission standards are now the toughest in the Nation and they already are scheduled to be even stricter.

Earlier this year we asked all auto manufacturers and oil companies to examine the possibility of producing lead-free gasoline and modification of engines to use it. They responded in the affirmative.

Experiments are being conducted with steam and electric-powered vehicles, and with modification of the internal combustion engine. We plan, on a gradual, program basis, to convert the State-owned fleet of 28,500 vehicles to a dual-fuel system using smogless compressed natural gas.

We are moving this year on programs to control stationary sources of air pollution as well.

In addition to updating our smog laws, California last year completed a comprehensive Water Quality Control Act that the *Los Angeles Times* called the "strongest State water-pollution control bill in U.S. history."

This bipartisan program, the first major revision of our State water-quality laws in 20 years, provides for fines up to \$6,000 a day for violations, improves enforcement procedures and requires violators to pay clean-up costs.

San Francisco, for example, is just now working to provide adequate treatment facilities for its sewage. Action by the city followed a crack-down on offenders under provisions of our new State regulatory program.

In addition to the pollution threat, San Francisco Bay, one of the world's most beautiful natural harbors, has been in danger of being slowly swallowed up by land-fill projects around its declining shoreline. Last year, with strong bipartisan support, California completed action on legislation to protect the Bay from such a fate.

The bulldozer mentality of the past is a luxury we can no longer afford. It may cost more to reroute a highway around a grove of beautiful trees, but we must begin considering this extra expense a necessary part of the over-all cost.

We have formed an Environmental Policy Committee to insure policy coordination throughout the executive branch.

Emphasis has been placed on strengthening the State's conservation education program. Beginning with first grade, all students in California schools receive instruction in man's relations to his human and natural environment.

Currently, we are establishing a unified solid-waste planning and regulation program. It is absolutely essential that we learn to "recycle" what we discard.

There is no reason why we cannot achieve closer coordination between the Federal Government and the States on matters of such urgent public concern as pollution controls. Government, working closely with the private sector, can win the battle to protect and preserve America's environment. We are doing just this in California.

NEW YORK STATE'S ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM

(By Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of New York)

In New York State, we have been fighting—and winning—the battle to save our environment.

The Pure Waters program I proposed five years ago has provided the enforcement powers, research and State aid for sewage-treatment construction that is achieving dramatic results. Today, 117 sewage projects are built and operating, 83 are under construction, 139 are nearing building stages. Also, every major polluter is under an enforcement timetable.

Key to this water clean-up program has been a \$1 billion pure-waters bond issue that provides 30 percent State aid and prefinances up to 30-percent Federal aid for communities. The single biggest problem has been the lagging pace of Federal aid, which promises up to 55 percent of costs but has delivered only 7 percent because Federal appropriations have not matched anywhere near what Congress has authorized. This year, I have asked our State legislature to approve a \$750 million first-instance appropriation so that the State's pace-setting program may continue without any delay because of the lag in Federal funds.

A clean-air program I launched in 1966 has also had momentous impact. We have been the first State to create an air zoning system spelling out standards for air purity; adopted non-nonsense enforcement powers and set

cleanup deadlines for industry, power utilities, communities, and open burning sources. Industries can qualify for tax incentives for building approved air-pollution control systems.

Disease-spreading open dumps were outlawed early in the '60s, and a program to get communities to use the sanitary-landfill method instead has resulted in significant improvements. We also have meaningful programs to rescue wetlands, make wiser use of flood plain areas and preserve the natural beauty areas of our State.

This year, I am proposing legislation to provide State aid to help communities plan and design sanitary landfills, train landfill personnel, operate solid-waste demonstration projects, control the use of pesticides and curb exploitation of endangered wildlife species. We have also moved to curb thermal pollution of water from power plants and set up measures to ensure citizens a voice in the selection of future power-plant sites.

I am convinced that, if we are to preserve our environment and enhance the quality of life, a more integrated and comprehensive approach to the problem is required by government. Accordingly, I have submitted a major proposal this year to bring together all our State's existing environmental control programs into a new Department of Environmental Conservation. This agency would also have important new responsibilities to develop an over-all environmental plan, identify emerging problems and deal with them promptly and foster research in ecology and the recycling of wastes. Environmental quality standards would be set by an interagency State Board. A Council of Environmental Advisers from outside State government would weigh priorities, review policy and make recommendations to me.

These measures represent a bold new commitment by New York State to preserve our environment. The programs we began in the 1960s to clean up water, air and land are putting an end to the era of permissible pollution. But something more is required for the 1970s and beyond. From now on, we must become managers of the environment, learning to mediate the requirement for a livable environment with the continuing need for human progress and economic growth.

This can—in fact must be—the turnaround decade for our environment. At stake is a livable world for everyone—city dweller, suburbanite and rural inhabitant.

I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to include in my remarks an inspiring column, "I'm Proud To Be An American," written by Mrs. Mara Murphy, of the Dorchester section of Boston, that appeared in the May 28, 1970, issue of the *Dorchester Argus-Citizen of Boston, Mass.*

Mrs. Murphy was born in Italy prior to World War II, and when she was 14 years old, in 1946—her maiden name Mara Granchi—came to the United States with other members of her family. What an example of patriotism and love of America this Italian-born lady sets for all Americans to follow.

Her views, as expressed in her wonderful column should be carried as widely as possible. The press of this country should reprint her inspiring column. Will they?

The column follows:

I'M PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN!

(By Mrs. Mara Murphy)

The flag of the United States has been dragged through the streets, used for patches on pants, burned, and lowered at halfmast to the demands of so-called peaceful demonstrators amidst pretty speeches full of great promises. This is the in-thing for these demonstrators who say that the flag is a worthless piece of cloth, and many of whom I have heard admit they do not know or are unaware who their leaders are. Meanwhile the enemy congratulates them and encourages them to go on doing their "thing." This has infuriated me to the point I can no longer keep silent.

I have seen demonstrations and peaceful marches, I have heard pretty speeches full of great promises, and I, too, didn't know who the leaders were. I saw the results of such speeches and promises. They turned brother against brother, children against parents, neighbor against neighbor, and caused indescribable destruction. And when the speeches and promises had accomplished their well-planned purpose, the leaders emerged triumphant, and I knew then who they were.

I know only too well what war is, I've known hunger and thirst, I've felt the bitter cold, and went many days and nights without sleep. I've seen the dead men on the battle fields, I know what they look like, I've known how the enemy acts and learned to recognize it; I've seen the enemy's tactics and the remnants of war.

I heard, I saw, I learned as a child, and the horror of that time is burned deep in my memories which I chose to set aside.

But there are other memories which I chose to proudly think of very often. Memories like the first act of kindness shown towards me in a long time, the first decent meal in many months, the shelter against the cold where I slept for the first time in days, and finally the freedom which I now have and hold dear.

The American servicemen gave me all this while the flag of the United States waved high above our heads, and I knew then who my friends were. I saw the flag as a symbol of compassion toward an alien creature, of welcome to the tired and hungry, and of shelter to the homeless.

When I see Old Glory, I think of those days, of the founders and settlers of America, of the many battles they fought in the name of freedom in which they carried the flag, and in which they died to preserve that freedom. I think of the great legacy they left behind for generations to come. I think of the men who died to give me my freedom and I cry inside, but at the same time I feel terribly proud of them for they were truly courageous. They, too, carried Old Glory—a sight to be remembered and honored to the end of time.

May I always be worthy of their unselfish sacrifice and the legacy they left behind for me and mine to inherit. And may I always be free to proudly salute The Flag of The United States as a tribute to all the men who died to preserve my freedom.

I'm proud to be an American. I'm proud of my flag, and I'm wide awake. Are you?

THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with some amusement that I read that the Democratic national chairman is trying to blame the Republican Party for the "crisis of confidence" in America. If there is a crisis of confidence abroad in this land today it is

because successive Democratic administrations over the last 35 years have deluded the American people into thinking that the Federal Government has all the answers to all our problems. This approach has not only generated more problems than it has solved, but has raised false expectations among the people and discouraged them from tackling these problems on their own. But more tragically, it has shaken public confidence in our institutions.

The Democrats should realize by now that they cannot solve the problems of the seventies using the tired tactics of the thirties. If there is one thing we should have learned from this sad experiment, it is that there is a limit to what the Federal Government alone can do. And if we are to make our system work effectively and responsibly, we must decentralize and revitalize our Federal structure. That is what President Nixon's New Federalism is all about. Unfortunately, the Democrats are not taking the New Federalism seriously. Instead, they are still trying to handle the entire problem-solving burden at the top. They should recognize that any top-heavy structure is in a very precarious position and that its weight must be redistributed if it is to remain stable. This applies with equal force to government.

I, therefore, challenge this Democratic Congress to give top priority to the administration's proposal to share Federal revenues with the States and municipalities. This is an essential first step in decentralization, and it must be taken now.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR NOISE ABATEMENT DEVICES

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear that noise is an environmental pollutant comparable to air and water pollution, yet the United States has no general antinoise legislation. Surveys indicate that the rush into the age of technology has raised the average noise level by a decibel each year over the past 25 years.

Even more disturbing is a recent study which shows three out of every 10 Americans suffer some form of emotional instability and noise is proving a serious contributing factor.

Today, I am introducing legislation to deal with the problem of noise pollution, the forgotten member of the environmental triumvirate. My bill provides that any taxpayer would be allowed at his election to amortize any certified noise control facility or equipment at an accelerated rate over a period of 60 months. As indicated, the accelerated amortization deduction would be available only with respect to a noise control facility which is certified by the appropriate authorities. Normally, it would take 15 years for such amortization.

The authors of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 recognized the serious challenges posed by environmental pollution, and provided a 5-year accelerated amortization for pollution control facilities. My

bill would amend section 169 of the Internal Revenue Code and provide private industry with the same incentive to develop and install antinoise equipment.

Preventing noise is far better than blocking it out, which means that quiet operation of any product or machine must be an important feature. A start in this direction has been made by a Bethlehem Steel Corp. noise-control engineer, who has developed a steel garbage can that makes a thud instead of a clang when it is dropped. There are even quiet piledrivers that work by humming vibration rather than by the banging of a steam hammer. There are now on the drawing boards designs for quiet jet engines, vacuum cleaners, and quieter powermowers, but these will probably not be marketed until the public demands them.

It costs much less to reduce the decibels in the early stages of design than it does once a machine is built. A prime example is the jet engine. No attempts were made to deal with the noise problem created by these machines until the 1960's, when the noise of jets overhead became so unbearable that many people began to take their complaints to court. Engine makers responded by adding noise suppressors, but these reduced the thrust of the engines so much that pilots had to add power to compensate and this brought the noise level back to what it would have been anyway. It is probable that more adequate silencers could have been developed had the engineers worked on the problem in the early days of jet engine development. I believe my proposal will be an enormous incentive to airlines to install quieter jet engines much quicker.

Virtually all manmade noise, whatever its source, can be suppressed. While some major problems, such as insulating multiunit dwellings and the roar of subways, would cost large sums of money to correct, many of the most irritating noises could be reduced at negligible cost. The screech of truck tires on pavement, for example, can be reduced at no extra cost of efficiency loss by redesigning the tread, and a quiet home lawnmower costs only about \$15 more than the usual ear-jarring model. Some other examples of added costs: a garbage truck \$2,400—on top of an original cost of \$15,600—a small air compressor \$500 over the initial cost of \$5,300; and on most machinery, an additional 5 percent atop the original cost. In most cases there is a relatively small loss in efficiency caused by anti-noise modifications.

The expense becomes even less formidable when measured against the savings from noise suppression. The World Health Organization estimates that industrial noise alone costs the United States today more than \$4 billion annually—in accidents, absenteeism, inefficiency, and compensation claims. The human costs of sleepless nights, family squabbles, and mental illness are beyond measure, but they surely must be enormous.

Society's noisemakers are predominantly privately owned machines and plants, and in effect, private industry is being asked to make an investment which is a part for the benefit of the

general public. Moreover, quite often it costs relatively more to deal with the noise problem in the case of an existing plant or machine than to design a new one in such a way as to reduce the level of noise. Moreover, expenditures for noise control equipment generally do not result in any increase in the profitability of a product.

Aside from the financial aspects of noise pollution and its control, the medical aspects are equally as alarming. Clinical evidence has established conclusively that excessive exposure to noise constricts the arteries, increases the heartbeat, and dilates the pupils of the eye. One recent French study goes so far as to suggest that noise is the cause of 70 percent of the neuroses in the Paris area, and surely New York and Chicago are not dissimilar. John M. Handley, a New York authority on industrial acoustics, recently wrote:

Symptoms of hypertension, vertigo, hallucination, paranoia and, on occasion, suicidal and homicidal impulses, have been blamed on excessive noise . . . Noise pollution may be one of the reasons why the incidence of heart disease and mental illness is so high in the United States.

Other authorities have suggested that noise may be related to stomach ulcers, allergies, enuresis, spinal meningitis, excessive cholesterol in the arteries, indigestion, loss of equilibrium, and impaired vision.

Death by deafness is no joke and the most effective approach to governmental action lies in Federal regulation. At the same time, State and local governmental action against noise, as well as support from enlightened citizens, could go a long way in reducing the problem, and perhaps in setting a trend as Chicago and Memphis have in their noise ordinances.

My bill provides the needed incentive to encourage private industry to deal with the problem of noise pollution. The need for broader and more effective noise control standards remains. The amortization deduction provided by my bill, however, should be a useful component of the Nation's total efforts to deal with the problem of environmental noise. I urge all my colleagues to tune in on this problem and support passage of this urgently needed legislation.

A copy of my bill follows:

H.R. 17882

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an amortization deduction for noise abatement devices

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 169 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amortization of pollution control facilities) is amended by striking out "certified pollution control facility" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "certified pollution or noise control facility or equipment".

(b) Subsection (d) (1) of such section (defining certified pollution or noise control facility or equipment) is amended by inserting before "a new identifiable treatment facility" the following: "either certified noise control facility or equipment or a certified pollution control facility. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'certified pollution control facility' means".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Certified noise control facility or equipment. The term 'certified noise control facility or equipment' means noise control equipment or a noise control facility which under regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (or, in the case of aircraft or equipment affiliated thereto, the Federal Aviation Administrator) as meeting advisory standards prescribed by him for purposes of this section. Such advisory standards shall be prescribed and from time to time revised by regulation, and shall limit noise emissions to medically accepted levels. The regulations of the Secretary or his delegate under this paragraph shall contain rules similar to the provisions of the second sentence of paragraph (1) and of paragraphs (2) and (4) of this subsection."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1969.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for Tuesday, June 2, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. WHITEHURST (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 3, 1970, through June 8, 1970, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. YATRON, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, for 60 minutes, June 10.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LLOYD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Florida, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, June 4, 1970, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLANTON (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROBINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in three instances, and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LLOYD) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mr. BURKE of Florida.
Mr. KEITH.
Mr. SCHERLE in five instances.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. SNYDER.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.
Mr. KLEPPE.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. HARSHA.
Mr. QUIE.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. McDADE in two instances.
Mr. ROBISON in six instances.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. HOGAN.
Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.
Mr. WIDNALL.
Mr. PRICE of Texas.
Mr. HALL.
Mr. HALPERN.
Mr. DERWINSKI in five instances.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURLISON of Missouri) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.
Mr. MAHON.
Mr. KYROS.
Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.
Mr. FARBERSTEIN in five instances.
Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS in three instances.
Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
Mr. FRASER in eight instances.
Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. OBEY in 10 instances.
Mr. GILBERT.
Mr. HÉBERT.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. CULVER.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
Mr. SHIPLEY.
Mrs. MINK in two instances.
Mr. DULSKI in eight instances.
Mr. MINISH.
Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania in three instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.
Mr. BLANTON.
Mr. KEE in two instances.
Mr. UDALL.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11628. An act to transfer from the Architect of the Capitol to the Librarian of Congress the authority to purchase office equipment and furniture for the Library of Congress; and

H.J. Res. 1069. Joint resolution extending for 4 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3339. An act to authorize the Public Printer to fix the subscription price of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 1, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4813. To extend the provisions of the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13816. To improve and clarify certain laws affecting the Coast Guard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 3, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2098. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies on proposed U.S. participation in a replenishment of the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank (H. Doc. No. 91-344); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

2099. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve subsequent to June 30, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2100. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in increases in the authorized capital stock and resources of the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2101. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report for May 1970, on the Administration's implementation of section 301 of title III of Public Law 91-151; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2102. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending

applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of April 30, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2103. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 23, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Manchester Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 5, 1966; to the Committee on Public Works.

2104. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 3, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Ogdensburg Harbor, N.Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 13, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GIBBONS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 16745. A bill to exempt shrimp vessels from the duty imposed on repairs made to, and repair parts and equipments purchased for, U.S. vessels in foreign countries, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2499. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the Academies of the military departments, with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8663. A bill to amend the act of September 20, 1968 (Public Law 90-502), to provide relief to certain former officers of the Supply Corps and Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy; without amendments (Rept. No. 91-1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16298. A bill to amend section 703 (b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas (Rept. No. 91-1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 15112. A bill to repeal several obsolete sections of title 10, United States Code, and section 208 of title 37, United States Code; without amendments (Rept. No. 91-1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16732. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide that enlisted members of a uniformed service who accept appointments as officers shall not receive less than the pay and allowances to which they were previously entitled by virtue of their enlisted status (Rept. No. 91-1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 17869. A bill to authorize the construction of a dam on the Northwest River, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 17870. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 17871. A bill to establish a senior citizens skill and talent utilization program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 17872. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement or annuity payments, endowments or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive after attaining age 72; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 17873. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 17874. A bill to provide for the elimination, over a 10-year period, of the mandatory oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 17875. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates and income limitations relating to payment of pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 17876. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 17877. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 17878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax the first \$1,000 of interest on deposits of individuals in savings and loan and mutual savings institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 17879. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by requiring the designation of certain water and submerged land areas where the depositing of certain waste materials will be permitted, to authorize the establishment of standards with respect to such deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MNISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. BRASCO, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 17880. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 17881. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to remove statutory restrictions on the sale of .22 calibre ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 17882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an amortization deduction for noise abatement devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 17883. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced in such country from entering the United States unlawfully; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 17884. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 17885. A bill to amend section 236 (1) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 17886. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 17887. A bill to amend section 1682 of title 38 of the United States Code to define "established charge" for the purpose of computing veterans' educational assistance allowances for correspondence courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 17888. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 17889. A bill to provide for orderly trade in scissors and shears; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. BUTTON):

H.R. 17890. A bill to prohibit the use of any nuclear weapon in Southeast Asia unless Congress first approves such use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COWGER, Mr. BOW, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. COLLIER):

H. Con. Res. 652. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the

United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. Con. Res. 653. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H. Con. Res. 654. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of a United Nations international supervisory force for the purpose of establishing a cease-fire in Indochina to aid efforts toward a political solution of current hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 655. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should sell Israel jet aircraft necessary for Israel's defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAM (for himself, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. JACOBS):

H. Res. 1052. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KYROS (for himself, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. TAFT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MEEBS, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. WYMAN):

H. Res. 1053. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. REES, and Mr. RYAN):

H. Res. 1054. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 1055. Resolution to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its pilots and mis-

sile technicians from countries in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H. Res. 1056. Resolution to reestablish congressional responsibility in the determination of U.S. policy in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 1057. Resolution expressing the sense of the House on the growing threat posed by Soviet pilots and technicians in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 1058. Resolution urging the withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:
H.R. 17891. A bill for the relief of Jose Becerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:
H.R. 17892. A bill for the relief of Bruce M. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:
H.R. 17893. A bill for the relief of Peter Thomas, his wife, Vasilike Thomas, and their minor children, Georgia Thomas, Andreas Thomas, Mary Thomas, and Bobby Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXI,
396. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to flood control projects on the San Joaquin-Kings River Interstream Group, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

501. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Association for Grand Jury Action, Inc., Rochester, N.Y., relative to the Organized Crime Control Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. Also, petition of the Common Council, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to include the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CAMBODIAN SITUATION

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD remarks I made recently on the Cambodian situation, the President's conduct of the war, and the Cooper-Church amendment.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT AND CAMBODIA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, we are engaged in debate here in the Senate on the so-called Church-Cooper amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act. I do not doubt that historians in years to come will look upon this debate, and the vote here in the Senate upon this matter, as one of the most important debates and one of the most significant decisions to come before this body in the long history of this Republic.

Why is this matter of such grave importance to this Nation? Because it involves the fundamental constitutional war responsibilities of the Presidency as well as what role should be played by the Congress in general and the Senate in particular during wartime. The words here said and the vote here taken are also of tremendous significance because

it will have a direct effect upon the war effort, favorably or unfavorably. It has become the longest war in the history of the country. It has become one of the most controversial. It has become one of the most unpopular. It has become one of the most expensive. Not only has it aroused great controversy at home, but it has precipitated similar division of opinion abroad.

The President of the United States, under the Constitution, is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of this Nation.

In World War II, it was President Roosevelt who ultimately had to make the decision to land troops in North Africa and then in Sicily and Italy, and then on the beaches in Normandy. It was he who made the decision to begin the war in the South Pacific on the Island of Guadalcanal, to make the attack on Iwo Jima, Saipan, and Okinawa.