

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 23, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*He that handleth a matter wisely shall find good: and whose trusteth in the Lord, happy is he.—Proverbs 16: 20.*

Almighty and everlasting God, who art always more ready to hear than we are to pray, and are wont to give more than we desire or deserve, pour out upon us an abundance of Thy mercy, cleansing us, forgiving us, and empowering us to do what is right and good for our country and our world.

Grant that what we say with our lips we may believe in our hearts and what we believe in our hearts we may practice with our lives, that in deed and in truth we may be doers of the word and not hearers only. In Thy light may we see life clearly and in Thy straight path may we not stumble. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 20, 1969, was read and approved.

## RESIGNATION FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1969.  
HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.  
SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the governor of Wisconsin my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 7th district of Wisconsin.

MELVIN R. LAIRD.

## RESIGNATION FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1969.  
HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please consider this my formal resignation from the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in which I have served for the past four years as the Member from California's 27th District. This resignation is to be effective at the close of business, January 21, 1969. As you know, the reason for this resignation is that I have accepted the position of the Lieutenant Governor of California.

At this time, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and all of my colleagues for your kindnesses, for your cooperation, and above all for the privilege of knowing and working in this, the greatest legislative body in the world.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ED REINECKE,  
Member of Congress.

CCV—100—Part 2

THE LATE HONORABLE  
PAUL F. SCHENCK

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with very great regret that I rise to inform the House officially of the death of a distinguished former Member of Congress, the Honorable Paul F. Schenck, of Dayton, Ohio.

Congressman Schenck passed away at 2:30 p.m., Saturday, November 30, 1968, in the Miami Valley Hospital, in Dayton. He was 69 years of age. According to his family, death was caused by a heart ailment.

First elected to Congress in a special election in November 1951, Mr. Schenck served continuously for the succeeding 13 years and 2 months. His tenure is the longest on record for the Third Ohio District seat.

Congressman Schenck was a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, rising to become the second ranking Republican. He made significant contributions during his service on that committee, especially in the development of antipollution legislation, which led to the addition of safeguards on automobile exhausts.

Congressman Schenck also was the ranking Republican on the House Administration Committee and the Standing Subcommittee on Health and Safety. In addition, he was a member of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library.

The late esteemed Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, appointed Congressman Schenck as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

During his last term, he introduced a bill that had special significance for the Dayton area as the home of the Wright brothers and the birthplace of aviation. It was legislation granting a Federal charter to the Aviation Hall of Fame in Dayton, which President Johnson signed into law.

Mr. Schenck was a devoted Representative of the constituents of the Third Congressional District. He had a justly deserved reputation as a Congressman who worked for his people. He was unstinting in his efforts on behalf of all who sought his assistance and is well remembered by literally thousands of people in the Greater Dayton area for this service.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Third Congressional District, during Congressman Schenck's tenure, was one of the most populous in the Nation. At that time, including both Montgomery and Butler Counties.

Before he became a candidate for Congress, Mr. Schenck was a member of the Dayton Board of Education for 9 years. Appointed to fill a vacancy on the

board in 1941, he was elected in his own right in 1943 and 1947. During 7 of those 9 years, he served as the board president.

In 1935, Mr. Schenck established a business that bears his name today. It included real estate, general insurance, and mortgage loan services. He was the president of the Dayton Real Estate Board from 1947 through 1949.

Prior to that time, Mr. Schenck was the recreation director for the city of Dayton from 1929 to 1935. He also was a schoolteacher in Dayton for 8 years, serving also as faculty manager of athletics. He was the manager of Southwestern Ohio District basketball tournaments for 22 years.

Congressman Schenck was active in the Boy Scout movement. The various posts he held included scoutmaster, commissioner of Boy Scout Education and assistant Scout camp director. He also participated extensively in civic affairs and on civic committees. During World War II, he was the executive secretary of the Dayton Council for Defense. He was a member of the Grace Methodist Church of Dayton, Mystic Lodge 405, F. & A.M., Scottish Rite and Antioch Shrine.

Born in Miamisburg, Ohio, on April 19, 1899, Mr. Schenck moved to Dayton in 1908. He was a lifelong resident of Montgomery County, Ohio.

He graduated from Steele High School in June of 1917 and attended the University of Wisconsin.

Congressman Schenck is survived by his wife, the former Charlotte A. Rairdon, to whom he had been married for 47 years. Other members of the family include two sons, Richard R. and Thomas F., and five grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it was my very great honor to have known Paul Schenck personally and to have worked actively with him in politics. I was directly associated with him most closely during his 1952 campaign for Congress when I acted as his full-time campaign manager. This was immediately prior to my own start in elective office and much of what I learned is in large part the product of that stimulating experience and work with Congressman Schenck.

The Third Ohio District has lost a concerned and dedicated public servant as has the Nation he so deeply loved and for which he labored so long.

May God grant him eternal rest.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in a tribute to my longtime, good friend, Paul F. Schenck. He was one of the first to recognize and sound the alarm of the dangers of air and water pollution and its damage to the public and its people. Always forward looking in communications of every kind in America, he made

a contribution in solving the problems in that field, which will last far beyond the life of any man who served with him in Congress.

In addition, he had long, notable, and constructive service in the public schools of his home community and was long recognized as an authority in that field.

His widow, Charlotte, and the other immediate members of his family have our deep sympathy in the loss of such a husband, father, and friend to so many people.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me reemphasize the observations and comments which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH).

Those of us who knew Paul and who served with him in the House of Representatives have lost a good friend. He was a most able Member of the House of Representatives. He served his community for an extended period of time, not only in the school system but in many other civic activities. Paul Schenck was not only a friend but one who was a devoted individual to the legislative process and one who had a great allegiance to the legislative branch of our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we regret his passing and I extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) and thank him for arranging this time for us to pay tribute to the memory of our good friend and former colleague, Paul Schenck, who died November 30, 1968, in Dayton, Ohio.

Paul was one of my congressional classmates. We both were freshman Members of the 82d Congress. Incidentally, there are just 12 of us left in this House. Paul was first elected to fill a vacancy so did not take his seat at the beginning of the 82d but joined us later on during the first session in 1951.

During the years that followed I came to know Paul very well and to have great respect for his ability and diligence. I served with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during all the time that he was a member of that committee. I know of no person on our committee who was more diligent or attentive to the duties assigned to him. I have personal knowledge of many instances where Paul Schenck's individual work produced legislation of outstanding value.

Here was a man of the highest integrity, a gentleman whose word you could count on any time. As we all know in the legislative process that is most important. Paul Schenck was possessed of an outstanding quality that went far beyond his work on both the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

and the Committee on House Administration, on which he also did an excellent job.

The work Paul Schenck did in Congress cannot be measured in terms of his invaluable service to the Ohio district which he represented, but it was national in scope. He was the kind of man of whom it could truthfully be said, following his election defeat a few years ago, that we lost not only a Member who performed so well but also that this body lost a part of itself.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to his wife and his relatives my deepest sympathy in this loss of so great a man as Paul Schenck.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed to learn of the passing of my good friend and former colleague, Paul Schenck. He represented the Third District of Ohio in six successive Congresses, which in itself bespeaks the high quality of his service.

Paul was a dedicated public servant in the fullest sense of the word. He was keenly interested in our youth. Early in his career he was a high school teacher and took an active part in the Boy Scout movement. For a number of years he was on the board of education in the city of Dayton as well as director of recreation of that city.

Any man active in the field of education and active in all manner of projects for the betterment of our young people cannot be other than a man of compassion, understanding, and love for his fellow man.

Paul will be remembered for the contribution he made during his service in the Congress. He may be well remembered for his outstanding work on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. But he will be remembered most of all by many of us as a man who sought little for himself but sought much for others. In the final analysis this is the mark of greatness. I express my sympathy to his fine wife and family.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I too desire to associate myself with the tributes that have been paid today to a man I consider an outstanding Member of this House, and a fine gentleman of the highest order, and a good friend. I extend to his loved ones my own personal sorrow over his tragic death.

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to commend the gentleman from Dayton, Ohio, for taking this occasion to eulogize a great man, the Honorable Paul F. Schenck, a former Member from the Third Congressional District of Ohio.

Ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress, I was appointed to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Paul was our senior member on that committee. I have since replaced him as the second-ranking minority member.

Paul will always be remembered in the Congress as probably the most friendly and actually the jolliest of all Members of the Congress. Paul used to stand behind the rail on this side of the aisle and consult with all of the Congressmen, and I know they all held him in the highest regard.

Paul Schenck took great pride in his attendance record in this body, and rarely did he miss a day. He indeed rendered a great public service to the State of Ohio, and to our Nation as well.

I would like to join with my colleagues in their sorrow at his passing, and to pay tribute to his memory. I also wish to express my greatest sympathy to his wife, Charlotte, and to his family.

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

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know our departed former colleague the Honorable Paul F. Schenck, who served the Third Congressional District of Ohio in this illustrious body for over 13 years.

Paul Schenck and I were not only colleagues, we were office neighbors and we enjoyed a very warm friendship. He worked intelligently and tirelessly, and while he was a friendly and congenial gentleman, he was likewise a serious and conscientious legislator. He justified the confidence his constituents placed in him by rendering the highest caliber of service in this body.

To Mrs. Schenck, his children and his grandchildren, I extend my deep and profound sympathy.

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

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

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I, too, would like to join with the gentleman from Ohio in eulogizing the Honorable Paul F. Schenck.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Schenck and I came to Congress together in the 82d Congress and from the day we first met we were close personal and political friends.

Paul was a diligent worker and spent long hours on behalf of his constituents. He constantly worked for the best interests of his district and no Member ever served with more dedication and high purpose in this respect. Furthermore, he was a tireless student of legislation. He was one who always sought the advice and counsel of colleagues so that his own views would be tempered with the thinking of others over the wide range of consideration which wise legislation demands. His remarks on the floor always reflected this careful approach to problems as well as his own solid views on the subject.

The House of Representatives was his great love and he gave it the devotion and respect which marked him as a great public servant. He was a gentleman and a patriotic American whose friendship I

shall always cherish. He was a devoted family man who represented the fine and noble qualities which people admire in their public servants.

Mrs. Betts and I were saddened by his passing and extend our sympathy to his wife and family.

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

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I too would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late Paul F. Schenck, whom I regarded as a friend, and felt privileged to know and work with.

I served for a decade with Paul Schenck on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Paul Schenck was the type of man with whom you could differ, but it was always an impersonal difference of opinion. He was a delightful person, and always added to the enjoyment of any occasion where he was present.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying special tribute to our esteemed friend and distinguished colleague, the late Paul F. Schenck, who passed away on November 30, 1968. As we pause in our deliberations to honor the memory of the gentleman who so ably represented the Third Congressional District of Ohio for 13 years in this historic Chamber, from 1951 to 1964, we recall the accomplishments of this very able legislator.

Representative Schenck served as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was credited with development of an anti-pollution law which forced safeguards on automobile exhausts. He served as a member of the Dayton Board of Education for nearly 10 years, and as president of the Dayton Real Estate Board for 3 years, as well as serving in many capacities in numerous civic activities.

I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Congressman Schenck's family and assure them he will long remain in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting and appropriate for the Democratic Members of this House to recognize the fine accomplishments of the Honorable Paul F. Schenck who was one of our most able colleagues from 1951 to 1964. For more than 50 years, Mr. Schenck was particularly noted for his dedication to the noble cause of enhancing the quality of education in general and for his many constructive contributions to enriching the community life of Dayton, Ohio, a city which was always the center of his thoughts. Mr. Schenck was a fine Congressman, resolute in his beliefs, conscientious in the performance of his duties, and deeply aware of the dignity of his office and his responsibilities to his constituents. It is by the earnest labor of men of sincere character such as Mr. Schenck that our Congress has so well bridged the differences of party and been able to unite for the common good of the people.

The demise of Mr. Schenck on the last day of November at the age of 69 is most deeply mourned by all who served with him over the years and by the many thousands who knew and respected his work and solid achievements. I am privileged to join with the present Member from the Third District of Ohio, the Honorable CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr., in honoring the memory of Paul F. Schenck, of Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in paying tribute to the life and service of our former colleague, Paul Schenck, who passed away last November in Dayton, Ohio.

When I came to Congress in 1953, Paul Schenck had served one term. He was elected to the 82d Congress and I to the 83d, and I came to know him rather well because we both served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On account of that association I was to come to recognize his ability and the great contribution he made to important legislation which that great committee reported to the floor of the House.

Meanwhile, since he left Congress in 1964 I have vivid and pleasant recollections of Paul, and which his death brings to mind.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) and other Members in expressing our deep regret and sense of personal loss at the death of Paul Schenck. He was a fine man and an able legislator who leaves a record that all his friends and family can be proud of.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues today in honoring a warm and genuine human being who spent much of his life in the service of his fellow man and his country.

I was privileged to serve in the House with Congressman Schenck my first 3 years in the Congress. And, it was a privilege, for I knew him to be a humane and dedicated man, whose singular purpose as a legislator was to bring to his countrymen reforms that would enhance their daily lives and make our Government more responsive to their needs.

Congressman Schenck was among the most outspoken of the early fighters in the battle against air pollution. He firmly believed that the miracles of modern medicine should be available to all our people. He worked for a system of adequate health insurance for the aged. He supported the establishment of clinics for migratory workers. He was concerned with child research and human development and general medical sciences. His concern even reached into motor vehicle safety standards, which was indeed an innovative effort in those years.

Representative Schenck made a lasting contribution in the House to his country, to his State, and to his congressional district. His farsighted efforts in the areas of his interest have proven to be a base on which we are now building solid legislation. His work will not have been in vain, and he will not be forgotten in this House.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in this time of sorrow in the loss of the Honorable Paul F. Schenck.

Paul was among the first of the Members of Congress whom I came to know personally when I came to this body in 1961. He was the type of individual to whom one felt free to turn in seeking advice and guidance.

I maintained a close association with him not only on account of his friendliness but because of his approachability, ready counsel and willingness to be of assistance.

When he did not return to the Congress after 1964, I felt his absence as a personal loss. Now that I shall not see him again the separation is even more distressing and sorrowful.

My heartfelt sympathies go out to his family and to the Ohio delegation. The loss to his family and to his community will leave a void, I am sure, as does his absence from the Congress.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is but fitting and proper that we pause from our legislative duties to pay our respects to the memory of one of our distinguished former colleagues who on November 30, 1968, passed away to his eternal rest.

I, therefore, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers who so eloquently have paid just tribute to the late Paul F. Schenck. It is with a feeling of sadness that I rise to say what is in my heart about this great and good man who graced this historic Chamber from 1951 to 1964 as the able and distinguished U.S. Representative of the important Third Congressional District of the great State of Ohio.

It was in 1953, when I took my seat here, that it was my pleasure to have first met our late former colleague. The fact that he and I were both assigned to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee brought us closer together and served to establish a genuine friendship between us. It especially was during that committee's hearings and investigations that he brought to full focus his special talents and outstanding ability.

It should be noted that our departed colleague came from Dayton, Ohio, a city that has taken a major part in the development of aviation. That city was the home of the Wright brothers and is also a center of aeronautical research and experimental work. Hence, his assignment to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was both logical and beneficial. Nor should it be forgotten that his experience as vice chairman of the Dayton Safety Council was of particular assistance to the committee in its investigations. His knowledge of science was utilized by his community when he taught chemistry in one of its secondary schools.

The civic consciousness and commitment of our late colleague to the cause of education and help for youth can also be gauged from his activities as a member of the board of education of Dayton and as president of that board for 7 years. Small wonder then that Dayton's public school system is exceptionally well planned and among the best in the Nation.

It was, however, here in the Congress of the United States where the late

Congressman Paul F. Schenck achieved national stature. His contributions will long be remembered for they are recorded in the annals of this House.

For us, we will cherish his memory, as a distinguished statesman, an able legislator, an indefatigable worker, and a loyal friend.

To his family, we send our most heartfelt sympathy and feel comforted that his passing is but a prelude to a life everlasting.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable Paul F. Schenck.

Paul Schenck made substantial contributions to the Congress and the Nation from 1951 to 1964 and was a most able representative of the Third Ohio District.

During our terms together, I found him to always be a gentleman, laboring hard in the interests of America. He shall not be forgotten by those of us who knew him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad task to speak in memory of former Representative Paul F. Schenck. I always felt very close to Paul throughout the years I knew him, for he and my late father, who served with him here in the House of Representatives for many years, were such good friends and neighbors. His wife, Charlotte, and my mother were also close friends.

During the years he served in the House, Paul was a hard-working and able legislator. He served his constituency diligently and well. He was always on the job and prided himself on his 100-percent voting record.

He was also a kindly man and had many interests and hobbies. He was well-known for his wit and humorous stories.

But most importantly, Americans, now protected by law from gasoline pollution from automobiles, can thank Paul Schenck as the pioneer in this field of legislation.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he authored the act which bears his name—Public Law 86-493—providing for a 2-year study and report to Congress to determine the effects of gasoline fumes from automobiles on human health. Subsequent to this law, other laws were passed and finally the National Emission Standards Act was included in the Clean Air Act of 1967 making antipollution devices on automobiles mandatory.

Paul's widow and his sons, Dick and Tom, and his five grandchildren can be very proud of him and take consolation in the fact that he served his Nation with distinction.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character and public service of the late Honorable Paul F. Schenck.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us were moved last Monday by the sincerity and simplicity of President Nixon's inaugural address. On this solemn occasion in our Nation's history, now as in the past, the newly chosen Chief Executive of this Republic spoke for all the people, and voiced their continuing as well as current concerns and their noblest aspirations.

President Nixon's primary themes of peace at home and abroad; of spiritual renewal and reconciliation; of freedom and opportunity and justice for all, have kindled new confidence and hope wherever his words were heard. I shall not try to capsule his address, but I comment it to my colleagues for a silent second reading. Not because there are hidden meanings between the lines, as some speeches contain, but because there is so much meaning in the lines themselves, meanings which might have been missed in the chill of the day. It was a warm speech, from a heart that greatly loves America; it was a wise speech, from a mind that has thought deeply about America; and it was a strong speech, drawing its power not from rhetoric or oratorical flourish but from faith in God and his fellow countrymen.

History will rank this inaugural address with those that came before and those that will follow in the context of the times and the achievements of this administration. In my judgment, President Nixon struck the precise chord the whole world was waiting to hear, and I pledge him full support in striving to gain the goals he set forth for all Americans.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE CHAPLAIN OF THE U.S. SENATE: FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

(Mr. McCORMACK was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues in the House share my sentiments concerning the retiring Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. He has been, for all of us in both Houses, a continuous source of inspiration and renewed faith during his many years of dedicated ministry to the Congress.

With insight, eloquence, sensitivity, and courage, Reverend Harris has

brought consolation for the suffering and sorrowing in times of national tragedy or crisis, calm and reason in the excesses of heated debate, steadfastness in the face of the threats of our enemies, compassion for the downtrodden and oppressed of the world, and faith to uphold us in times of doubt and anxiety.

In our search for strength and wisdom in the conduct of the public affairs of our great Nation, the daily prayers of Dr. Harris have given each Member renewed faith in discharging his responsibilities for the good of all the people, have helped to keep us from indulgent complacency, and have served as constant reminders of the highest and most profound convictions and principles.

Dr. Harris has served as Senate Chaplain continuously since 1942, except for 2 years during the 80th Congress—26 years in all. Ordained in 1912, he was also the full-time minister of Foundry Methodist Church here in Washington for 30 years, until 1955.

Through the years he has been a dedicated spokesman, before audiences and in print, for the protection and preservation of liberty and freedom here and abroad. In sermons, addresses, and articles, he has aroused the admiration and gratitude of millions of citizens whose friends and relatives still suffer slavery and oppression in the captive nations. In moving phrases such as those that follow, he has expressed deep-seated convictions on the nature of national and personal freedom:

We are conscious that this is a world where tyrants still deal in fetters and chains as they attempt to shackle the free spirits of men made in Thy image. We praise Thee for the multitude in every land with whom we are joined, who cherish freedom of body and mind more than life itself.

What American could fail to be profoundly affected by his pleas that—

In this day of global conflict for the bodies and minds of man, Thou wilt purge and cleanse our own hearts, that we may be found worthy to march with the armies of emancipation which bring both liberty and release from the want and woe which beset so many millions of Thy children and grind them into the dust of poverty; that our hearts may be shrines of prayer and our free Nation a bulwark for the oppressed, a flaming beacon of hope whose beams shall battle the darkness in all the world.

I know that all of us in both houses who have received the great comfort of Dr. Harris' spiritual and personal guidance feel a great sense of loss at his departure. He is the gentlest and most generous of human beings, never too busy to come to the aid of those in need who call upon him. He has been a close personal friend to many of us and to our families. As a Member of the Senate once remarked:

Dr. Harris could be called a nonvoting member of our group who, while elected by no constituency, serves all constituencies.

Through the Members of Congress, who represent nearly every religious creed, his spiritual inspiration has been felt throughout the country.

Yet, spiritual guidance and inspiration are only a part of Dr. Harris' great service and devotion to America. He has been in the forefront of those who have fought

to preserve and protect America's great treasure of natural resources, especially in the years before this was generally recognized to be a national trust and obligation. In articles and sermons he declared his conviction that there can be no genuine patriotic consecration without conservation. He declared:

Every intelligent citizen must be interested in conservation and we must alert and alarm the people of the devastated and desecrated land to stop waste.

He reminded the Nation of the warning from Isaiah 5:8:

Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place where one may be alone in the midst of the earth.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Harris for speaking out so courageously against water and air pollution when most Americans were still trying to ignore these unpleasant realities.

Dr. Harris has also rendered invaluable service to his country as both a private and an official emissary in Southeast Asia, because of his long personal friendship with President Syngman Rhee of South Korea. He was the pastor and close friend of President Rhee when the latter was a member of the congregation of Foundry Methodist Church during his years in Washington. As a political exile in Hawaii, Mr. Rhee requested Dr. Harris' companionship and counsel, and later, as a visitor to President Rhee's government, Dr. Harris helped work out some of the misunderstandings which had disturbed relations between the United States and Korea. Today Korea is a strong and independent nation, with a rapidly growing economy and an increasing dedication to the democratic system of government. I cannot help but think something of its nearly miraculous success is due to Dr. Harris.

Congress has not been the only body to benefit from the wisdom and inspiration of Dr. Harris. For many years, in his weekly column in the Washington Star entitled "Spire of the Spirit," he brought the message of the greatness that is America and counseled each of us to raise our sights for the betterment of all. These columns have been collected and published in a volume by the same name that is treasured by all who have read it. Dr. Harris is also in great demand as a speaker, and spends much time traveling throughout the country to fulfill these requests.

For his work through the years, Dr. Harris has received many honors, including four awards from the Freedoms Foundation. The citation on one of these awards sums up the high regard in which he is held by all who have come in contact with him. It reads as follows:

With esteem and affection to an American whose prayers, sermons, and editorial works have lifted the hearts of multitudes—

With regard and honor to him whose thoughts, far vision, and steadfast faith move all whom he touches to patriotism and love of country—

With matchless service to the cause of free men, he makes known the strength of prayer and iron will in language beautiful in his prayers in the Senate of the United States. Truly one who desires freedom for all under God, and asks nothing for himself.

I believe this citation expresses perfectly the feelings of myself and all my colleagues as we bid farewell to a true and valued friend and wish him health and happiness in his richly earned retirement years.

#### RETIREMENT OF ROBERT K. WALSH

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal regret that I call to the attention of the House the fact that my good friend, Robert K. Walsh, one of the veteran reporters of the Washington Evening Star, has retired after nearly 25 years of reporting national affairs on Capitol Hill.

Bob Walsh has been a familiar presence in the House Press Gallery and in the corridors and offices of this building. I know all of his many friends in the House are going to miss him and this is particularly true in my case.

Bob Walsh is an outstanding reporter and an excellent writer with a keen awareness of what is the "big story" in the events of each day. He has been fair. He has been objective. He has been accurate. The Press Gallery of the House of Representatives is blessed with many outstanding newsmen and women. Bob Walsh has been one of the best and we will indeed miss him.

Bob was born in my hometown in what was then McAlester, Indian territory in 1903. He attended the same high school that I attended in McAlester. Bob then attended and graduated from St. Louis University.

He went straight from college into the newspaper business, starting with the old St. Louis Star in 1924. He also worked on the Springfield, Ill., State Journal and the St. Louis Globe Democrat before moving to Providence, R.I., for a long stint—18 years—with the Journal and Evening Bulletin.

Walsh covered the Rhode Island State Legislature and was an editorial writer for 5 years before he transferred to the paper's Washington bureau in 1944.

On April 22, 1946, Bob Walsh joined the Washington Evening Star. On his very first day, he covered the first of many historic events, the death of Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone.

During his first 10 years on the Star, Walsh divided his time between the Supreme Court and the Capitol. And often his days would begin in the office on the rewrite desk, handling routine chores with the same cheerfulness and competence with which he approached the world-shaking events of the day.

He covered Supreme Court cases dealing with school segregation, restaurant segregation, the Rosenberg spy case and Truman's seizure of the steel mills—among others. He covered budgets, tax bills, civil rights annually. He covered the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in the Alger Hiss case.

Mr. Walsh also attended every Republican and Democratic National Convention since 1944. He has been secretary

and chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents on Capitol Hill. He has been a member of the National Press Club since first coming to Washington in 1944 and is also a member of Sigma Delta Chi and the John Carroll Society in Washington.

Mr. Walsh married the former Anne G. Murphy of Providence on September 8, 1934. They live at 2222 Q Street, Northwest.

Mrs. Albert and I extend to Bob and his lovely wife our very best wishes for a happy and enjoyable retirement. We know he will not forget his old friends on Capitol Hill and hope he will come back to see us often. We certainly shall not forget him.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although I, from Michigan, cannot claim Bob Walsh was a constituent or a person born in my district or in my State, I can appropriately claim Bob Walsh as a friend. Bob Walsh epitomized objectivity and fairness in his work in the Press Gallery. Bob Walsh was a friend to the legislative branch. He criticized us when we were wrong, but he was glowing in his praise when we were right.

All of us extend to Bob the very best in his retirement. He will be missed. We welcome him back whenever he can find time to join his friends in the Chamber or elsewhere on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader. All of us who have known Bob Walsh for many years might agree immediately upon the use of the word "objective," because Bob Walsh has been objective and fair as well as perceptive in covering the activities of this body particularly. All of us will miss him. I am glad, however, that he is in very good health, and I am sure that he, his wife, and his family will have a very happy retirement.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the service of Bob Walsh.

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

There was no objection.

#### A DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

(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, on January 23, 1966, just 3 years ago, a group of 1,500 patriotic Cubans living together in exile adopted a "Resolution of Free-

dom" at the San Carlos Club in Key West, Fla.

I have today introduced a resolution that expresses the sense of the House of Representatives—the Senate concurring—that that noble declaration should be earnestly considered by—and I hope supported by—all Cubans living in exile and all who wish to restore freedom and democratic government to the beautiful isle of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 92

Whereas on January 23, 1966, a "Declaration of Freedom" was adopted by 1,500 Cubans in exile meeting in Key West, Florida; and

Whereas this declaration was written at the San Carlos Club from which the great Cuban patriot Jose Marti in 1898 turned the course of history by proclaiming the ideological basis of a free Cuba; and

Whereas Cuba once again has fallen victim to a totalitarian regime as embodied by Castro communism; and

Whereas the "Declaration of Freedom" reads as follows:

"DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

"In the city of Key West, Monroe County, State of Florida, United States of America, we, the Cuban exiles in the United States, in the name of God Almighty, and speaking both for ourselves and the oppressed people in Cuba, the martyr island, do say:

"That on January 1, 1959, the slavery yoke that came from Europe and was extinguished in Cuba at the end of the 19th century, was resumed.

"That those responsible for this high treason to our fatherland and to our people are just a score of traitors who, usurping the government of the country have been acting as mercenary agents for the Sino-Soviet imperialism, and have surrendered to that imperialism our freedom and our dignity, also betraying the American hemisphere.

"That as a consequence of this high treason, those who are usurping the power in Cuba (as they were never elected by the people), are imposing a regime of bloodshed, terror and hate without any respect or consideration to the dignity of the human being or the most elementary human rights.

"That in their hunger for power, these traitors, following the pattern of totalitarian regimes, are trying, within Cuba, to separate the family, which is the cornerstone of actual society, and at the same time, are poisoning the minds of the Cuban children and youth, in their hope of extending the length of time for this abominable system.

"That the rule of the law has been wiped out in Cuba, and it has been replaced by the evil will of this score of traitors, who are acting under orders from their masters, the Sino-Soviet imperialists.

"In view of the foregoing, we declare:

"First, That the actual Cuban regime is guilty of high treason to our fatherland and to the ideals of the freedom revolution which was started on October 10, 1898.

"Second, that this score of traitors who have committed treason against our fatherland, in case they survive the downfall of their regime, will have to respond, even with their lives before the ordinary courts of justice of Cuba.

"Third, That as the noble Cuban people will not ever surrender, because that nation was not born to be slave, we, the Cuban people, hereby make the present declaration of freedom.

"We hereby swear before God Almighty to fight constantly, until death comes to us, to free Cuba from communism.

"The fundamentals of this resolution for freedom are:

"First. God Almighty, above all things, in whom we believe as the essence of life.

"Second. The fatherland, with all of its laws, traditions, customs, and history as a spiritual value, only surpassed by the concept of God.

"Third. The family, as the cornerstone of the human society.

"Fourth. Human rights, for each and every citizen, regardless of race or creed.

"Fifth. The law, as the foundation for the proper development of the human society.

"Sixth. Democratic government, with its three independent branches: Legislative, executive, and judicial.

"Seventh. Representative democracy through the exercise of universal suffrage, periodically, free, and secretive, as the expression of popular sovereignty.

"Eighth. Freedom of worship, freedom of teaching, freedom of the press and free enterprise.

"Ninth. Private property and ownership, as the basic expression of liberty.

"Tenth. The improvement of living conditions for both rural and city working masses, with the just and necessary measures, keeping in mind the legitimate interests of both labor and capital.

"Eleventh. The derogation and eradication of anything which is opposed to the political and religious fundamentals aforementioned, and specifically, the abolition of communism and any other form of totalitarian manifestation.

"Signed and sealed in Key West, Fla., on the 23rd day of January, 1966."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that this inspiring declaration should be patriotically considered by all Cubans in exile and by all who wish to end the tyranny of Castrolism and communism in Cuba and that the "Declaration of Freedom" should serve to unite those pledged to restoring Cuban liberty and independence, and that it should be the objective of the United States to commend and encourage recognition and respect for the declaration.

UNIFORM CREDIT CODE PROPOSES LEGALIZED USURY

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year, proposals to legalize usury will go before the legislatures of 48 of our 50 States.

Through a device known as the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, the lobbies for the banks and the small loan companies are attempting to have a maximum interest rate of 36 percent written into law. In short, the Uniform Code, if adopted, will legalize some of the highest interest rates ever imposed on the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, when this code was being drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, the American Bankers Association raised a \$75,000 fund to help finance the project. This proposed 36-percent interest rate makes it plain why the banks were so willing and so quick to pay for this project.

The proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code not only would apply a 36-percent interest rate on small loans and installment purchases, but would allow department stores and others to charge 24 percent on revolving credit. Based on the charges imposed by most major de-

partment stores today, this Uniform Consumer Credit Code would mean an immediate increase of 33 1/4 percent in the charge to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, in coming days, I will discuss other parts of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, but today I want to call attention to what I regard as the foremost evil of this proposed code—legalized usury.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this move to legalize high and usurious interest rates must be stopped. Although this Uniform Code is being proposed to the 48 legislatures which meet this year, the U.S. Congress cannot dodge its responsibility in this area.

Through the passage of the Consumer Credit Protection Act—truth in lending—the 90th Congress wrote a magnificent chapter in the protection of the consumer in the area of credit. The 91st Congress now must make sure that the gains of this act are not wiped out by such things as a legalized interest rate of 36 percent.

I am convinced that we must take a long and hard look into this so-called Uniform Code to determine fully what it means to the consumer; and what it means to the Truth in Lending Act of the 90th Congress. We should determine just how some of these provisions were drafted and we should learn what effect the bankers' \$75,000 contribution has had on this project.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN INTRODUCES BILL TO INCREASE SBA LOAN CEILINGS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill that would raise the ceiling on the amount of loans by dollar amount the Small Business Administration may have outstanding.

This bill does not provide money for SBA, but rather places a ceiling on the loans that may be made.

The bill would affect three amendments to the provisions of section 4 (c) (4) of the Small Business Act governing the amount of loans, guarantees, and other obligations or commitments which may be outstanding at any one time in the business loan and investment fund. The first of these amendments would increase from \$1,900,000,000 to \$2,200,000,000 the amount which may be outstanding from the fund at any one time under sections 7(a), 7(b) (3), 7(e), and 8(a) of this act, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The second amendment would increase from \$300,000,000 to \$500,000,000 the amount which may be outstanding at any one time under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The third amendment would increase from \$200,000,000 to \$300,000,000 the amount which may be outstanding at any one time under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The reasons for the proposed increases in the specified limitations are to be found in the legislative history of Public Law 87-550, approved July 25, 1962. The

conference report accompanying the bill (S. 2970) which became Public Law 87-550 contains the following declaration of intent:

The combined increased authorization . . . is intended to meet estimated needs for a 2-year period (fiscal 1963 and 1964) . . . The agreement of the conferees upon this increased authorization was predicated upon their belief that SBA's business loan program should be reviewed at least every 2 years. In order to assure adequate time for consideration, the estimated business loan program needs for SBA for an additional 2 years should be submitted to the new Congress when it convenes in January 1963, and this process then should be repeated as necessary every 2 years as each new Congress convenes in order to provide for an orderly and recurring review of this program by the Congress and to avoid emergency appeals by SBA for additional authorization. (H. Rept. No. 1974, 87th Cong., 2nd Sess.)

In accordance with this expression of intent, a review has been made of the probable requirements of the section 7(a) business loan program through June 30, 1972, based on a straight-line projection of fiscal year 1970 budget estimates for this program. However, the amount of the limitation applicable to this particular program—\$1,900,000,000—also limits in addition the maximum outstanding amount for displaced business loans under section 7(b)(3), trade adjustment assistance loans under section 7(e), prime contracting activities under section 8(a) and business loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Consequently, in order to determine the increased limitation amount adequate to cover the probable requirements for all of the cited activities covered by this one specific limitation, straight-line projections of the 1970 budget estimates through June 30, 1972, have also been made for the programs in addition to section 7(a) business loans, as identified above.

These projections indicate that a limitation of about \$2,090,000,000 is needed for the combined activities. In order to provide a reasonable reserve for contingencies, the limitation would be increased from \$1,900,000,000 to \$2,200,000,000.

The projected amount outstanding at June 30, 1972, for business loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as included in the figure of \$2,090,000,000 cited above, is slightly in excess of \$253,000,000. Allowing in this instance also a reserve for contingencies, the present limitation of \$200,000,000 for title IV loans would be increased to \$300,000,000.

Section 4(c)(4) provides a separate limitation of \$300,000,000 on the amount of loans, guarantees, and so forth, which may be outstanding at any one time under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958—loans to State and local development companies. The budget estimates for 1970 indicate that this limitation will have been reached prior to June 30 of that year. Accordingly, straight-line projections through June 30, 1972, of probable limitation requirements for these loans have been made also. These projections indicate a need for a limitation of \$449 million, without any provision for contingencies. Including a relatively small reserve, the

present limitation of \$300,000,000 would be increased to \$500,000,000.

Section 4(c)(4) provides an additional separate limitation of \$450,000,000 on the amount of loans, guarantees, and so forth, which may be outstanding at any

one time under title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Projections have been made of transactions for this program through June 30, 1972, also. These indicate that the current limitation is adequate.

## SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

## ESTIMATED BUSINESS LOAN AND PRIME CONTRACT LIMITATION REQUIREMENTS, FISCAL YEARS 1969-72

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget estimates		Projected	
	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972
Outstanding loans and commitments, start of year	1,321.6	1,514.9	1,781.3	1,975.8
Plus new loan approvals:				
7(a) business	444.1	578.0	578.0	578.0
Economic opportunity	59.2	82.0	82.0	82.0
Displaced business	43.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
Trade adjustment	1.2			
Total	547.5	705.0	705.0	705.0
Minus repayments and cancellations:				
7(a) business	327.1	397.1	455.0	520.0
Economic opportunity	16.6	25.7	34.1	43.0
Displaced business	10.5	15.8	21.4	27.2
Trade adjustment				
Total	354.2	438.6	510.5	590.2
Outstanding loans and commitments, end of year	1,514.9	1,781.3	1,975.8	2,090.6
Plus contingency reserve			124.2	109.4
Recommended limitation			2,100.0	2,200.0
Memorandum:				
Outstanding by program:		June 30, 1968		
7(a) business		\$1,144.8	1,261.8	1,442.7
Economic opportunity		67.4	110.0	163.3
Displaced business		104.1	136.6	165.8
Trade adjustment			1.2	1.2
Sec. 8(a) prime contracts		5.3	5.3	5.3

## ESTIMATED DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LIMITATION REQUIREMENTS, FISCAL YEARS 1969-72

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget estimates		Projected	
	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972
Outstanding loans and commitments, start of year	205.8	256.8	322.5	396.6
Plus: New loan approvals	67.0	86.0	86.0	86.0
Minus:				
Loan repayments	10.5	11.2	12.8	14.4
Cancellations	5.5	9.1	9.1	9.1
Total	16.0	20.3	21.9	23.5
Outstanding loans and commitments, end of year	256.8	322.5	396.6	449.1
Plus: Contingency reserve		27.5	38.4	50.9
Recommended limitation		350.0	425.0	500.0

## ESTIMATED INVESTMENT COMPANY LIMITATION REQUIREMENTS, FISCAL YEARS 1969-1972

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget estimates		Projected	
	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972
Outstanding loans and commitments, start of year	276.3	290	290	290
Plus new loan approvals	43.7	40	40	40
Minus repayments and cancellations	30.0	40	40	40
Outstanding loans and commitments, end of year	290.0	290	290	290
Plus contingency reserve			160	160
Recommended limitation			450	450

## BANKERS TAKE OVER THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, President

Nixon today sent forward the nomination of another banker to be a high official in his administration.

This time it was Dr. Charles Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury. Dr. Walker, of course, is the chief lobbyist for the big

banks and, as such, has supported a variety of antipublic legislation through the years.

It is becoming painfully obvious that the Nixon administration is turning the Treasury Department over to the commercial banking industry. This is in total disregard for the vital public functions that must be carried out through the Treasury Department.

First, President Nixon nominates David Kennedy, chairman of the board of the Continental-Illinois National Bank, as Secretary of the Treasury. Now he follows it with the ABA's chief spokesman, and I understand more appointments of this nature are on their way to the Senate.

When the Walker appointment was first mentioned, I protested the proposed nomination in a letter to David Kennedy. Mr. Speaker, I place in the record a copy of this letter:

JANUARY 6, 1969.

HON. DAVID M. KENNEDY,  
Secretary-designate of the Treasury, Care of  
Mr. John Whitaker, Secretary to the  
Cabinet, Office of the President-elect,  
the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Bill Timmons, a Deputy Assistant for Congressional Relations to President-Elect Nixon, has very kindly informed me of the fact that the incoming Administration has in mind nominating Dr. Charles E. Walker, Executive Vice President of the American Bankers Association, to the highly important position of Under Secretary of the Treasury. Dr. Walker, as I am sure you know, has for years directed the lobbying activities of what I consider to be, and I think the record will show, the most effective lobby in the United States. In my opinion the record will also show that seldom, if ever, has this lobby operated in the public interest. In the main, its activities as directed by Dr. Walker, have been for the sole purpose of preserving and fostering the growth and benefit of the commercial banks in the United States in general to the detriment of the public.

As Mr. Timmons was informed, it would be my duty, if presented with the opportunity, to oppose the nomination of Dr. Walker for the simple fact that, in my opinion, it would be impossible for him to divorce himself either consciously or unconsciously from his prior position as chief lobbyist for the American Bankers Association in order to carry out the job of Under Secretary of the Treasury as a public servant with the responsibility to operate exclusively in the public interest.

This nomination is, of course, entirely within the discretion of the Executive, subject to confirmation by the Senate, and while I would consider the advisability of making my views known to the Senate Committee with respect to any nominee for such a vital position, the purpose of this letter is to acknowledge and reciprocate the courtesy you have already extended to me in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD a copy of a news release which I issued earlier today on the Walker appointment:

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 23.—Chairman Wright Patman (D, Tex.) of the House Banking and Currency Committee today charged that the Nixon Administration "has consciously embarked on a campaign to turn the Treasury Department over to the nation's commercial banking industry."

Mr. Patman described the nomination of Dr. Charles E. Walker for Under-Secretary of

the Treasury as "incredible and in blatant disregard for the public interest responsibilities of the Department."

"Dr. Walker, Executive Vice-President of the American Bankers Association, has been and is today the Number One lobbyist for the nation's Number One special interest group—the commercial banking industry," Mr. Patman said. "In his role as spokesman for the nation's big banks, Dr. Walker has supported a multitude of anti-public legislation ranging from special tax favors for the banks and big corporations to attempts to gut anti-trust laws."

"Even in a Republican Administration, it seems incredible that the chief spokesman would be installed in office to regulate the very industry for whom he has lobbied. Regardless of one's feelings about the performance of the commercial banking industry, such a situation raises basic questions of ethics and public policy."

Mr. Patman said the seriousness of the Walker appointment was heightened by the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, likewise came directly from the commercial banking industry. Kennedy was the chief executive officer of the Continental-Illinois National Bank, the nation's eighth largest bank.

Mr. Patman noted that Dr. Walker had consistently supported higher interest rates including the removal of the ceiling on long-term Government bonds, and had plugged for large tax cuts for corporations and had consistently sought the imposition of discriminatory taxes on competing financial institutions such as savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. He also charged that Dr. Walker had "all but wrecked" the college student loan program through the insistence that the banks be guaranteed windfall profits from the program.

"President Nixon is now proposing that Dr. Walker be placed in a position of public trust that will allow him to implement these positions," Mr. Patman said. "The Senate should reject this nomination."

#### LET THEM KNOW ABOUT TENDERS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for adequate notice to the management of the corporations involved, in the case of certain proposed bids for corporate takeovers.

For the past several years the subject of the conglomerate merger boom has been receiving increasing attention by the press, governmental officials, business spokesmen, and security shareholders. The seemingly unrestrained nature of the boom has raised justifiable alarm in many quarters. Last year, in response to the rising apprehension, Congress took steps to protect the interests of target company shareholders in takeover cases involving cash tender offers.

It is my view that the legislation of last year could be wisely amplified so as to provide further protection to target company shareholders and, no less important, to provide some degree of protection to the management of the target company.

As things now stand in the conglomerate merger field, target company management has a reasonable opportunity to scrutinize and—if deemed necessary—defend against a takeover bid when the merger offer involves an exchange of se-

curities. Not so in the instance of a cash tender bid.

Under legislation enacted in 1968—Public Law 90-439, an act providing for full disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities—a full disclosure of intentions with regard to the company being taken over must be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. But since cash tender offers can be consummated immediately upon the filing, target company management is often given no chance to avail itself of the information provided in the disclosure statement. Target company management is actually rendered defenseless by the secrecy factor which makes cash tender takeovers so advantageous to the bidder and, conversely, so disadvantageous to management.

My bill attempts to redress the balance by providing both the offeror and management an equal opportunity to present their cases to the stockholders of the target company. Disclosure requirements, in my opinion, are very much in the interests of legitimate business and economic stability. In this bill, a period of 30 days is required between the filing of a disclosure statement involving a cash takeover offer and the actual consummation of the offer; that is, the tendering of the shares by the stockholders. A 30-day period will give management sufficient time to study the takeover proposal but—since 30 days is not of excessive duration—will not serve to impair the economic advantages of the intended merger.

#### OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND OTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the proposed salary increases for Members of Congress, as well as for top officials of both the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government. I strongly opposed and voted against the pay increase bill of 1967 which created the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries and which said Commission recommended the salary adjustments. I do not feel that salary increases are economically feasible at this time due to the heavy national debt, and, in addition, I do not believe this is the proper way for Congress to consider salary measures. This should be done through the regular legislative process. Congress should not be given a 30-day time limit to consider a proposal of this importance. Furthermore, the proposal was presented to Congress before the committees had had time to organize.

I am told that the salary recommendations of the Commission will cost the Federal Government an additional \$34 million each fiscal year. I cannot in good faith to myself and to my constituents, State and country support a measure that will add \$34 million to our already



astronomical national debt. Had my votes in the House prevailed through the years, the national budget would be balanced at the present time or at least the Federal debt would be much smaller. Unfortunately, this has not been the case. Therefore, I rise in support of the resolutions that have been introduced in the House of Representatives disapproving the recommendations of the Commission.

According to information I have been furnished, the interest on the national debt in fiscal 1970 will be \$16 billion, an unbelievable figure. Charity should begin at home—economy in the Congress.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today H.R. 4129, the Federal Maritime Act of 1969. This bill, which amends title II of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, is similar to the one in the 90th Congress which was favorably reported with amendments by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and passed both the House and Senate but was not signed into law.

This bill would take the Federal Maritime Administration out of the Department of Commerce and set it up as an independent Federal maritime agency.

The past history of the maritime industry indicates that the American merchant marine has done better when its affairs were handled by an independent agency than when delegated to a department not primarily concerned with its well-being.

From 1936 to 1950, maritime affairs were in the hands of the U.S. Maritime Commission. During this period the merchant marine enjoyed a period of strength, both in terms of the number of ships in the fleet, and in terms of the percentage of our national cargoes carried by these ships.

The percentage of total U.S. cargoes carried by ships flying the American flag during the prewar years of 1937-40 rose from 26.5 to 30.5 percent. The figure stood at 42.5 percent in 1950 when the existence of the Independent Maritime Commission was ended and its functions transferred to the Department of Commerce.

Since the Maritime Commission lost its independence two decades ago, we have seen the virtual disappearance of U.S. shipping in coastal trade. We have seen the decline in passenger trade as a result of tremendous strides in aviation. We have seen bulk cargo emerge as an increasingly important element of our foreign commerce, but we have seen at the same time, the device of "runaway flag" cut sharply into our share of that commerce. We have seen during this period, a surge in our foreign commerce not matched by an equal surge in our merchant fleet. We carry only 8 percent of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States.

We have stood by and watched the United States drop from first position as a merchant maritime power to sixth place. We rank a tired 15th as a merchant shipbuilding nation. The U.S. Maritime Administration reports that as of January 1, 1969, the U.S.S.R. had 12 passenger ships either on order or under construction. The United States had no passenger ships on order or under construction.

The net result is that while the world merchant fleet has increased slightly more than 60 percent in the last 15 years, the fleet flying under the American flag has decreased by slightly more than 24 percent.

Today, the privately owned American merchant marine consists of about only 900 ships, and about three-quarters of these are 20 years of age, or older. In addition, only about 10 percent of these 900 ships have a speed of 20 knots or more. This is a record of neglect.

I do not want to dwell on the past—I am more interested in the future; I am more concerned about the next decades of merchant marine history.

The maritime industry is vital to our national economy in terms of high employment and a healthy balance of payments. It is of equal importance to our national defense and the success of our foreign policy. We must start now to develop a national maritime policy which will build modern and competitive ships in American shipyards, to be registered under the American flag, and to be sailed by American seamen. I believe such a policy of rebuilding our maritime industry can best be developed and administered by a strong, independent agency—one which is not subordinate to any other department of the Government.

#### REDUCTION OF FEDERAL SPENDING

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, last year conservative Republicans and conservative Democrats, including myself, made a genuine and earnest effort to invoke some economies in Government and to reduce the Federal budget. I was among those who voted for every amendment, except one, to reduce Federal spending. And I voted against this because I felt it was without merit.

I had high hopes this spirit of economy would carry over into this session of the Congress. My hopes were leveled considerably this morning when I read a statement made yesterday by our Secretary of the Treasury. After taking the oath of his office, he issued a statement to the effect that it would be "very difficult to cut the budget substantially," and of course, he was speaking of the budget of the outgoing administration as submitted by the then President Johnson.

With all deference, I just do not understand how it is possible for the new Secretary of the Treasury to have determined so quickly that the Johnson budget was so tight and not amenable to substantial reductions. Unless he is a most remarkable person, he just could

not have examined this near \$200 billion budget close enough in this short period of time and determined for a certainty that it is so tight that it is not subject to substantial cuts.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the conservative bloc, made up of Republicans and Democrats, will be as dedicated and aggressive during this Congress and during this administration to reduce Federal spending as it was last year during the Johnson administration.

Please, at least let us wait and see what we can do before we start saying "can't."

#### NATIONAL PREFERENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution designed to amend the Constitution in order to provide for a national preferential primary election to select candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency.

Additionally, the amendment would provide for a popular vote election of the President and Vice President.

Much has been said concerning the need for reform and change in our current electoral college system. What better way for a democracy to respond to the will of the people than by the adoption of a direct election system?

The legislation is being cosponsored by eight of my colleagues from the State of California: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. WILSON. I know they join me in urging this body to consider legislation in this area at the earliest possible time.

#### RESOLUTION ON BIAFRA

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with 103 other Members in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 97, a bill aimed at helping to alleviate the starvation and suffering brought about by the Nigerian-Biafran war.

The large number of cosponsors is a clear indication, I think, that there is strong support in Congress for expanding American relief efforts to this beleaguered area of Africa. The support is bipartisan; joining me in obtaining cosponsors has been the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Morse). Similar bipartisan sponsorship is being obtained for a Senate resolution.

In brief, the resolution makes two proposals: First, for the administration to increase significantly the amount of food, money, and nonmilitary transportation vehicles needed for relief; and second, to seek international cooperation in the humanitarian effort.

The words "humanitarian effort" are especially significant, Mr. Speaker, be-

cause this resolution has been drafted only for the purpose of fulfilling our humanitarian obligations while avoiding military and political involvement. The conflict is complex and dangerous. Several other major powers already are supporting one side or the other militarily. The United States has, wisely in my opinion, avoided military assistance to either side, and should continue to follow this policy.

However, a clear distinction must be made between the political and military aspects of the situation, on one hand, and the humanitarian aspects, on the other. As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Morse) and I pointed out in our letter to Members of the House, the United States has provided more than \$22 million and eight aircraft to the relief agencies so far. With only 200 tons a day reaching a people whose minimum relief needs are estimated at 2,000 tons a day, it is obvious that much more must be done. The relief we are proposing would be furnished to the relief agencies operating in the area with the consent of Nigerian and Biafran authorities.

Apart from the rightness or wrongness of either side in the conflict, Mr. Speaker, our Nation should be doing all that it can to prevent the already appalling starvation in Nigeria-Biafra from becoming one of the major disasters of our time. Millions of lives are at stake.

The text of Concurrent Resolution 97 follows:

Whereas reliable reports indicate that there is a tragic loss of life in the Nigerian Civil War caused by starvation and disease in areas controlled by the Federal Government and under the control of the "Biafran" authorities;

Whereas present relief operations are inhibited by poor roads, bad weather, inadequate transport, and the inaccessibility of certain areas to overland supplies; and

Whereas increased shipments of food and medical supplies are needed to reduce the tragic rate of starvation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the President should act to increase significantly the amount of surplus food stocks, relief monies, noncombat aircraft, and such other vehicles of transportation as may be necessary for relief purposes; and this relief assistance should be made available to and at the request of the Organization of African Unity, UNICEF, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and such other suitable religious and charitable relief agencies now or hereafter operating in the area with the consent of the responsible authorities; and (2) the Government of the United States should solicit the cooperation of other nations in this humanitarian effort.

Following are the cosponsors:

BROCK ADAMS, of Washington.  
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, of New York.  
JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois.  
LESLIE C. ARENS, of Illinois.  
THOMAS L. ASHLEY, of Ohio.  
EDWARD G. BIESTER, Jr., of Pennsylvania.  
JONATHAN M. BINGHAM, of New York.  
JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota.  
EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts.  
RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri.  
JOHN BRADAMAS, of Indiana.  
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.  
GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr., of California.  
JOHN BUCHANAN, of Alabama.

PHILLIP BURTON, of California.  
DANIEL E. BUTTON, of New York.  
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, of New York.  
BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr., of New York.  
SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts.  
JOHN CONYERS, Jr., of Michigan.  
JAMES C. CORMAN, of California.  
JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa.  
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, of New Jersey.  
HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts.  
JOHN J. DUNCAN, of Tennessee.  
DON EDWARDS, of California.  
MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan.  
DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida.  
HAMILTON FISH, Jr., of New York.  
THOMAS S. FOLEY, of Washington.  
DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota.  
PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., of New Jersey.

RICHARD FULTON, of Tennessee.  
ROBERT N. GAIMO, of Connecticut.  
JACOB H. GILBERT, of New York.  
WILLIAM J. GREEN, of Pennsylvania.  
GILBERT GUDE, of Maryland.  
SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York.  
LEE H. HAMILTON, of Indiana.  
JAMES M. HANLEY, of New York.  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, of Washington.  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, of Maine.  
KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia.  
MARGARET M. HECKLER, of Massachusetts.

FLOYD V. HICKS, of Washington.  
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, of Maryland.  
FRANK J. HORTON, of New York.  
ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., of Indiana.  
HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California.  
JOSEPH E. KARTH, of Minnesota.  
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin.  
HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts.  
EDWARD I. KOCH, of New York.  
DONALD E. LUKENS, of Ohio.

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr., of California.  
JOSEPH M. McDADE, of Pennsylvania.  
MARTIN B. McKNALLY, of New York.  
CATHERINE MAY, of Washington.  
THOMAS J. MESKILL, of Connecticut.  
ABNER J. MIKVA, of Illinois.  
JOSEPH G. MINISH, of New Jersey.  
PATSY T. MINK, of Hawaii.  
CHESTER L. MIZE, of Kansas.  
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania.  
BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts.  
CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.  
WILLIAM T. MURPHY, of Illinois.  
LUCIEN N. NEDZI, of Michigan.  
JAMES G. O'HARA, of Michigan.  
THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., of Massachusetts.

RICHARD L. OTTINGER, of New York.  
CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.  
BERTRAM L. PODELL, of New York.  
TOM RAILSBACK, of Illinois.  
THOMAS M. REES, of California.  
OGDEN R. REID, of New York.  
HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin.  
HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York.  
PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey.  
FRED B. ROONEY, of Pennsylvania.  
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York.  
PHILIP E. RUPPE, of Michigan.  
WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York.  
FERNAND ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island.  
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania.

FRED SCHWENGL, of Iowa.  
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont.  
WILLIAM J. STANTON, of Ohio.  
LOUIS STOKES, of Ohio.  
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., of Ohio.  
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California.

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey.  
ROBERT O. TIERNAN, of Rhode Island.  
JOHN V. TUNNEY, of California.  
MORRIS K. UDALL, of Arizona.  
CHARLES A. VANIK, of Ohio.  
JEROME R. WALDIE, of California.  
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., of Connecticut.  
G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, of Virginia.  
LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, of Pennsylvania.  
CHARLES H. WILSON, of California.  
LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York.  
JOHN W. WYDLER, of New York.  
SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois.

#### BIAFRA

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining over 100 other Members of the House in introducing a concurrent resolution calling upon the President to increase significantly the amount of surplus food stocks and relief monies to Biafra, as well as the number of airplanes and other vehicles of transportation, to several nonpartisan relief agencies which are presently operating in the area of the conflict. The resolution also urges that the Government of the United States solicit the cooperation of other nations in this humanitarian effort.

During the past several months conditions in Biafra have grown progressively worse. According to statistics released by the International Red Cross, about 12,000 persons in Biafran-controlled regions and about 4,000 in federally controlled areas are starving to death each day. Estimates for the total number of deaths attributable to starvation now range from 1.5 to 2 million people. Each month almost 500,000 people die for lack of adequate nutrition. The horror of these statistics makes clear the gravity of the present situation.

The lack of decisive action by the executive branch in dealing with this critical situation makes it imperative that Congress make its feelings clear to the President. To this date, the United States has provided \$20 million and eight aircraft to relief agencies. This aid, according to State Department figures, provides about 100 tons of supplies a day. But the minimum relief needs of the people in this area have been estimated at 3,000 to 6,000 tons per day. The United States can and must do more.

We cannot wait for matters to resolve themselves. Conscience demands that the United States take those steps authorized in our resolution to provide relief to the millions of Biafrans suffering from malnutrition and disease. This relief should include food, medical supplies, and the transportation vehicles necessary to carry out adequate relief programs.

I recognize the complexity of the issues at stake in this conflict. But the humanitarian questions involved demand that immediate steps be taken to rescue millions of people from starvation.

#### TRIBUTE TO APOLLO 8 CREW

(Mr. BURLISON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments and auspicious characteristics of our Apollo 8 crew have sundry ramifications. One of these is vividly illustrated by a letter written by the pastor and certain members of the congregation of the Lebanon Baptist Church. A number of these church members live in my district. I insert the letter and names of its subscribers at this point in the RECORD:

Members and friends of the Lebanon Baptist Church would like to take this opportunity to commend Air Force Col. Frank Borman, Navy Capt. James A. Lovell, Jr. and Air Force Lt. Col. William A. Anders on their recent moon flight. We especially commend Navy Capt. James A. Lovell, Jr. for the very appropriate scripture passages read from the Bible.

Our Church would like to express our appreciation for men of these positions who pray and read scripture voluntarily and of their own free will. There should be more commendations for this rather than criticism.

Mrs. Oliver E. Hayes, Mrs. Ora Parker, Mrs. Mary Pribble, Mrs. Betty Allen, Elbert R. Yarbrough, Sylvester Darby, Mrs. Bess Darby, Mrs. Maxine Spence, Glen Spence, Mrs. Lola Yarbrough, Paul D. McCrorey, Elmer Steffan, Mrs. Mary Steffan, Mrs. Delores McConn, Jeny R. Wiles, Mr. and Mrs. Ray Wiles, Rev. Bill McConn, Aline Myers.

#### REAR ADM. RICHARD EVELYN BYRD ENSHRINED IN AVIATION HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd is the last of what is known as the romantic age of exploration, at least as far as our own planet is concerned.

His great expeditions included the first successful flights over the North Pole on May 9, 1926, and the South Pole on November 29, 1929.

To explorers themselves, he was known as a triple-threat explorer. More to the point he conceived his expeditions and used his tremendous organizational skill and energies to finance and build them. Third, he was the leader in the field.

Perhaps the principal reason for his success was his ability to maintain a perfect blend between his creative visionary nature with his scientific practical nature. Of equal importance was his well-known ability to motivate and lead men. It has been said few, if any men had greater powers of concentration. Admiral Byrd has been known to say:

We don't take chances, we do take calculated risks.

Preparation was the keystone to his astounding success.

Explorers who have accompanied Admiral Byrd have said:

No man ever penetrated the Arctic and Antarctic who inspired greater confidence and dedication on the part of his men than did this gallant naval officer.

A cardinal principle of the admiral was

his constant concern for the safety and welfare of his men.

His expeditions are of lasting importance because the flights over the poles were only part of his objectives and accomplishments. His explorations contributed enormously to our knowledge of flight and of the scientific nature of our planet earth and the elements which control it.

His life will forever inspire men to lofty goals and his courage, character, and integrity will always strengthen men in their search for knowledge.

As is known to many, Admiral Byrd was the illustrious brother of Virginia's beloved late Senator Harry F. Byrd, and uncle of the now senior Senator from Virginia, Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am confident, therefore, that Members of Congress, as well as many others, will be interested in the following account of an additional honor recently bestowed upon Admiral Byrd.

On Tuesday, December 17, 1968, Admiral Byrd was enshrined in the Aviation Hall of Fame. Impressive enshrinement ceremonies were conducted at the Sheraton-Dayton Hotel, in Dayton, Ohio, during which Vice Adm. Thomas F. Connolly, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Air, made the following address:

On behalf of the men and officers of the United States Navy, who valiantly serve this Nation on the sea and in the air, I am personally honored tonight to attend these ceremonies of Aviation's Hall of Fame and particularly to present the achievements of one of America's most distinguished flying explorers and the fifth Naval Aviator to be enshrined by this distinguished body.

Born in Winchester, Virginia, just eighty years ago, his early youth, and in fact his whole life, was filled with a great love of adventure and exploration. Even at the tender age of twelve, he begged his mother so insistently that she consented to his making a trip around the world all by himself. She had thought that after a few days he would become homesick and return. But she was wrong, for he was an adventurous lad and worked his way to the Philippines aboard a steamer. Then he traveled from one Asiatic port city to another, absorbing all that he could before he returned home, three years later.

After entering the United States Naval Academy in 1908, he became greatly interested in the epic tales of Arctic exploration and decided that he would be the one to discover the North Pole. But after Admiral Robert E. Peary's discovery of the Pole in 1909, after spending 23 years in the quest, he then resolved to be the second man to explore that vast uncharted region.

While a Midshipman at the Academy, he distinguished himself in scholastics and athletics. Upon graduation in 1912, he was commissioned an ensign and assigned to battleship duty. While serving aboard the battleship Washington, he twice rescued a man from drowning and received Letters of Commendation from the Secretary of the Navy, and Silver Life Savings Medals from the Treasury Department.

When the United States declared war on Germany in 1917, he helped organize the Navy's Commission on Training Camps. But such service was too confining and before long he secured a transfer to aviation training at Pensacola, Florida. A few months after he was designated Naval Aviator No. 608, he became the Commanding Officer of the U.S. Naval Aviation Forces in Canada, with two stations in Nova Scotia serving as operating bases for Navy seaplanes on sub-

marine patrol over the sea approaches to the North Atlantic.

After the Armistice, he helped the Navy plan the first flight across the Atlantic. While he did not participate in the flight directly, he helped solve the many navigational problems and invented an improved sextant with a bubble level so that the navigators could take celestial sightings without having to also see the horizon. For this, he received a Letter of Commendation. Participating in the historic venture were Commander John Henry Towers and Lieutenant Commander Albert Cushing Read, both enshrines in Aviation's Hall of Fame. The NC-4 flying boat, under Read's command, completed the epic flight across the Atlantic to Portugal, via the Azores, in May, 1919.

In the early 1920's, our distinguished pioneer went to England to take charge of the new dirigible, the ZR-2, being built there for our Navy. He arrived just after the huge dirigible had taken off on its maiden flight. Disappointed at first, he was suddenly stunned when the news was flashed that the ZR-2 had exploded in mid-air and all but one of the crew were killed.

After completing advanced studies in aerial navigation in England, Admiral Moffett asked him to help plan a flight by the Navy's dirigible, the "Shenandoah," from Alaska over the North Pole to the island of Spitzbergen. It was a fantastic personal challenge, but unfortunately President Coolidge canceled the project.

Now his interest in the Arctic was fully reawakened and he began planning a flight of his own over the North Pole. But before he could complete his plans, the Navy placed him in command of an eight-man Naval Aviation Arctic Unit that was to accompany a privately sponsored expedition to explore the sea and air approaches to the North Pole.

Let us turn now to the filmed story of the adventures that followed. (Eight minute film was then shown.)

When World War II broke upon the Nation, he was called to active duty and took part in special missions in the Pacific and European Theaters. He carried out these important and exciting missions with untiring energy, unusual foresight and a high order of professional ability, for which he received a Letter of Commendation With Ribbon from the Secretary of the Navy, as well as the Legion of Merit with a Gold Star.

With the war behind him, he helped the Navy plan "Operation Highjump," a massive expedition to Antarctica involving 4,000 men, 13 ships, numerous aircraft, and even an aircraft carrier and two aircraft tenders. The expedition operated in three separate groups and their explorations encircled the entire continent. A vast number of photographs documenting the nature of Antarctica and a great wealth of data in a number of scientific fields were obtained. He again flew over the South Pole, unseen since his flight over it in 1929, and dropped the United Nations flag at the site. "Operation Highjump" was a challenging project for him to lead and our Navy personnel received invaluable training and our ships underwent rigorous cold weather testing. Also, the political task of consolidating and extending our sovereignty over the largest practical area of the Antarctic Continent was completed.

In the years that followed, he became the founding chairman of the Iron Curtain Refugee Committee of the International Rescue Committee, assisting escapees from communist tyranny. He also was co-chairman of Operation Brotherhood, giving assistance to the anti-communist government of South Vietnam. Both of these activities were highly commended by the President and Department of State.

In 1955 he headed a new Antarctic expedition, "Operation Deep Freeze," and was in

charge of the United States Antarctic Programs, reporting and making recommendations to the Secretary of Defense on all political, scientific, legislative, and all operational activities pertaining to our Nation's interests. He arrived in Antarctica in December, 1955, and established two bases in preparation for our participation in the International Geophysical Year 1957-1959. Before he returned home in 1956, much new territory had been explored by air and the Navy Task Force had arrived to carry out additional explorations.

In recognition of his very great achievements and many contributions to polar science and geographic explorations, as well as his humanitarian contributions to the world, the Secretary of Defense awarded him the Medal of Freedom in 1957.

Thus came to an end an active career of unparalleled experiences in the last remaining unconquered regions of our world. His was a unique contribution to international scientific understanding and good will, consistent with promoting our Nation's interests in both polar regions. His was a lifetime of service which encompassed unequalled exploits of skill and daring in the air, including flights across the North and South Poles and five historic expeditions to Antarctica. His was a service in the highest traditions of a naval officer and of a citizen of our great Nation. His legacy to all of the peoples of the world will be remembered as long as man has the individual will to challenge the unknown—and the personal spirit to extend his pioneering deeds in the air—and now into space.

Rise now in his honor as we enshrine Rear Admiral Richard Evelyn Byrd into Aviation's Hall of Fame. (Portrait of Admiral Byrd was then unveiled, followed by presentation of Award Plaque.)

Ladies and Gentlemen, here to accept this honor on Admiral Byrd's behalf is his daughter, Mrs. William A. Clarke, Jr. of Southmore, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, following the introduction by Vice Admiral Connolly, a brief response, on behalf of her mother and her brother and sisters, was made by Mrs. Clarke.

#### TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER McCORMACK

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include an editorial.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Florence Times-Tri-Cities Daily, published in Florence, Ala., has printed an editorial commenting on the election of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The editor, Mr. Louis Eckl, has long been an astute observer of Government affairs and a positive force for proper development of northwest Alabama and surrounding regions.

I want to include the editorial in my remarks at this point so that all of my colleagues can share its thoughts:

#### HOUSE RETAINS TVA FRIEND

A staunch friend of TVA, John W. McCormack of Massachusetts, has been re-elected Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Throughout his long service in the Congress, Speaker McCormack has been unflinching in his support for water resources development in this and other sections of the nation.

Although a city dweller, he understands the farm problems of an area like North Alabama. He is aware of the interdependence of the various sections of the country. He

supports the people who walk behind the plows and drive the tractors to produce the food and fiber for the increasing urban population.

It is said that Speaker McCormack is patient, tolerant, and considerate of all the Members of the Congress. He is acquainted with the needs of all the people of this nation and alert to the nuances of the problems involved in their solution.

All these factors make of him a great parliamentarian. But probably more important to us is his willingness to receive Members of Congress to discuss legislation—its progress and its hopes. Speaker McCormack is a man who is not given to impulsive and hasty action. All his moves are marked by high purpose.

He is among the most devout of Catholics, yet he has always maintained a Protestant as Chaplain in the House of Representatives.

Our own Congressman Bob Jones has remarked: "We have a great patriot and noble legislator in Speaker McCormack. He has an understanding and compassion for our problems of the South."

#### ACTION URGED TO END BIAFRAN CRISIS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues who are urging further action upon our country with respect to what it should do in Biafra. We are facing there a situation which is no less than genocide, and one which warrants our sending, not military aid, but food, medical assistance, and joining with other countries which wish to assist in preventing further deaths.

I do not intend to pass judgment on the political morality of the civil war. For this internal problem, a settlement must be reached between the parties immediately concerned. Unilateral involvement by the United States could only serve as the vehicle for another Vietnam—a situation we clearly do not want to create again.

My concern is not for the political nor for the military. My distress is for the moral and the humanitarian.

The stark facts are almost beyond full comprehension: An estimated 2 million have died of starvation. The remaining Biafran population of 4 to 6 million face daily the problem of famine. The dimensions of this tragedy cannot easily be judged in this day of mass measurement. The holocaust can only be compared to the genocide in Germany when 6 million Jews were slaughtered and the genocide in Armenia, when 1 million Armenians were destroyed by the Turks.

How long can we stand aside while judgments are sought as to the efficacy of action? How much guilt can humanity bear until we are moved to help?

The U.S. Government has provided some \$22.5 million in relief assistance of surplus food, medical supplies, and technical equipment to the International Red Cross and the Joint Church Aid Group. Some 2 to 2½ million Biafrans are receiving relief through the airlift operations of these organizations. The Red Cross is feeding another million in Nigeria. Since the terrible famine of last fall, the death rate has decreased somewhat with the harvest and the improved

airlift operation, but February through April will be another crisis period of famine.

About two and a half weeks ago I had the pleasure and privilege of joining with the junior and senior Senators from New York and the Archbishop of New York, Archbishop Cooke, and Mrs. Nixon, on the steps of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, to urge further assistance. Food and medical supplies were gathered on this day of public giving to load on the Biafra Christmas ship.

Food and transportation facilities are badly needed to combat further starvation. However, the events of recent weeks, with the limits imposed by the Guinean Government on flights, have severely hampered airlift operations. The International Red Cross has not been able to fly into Biafra for the last 10 days. Food is being used by both sides for political purposes, and its supply is tied in to the questions of the civil war.

Disaster of this magnitude transcends the political boundaries of either Nigeria or Biafra. Through the offices of the United Nations, we must with other nations bring pressure to bear and terminate the fighting to allow shipments of food and other badly needed supplies.

Vast numbers of human lives are hanging in the balance, dependent in large measure on pressures and actions beyond their control. The situation demands action, and time is of the essence.

#### THE FUTURE OF U.S. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY—IV

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week, on January 15, 16, and 17, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information relating to a recent report of my subcommittee—the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—entitled "The Future of United States Public Diplomacy."

On the first day, I described the purpose of our report and inserted in the RECORD its findings and recommendations.

On the second day, I listed the names of some 80 distinguished Americans—leaders of business and industry, executives of foundations and voluntary organizations, and academic specialists—who endorsed our subcommittee's call for a thorough review of our Government's overseas information programs.

On the third day, I quoted some of those leaders' reactions to our report—reactions which stressed the timeliness of our findings and the importance of our recommendations for a more effective implementation of our Nation's foreign policy.

Today I should like to place in the RECORD a few articles from American newspapers, commenting on the issues discussed in our report, and on its findings and recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, the proper handling of information activities—at home and abroad—by our Government, is of deep

concern to all thinking Americans. Our Government should be one of the strongest champions of freedom of information. At the same time, it should adapt its methodology—its information policies and programs—to the realities of our day: realities which are shaped largely by the ongoing revolution in communication technology.

We feel, and many persons in this country and abroad agree, that our Government has not responded fully and effectively to the challenge and the opportunity brought to us by the communication revolution.

It is for this reason that we have urged, and continue to urge, a thorough, systematic overhaul of our overseas information activities by a competent, high-ranking body appointed for that purpose by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the articles which I mentioned follow:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 22, 1968]

**U.S. IMAGE TERMED AT A 50-YEAR LOW**  
WASHINGTON, D.C.—World attitudes toward the United States are at a 50 year low, with many foreigners considering it "a violent, lawless, overbearing, even a sick society," a congressional subcommittee reported Saturday.

Even so, the nation still enjoys wide global popularity, the report of the house foreign affairs subcommittee added. It gathered testimony from experts in compiling the study.

The panel, headed by Rep. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), said there was general agreement that the United States must push harder to set its domestic house in order.

"People abroad judge us on the basis of what we do rather than of what we say," is declared.

Basically, the report said, the United States needs a "propaganda of action"—maintenance of civil order, effective gun control legislation, "a serious attempt to persuade the mass media to stop making violence attractive."

The subcommittee also called for "a thorough, systematic reappraisal of the entire information policy of the United States government . . . preferably by a bipartisan commission of outstanding national leaders and experts in communication and in the social sciences."

#### GREATEST IMPACT

The Vietnam war has had the greatest impact on public opinion abroad, the subcommittee said, but the race problem, crime and lawlessness also contributed heavily and the most devastating impact . . . came from the assassinations of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The report said: "Overseas opinion surveys indicated widespread misunderstanding and confusion about our purpose in Vietnam—and that United States actions in that country are strongly, at times passionately, disliked."

Such attitudes are found in countries which depend on the United States for protection against Communist aggression, the report continued. It cited polls in four western European countries that favored United States withdrawal from Vietnam even at the cost of a possible Communist takeover.

The next most important factor in worsening the American image, the report said, was race relations.

"Foreign observers who looked upon the Americans as friendly, generous, open-minded and progressive people, were profoundly shocked by the exposure of the conditions in American urban ghettos, by the massive Negro riots of the last three years,

and by the specter of continuing racial conflicts in this country," it said.

The condemnation of crime and lawlessness in America derived, in part, the subcommittee said, from "other people's stereotyped conception of our national characteristics; from American movies, radio and television, and from violence in our streets."

In spite of the slump in international esteem, the report said:

"The United States has been and probably still remains the most popular major power in the history of the world, particularly when compared to foreign public attitudes toward the Soviet Union and Red China."

It said polls showed respect for the strength and technical accomplishments of this country, its intellectual and artistic achievements and the steadfastness of its foreign policy. Pollsters were told that foreigners would rather side with the United States than any other world power.

"According to polls cited in this document," the report went on, "the things which other free nations admire most about the United States are this country's generous idealism, willingness to help acceptance of the burdens of world power and desire to do good to others."

Foreign aid and the peace corps showed up as big contributors to a positive image.

The report summed up: "Ambivalence appears to be the keynote of popular attitudes toward the United States; we are both loved and hated, admired and envied, resented and emulated, rebelled against and followed."

Witnesses generally agreed that "the United States information agency is urgently in need of new directions, new dimensions, new duties and new emphases." The report continued:

"It is astonishing in some respects how little the United States government has done over the years to adjust its overseas information policy and operations to the new realities in international relations, realities fashioned largely by the ongoing revolution in communication technology."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 22, 1968]

#### U.S. IMAGE CALLED DIMMER (By Edmond LeBreton)

World attitudes toward the United States are at a 50-year low, with many foreigners considering it "a violent, lawless, overbearing, even a sick society," a congressional subcommittee reported yesterday.

Even so, the nation still enjoys wide global popularity, the report added.

A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee summed up views of witnesses in these terms. It said also there was general agreement the United States must push harder to set its domestic house in order; "People abroad judge us on the basis of what we do rather than of what we say."

#### CALLS FOR REAPPRAISAL

But the subcommittee, on its own, called for "a thorough, systematic reappraisal of the entire information policy of the U.S. government . . . preferably by a bipartisan commission of outstanding national leaders and experts in communication and in the social sciences."

Subcommittee Chairman Dante B. Fascell, D-Fla., said more than 40 leaders in communications, commerce, industry, foundations and educational institutions, who were shown advance copies of the report, endorsed the idea of a bipartisan commission—which would be appointed by President-elect Richard M. Nixon to review U.S. overseas information programs.

#### CONFUSION ON WAR

The subcommittee said it found that the Vietnam war has had the greatest impact on public opinion abroad, but the race problem and crime and lawlessness also contrib-

uted heavily and "the most devastating impact . . . came from the assassinations of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King."

The report said "Overseas opinion surveys indicate widespread misunderstanding and confusion about our purpose in Vietnam—and that U.S. actions in that country are strongly, at times passionately, disliked."

The next most important factor in worsening the American image, the report said, was race relations:

"Foreign observers who looked upon the Americans as friendly, generous, open-minded and progressive people, were profoundly shocked by the exposure of the conditions in American urban ghettos, by the massive Negro riots of the past three years, and by the specter of continuing racial conflicts in this country."

In spite of the slump in international esteem, the report said, "The United States has been and probably still remains the most popular major power in the history of the world, particularly when compared to foreign public attitudes toward the Soviet Union and Red China."

It said polls showed respect for the strength and technical accomplishments of this country, its intellectual and artistic achievements and the steadfastness of its foreign policy. Pollsters were told people would rather side with the United States than any other world power.

"According to polls cited in this document," the report said: "the things which other free nations admire most about our United States are this country's generous idealism, willingness to help, acceptance of the burdens of world power and desire to do good to others."

Foreign aid and the Peace Corps showed up as big contributors to a positive image.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 22, 1968]

**U.S. IMAGE ABROAD HIT BY HOUSE PANEL**  
WASHINGTON, December 21.—A Congressional panel expressed concern today over America's deteriorating image overseas, and supported more Government action to combat racial and other domestic problems.

A report by a foreign affairs subcommittee of the House of Representatives also urged a bipartisan committee be set up to reappraise thoroughly and systematically United States Government information programs.

The recommendations were made in a report entitled "Winning the Cold War: the U.S. Ideological Offensive" by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.

The panel held hearings in July during which a number of public opinion poll experts testified that the United States image overseas had deteriorated largely because of race and other problems at home and the involvement in the war in Vietnam.

The report said the United States should "accept the fact that foreign policy begins with domestic conduct."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 31, 1968]

#### U.S. IMAGE STUDIED

WASHINGTON.—A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee—reporting America's image abroad at a 50-year low—has called for a systematic reappraisal of the government's entire information policy.

Many foreigners consider this country "a violent, lawless, overbearing, even a sick society," said a subcommittee report, even though America still enjoys wide global popularity.

The report said opinion surveys overseas showed United States Vietnam actions often confuse and sometimes repel many foreigners, that race and crime problems shock them, and that "the most devastating impact" came from the assassinations of Sen. Robert F.

Kennedy and the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The subcommittee proposed reappraisal of United States information policy by a bipartisan commission of experts and suggested among other things more personal contact abroad and better training of United States information personnel.

[From Broadcasting, Jan. 6, 1969]

STANTON BACKS REPORT USING REVIEW OF USIA

CBS Inc. President Frank Stanton is one of 56 national business, foundation and education leaders who last week endorsed a congressional recommendation to reappraise the U.S. Information Agency (Broadcasting, April 1, 1968).

The recommendation emanated from the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, headed by Representative Daniel B. Fessell (D-Fla.). It was embodied in a report on "The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy" released December 22 by the subcommittee.

The 175-page report calls attention to the recent deterioration of the "U.S. image abroad" and suggests that a thorough reappraisal of U.S. overseas information programs would be the logical first step in any effective remedy for that situation.

Dr. Stanton said of the report: "Your draft report is a most comprehensive document, and a truly amazing record to have been compiled in so short a time. I concur not only readily but eagerly to the conclusions set forth and hope they gain widespread currency among those who must deal with our country's public diplomacy in the future." Dr. Stanton is head of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

APPRECIATION FOR SERVICES OF CAPITOL EMPLOYEES IN CONNECTION WITH INAUGURATION DAY

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this inauguration drew one of the largest crowds ever to assemble in Washington. In my 29 years it was the largest crowd I have seen at an inauguration.

As a consequence, there were many hundreds of thousands of visitors and many functions being carried on on Capitol Hill. I asked the Superintendent of Restaurants just to find out what was done.

I think a word of appreciation should be extended to those employees who took care of the requests of Democrats as well as Republicans. In the Cannon Building there were 30 special services in offices, in Longworth there were 35, and in Rayburn there were 37 special services, as well as two banquets catered in Rayburn Building, and six special functions in the Capitol, all of which required many thousands of extra hours of service. Some of the employees worked all day Sunday and Sunday night, and they did an outstanding job. The Superintendent of the buildings did so also.

I, for one, and on behalf of Members, if they will permit me, extend a word of thanks to these people.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a letter which I received from the assistant manager of the House restaurant:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
RESTAURANTS, U.S. CAPITOL,  
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1969.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: In reference to our conversation this morning, we performed the following special services for the Congressmen on Inauguration Day:

C.H.O.B.	29 Room Service.
L.H.O.B.	35 Room Service.
R.H.O.B.	37 Room Service.
Rayburn Catering	2 Banquets.
Capitol	6 Special Functions requiring help in serving.

All of this service would not have been possible without planning and foresight of our very able and dedicated General Manager, Mr. Kermit A. Cowan. One of the most important steps in preparing for the inauguration was the printed rules and instructions sent to each Member concerning items we were preparing and delivering to the offices. Also, without the full cooperation and hard work of the management and employees of each unit, none of the above would have been possible. Many long hours have been put in by all concerned in the past week preparing for this important event.

Another person who was very cooperative and showed much interest in seeing that Members and guests were well taken care of was Mr. Ridgell. He was very nice to loan us some of his help to use in delivering and cleaning up.

We also owe thanks to the Superior Coffee Company who flew in 28 coffee urns and Standard Brand Coffee who loaned us 10 coffee urns. A very special thanks to Mr. Ray Turek of Standard Brand Coffee who spent 7-8 hours of his own time in making coffee for us.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. DAMM,  
Assistant Manager.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for expressing this word of appreciation, and I join him in commending the employees of Capitol Hill.

I would like to add also that the police force did a grand job.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I include them too. Also, the chairman of the program committee, who had jurisdiction over this, did a grand job. These people all did a good job. I know a word of thanks will encourage all of them.

SOLVING THE PROBLEMS OF CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which I believe will go a long way in solving the problems of crime in the District of Columbia.

This legislation has one principal objective: to bring the accused to trial as quickly as possible without jeopardizing his right to constitutional defenses and without jeopardizing the right of the prosecution to properly present its case against the accused.

To realize this goal of swift and judicious trials will require manpower, and additional manpower will cost money.

However, I firmly believe that the lives that will be saved from death and bodily injury, and the property loss that will be prevented is certainly worth the price.

The simple fact which confronts us is that there is not sufficient manpower in our judicial force here in the District of Columbia to deal properly with the crime situation.

We have undertaken to employ more law enforcement officers and this is most welcome and necessary. But, making more arrests is only part of the solution. We must be able to deal properly with these defendants in our courts and this we are not now able to do.

I have supported the strengthening of the law enforcement in the District, but this is not enough.

In the 90th Congress I introduced legislation to permit a judge to consider a defendant's potential danger to the community in determining whether to admit the person to bail.

I have again introduced this bill in the 91st Congress, H.R. 335, but this legislation, when passed, and I believe it will be, will not be enough.

We must move swiftly to clear our criminal court dockets of the backlog of cases, many of which have been 18 months awaiting trial.

The legislation which I am introducing today would do the following:

First, authorize an additional 10 judges for the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. It is this court which tries all felonies in the District of Columbia.

At the present time, there are 15 U.S. district judges authorized for the District of Columbia, and a backlog of cases going back well into 1967.

This is not justice, neither to the accused nor to society.

The estimated cost of these 10 more judges and the necessary supporting clerks, probation officers, and physical plant is \$800,000.

Second, this legislation would increase the authorized appropriation ceiling for the District of Columbia Bail Agency from \$130,000 to \$350,000. This would enable the bail agency to properly enforce strict release conditions which are not now being imposed by the courts because they cannot be enforced. This increase in the authorization would enable the bail agency to increase its present staff of 13 full-time personnel to 35, and would enable the Agency to perform many more necessary functions such as: First, investigation and the furnishing of information to the court before bail restrictions are set; second, proper supervision of the accused, and, third, proper notice to the accused concerning his time for appearance in court.

Third, in a separate appropriation bill, I ask that the Congress act immediately to appropriate \$264,000 to hire 22 additional assistant U.S. attorneys for the District of Columbia for the balance of the present fiscal year to strengthen the posture of criminal prosecution.

At present there are approximately

1.6 assistant U.S. attorneys for every criminal judge on the U.S. district court. This means each attorney has approximately 35 minutes to prepare for each case in court. As a result, many defense motions are granted to defense counsel simply because the prosecution has not had the time to prepare its cases.

The appropriation bill that I am introducing would increase this attorney to judge ratio to the necessary 3.5 for the current complement of the U.S. district court, and I would hope that the Congress, in its consideration of the 1970 budget would see fit to again increase the number of assistant U.S. attorneys when the number of judges is increased.

The final bill that I am introducing would provide for a mandatory penalty of 5 years for anyone who uses a deadly or dangerous weapon in the commission of a crime in the District of Columbia. The present law provides only that a judge may impose such an additional penalty. I do not feel that this is sufficient, hence I offer this bill to make such a penalty mandatory.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in this attack on crime in the District of Columbia, in order to make the residents and the millions of visitors safe.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, since the Bilingual Education Act was first authorized in the 90th Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has lacked adequate funds to implement the objectives of the program. The administration's fiscal year 1969 budget request was cut by 75 percent from \$30 million to \$7.5 million. As an original sponsor of this legislation I am concerned about the fact that HEW has not yet approved any application under this program.

HEW's Office of Education has informed me that 310 preliminary applications for grants were received by the cutoff date of December 20. After both an in-house review by HEW and a non-governmental review by a selected panel of experts in this field, those preliminary applications showing most promise will be approved for formal application and funding by early summer. However, the response of educators and interested parties throughout the country has been such that the Office of Education will be forced to disapprove many promising and necessary programs to aid our Spanish-speaking population.

The 310 preliminary applications represent a total request of \$40.4 million compared to an appropriation by Congress of only \$7.5 million for fiscal year 1969. These same applications project a total budgetary cost of \$46.9 million for fiscal year 1970 and a 5-year total cost for the time period 1969-73 of \$237.9 million. The figures show that there is a widespread demand for the bilingual education program. The National Education Association has urged, "that the full \$30 million authorized by Congress be

appropriated to implement the Bilingual Education Act, with emphasis on pre-school education."

With such a demand as well as a large need for this program, I have introduced legislation to provide supplemental appropriations of \$22.5 million for fiscal year 1969—H.R. 2793—and an appropriation level of \$40 million for fiscal year 1970—H.R. 2794.

The Bilingual Education Act is a particularly tragic example of a desperately needed domestic program that has been doomed by the warped state of our national priorities. In the United States there are over 2 million schoolchildren who lack a command of even basic English. For a majority, their first language is Spanish. The bilingual education program is a program of compensatory education for both youth and adults to overcome the language handicaps which persons of limited English-speaking ability face in a society where the majority speak only English. For these people, language is a discriminatory barrier—for an inability to use the English language affects opportunities for educational attainment, and ultimately, the employability of the person. Unless we take prompt action to insure equality of opportunity for all Americans, including their ability to communicate with and understand one another, we cannot expect to achieve a humane, just, and equitable society. An individual, at this time in our history, is disadvantaged from the offset, if he is not able to speak the English language. The end result for such individuals often is under- and unemployment and poverty.

The bilingual education program provides a broad range of activities including research and pilot projects for improved techniques for the teaching of English, adult education programs, closer ties between home and school, and special training programs to prepare qualified persons to become teachers in bilingual education endeavors. In addition, the bilingual program stresses the importance of the history and culture of the minority participant. The program is designed to "impart to students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their language" so that they will grow to appreciate their own heritage and realize its contributions.

Economic indicators, such as education and income levels, demonstrate that Spanish-speaking Americans are severely handicapped by present language barriers. A good example of this is in New York City, which has a Spanish-speaking population of three-fourths of 1 million and is the largest language minority in New York. The exclusive use of English in public schools presents the Puerto Rican child with an enormous handicap. Children who have spent their early years speaking Spanish are thrown, usually totally uninitiated, into a kindergarten or first grade, where all communication is in English. These children may suffer, as a result, a combination of reactions, all with detrimental implications.

In New York City, the board of education has found that fewer than 10 percent of Puerto Rican third graders were reading up to their grade level in 1966.

Three out of 10 were already at least a year and a half behind the average level of attainment of their fellow students. By the eighth grade, reading disability had increased to such a degree that as many as two-thirds of the Puerto Rican children at the eighth grade level were more than 3 years behind. When one realizes that in New York City, 46 percent of the Puerto Rican population is under 20 years of age, the tremendous impact the bilingual education program could have on these Spanish-speaking children is clear.

Unless Congress acts promptly to fully and adequately fund the Bilingual Education Act, many Spanish-speaking children will grow into adult life with a serious language handicap which will ultimately impair their economic potential and their ability to function in a society where English is the predominant language. This program will do much to equalize the opportunity for achievement of the non-English-speaking student both in the classroom and in the employment market.

I urge immediate action to increase the appropriation for the Bilingual Education Act for fiscal year 1969 by \$22.5 million to the level authorized by Congress and the 1970 fiscal year appropriation to its full authorization level of \$40 million.

#### SECTION 236 INTEREST RATE REDUCTION PROGRAM URGED FOR EXISTING STATE AND MUNICIPALLY FINANCED HOUSING

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today 11 Members of the House have joined me in cosponsoring legislation which would make the section 236 interest subsidy and rent supplement benefits of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 available to existing State or locally financed middle-income housing projects. Those Members joining me include Representatives MARIO BIAGGI, of New York; JOHN CONYERS, of Michigan; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York; JOSEPH GAYDOS, of Pennsylvania; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; CHARLES JOELSON, of New Jersey; EDWARD KOCH, of New York; RICHARD MCCARTHY, of New York; ROBERT NIX, of Pennsylvania; and BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, of New York.

This legislation is offered as an extension of my amendments which were included last year in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, which made interest subsidies and rent supplements available to State and municipally financed housing approved for such programs prior to construction or rehabilitation; the bill is identical to H.R. 49 which I introduced on the opening day of the 91st Congress. State and municipally financed housing projects completed before the enactment of the 1968 act are currently ineligible to apply for the reduction in interest rate down to 1 percent provided by section 236 and rent supplements.

Seven States—New York, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New

Jersey, and Pennsylvania—have programs which would benefit from this legislation. The purpose is to provide relief to State and local programs which have recently been severely undercut by spiraling interest rates. High interest rates have resulted in increased mortgage interest rates, carrying charges, and rents for publicly assisted middle-income housing programs. The consequences for many middle-income New York City families have been alarming. Rents in new Mitchell-Lama projects have recently been approved for as much as \$48 per room per month, or \$144 per month for a one-bedroom apartment.

Under the Mitchell-Lama program New York State floats bonds, the proceeds of which may be lent to sponsors of middle-income housing at the current rate of 5.7 percent. In order to borrow funds from the program, a sponsor has to agree to limit his rate of return on the housing facility. The abatement of real estate taxes has also helped to keep costs down.

New York City has a similar program for which average costs have risen steadily from \$26 per room in 1961 to \$38 per room in 1968. Last April New York City approved increases in carrying charges in 26 middle-income Mitchell-Lama projects; on August 22, 1968, 16 more projects experienced increases. In several middle-income projects increases in costs have led to conflicts between residents of the projects and city officials. In November of 1968 the city of New York took steps to foreclose mortgages on 14 cooperative apartment facilities housing 9,269 families who had refused to pay the 5- to 15-percent increase in charges ordered by the city last April. Thirteen of those cooperatives are now involved in litigation initiated by the city against them.

If relief is not promptly provided to housing programs currently threatened by skyrocketing interest rates, thousands of families may be forced to vacate their apartments. If middle-income families are to continue to live in New York City and other central cities, the cost of housing must remain within their financial ability.

Our bill makes limited-profit State and locally financed projects eligible for the interest rate reductions now authorized by section 236 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. For those projects approved for Federal assistance, it would help to keep carrying charges and rents at levels commensurate with the incomes of the tenants.

An important advantage of this proposal is that it would cost the Federal Government less to subsidize the interest rate on a Mitchell-Lama housing project down to 1 percent than to subsidize a privately financed project down to an interest rate of 1 percent interest. This is because interest rates for the Mitchell-Lima program are already at levels which are lower than the regular market rate. The Mitchell-Lama interest rate is 5.7 percent compared to a privately financed 7.5-percent market loan. Since the State does not finance the interest rate—but simply offers a below-market interest return to the holders of

its bonds—the Federal subsidy would not constitute a “second subsidy.”

When the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 was approved, it was hoped that the subsidies on market interest rates provided for in section 236 would stimulate the construction of more middle-income housing. Unfortunately, the Congress appropriated only \$25 million for this program, which was \$50 million less than the sum of \$75 million authorized by the act.

Even if a fuller amount of money had been appropriated to carry out section 236, however, this would not have brought relief to existing State and locally financed programs which, because they were completed before the enactment of the act, are not eligible to apply for interest subsidies provided by that section. The aim of our bill is to allow these existing housing projects to apply for the relief they need to keep rents, carrying charges and interest rates within the reach of the middle-income residents whom the projects are designed to serve. It does little good to construct new projects if facilities already in existence cannot maintain costs that are commensurate with the means of their tenants.

Mr. Speaker, there is no problem in our cities today that is more acute than the continuing shortage of adequate housing. The bill I have introduced would bring relief to middle-income projects that may otherwise be unable to prevent costs from reaching untenable levels. If middle-income families are to remain in our central cities, the cost of housing must be kept within their reach.

#### THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM SHOULD BE CONTINUED

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RYAN, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget recommends the termination of the special milk program, authorized under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, at the end of this fiscal year. In the proposed budget for fiscal year 1970, only \$14.7 million is requested by the Department of Agriculture compared to a \$104 million appropriation for fiscal year 1969. The Department of Agriculture maintains that the special milk program is no longer needed because of the expansion of other programs such as school lunch, child nutrition, and special food service programs.

The special milk program was intended to increase the consumption of milk by schoolchildren at both the elementary and high school levels. It is available to child-care centers, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions. Under the provisions of the program letters of credit from the Federal Government are issued to State agencies to reimburse districts or institutions for a part of the cost of the fluid milk consumed. On the average, a student pays 3 to 4 cents for a half-pint carton of milk rather than the unsubsidized price of 6½ to 7 cents. In school districts, where there is a special need, the milk program provides for the entire cost of the milk consumed by children.

State agencies administer the program except in those circumstances where a State agency has not assumed responsibility for the program or where it is prohibited by law from disbursing funds for the milk program. In such cases, the program is directly administered by the localities. There are presently about 8,000 such cases.

The special milk program is now being utilized in some 96,000 schools throughout the country. In 1968 over 3.1 billion half-pints of milk were served to an estimated 17 million children.

The special milk program should make it possible for children from all walks of life to have a daily consumption of milk which is important for their growth and vitality.

It is regrettable that in some States it has been denied to some schoolchildren because of racial considerations. I have repeatedly urged the Department of Agriculture to enforce title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 with respect to school milk and lunch programs.

The phasing out of this program will leave many children now benefiting from it without the nutrition which it provides. A hardship will be created by discontinuing this program which Congress should not countenance. Instead of reducing the budget level from \$104 to \$14.7 million, Congress should insist that the special milk program be funded at a level commensurate with the need.

#### DESALINATION PLANT FOR ISRAEL

(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, eight Members of Congress have today joined me in sponsoring legislation to provide assistance to Israel in the design, development, and construction of a dual purpose electrical power and desalination plant.

Those Members cosponsoring the bill are Representative JOSEPH ADDABO, of New York; Representative PHILLIP BURTON, of California; Representative JAMES CORMAN, of California; Representative ROBERT GAIAMO, of Connecticut; Representative HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; Representative JAMES SCHUEER, of New York; Representative LIONEL VAN DERLIND, of California, and Representative LESTER WOLFF, of New York.

Under the provisions of the bill, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to enter into an agreement with the Government of Israel to share the cost of constructing a desalination plant which is capable of producing 100 to 150 million gallons of fresh water and 300,000 to 400,000 kilowatts of electricity daily. This legislation is identical to H.R. 587 which I introduced on January 3, the opening day of the 91st Congress. I had previously introduced this proposal in the first session of the last Congress.

On January 19, Premier Levi Eshkol told the Israeli public that President Johnson had asked Congress to help Israel build the desalination plant which she so badly needs. As one who has long advocated U.S. aid to Israel for the construction of such a plant, I am pleased that the Johnson administration asked



Congress to support this project. The draft bill which the Department of Interior, on behalf of the President, sent to Congress on January 17 is similar to my bill. As Assistant Secretary of Interior Max Edwards pointed out in his January 17 letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the project, in addition to being "vital to Israel in terms of water supply and power," gives the United States an "opportunity to improve and advance science and technology in the field of saline water conversion and to contribute materially to the development of low-cost desalination processes."

Assistant Secretary Edwards goes on to urge the early enactment of legislation which would give the Secretary of the Interior authority to enter into a formal agreement with Israel to construct a desalination plant.

New incremental sources of water, as Assistant Secretary Edwards notes, "must be made available by the mid-1970's," if Israel is to maintain her industrial and economic growth. A desalination plant would make it possible for Israel to cultivate large portions of arid desert land which cannot now be utilized. The usable land and jobs that would be created by such a plant would make a significant contribution to the stability of the entire Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity this bill presents to aid Israel in the development of water resources and the possibilities which the project holds for developing our technical ability to produce large amounts of fresh water at low cost lead me to believe that the development of a desalination plant in Israel should receive a high priority from Congress.

I hope that the Nixon administration will support the decision of the Johnson administration by also urging the Congress to authorize U.S. participation in this project.

#### THE ACTUAL DEFICIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

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

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to point out that the actual budget for the operation of the Federal Government, as proposed by the outgoing administration, in fiscal year 1970, does not have a surplus, but actually is in deficit by over \$6 billion, according to the figures contained in budget documents of both the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Treasury.

It is overlooked that the Federal Government within the last 2 years went to a new budget concept which lumps together the tax revenues of the Federal Government with the trust fund receipts, which are largely social security funds, and run, in total, in excess of \$40 billion, and the surplus of receipts over expenditures are valid only if the trust fund receipts are included.

Under the old administrative budget, which showed the operation of the Federal agencies and their programs, and the general tax revenues for these expenditures, we are in the red by \$6,800

million dollars. In fact, it is planned that in order to make up this deficit, that funds will be borrowed from the trust funds by the Department of the Treasury.

The deficit figure that I cite above is clearly stated in the documents accompanying the budget sent to Capitol Hill, and may be found on page 20 in the "Special Analysis of the Budget" prepared by the Bureau of the Budget in cooperation with the Department of the Treasury and the former administration.

This figure of a deficit of \$6,800 million is contingent on continuing the surtax, which is expected to yield about \$9 billion. If the surtax is not continued, the budget deficit will be nearly \$16 billion. The budget figures of the outgoing administration are also conditioned on passing the postal rate increase. If this does not occur, you can add \$519 million more in the red.

Shortly over a week ago on the 15th day of January, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), took the floor to point out to Members substantially what I have just said, and I refer to his remarks on page 731 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 15.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) has pointed out that the true budgetary problem, as it affects the Federal Government in its normal operating procedures, must include a full understanding of the trust fund income and outgo.

He further emphasized that the figures contained in the proposed budget are based on a number of conditions and legislative contingencies, even to obtain the most favorable picture of our financial situation. For example, it is conditioned on extending the excise taxes, and if this does not occur, you can add another half a billion dollars to the deficit.

Also a condition is adopting certain user charges for aviation, waterways, highways, and other user charges which, if they are not adopted, will make the deficit climb \$410 million more.

Not only are there these contingencies that relate to collection of revenues which, if not implemented, will cause the deficit to soar, but the new budget for fiscal year 1970 has certain legislative contingencies that require the adoption of legislation that relates to programs which, if not enacted by the 91st Congress, will cause further fiscal and financial woes.

It should be noted that these budgetary figures that I have mentioned are contained in the proposed budget presented to Capitol Hill by the outgoing administration and at this time, it is impossible to determine what changes the incoming administration will make.

In all events, instead of patting ourselves on the back about the so-called surplus, we are going to have to dig deeper in our pocket.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN DAY CARE CENTERS

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the education service in public and private nonprofit child day care centers. My bill is cosponsored by 50 of my colleagues, and others have indicated a willingness to join the sponsorship.

This bill was introduced in the 90th Congress as H.R. 10572, and extensive hearings were held on it.

My bill would provide funds for supplementing educational programs for preschool children who spend the day in child care centers, many of which now furnish primarily only custodial care. Most of these preschool children do not qualify for assistance under existing Federal programs because the income of their parents is greater than the criteria established for these programs. This gives rise to the same old familiar situation in which the parents earn too much to qualify for current programs, but not enough to provide their children with really meaningful preschool educational opportunities. And so the children end up spending 2 or 3 years, or more, in a kind of educational limbo where their physical needs are attended and their safety assured, but where they make no educational headway at all. We all know now that these early years could be productive years, not only for the child, but for society as well. The good habits of learning, implanted during these highly formative years would greatly enhance the child's later academic life to the benefit of everyone.

The Congress has already recognized the validity of this educational concept and the need of children in this age bracket. We did so by authorizing funds for Operation Headstart and by enacting the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Those two programs are great programs as far as they go. But there is a gap between them—a kind of no man's land where millions of our children now simply wait, marking time—and wasting time—until their formal education can proceed a few years hence.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, would begin to close that gap and begin to provide for these children, their first lessons in learning. The funds authorized in my bill, Mr. Speaker, would enable many of these day care centers to become more than mere establishments for group babysitting; they would be able to upgrade their services to provide for these children, the first steps in basic education. A child's future is shaped by his early experiences and we must not overlook these young children already in day care centers.

The employment of mothers in our economy is increasing and that trend can be expected to continue. There are more than 26 million working mothers in our country right now and more than 2 million of them have children under 3 years of age. As more and more mothers take up jobs, the number of children in day care centers will increase; and since they will already be in the centers they can easily be reached with such educational services as will be provided by my bill.

This bill will not provide educational

opportunities for all our preschool children, and not even for all our preschool children who are now in day care centers. It will be but a beginning—and now is a good time to begin.

My bill, which is entitled "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act" would authorize for fiscal 1970 and each succeeding fiscal year, \$300,000,000 to make grants available to the States. States participating in the program will designate a State agency broadly representative of these public and private child care centers and submit to the commissioner of education a State plan for participation. Priorities shall be given to centers with children in greatest need of such programs and which best demonstrate that they can achieve the objectives of this act, while still leaving maximum flexibility for the development of State plans and standards. These centers and groups to qualify must first be approved by State licensing agencies for safety and sanitary conditions and the projects they submit to the Commission must be approved by the designated State agency created under this act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to urge its enactment in the present session of Congress for the thousands of youngsters whom this bill will help.

#### THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S REMAINING JOB IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, throughout American history, individuals have brought their creative talents and personal skills to bear in advancing the social goals of this country.

In the field of education, the departing U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Samuel Halperin, have contributed much to quality education. Their thought on the future direction and unfulfilled goals which this country should consider are interesting and very useful and merit the attention of any of us who are concerned about continuing the advances we have made in education over the past 5 years.

Both of these individuals were instrumental in shaping the initial education legislation now on the books, laws which are now advancing the course of education all across this country. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to this tape-recorded conversation between these two individuals, which follows:

#### THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S REMAINING JOB IN EDUCATION

(Transcript of a tape-recorded conversation, on July 31, 1968, between Dr. Samuel Halperin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II.)

Mr. HALPERIN. Looking at the legislative authorities of the U.S. Office of Education as of August 1968 we see that this Federal agency is empowered to spend, if appropriated, some \$8 billion annually under programs covering virtually every area of educa-

tion. These authorizations affect, in a major way, higher education, educational research, elementary and secondary education, teacher training, vocational education, education of the handicapped, adult education, student financial aid, community services, library programs, and many other areas. Thus, it is no exaggeration to say that, with only slight modifications, the programs now on the statute books could address virtually any education problem in our country.

Except possibly in the education of the handicapped, these Federal undertakings are not what might be called general support programs. Instead they tend to be, in varying degrees, of a categorical nature. That is to say, the Congress has agreed upon particular national educational priorities which call for Federal resources and has enacted programs accordingly.

Mr. Howe. It seems to me that the priority that most clearly reflects the educational thrust of the Johnson Administration has been the focus on disadvantaged people and on using education as the instrument to solve the problems of disadvantaged people. And I think the programs that you have been describing can be seen, in very large proportion, in that context.

The funds that have been appropriated for support of these programs are by no means adequate to do the job, nor has there been adequate time to complete that job. But a very effective start has been made, and it seems to me that there is need now for two major new directions in Federal education programs.

One of these directions can be suggested by the word "consolidation"—some kind of pulling together of existing programs so that they relate better to each other; so that they have more flexibility; so that they are more convenient for the people who use them; so that administrative problems that arise from multiple application forms, filing deadlines, and that kind of thing are simplified. Both administrative and legislative action are needed so that efforts in teacher training, for instance, are related to the efforts of local school districts in educating disadvantaged children and so that curricular reform and other measures by school districts to serve those children are reflected in the teacher training programs of the colleges and universities.

I think there is the possibility of bringing about more efficient combinations of these Federal programs. In saying this I do not mean to suggest that the relative degree of disorder which exists is anybody's fault. It has developed historically, growing out of the mechanisms by which the Congress enacts programs and the manner by which an administration formulates and proposes them. Apparently there are those who imagine that this disorderly picture justifies criticism of the Congress or the Administration. I don't feel that way about it at all. Rather, it is the natural result of historical development.

The second point I would make in regard to the Federal activities of the future has to do with the organization of the Federal establishment in education itself. The Johnson Administration, in introducing all these new programs, has introduced them across the board in the Federal Government. You find them in the Office of Economic Opportunity, in the Labor Department, in aspects of the Model Cities Program related to education, in the Arts and Humanities Endowments, in the National Science Foundation, in the Appalachia programs, in a whole variety of agencies. Whereas the Federal Government has looked at the complexities of transportation and organized a new Department to deal with them or the problems of the cities and organized the new Department of Housing and Urban Development, education has simply mushroomed all over the Government. It seems to me that

one of the major tasks for the future is an organizational housecleaning and re-ordering of the Federal role in education.

There are many proposals around, and one of them is that there be a Cabinet-level Department of Education. Another is that the education function in HEW be escalated by the establishment in the Department of an Under Secretary for Education. Personally, I would lean toward the former.

Mr. HALPERIN. It seems to me that one can't do a very adequate job on the first problem—in the area of consolidation and coordination—without paying attention to the second. You can cut down the number of categorical grant programs, perhaps, and you can simplify forms. But you cannot ordinarily get any consistent, Government-wide policies for, let's say, fellowships or stipends, or for the Federal matching share for the construction of facilities, or for the problems of campus planning, without some rather fundamental changes. University administrators today are basically themselves trying to put together campuses with funds from NIH, the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, NASA, HUD, and so on. Therefore, I put a very high priority on a major reorganization across-the-board—not merely an elevation of the Office of Education, but a broad restructuring of Federal education enterprises in order to get at the problems of individual program improvements and consolidations.

It is important to note that the Federal budget for education has tripled under President Johnson to a current level of over \$12 billion. Only about \$3.7 billion of that sum is administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Therefore, I do not think you can get a really effective Federal policy in the field of education—one which maximizes the benefits of Federal investments for the recipients and for the Nation as a whole—unless you can coordinate both the planning and operations of the thirty or so major Federal agencies that now operate literally hundreds of education programs with little or no collaboration or communication among them.

Mr. Howe. I think this is an important point, and I would add as a footnote that I don't believe you are advocating (nor would I) that all of the programs of all these various agencies be pulled together into a single Department of Education. I would foresee instead the development of an across-the-board planning capability that brings about some inter-relationship of these programs; so that when decisions affecting educational institutions are made unilaterally in NASA or the Atomic Energy Commission there is a knowledge about what other agencies are doing about the same matters.

A good example of this point is found in graduate fellowships. Last year several agencies had independent budgets for fellowships and dealt independently with the Bureau of the Budget on the matter. When their decisions were added to the decisions of other agencies acting independently in the same fashion, the result was severe impact on the colleges that none of the individual agencies intended.

Mr. HALPERIN. We should add, of course, that Congress legislates in the same relatively isolated and piecemeal fashion. For example, the cuts made by the Space Committee in fellowship and building programs in the educational area were not known to most of the Members of the Congress who preside over the Department of Defense's programs in the field of education, or to the Members of the Education and Labor Committee or the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who legislate in related areas.

Thus, there is a cumulative effect on the Nation's campuses, brought about not with malice and certainly not with forethought—a cumulative and unforeseen effect produced by a lack of knowledge of what other people

are doing and lack of overall policy and legislative cohesion.

I certainly do not favor gathering every education-related program together under a common agency. I do advocate a very careful study, followed by relatively swift Executive and Congressional action, of ways to pull together the major programs whose essential function is the strengthening and support of educational institutions, as distinct from the mission-oriented tasks that every Federal agency must necessarily carry out.

In this reorganization that we are both talking about one should look at education broadly. We are looking at manpower and we are looking at training of various types. We are also involved with overall science policy and with the humanities and the arts. We must consider education in a very catholic sense.

I would also add to your two top priority issues for future attention a third. In my mind, it is the third in time as well as in importance, but it needs to be looked at—and planned for.

As I said at the outset, our programs today are of a categorical nature. And while we want some pulling together and some greater simplification and a greater flexibility for these programs, we also have to ask ourselves about the extent to which the Federal role should ultimately be supplemented to include some sort of institutional aid in both higher education and in elementary and secondary education—institutional aid with relatively few Federal priorities, recognizing that educational costs are spiraling, recognizing that there is a limit to the fiscal capacity of the States and local communities that perhaps has not yet been reached but that is an increasing burden in both a political and an economic sense? Should the Federal Government do something in these areas to provide across-the-board aid?

Mr. HOWE. It seems to me we ought to address this broad topic you have introduced separately for elementary and secondary education on the one hand and higher education on the other.

Let's talk for a minute about elementary and secondary education.

Historically, there has been a sort of unsuccessful reach for some form of general aid to elementary and secondary education. A number of Presidents have brought this up. A number of Senators and Congressmen from time to time have proposed bills, some of which have even passed one House of the Congress. But general aid has always foundered either on grounds of fear of Federal control or on anxieties about church-state relations, or both.

Mr. HALPERIN. Plus some related issues such as integration and the question of interstate equalization. The timing of any particular program may make a difference, too. Witness the fact that once upon a time you could get a great deal of support for classroom construction *per se*. Today, with the new militancy in the teaching profession, enthusiasm for general aid differs greatly among different educational groups. A school construction program, once viewed as "general aid" in most people's eyes, is clearly less acceptable today than it was just ten or fifteen years ago.

Mr. HOWE. The reason, of course, is simply that the militant teaching profession would want to be sure that any major new funding included the possibility of raising salaries with Federal funds—something which is not supported by existing programs.

But you introduced an idea that needs to be discussed in the context of general aid to elementary and secondary education, and that is the idea of equalization.

There is quite a bit of equalization in existing programs, particularly Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is not a major effect in terms of redress-

ing balances; it just reaches in that direction.

Mr. HALPERIN. Nor was it a major intention in that legislation.

Mr. HOWE. That is of course true, but I think we still confront the fact that pre-pupil support in our more fortunate States—our more industrialized States, our States with higher levels of production and higher levels of employment and higher levels of income—that per-pupil expenditures there are more than double those in the poorer States.

Mr. HALPERIN. To be specific, the latest figures we have indicate a per pupil expenditure of \$413 in Mississippi and \$1,125 in New York.

Mr. HOWE. Close to triple. Those figures, of course, include existing Federal expenditures in both places. Without Federal funds the disparity would be even greater.

Such a difference by itself creates a lack of equal educational opportunity in places where expenditures are lower. And yet, the youngsters in the low-expenditure States are citizens of the United States just as the children from the more affluent States are.

One of the general principles that the Johnson Administration has pushed into the Nation's thinking has been the idea that there should be equality of educational opportunity for citizens of the United States regardless of where they happen to be born and where they happen to live. And this disparity in expenditure denies that equality.

So it seems to me that any general aid program which may emerge has to run the political hazard of not providing much support in some places in order to provide a great deal of support in others. That is what equalization is all about. Obviously some kind of compromise will be necessary in a general aid program—a compromise that brings some support to all places but that redresses, at least in part, the imbalance we have been discussing.

I think also that a Federal program of general aid with an equalization feature in it cannot achieve its objectives if, within the States, Federal money is distributed through traditional channels in such a way as to deny pupils who happen to live in the central city the kind of special and additional compensatory support necessary to make their education successful. The Federal Government must concern itself not just with the distribution of Federal funds among the States but also with the way in which these funds are, in turn, distributed by the States.

Mr. HALPERIN. I certainly agree that we need not only inter-State equalization but also intra-State equalization. The Carnegie-funded Syracuse studies and others indicate that existing State equalization programs are woefully inadequate. To use Federal resources in the future merely to compound the injury would be an ironic climax to the excellent progress that has been made in education in recent years.

Besides inter-State equalization and intra-State equalization there is a third consideration I should like to add. It is the notion of somehow designing a Federal program in such a way that it would act as an incentive to greater State and local effort. This, of course, is an idea which has been around a long time. And yet it seems to me that we have to do more about it. The Intergovernmental Advisory Committee on Government Relations indicates that there is untapped fiscal capacity in the States and localities. I would hope we could design a general aid program to act as an incentive to tap these resources in return for larger amounts of relatively unfettered Federal funds.

This whole general aid approach is, of course, fraught not only with the political difficulties you mentioned but, it seems to me, with the possibility that we may have a new outbreak of bitter church-state conflict.

The Johnson Administration, legislating on what some people have called the "child benefit" or the "public trustee" theory—in which all funds have flowed directly only to public schools—has avoided church-state confrontations by the corollary principle that non-public school students were entitled to certain types of benefits. This system of getting Federal funds to all pupils, both public and private, opened a new era of interfaith and inter-school cooperation. But this principle applies most easily to categorical programs directed by the Congress to particular purposes over and above the normal programs which schools provide.

When one talks about "general aid"—and if one wants to avoid religious and inter-community strife—it is politically necessary to find a way to assure that some benefits—even if they are not always proportional or equitable—continue to flow to all the children in the community, regardless of whether the school they attend is public or private.

It is a particularly difficult to accomplish this in a general aid bill because under such a program it is not feasible to maintain control over how the funds shall be spent—for books, for instance, or for equipment or for other programs in which non-public school children can participate. If, for example, the bulk of general aid funds flow, as intended, into teachers' salaries, it is difficult to see how private school students' interests can be served or protected.

Mr. HOWE. I quite agree, and I think that another qualification that needs to be made is that some people see general aid as the only form or the ideal form which Federal support of the schools should take. And it seems to me that this view is wrong—that while general aid should round out the picture of Federal aid, the rest of the picture should also remain. The broad categorical programs which address themselves to a whole variety of particular objectives which may not be met or even approached by the schools unless these categorical programs remain in place are in my view a first priority for Federal support.

So I think that in the future those who are designing general aid need to be very careful not to damage the categorical programs but to continue them at adequate levels and to move to general aid only in a budget which will allow the continuation of the categorical programs as general aid gets started.

Mr. HALPERIN. There are other reservations that need to be borne in mind in the design of a general aid program. Certainly we are painfully aware that many people look upon general aid not only as a convenient way to avoid the dictates of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 but also as a means to avoid having to come to grips with the problem of racial imbalance, particularly in our northern cities.

I don't really believe that we can design a general aid program that in and of itself does away with racial imbalance. To try to do so would involve a contradiction in terms. Unless one assumes that the money flowing to the recipients will generally be used for good purposes and good effects one shouldn't go in the direction of a general aid bill at all.

To get at the problems of racial imbalance, desegregation and genuine integration will probably require new types of categorical programs—or at least new provisions in existing categorical programs—which offer an incentive, a bonus or "carrot" if you will, for those school systems and those communities that wish voluntarily to move in the direction of true racial and economic integration.

Mr. HOWE. In line with this, it seems to me that a program for school construction, which we don't have at the present time except in a very small way through the School Assistance for Federally Affected Areas Program, could have an element of general aid in it and yet

also contain some of the characteristics you have just outlined.

A program for school construction could apply to all school districts in the country, but include provision for payments to school districts with very special problems, such as those in the big cities or those that are rurally isolated. Similarly, such a new program could also place a premium on cooperation between, or among, several school districts, thereby introducing the possibility of a city cooperating with the suburbs around it to develop certain kinds of specialized facilities. Or as another option, regular school facilities which would have the effect of reducing racial isolation could be given premium levels of Federal support.

This kind of program would be tough to handle politically, but if it had a broad general component of a percentage of payment toward construction costs and then additional percentages of payments where these important public purposes are met, it would at the same time help all school districts and give special help where special needs exist and where there is a willingness to attack the problems the Kerner Commission has identified.

Mr. HALPERIN. I'd like to return to an earlier thought. We introduced this general aid discussion as a kind of third priority, or something to be done at a later stage.

In my view, the most important thing this Nation should do in the next several years is to put realistic and substantially greater funding into existing programs at the same time that we make them broader and more flexible and seek to consolidate them.

It seems to me that in the absence of sizable amounts of new money we can expect some erosion of these programs. Many school districts do not benefit substantially from the programs now, and for what they do get they have to go through a great deal of what they call "red tape and bureaucracy." Such grievances are intolerable when the pay-off is relatively small. When these grievances are cumulated, I think there is a very real chance that regardless of the Administration in power, there will be a tendency on the part of the Congress and the political electorate to wipe out such programs and to replace them with some sort of undirected, block-grant or non-criteria-laden program.

Thus, I was particularly glad to hear your point about the necessity for general aid as a supplement to, rather than a replacement of, existing programs. In the short run, this requires a commitment to appropriate much more money, since an essentially *status quo* operation is not politically viable.

Moreover, it isn't viable in an educational sense either. We cannot really expect to reach and teach the disadvantaged, for example, under Title I of ESEA with only a little more than \$100 per-pupil per year, which is about what we are spending today. We cannot really hope to make much of a dent in the high school dropout problem—thirty percent of our youth, a million young people a year—with the less than \$10 million for an antidropout program which was appropriated by the Congress. We cannot really reach many of the young people who need to go on to post-secondary education with as few as seventy thousand Educational Opportunity Grants a year.

Everything we have been talking about has to be done on a substantially larger scale, both in order to have integrity in the programs and also to find out if they will truly work. At present we just don't really know. It is going to take time, but it is also going to take a substantially larger investment simultaneously.

Mr. Howe. I thoroughly agree with the need for a substantially larger investment. And, being a realist, I am aware that a substantially larger investment in education on the domestic scene is going to be in competition, direct competition, with a whole

galaxy of other important domestic causes. People today are expecting a great deal more from their government than they once did. They want greater effort toward control of the environment: conservation, air pollution, water resource management, and the like. They want government help in transportation and in housing and in the replanning and rebuilding of the cities. And they want it in education. And each of these has its own claim on new dollars that the American taxpayer may be willing to give to his government to serve him.

This means that education is going to be in tough competition. I think that education will meet that competition to the degree that it is able to make a strong case for success in what it is doing.

This in turn argues strongly for the investment of funds in research, for effective dissemination of existing knowledge, and for effective evaluation of the programs that we have. And, therefore, as perhaps a first priority in the investment of any new funds, I would seek funds for those activities and for beginning to get a feedback from them. I believe that over time that feedback will build the confidence which will bring additional funds into major areas of service such as those under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

And I believe that right now, by any reasonable measurement, the funding for research and demonstration and evaluation in education by the Federal Government is minimal.

Mr. HALPERIN. Educational research and development, dissemination, and evaluation would be among my major priorities, too. I would like to follow up on your first priority in educational research by saying that I think in the years ahead a Federal goal should be stated as a percentage of our education budget.

We have all been talking in recent years—with justification, I think—about insufficient educational research. At the present time of the \$12 billion spent by the Federal Government in education, substantially less than one percent is for educational research and related efforts. Of the Office of Education budget, only about 2.5 percent goes into educational research. I would like to suggest to an incoming Administration that, for the reasons you have stated so well, we ought to set a national goal of ten percent of our education budget for research, development, and evaluation; a goal to be reached in stages over, let's say, five years.

My second suggestion for a priority for investment of new funds is the whole area of teacher training, and inservice training broadly conceived to include the subprofessional aides, the administrators, the school board members, the supervisors, the directors—all of the policy-makers in the field of education. Obviously, people are the core of any system, and this is true in education as well as elsewhere.

The largest single professional group in the United States today is that encompassed by the field of education—almost 3 million persons. Yet we are training or retraining only a small fraction of these people each year. There is a tremendous turnover because of retirement and new job opportunities outside education. It seems to me that we ought to put a large investment into the teacher training area in the years ahead. And to hazard a goal or a target, I would suggest that we ought to aim at retraining ten percent of our teaching force annually. I think the current training level is about one to two percent through the various Federal programs. States and localities are unable to expand their commitments to the retraining of teachers because of the tremendous pressures for salary increases. But unless there is adequate retraining, the across-the-board salary increases may not be justified. So I think it's a reasonable goal to

state specifically on the part of the Federal Government that we aim—through sabbaticals, fellowships, institutes, and other training programs—to provide ten percent of our teaching force with some kind of educational experience each year.

Mr. Howe. That makes very good sense. And of course one of the great achievements of the Johnson Administration is the Education Professions Development Act, which provides most of the authority needed to do the job you have described, although one or two amendments might well be added to it. For example, school board members are not now included, contrary to the original suggestion by the Administration. Elements of added flexibility of this kind could advantageously be placed in this Act.

But the basic legislation is excellent. It has a very nice balance in it. It creates a Federal role, it creates a State role, and it addresses itself to a local school district role in the training of people to serve education, a desirable element omitted in previous legislation. A big window has been opened by this legislation, and there are all sorts of opportunities as a result.

I think one of the major administrative responsibilities of the Office of Education in the years ahead will involve making imaginative use of this new authority.

Mr. HALPERIN. With regard to your last comment on the imaginative use of that authority, it's interesting to note that most of us are very proud of the Teacher Corps. We feel that it has great promise and that the program should be expanded substantially.

But under the Education Professions Development Act many new kinds of "teachers' corps" are possible—new types of teacher training and retraining efforts. Thus, I hope that they will be generously funded in the years ahead.

I would like to add a footnote to an earlier point you made about dissemination: I feel very strongly—and many Members of the Congress do as well—that in this huge country of ours, with 21,000 operating school districts and more than 2,000 colleges, many, many things are going on right now that are effective, that are promising, that are adaptable by others. But communications in a country as large as ours are terribly difficult. I would hope that special efforts would be made in the years ahead to disseminate widely to the taxpaying public—to the lay policymakers, as well as to the professionals—the results of programs at all levels of education. We certainly have the authority to do this both in our new legislation and under the general charter establishing the Office of Education in 1867.

Mr. Howe. The dissemination function includes a wide variety of activities, and not the least of them are the processes of letting the people know of developing markets, demonstration. Education hasn't thought this way enough.

Mr. HALPERIN. Possibly there might be an activity somewhat analogous to the system of agricultural experiment stations, and particularly to the work of the county agents. We of course have the regional educational laboratories, but it may be that we need to look more carefully at dissemination models that would reach all over the country, using non-educators and sub-professionals, as well as the more traditional groups.

Mr. Howe. And now to give this conversation a balance I don't think it has at this point, let's have some general discussion about higher education. I think of one or two observations that can be made. First of all, higher education activity is widely dispersed throughout the Federal Government and therefore needs to be examined in the light of our earlier conversation about the need for planning capacity to get at the problem of impact of the many separate Federal programs on individual institutions.

Secondly, I'd say that the types of assistance provided by the Federal Government to higher education tend, to some degree, to be less change-oriented than the types of assistance the Federal Government provides to elementary and secondary education. Our scholarship grants, work-study funds, and similar support measures do help a different type of student to get into the higher educational institutions than the traditional college student from the upper economic stratum.

But programs like these, and the programs which build buildings, and those which promote research activity in our educational institutions—and these are the major components of support: buildings, research, and student aid—don't address themselves much at all to institutional change. We can speculate that perhaps it is because neither the Federal Government nor indeed other agencies have thought about this very much—or at least done much about it—that students around the country are themselves seeking institutional change in a variety of ways.

There are some small programs that do reach for change. Title III of the Higher Education Act could be described as addressing itself to improving quality and to bringing about institutional change. But I think the broad generalization still holds.

So I think it would be constructive if those people responsible for the future Federal role in education would explore something analogous to Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for higher education, a foundation-like function addressed to change, addressed to picking up the bright ideas that have surfaced in the world of higher education and giving them some backing from Federal sources.

That type of activity has been carried out in our society more commonly by private sources than by public sources, largely through foundations. And I think there is a promising Federal role here.

Then there is the whole broad question of what should be the shape of any general or operational aid to higher education. Higher education institutions are facing increasing unit costs. It costs more money to educate each student in every college every year. This is largely a function of rising faculty salaries, but other costs as well.

Mr. HALPERIN. And obviously enrollments are going to double.

Mr. HOWE. Enrollments are going up while this increasing cost is impinging on the institutions. And many of them are in deep trouble.

We don't know the exact dimension of this trouble. One of the constructive moves directed by President Johnson is a study to devise a long-range plan for the financing of higher education. None of us knows what will emerge from that. But obviously a major job for a future Administration is that of picking up the results of this study and doing something constructive with them. And I suspect that one of the results of the study may be some suggestion about how the Federal Government could encourage more private and State support for higher education and, at the same time, make a contribution to the operational costs of running a college or university. My own inclination is to suggest that the Federal Government give a priority to increases in student aid programs so that segments of the society now denied a higher education can have increased hope of receiving one. If the Government does this, then the way to provide operating aid to institutions might be to give an unrestricted grant for every student on a Federally supported scholarship. We do this already for graduate fellowships, and I think it would work in four-year colleges and community colleges.

Mr. HALPERIN. The difficulties that beset general aid in the elementary and secondary

area, of course, are to at least some degree also present in the higher education area. To be sure you don't have the church-state issue to the same extent. But there is a tendency on the part of many policy-makers, both in and out of the Congress, to want to control the results of Federal aid. We can't have this. If we believe in the ability and the know-how of the institution, then we just have to go ahead and authorize some general aid at whatever time that is fiscally feasible, regardless of opposition from those who fear that general aid in any form, at any level, means "money down a rat hole," or other pejorative expressions. I do think this notion runs counter to the concept of grants for innovation.

Perhaps in the years ahead we must try to find an increased or new role for the Federal Government that couples the encouragement of innovation with an appropriate response to the increasing outcry of the institutions for operating money.

Mr. HOWE. I think there is a very good analogy hereto what we were saying about elementary and secondary education. We were saying there that the categorical programs should grow and should continue to be supported when general aid comes in. I think we ought to say exactly the same thing about higher education. Student aid programs should grow and continue. The programs that support special research of particular interest to the Federal Government ought to grow and continue. But at the same time, the Federal Government in the future needs to think about the problems of the institutions as such.

By and large the Federal Government has tended to look at the institution from the point of view of what purposes it can accomplish for the Government without worrying too much about what happens to the health of the institution while it is serving Federal ends.

Uncle Sam makes it possible for a lot more people in the United States to get a higher education, because that's a significant national objective. And we back a variety of specialties because they are needed either by the Federal Government, by the economy, or by some aspect of public service in the States and localities. But we have not thought enough about the capacity of the institution to keep its balance while doing all these things to serve important national objectives. It is into that picture that I would put the problem of operating costs of these institutions and the capacity to at least stay alive and healthy while picking up these categorical aid programs that the Federal Government provides.

Mr. HALPERIN. While we're talking about what might lie ahead for higher education, I wonder if your priorities and your sense of timing would match mine.

I would say that in the next couple of years, as more funds hopefully become available, my own set of priorities would emphasize continuing the thrust of the Johnson Administration to ensure equality of educational opportunity, particularly for minority groups and for the poor, regardless of their race.

I think that this can be stated in a kind of a declaration of rights: that any student of ability should be enabled to go on to the post-secondary institution of his choice, whether a technical institute or a business school or a college. And I think the goal ought to be stated in terms of some numbers. For example, for an additional one billion dollars a year we can help an additional two million students—the equivalent of some forty percent of those now enrolled in college—to go on to further education after high school.

I think that's the kind of a statement of a goal that we need. That would be my first priority.

Mr. HOWE. Yes, I fully agree. And, of course one must take into account the fact that

higher education today is, to a degree, a segregated enterprise. Most of our high quality institutions have a relatively small proportion of minority group people in them, and there is an important job to do in somehow achieving throughout the higher education spectrum a better representation of minority group people.

Mr. HALPERIN. Speaking further about higher education, I would say that either simultaneously or as the next priority we ought to give attention to more adequate funding of some of our broader categorical programs, for example, the programs to improve college library and instructional resources. This is one way that you get at quality. This is one way you can change the institution. At the same time you exercise the Congressional discretion as to where the funds go.

I also think the Federal Government should do something special for graduate education. This is the fastest growing part of higher learning, and it's also the most expensive part. Here again, we do have on the statute books in a variety of Federal agencies the necessary tools, but we do not now have the funding in institutional aid or institutional development programs or institutional excellence programs—they are called different things in NASA and NSF and NIH. Hopefully, we will have a new program in the Office of Education under the pending Higher Education Amendments of 1968. Particularly through the fellowship programs, with their accompanying cost-of-education allowances, we have an ideal mechanism to help graduate education simply by raising these allowances. Through these two mechanisms it seems to me we can do a great deal to help the graduate schools meet their financial crisis.

Mr. HOWE. Let me point out that some thinking has already developed about increasing the cost-of-education allowances. Many agencies have had a part in that thinking. It's ready to move. All that is necessary, really, is a planning move by the Bureau of the Budget to standardize these cost-of-education allowances at a higher level. And it could be done in many ways. For example, it could be phased in over a period of three, four, or five years by adding \$500 a year to the allowance, which now runs around \$2,500, and build it up to \$3,500. In this fashion, an institution could get some funds for its own development as it takes in a graduate student but that can happen only if the amount is raised appreciably.

It's pretty important to point out that in the graduate schools, which indeed have the special problems you outline, the cost of education of an individual graduate student may run as high as \$10,000.

Mr. HALPERIN. Perhaps five to ten times that of an undergraduate.

Mr. HOWE. Yes. So when an institution takes in a graduate student with Federal support and gets a \$2,500 cost-of-education allowance, it may be losing as much as \$7,500 on the deal.

Let's turn to other areas and consider the education of the handicapped, and then perhaps vocational education, which I think needs considerable discussion here.

Why don't you start with the handicapped?

Mr. HALPERIN. In the area of the handicapped we not only have a host of programs, but one particular program—Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—which is, it seems to me, almost a true "general aid" program. It provides funds to the States to support the operating costs of virtually any educational service or program for the handicapped. One might therefore conclude that it would be possible to build

\*Since enacted as Title X of the Higher Education Act; see Public Law 90-575, October 16, 1968.

upon existing authority to design programs that would reach particular target groups—for example, the deaf-blind or the multiply-handicapped.

Here, too, we ought to state an overall goal for the next five to ten years, for example, that we will reach and teach and provide the necessary ancillary services to all of the handicapped children of the Nation.

One-tenth of all of our children are estimated to be physically or mentally handicapped and to need some sort of special attention. Yet, we are serving only about two million of these children today. Three million are not served at all. And among the two million who are receiving some sort of special service, the adequacy of service obviously leaves much to be desired.

So I would say that here again a useful device for the next Administration would be to set a specific numerical goal. Under the Johnson Administration we made fantastic progress in getting started in each and every one of these areas. Now I think we have to measure our objective and pace ourselves so that we are sure to reach it.

Mr. Howe. Yes, not only has the Johnson Administration gotten some very effective legislation in place for the benefit of the handicapped, but it has also moved forward on funding for this legislation in very tight budget years, when money was hard to find because of all sorts of national commitments. There has been a significant move percentage-wise in what has happened in our appropriations for handicapped legislation.

The budget of the Office of Education, in moving from Fiscal '68 to '69 has reflected close to a 50 percent increase in the money being made available for education of the handicapped. And although as we approach our Fiscal '70 budget we are not talking about that large an increase, we are nevertheless talking about some increase while the '70 budget for the Office of Education as a whole may remain rather stable or even decrease.

I would mention another point, too, which relates not just to the handicapped but more broadly to our earlier conversation about elementary-secondary education. That is the very great achievement of this Administration in getting the idea of early childhood education generally accepted around the country. The Head Start program supervised by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the focus of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on early childhood education, as well as the Follow Through Program, are all evidence of this.

Mr. HALPERIN. And the various Day Care Programs, under Social Security and welfare legislation, too.

Mr. Howe. Right. These efforts have awakened people and gotten them ready to move. There is now a real opportunity for a much broader program of early childhood education. What we know about children—about the way they grow and develop and achieve success in school—indicates that this is an eminently sensible move.

I bring this up in the context of the handicapped because I think that an effective move in early childhood education may lead to much earlier identification of physical and mental handicaps and a much higher percentage of solutions to those problems. The result in the long haul may be lower levels of investment in the handicapped if early identification and diagnosis and early intervention can be developed through Federal initiative working with States and localities.

I would like early childhood education, first of all, to the disadvantaged population; secondly, to this notion of early identification of handicaps and thirdly, to service of the entire population. I think that future Administrations are in a firm position to move in these directions as a result of what has already been accomplished.

Let me add, finally, that adequate services to handicapped children (as well as to the

disadvantaged) depend absolutely on categorical programs. There is little likelihood that general aid programs will help these children. Future planners of the education role of the Federal Government must keep this in mind.

Mr. HALPERIN. To go on now to a new subject—vocational education—this is the area in which the Federal Government was doing most before the advent of the Johnson Administration. The momentum was continued and, in 1963, important steps were taken to modernize and update vocational education programs. Since 1963 there has been a substantial increase in vocational enrollments. Now, in 1968, the Congress of the United States is about to pass the most far-reaching reworking, expansion and extension of vocational education in our Nation's history.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, I would suggest that by and large we have been something less than completely sympathetic to the needs of our young people in this area.

We have been so strongly oriented to the colleges and to the disadvantaged very young in recent years that we have tended to understate the needs of the four-fifths of our young people who do not graduate from college and the three-fifths of our young people who never see the inside of a college.

We know that vocational education has been and can be a dumping ground for young people. It can be a dead-end street. The new legislation brought into being under the Johnson Administration, and some of the funding which has begun to flow since 1964, does indeed provide substantial opportunities to make a meaningful bridge between the school and the first job, to bring industry and business into a partnership with the schools so that our young people will have a realistic understanding of the world of work outside of the classroom.

I would hope that using the new legislation, possibly with further developments in the area of guidance and counseling, we would move with more vigor in vocational and technical education. In other areas I have suggested a goal; I will suggest one here, too: We have about 7.5 million people enrolled in vocational education today. I think it is entirely realistic as well as important to suggest that in 1975 or so we should have tripled these enrollments—about 21 or 22 million Americans of all age groups in vocational and occupational education. This is going to require several billion dollars more than we are now putting into the enterprise. But considering the importance of the labor force in the growth of the American economy I can think of few better investments.

Mr. Howe. I would like to make several comments on vocational education. I quite agree that the levels of investment need to be very much changed, as you suggest. But as they are changed I am concerned lest the United States develop two entirely separate systems of education, one labeled as vocational and the other labeled as the regular or general system of education.

It seems to me that both in legislation and in administration of the new Act that you cite, efforts have to be made to avoid this separatism. I think there should be an infusion of a major vocational component into the normal high school and junior high school education programs across the country and that the new money that comes into vocational education ought to encourage the pulling together of vocational education with the usual public school system rather than increasing their separatism.

I would also pick up your point about the wider involvement of business and industry and in finding ways to give them an input into the affairs of vocational education. I think it is really the job of industry and

business to define the skills that are needed. That is where the people are going to be employed. And I don't see enough back and forth between industry and business and the world of education.

One of the problems we confront and that future Administrations will confront is that of somehow crossing this gap. Whenever we bring before the Congress proposals for allowing Federal grants to flow to business and industry for purposes of training teachers—for training them right within business and industry so that they will know what they should teach their students that will be pertinent to the jobs youngsters will have available to them—we run into a roadblock.

We find that a number of educational organizations are, as a matter of principle, opposed to Federal grants to private industry for purposes of this training function or for purposes of curriculum development, or really for purposes of any kind of constructive interaction. And I think a future Administration has got to find a way to persuade people that such arrangements are not a threat to the public schools in any sense but rather comprise an added resource to the public schools. The new vocational legislation as now written opens the door between business and education. I hope that it passes and that future administrations make vigorous use of it.

Third, I think we ought to use this conversation about vocational education to register our general concern for the community college and junior college. The fact that such institutions are in part avenues to the later years of college and the baccalaureate degree must be put against the fact you mentioned earlier that only twenty percent of the people are now getting this degree. In short, the community college has open to it a role that goes far beyond being a half-way house to a four-year institution.

The two-year institution is the most rapidly growing component of the higher education spectrum in terms of new institutions being built and of the numbers of students going into post-secondary education.

Yet there are gaps in the Federal support of community colleges. I think the new Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 offer real opportunity to fill those gaps; so it is possible that with adequate funding we may have almost all the legislation we need.

The Higher Education Facilities Act offers opportunities for supporting the construction aspects of those new community colleges.

So far, however, we have neglected the curricular development side and teacher training aspects of community college operations. We have the legislation to do both these things, but we don't have the funds, and we don't have the leadership at the present. It seems to me that additional funds for vocational education over the next five years ought to be so planned and administered that they take account of those gaps and needs.

Mr. HALPERIN. I'm glad that you touched on the community college question because I think there is a bridge there to contemporary politics which can help win public acceptance for increased Federal aid to education.

There is at this moment in history what can only be regarded as an unfortunate tendency on the part of many people to reject Federal programs on the grounds that they are allegedly aimed only at the poor or the black or the neglected. And we hear grumblings like, "What do you have to do to get some of your own Federal money back from your Government?" I think Federal support, while it must necessarily give priority to the disadvantaged—regardless of whether that disadvantage is physical or mental or racial or educational or cultural—should also aim at making it clear that the Federal education programs are intended for all of the people of the country.

<sup>1</sup> See Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Public Law 90-576, October 16, 1968.

It seems to me that vocational and technical education, particularly with a community of junior college component, touches a deep-rooted desire of the American people: better education for their youngsters as a path to a better job and a better economic future. If we build a closer alliance between our vocational and technical programs and the junior and community college movement, we will go a long way toward overcoming what I detect as a disaffection on the part of some members of the taxpaying public with programs they feel are not benefiting them. Apparently they either do not see their children as being candidates for the full baccalaureate degree or they do not see their children benefiting from programs addressed to the educationally and culturally disadvantaged. The community college-technical school movement can bridge this gap.

Mr. Hows. I would add that higher levels of literacy are going to become an increasing requirement for vocational education. There is thus some likelihood that the production of those higher levels of literacy will increasingly become the job of the secondary schools and that this will tend to thrust a larger proportion of the vocational education component onto the community colleges.

I hope if that happens that those who are devising the new programs in these colleges, and those who are devising support for them on the Federal side, will keep in mind the need for flexibility. The great thing about this community college now is that it hasn't solidified. It can be all kinds of things at the same time. It can offer six-week courses to develop a very special skill. It can take in a person who needs literacy training and give him that, if he's an adult or if he has finished high school or if he has dropped out of high school. It can offer a specific two-year program leading to an intermediate degree.

There is a tendency among community colleges to see as the basic measurement of excellence the movement of a very high proportion of their graduates into four-year institutions. It seems to me that we need to help the community colleges to develop a concept of excellence in other sorts of services and to take pride in them; so that we avoid the danger that is now so evident among some community colleges of wanting to lose their identity as vocational and technical training places and transform themselves into four-year colleges. I suppose after they were four-year colleges for a period of years they would want a graduate school.

While I think we need well-planned, high-quality, widely-available services at the graduate level, we certainly don't need every community college to follow that course. We are going to need in the years ahead the service of a growing number of community colleges to a major proportion of the population.

I believe that the most recent prognosis I saw was something to the effect that in 1975 about 75 percent of the population would be graduating from high school.

Mr. HALPERIN. We're at about 71 percent now.

Mr. HOWS. We may be up to 80 or so by 1975. That means a very great demand for these new community colleges. That prospect raises the question of whether in the future the Federal Government won't have to find a more flexible method than it now has for helping institutions to get started.

Most of our legislation today is written to provide aid only to higher education institutions that already exist. This stipulation is, in fact, set in law by the Congress. Institutions either have to have received accreditation or provisional accreditation of some carefully defined kind. In any case, there are relatively few Federal resources to help the people lacking a vocational and technical college to get one established. They have to do it entirely on their own initiative, with their own resources. And fre-

quently the places where such services are particularly needed have insufficient economic base to do the job.

Mr. HALPERIN. That point suggests another to me, namely, that we really do not now have a planning capability or a program that would enable us to know when, for example, support ought to be extended to an emerging new community college or emerging new graduate school because there was a genuine need or when, alternatively, the availability of Federal funds would merely proliferate programs, produce non-economic institutions, and cater to particular community whims which may not be soundly based in educational terms.

We hear a great deal, for example, about the desire of virtually any community of any size to have its own community college for reasons of "civic pride." That may be a caricature and exaggeration, but it is no exaggeration to say that at the present time we have no mechanisms for deciding when scarce Federal funds ought to go to an institution and when they should not.

Mr. Hows. We have reviewed the major aspects of the Federal role in education in our earlier conversation about elementary and secondary education and the relationship of categorical programs to general aid, then in our subsequent conversation about higher education in that same relationship, and then in these special thrusts into vocational education and education of the handicapped. One area we have missed is the very broad one, which, for want of a better phrase, I will call adult education, but which isn't really that. It's the idea that Americans in this complex society will need increasingly to be engaged in education all their lives.

The Federal Government is already involved in the support of a variety of enterprises which contribute to lifelong education opportunity. Contributions now made by the Federal Government include major support to public libraries and support for the development of a new kind of non-commercial or public broadcasting system which will be an education device although not institutionally based.

It occurs to me that the museums of the country are really in this same category, and have not captured major attention from the Federal Government. The President addressed a letter not long ago to the Council for the Arts and Humanities asking that group to advise him on what the Federal role might be in relation to museums. And I think one of the opportunities before the Federal Government in the years immediately ahead is to respond to the report that will be forthcoming shortly about this matter.

There are, of course, some very specific programs directed at adult literacy and the decreasing but still large proportion of adults who don't have adequate basic literacy to undertake vocational or other programs that will get them started.

I think the Federal Government at this point has moved in this area by bits and pieces rather than thinking about it as a total package.

Mr. HALPERIN. What might be called an Adult Opportunity Act has been suggested in this connection—something that would tie together the continuing needs for new forms of education, cultural development, recreation, and that would enhance the cultural literacy of our population.

The concept takes in some of the elements you mentioned, with possibly a specific recommendation for some sort of research and development institute that would push information science, communications science, ways to handle the information explosion, better non-commercial television, and library services of all types, particularly library services that would reach into homes and into disadvantaged neighborhoods.

It could also include mid-career develop-

ment—ways in which the adult could change his job with appropriate training, possibly under a broadened Manpower Development and Training Act or some other type of adult education.

It could take in specialized needs, such as those of the housewife who has raised her children and wants to return to the labor force (not necessarily into education, where we now have the Education Professions Development Act, but somewhere else), some way that she can get the necessary retraining or continuing adult education; the needs of the retired, of senior citizens, of people who have finished one career as business executives or as Army officers and who need special resources and programs to help with the start of a new career.

Obviously, this is quite a major area. Thus far, we have inched into it. We now need to step up the pace considerably.

Another dimension of this subject occurs to me. We do have the program of adult basic literacy, of course. But to my way of thinking, we have not done what we should have done. We still have 23 million Americans with less than an eighth grade education. We have eleven million functional illiterates with less than a sixth grade education. And we are spending under \$50 million a year on this particular social and economic problem. We ought to expand that commitment many fold.

Ultimately, we ought to look also at the sixty million or so Americans without a high school education. While they may not occupy the same priority as some of the things we've been talking about today, in developing a rounded picture we should ask ourselves whether high school equivalency programs and various other specialized opportunities might not be made available to this population, not only to bring about more gainful employment, but for personal satisfaction, for creative adjustment to society, for more satisfying relationships with their fellowman.

Mr. Hows. To touch on another point in this look to the future and the job that remains to be done, I would raise the problem of the distribution of educational resources in the U.S.A. Although States are increasingly doing a more effective job of planning for new educational services in places where these are in short supply, it occurs to me that there are opportunities for the Federal Government to be of assistance in a number of different ways.

We know that more and more people are moving toward metropolitan centers and will continue to do so in the years ahead. Yet, the costs of providing such people with adequate educational services are much higher at all levels than are the costs in rural and suburban areas. One typical result is that we are getting more colleges in those places where there are fewer people while we confront a shortage of post-secondary education services in the cities, where land and buildings are expensive and operating costs higher.

Shouldn't the Federal Government devise a program to pay a larger percentage of central city construction costs than the percentage it pays outside the city? Shouldn't the Federal Government find the means to help new institutions get started in the places where the great concentrations of people are to be found?

These concentrations of people do not pose problems just for the States. More and more, the metropolis cuts across State boundaries. The economic and social pressures which cause the migrations that in turn create the metropolises are far beyond State control.

There clearly seems to be a need for the Federal role to include a planning and financing component to help meet the educational challenges created by these migrations. Some Federal programs, such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, already have this effect. But more remains to be done at all levels of education.

Finally let me mention a couple of items that have not been a part of our conversation but that must be kept on the agenda for the future:

(1) Forward funding—The Federal Government's fiscal cycle is badly out of phase with the planning cycle of the schools. As a result, States and school districts do not learn what appropriations they will actually get until long after they have had to make commitments for the use of the appropriations. If someone were to start out to design a system for the maximum inconvenience of the schools, he might well come up with the arrangement we now have. Forward funding, under which the President and Congress would consider funding of Elementary-Secondary programs a full year ahead, would solve this problem. Many higher education programs now have this arrangement. All education programs should have it.

(2) International Education—One of the failures of the past few years has been the inability of the administration to get Congressional backing for the International Education Act. This Act, growing from the President's Smithsonian speech of September 1965, holds great hope for improved training of all sorts of specialists vitally needed by American Government and by business—specialists with knowledge of language, economics, government, health, education, engineering, and a variety of other fields as they apply to the problems of particular parts of the world in which the United States has national interests. The study now underway at the direction of the Appropriations Committee may lead the way to favorable action in the future. The Act must be kept alive, and appropriations for it should be a high priority matter.

(3) Education in special fields—Particularly in health and in conservation, the years ahead will see major new manpower needs. Medical education requires a complete re-study to make it more efficient. New specialties will develop related to control of the environment. The Federal Government must take its share of responsibility in these areas of education.

#### A DAY OF PRAYER FOR OUR NEW PRESIDENT

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to read to my colleagues an editorial from the front page of the *Morning News*, which is published in Paterson, N.J., in the congressional district which I represent.

I think that the recommendations of the editorial merit our favorable consideration, and that Mr. Harry B. Haines, the publisher of the newspaper, and Mr. Abe J. Greene, the associate editor, are to be congratulated for initiating this movement which can unify our Nation behind our new President.

Due to the fact that congressional committees are not yet fully organized, it will unfortunately not be possible for a resolution to clear both Houses of Congress in the early days of the Presidency of Richard M. Nixon. However, it is my earnest hope that congressional leaders of both parties will unite in urging a national day of prayer for Divine guidance for our new President in the difficult and dangerous decisions with which he will be faced in the days and years ahead. The editorial follows:

America has a new President, chosen by its people. From this day on, he will speak

for us in one voice. President Nixon is committed to a speedy peace and an end to the division among our own people. He has asked all Americans to pray for him, to work with him to achieve the goals ahead. Together, there is no task too great that Americans cannot achieve.

But, we need strength and character and resolve and we need Divine assistance in the difficult days ahead. We propose that Congress immediately proclaim next Sunday as a national day of prayer for strength and guidance for the new President to achieve his laudable goals. In every home, in every church and synagogue in the land, let our prayers rise to the heavens towards a new era in the world.

Let us pray!

#### THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1969, is the 51st anniversary of the restoration of Ukrainian independence. I rise to speak in commemoration of those great people whose fatherland remains occupied by the Soviet Union.

I will not concentrate on the reasons why Ukraine decided to break with Russia, for they are too numerous. History tells us that for the 300 years of the Ukraine an opportunity to throw off the Pereyaslaw in 1658—the Russians continuously violated the treaty, occupied Ukraine militarily, exploited her economically and even forbade the Ukrainians to speak their own language in their own country.

Collapse of czarist Russia, in 1917, gave Ukraine an opportunity to throw off the Russian yoke, and renew her full independence.

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitled them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

These words, which were spoken in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776, were repeated by the leaders of the Ukrainian Nation on January 22, 1918, in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, when Ukraine decided to dissolve her political bands with her arch-oppressor—Russia.

However, the imperialistic Russian Bolsheviks unleashed their hordes on the Ukraine, and after 4 years of bloody struggle, reimposed an iron-fisted military rule which exists up to today. But, Ukrainians have never given up in their fight to regain freedom from Russian occupancy:

In 1932-33, the Russians introduced compulsory collectivization of Ukrainian farms. Revolt broke out and as a result, 7 million Ukrainian farmers were systematically liquidated in 1 year by artificial famine imposed by the Russians as a retaliation.

In 1937-38, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian intelligentsia were arrested and executed for their membership in the Association of Liberation of the Ukraine.

As late as 1943, in Wynyntzia, central Ukraine, over 30,000 victims of this purge were exhumed from mass graves.

In 1941, when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, Ukrainian leaders issued in Lviv—Lemberg—on June 30 a proclamation declaring Ukraine an independent state. Thousands of Ukrainians in the Red army surrendered to the Germans. Some pro-Soviet historians consider this a brilliant Nazi operation; however, those who fully understand those developments know that this was a refusal of the Ukrainians to fight for Stalin and his regime.

Even though the Iron Curtain does not permit the free press to report about the present situation in the Ukraine, free men the world over know that the struggle of the Ukrainian people with the Russian occupancy goes on and on.

Only recently, stories of unrest in the Ukraine and mass arrests and trials of Ukrainian writers and intellectuals reached us in the West.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are some in this Chamber who would ask this question: "What is our concern with the situation in the Ukraine?"

For us Americans, Ukraine is not only a moral issue of the first magnitude, which we cannot any more ignore, but we must also realize that a free independent Ukraine could prove a valuable asset to the United States and the free world.

Needless to say, the present deplorable international situation is a direct result of our lack of understanding of the Russian issue and our misguided approach toward the Soviet Union, which must be reexamined.

I am wondering if it ever occurred to the architects of our foreign policy that during 25 years of the cold war with the Soviet Union, in which we have sacrificed over 100,000 boys, with over a quarter of a million more wounded, not one Russian died in Korea or Vietnam? Could anyone consider this an accomplishment for our side?

I hope that in this changing world, where our own approach also must be changed, all those who swallowed the party line that the Russians were mellowing are "cured" by the recent Soviet military invasion of Czechoslovakia, and continued suppression of the Czech people.

I am wondering—why free elections and freedom for South Vietnam and not for Ukraine—or other nations enslaved by the Russians? Why do we continue to use a deadly wrong and bankrupt policy toward the Soviet Union? Why not adopt a positive role to weaken this monstrous Soviet Union, who continues its goal to overthrow our Government by force; who continues war during peace by supporting riots, insurrection, and lawlessness in our country and throughout the world?

I do not advocate any preventive war or any military adventure, but there are peaceful weapons; that is, encouraging the aspiration to independence of the nations enslaved by the Russians, and self-determination for the minorities under Russian imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, I am sending a memorandum to our Department of State with a request to put on the agenda of the United Nations the issue of existing slav-



ery in this world's last colonial empire—the Soviet Union.

I am also requesting the Department of State to prepare a resolution which requests the right of self-determination, free election in the Ukraine and other nations, enslaved by the Russians, which elections should be supervised by the United Nations. There is already a unanimous resolution of the U.S. Congress from July 1959, which supports the aspirations of all nations, enslaved by Communist Russia and China.

On this January 22, 1969, the 51st anniversary of the restoration of Ukrainian independence, we salute you, brave Ukraine. You have paid perhaps the heaviest price to be free, and we pray with you for that day when you, too, will join the great family of free nations.

I take this stand because your liberty is our liberty.

#### WE DISCOURAGE PRODUCTIVITY AND JOBS

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as is usual at the beginning of a new Congress or new administration, there is much talk of tax reform. We are quite aware of the inequities that occur in the taxation of individuals, but we seem hesitant to discuss the inequities of corporate taxation. The corporations are the convenient "im-personal whipping boys" of our economy. Closer examination reveals that the ownership of these legal entities represents the savings and investments of over 24 million Americans. This ownership group is larger than the combined union membership, and includes many therein.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, the noted economist, in a thought-provoking analysis, describes the unfairness of present corporate taxation and its effects upon the economy. This article appeared in the January 1969 issue of the Freeman, and is entitled "How We Discourage Investment."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this poignant, but short article in the RECORD:

#### HOW WE DISCOURAGE INVESTMENT (By Henry Hazlitt)

Personal income tax rates that rise to the level of 77 per cent obviously discourage incentives, investment, and production. But no politician raises the point for fear he will be accused of defending the rich.

What is probably an even greater discouragement to new investment and increased production is the present income tax rate of 52.8 per cent on corporations. Yet this gets even less criticism than high personal income taxes. Nobody wants to defend the corporations. They are everybody's whipping boy. And yet they are the key productive element on which the nation's income, wealth, and economic growth depend.

There was at least some awareness of this until recent years. When the tax on corporate income was first imposed in 1913 it was at the very cautious rate of 1 per cent. It never got above 15 per cent until 1937. In the midst of World War II it was almost 40 per cent. It did not get to 52 per cent until 1952.

Today such a rate is taken for granted. Yet most of those who approve of it, and even

suggest it could be a little higher, are the very people who have been complaining most loudly in recent years about the country's disappointing rate of economic growth.

The present average tax on all corporations is about 45 per cent. On successful corporations of any size, however, the average rate is close to 52 per cent. Broadly speaking, therefore, when anybody contemplates a new corporate investment, he will not make it unless the investment promises to yield before taxes at least twice as much as the return he would consider worthwhile. If, for example, a man would not consider a new investment worthwhile unless it promised a 10 per cent average annual return on his capital outlay, it would have to promise a return of 20 per cent on that outlay before taxes.

What is at least as important as reducing the incentive to investment is that the present corporate income tax reduces the funds available for investment. In the second quarter of 1968, according to estimate of the Department of Commerce, U.S. corporations were earning total profits before taxes at an annual rate of \$92 billion. Out of this their corporate tax liability was \$41 billion. This reduced their profits after taxes to \$50.7 billion. Out of this sum, in turn, \$24.4 billion was paid out in dividends while \$26.3 billion was retained in undistributed profits.

This last figure represents the corporations' own reinvestment in working capital, inventories, improvement, new plant, and equipment. If there had been no corporate tax whatever, and there had been the same proportionate distribution of profits between dividends and reinvestment, the amount of money reinvested would have been \$47 billion instead of \$26 billion—about \$21 billion, or 80 per cent, more a year.

By discouraging and retarding investment in new machinery and plant, the 52.8 per cent marginal corporation income tax shields existing obsolescent capacity from the competition of the new, modern and efficient plant and equipment that would otherwise come into existence, or come into existence much sooner.

It is obvious that a corporation income tax in the neighborhood of 50 per cent must drastically reduce both the incentive and the funds for new investment, and therefore for the consequent increase in jobs, productivity, real wages, and economic growth that the politicians are always calling for. By striking so directly against new investment, in fact, the present high corporate income tax slows down economic growth more effectively than almost any other type of tax.

#### ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF UNITED STATES GROUP TO INTER- PARLIAMENTARY UNION

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, as President of the United States Group to the Inter-parliamentary Union I wish to advise my colleagues that the organizational meeting of the group for the 91st Congress will take place on Wednesday, January 29, 1969, in Senate reception room S-207, commencing at 10 a.m. One of the principal items on our agenda will be the election of officers. All Members of the House are welcome to participate.

#### RETENTION OF JUDGE ADVOCATES AND LAW SPECIALIST OFFICERS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation authorizing professional pay and a continuation bonus for judge advocates in the uniformed services. The intent of the bill is to provide retention incentives for service legal officers similar to those presently received by doctors, dentists, and veterinarians in the Armed Forces.

The retention rate of legal officers by our services is now dangerously low and the situation will continue to deteriorate unless prompt action is taken to make legal careers in the military more financially acceptable. My bill is designed to do just that by providing a monthly professional pay allowance based on rank and a variable continuation bonus which the officer could earn by continuation in the service past his initial obligation and after he becomes eligible for voluntary retirement with pay.

Specifically, the legislation provides: First. Retention incentives as follows: \$50 per month through grade O-3—captain; \$150 per month for grades O-4 and O-5—major and lieutenant colonel; \$200 per month for grades O-6 and above—full colonel and above.

Second, a continuation bonus payable at the rate of 2 months' basic pay for each year for which the judge advocate agrees to remain in active service beyond any then outstanding active duty service obligation or service commitment. The contract would be for a minimum of 3 additional years and a maximum of 6 years. Judge advocates would be eligible for this bonus on two occasions: First, upon the completion of 4 years' active service; and second, at the time when they become eligible for voluntary retirement with pay. A provision is included which would allow the judge advocate to receive the bonus either at the beginning of the period or to have it prorated.

It should be noted that the problem plagues all the uniformed services and shows no sign of diminishing in the absence of affirmative proposals.

The seriousness of the retention problem was highlighted in a feature article contained in the April 8, 1967, edition of the Journal of the Armed Forces entitled "Career Legal Billets Go Begging."

At the outset, Journal Editor Lou Stockstill placed the problem in proper perspective:

The armed forces are having a tough time filling "lawyer" billets in their career ranks.

As a result, much of the legal workload of the Services is being handled by young and relatively un-tried officers whose diplomas still smell of wet ink.

In response to a Journal survey, all four Services say the problem is not one of obtaining sufficient numbers of law specialists and judge advocates—but of keeping them. The turnover rate is extremely high and the retention rate is very low.

In the intervening year and a half since the Journal article, the retention problem has worsened.

For example, within the Army during the 14-year period from 1951 through 1964, of the 3,020 military lawyers who entered active duty, only 380 remained as of 1968. This represents an overall retention rate of 12½ percent. Since 1960, in the Navy, the number of career

lawyers has steadily declined to the point where the situation is now critical. As recently as last October, the Navy had only 38 regular lieutenants out of some 630 lawyers on active duty. This amounts to an average yearly retention of 12 lawyers per year. To assure experienced lawyers in the overall career structure, the Navy must retain 30 lawyers in each year group. Without remedial action, it is anticipated that by July 1972, 75 percent of all uniformed Navy lawyers will have had less than 5 years' legal military experience.

The situation in the Air Force is likewise distressing. Since 1956 that service has been able to retain only 19 percent of its judge advocates, including recallables. If the recallables are excluded, the percentage drops to 14 percent. The Air Force estimates that between 40 and 45 percent retention is necessary to maintain the JAG Department at the desired level.

The situation I have just outlined demands and deserves our immediate attention, but it is important to realize that one further relevant factor must also be considered. During the past session, we passed and the President signed into law the Military Justice Act of 1968—a landmark proposal which extends to service personnel the right-to-counsel safeguards which the Supreme Court in recent years has granted to criminal defendants in civilian courts. In addition, this new law requires the services to provide qualified and experienced lawyers as military judges in trials by special and general courts-martial. The four services estimate they will need approximately 700 additional military lawyers in order to meet this requirement.

It is, therefore, imperative that Congress take steps to insure a higher lawyer retention rate in the Armed Forces. To do otherwise is to forsake the high standard of military justice we have long set. Last session, we affirmed our commitment to our men in uniform that they be afforded the same legal protection that our courts extend to civilians. We cannot now deny them the means of obtaining those safeguards through our failure to provide experienced and qualified military lawyers.

My bill should enable the armed services to substantially increase their lawyer retention rate thereby improving significantly the quality of legal advice and military justice in the services. The Judge Advocates Association and the American Bar Association have approved this type of legislation in the past. I am confident that it will have the support of this body.

#### TAX REFORM

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, as we get down to the serious business of government now that the ceremony has been completed, I want to express a very specific hope for the 91st Congress: that it earnestly seek and achieve a comprehensive tax reform. The recent history

of reform efforts here has not been a happy one. It was a disappointment that the 90th Congress did not achieve either election reform or any degree of congressional reorganization.

For some time it has been the tacit and explicit assumption by both taxpayers and Congressmen that one of the first orders of business by our tax writers in this new Congress would be sweeping income-tax review leading to reform. Congress had directed that President Johnson submit recommendations for reform last month under the terms of the surtax-spending cut legislation we passed in June. That President, for reasons that are not clear to me, did not make his recommendations public, although presumably the new administration has access to them and will be studying them.

I am not pushing for any tax panacea, or for any special type of reform, but I do not want to see this opportunity slip away from us for any reason. While I regret that the last administration did not pursue tax reform more vigorously, I believe a comprehensive set of recommendations developed by the Treasury Department is in existence and can form the basis for study and action by the 91st Congress. We should make this a matter of high priority, because nothing is more basic to the relation of the Government to the productive citizens of our country than the equity of our tax system. As our economy has changed, the equities have changed; a thorough review is again necessary.

#### A BILL TO BAN ANY STATE FROM LEVYING INCOME TAXES ON NON-RESIDENTS

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would prohibit any State from levying income taxes on non-residents of the State.

My purpose in doing this is to strike down by means of legislation a decision by the Washington State Supreme Court making residents of the State of Washington liable for Alaska State taxes on income earned in Alaska.

This litigation has been in the courts for a long time and Alaska is now demanding back tax from 1960.

Most of the victims of this discrimination are maritime personnel who earn their living on ships that serve Alaska.

When the Alaska Statehood Act was enacted by the Congress of the United States, in the hearings and in the debate, full assurance was given that under the Constitution of the new State of Alaska, there would be no discrimination against nonresidents because much of the nature of employment in Alaska is seasonal.

But, now that promise is overlooked and persons living in the State of Washington who have no property or derive no benefits from the tax, who have no children in Alaskan schools must pay tribute as seamen because their source of income does business in Alaska.

This taxing of nonresidents is taxation without representation and works a tremendous hardship on the families of a

few U.S. citizens who are unfortunate enough to earn their living with business concerns which serve Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, the courts have opened up a Pandora's box and the precedent is such that the American citizen anywhere in the United States will be in danger of having his earnings subject to taxation in two or even more States.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this important legislation.

#### BIAFRAN STARVATION

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today calling for a significant increase in U.S. relief efforts to stop the tragic starvation that has already taken the lives of thousands of innocent civilians in the Nigerian-Biafran conflict.

As early as August 1967 I warned that the military conflict in Nigeria had become a problem of significant international dimension that demanded our serious attention. Since then the situation has worsened, not only in political and military complexity, but especially in terms of the continuing human tragedy which is growing increasingly serious each day.

It has become clear that neither unilateral efforts, nor the regional efforts of the Organization of African Unity, have been sufficient to end the political stalemate and halt the growing threat of starvation, but our world organization, the General Assembly of the United Nations, has been kept from taking up its proper humanitarian role by the military-political involvement of a number of its members.

The political-military situation is a complex and dangerous one. It will take the continuing and careful efforts of the entire international community to work out the effective settlement that is necessary, and is far beyond the realm of a single resolution. It is because the humanitarian problem—the lives of thousands more innocent men, women, and children—cannot wait, however, that I am introducing this resolution today. The text is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 97

Whereas reliable reports indicate that there is a tragic loss of life in the Nigerian Civil War caused by starvation and disease in areas controlled by the Federal Government and under the control of the "Biafran" authorities; and

Whereas present relief operations are inhibited by poor roads, bad weather, inadequate transport, and the inaccessibility of certain areas to overland supplies; and

Whereas increased shipments of food and medical supplies are needed to reduce the tragic rate of starvation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—

(1) that the President should act to increase significantly the amount of surplus food stocks, relief moneys, noncombat aircraft, and such other vehicles of transportation as may be necessary for relief purposes; and that this relief assistance should be made available to and at the request of the

Organization of African Unity, UNICEF, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and such other suitable religious and charitable relief agencies now or hereafter operating in the area with the consent of the responsible authorities; and

(2) that the Government of the United States should solicit the cooperation of other nations in this humanitarian effort.

Over 100 Members of the House have indicated their support in this endeavor to Congressman DON FRASER and myself, as chief sponsors of this resolution in the House. It is our hope that, through this action, the United States can work toward fulfilling its humanitarian obligations while avoiding the diplomatic and military pitfalls of direct involvement in the war itself, and the cold war polemics that paralyze more effective action by the U.N.

I am pleased to announce that 52 Members of the Senate joined an identical resolution introduced into that body yesterday.

The House sponsors of the bill include: BROCK ADAMS, Democrat, of Washington.

JOSEPH P. ADDABO, Democrat, of New York.

JOHN B. ANDERSON, Republican, of Illinois.

LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois.

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio.

EDWARD G. BIESTER, Jr., Republican, of Pennsylvania.

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York.

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota.

EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

RICHARD BOLLING, Democrat, of Missouri.

JOHN BRADEMANS, Democrat, of Indiana.

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Republican, of Michigan.

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr., Democrat, of California.

JOHN BUCHANAN, Republican, of Alabama.

PHILLIP BURTON, Democrat, of California.

DANIEL E. BUTTON, Republican, of New York.

SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, Democrat, of New York.

BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr., Republican, of New York.

SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts.

JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.

JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California.

JOHN C. CULVER, Democrat, of Iowa.

DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey.

HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

JOHN J. DUNCAN, Republican, of Tennessee.

DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California.

JACK EDWARDS, Republican, of Alabama.

MARVIN L. ESCH, Republican, of Michigan.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Democrat, of Florida.

HAMILTON FISH, Jr., Republican, of New York.

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Democrat, of Washington.

DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, of Minnesota.

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey.

RICHARD FULTON, Democrat, of Tennessee.

ROBERT N. GAIAMO, Democrat, of Connecticut.

JACOB H. GILBERT, Democrat, of New York.

WILLIAM J. GREEN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

GILBERT GUDE, Republican, of Maryland.

SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York.

LEE H. HAMILTON, Democrat, of Indiana.

JAMES M. HANLEY, Democrat, of New York.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Democrat, of Washington.

WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Democrat, of Maine.

KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia.

MARGARET M. HECKLER, Republican, of Massachusetts.

FLOYD V. HICKS, Democrat, of Washington.

LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Republican, of Maryland.

FRANK HORTON, Republican, of New York.

ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., Democrat, of Indiana.

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, Democrat, of California.

JOSEPH E. KARTH, Democrat, of Minnesota.

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts.

EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat, of New York.

DONALD E. LUKENS, Republican, of Ohio.

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr., Republican, of California.

JOSEPH M. McDADE, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

MARTIN B. McKNEALLY, Republican, of New York.

CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington.

THOMAS J. MESKILL, Republican, of Connecticut.

ABNER J. MIKVA, Democrat, of Illinois.

JOSEPH G. MINISH, Democrat, of New Jersey.

PATSY T. MINK, Democrat, of Hawaii.

CHESTER L. MIZE, Republican, of Kansas.

WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts.

CHARLES A. MOSHER, Republican, of Ohio.

WILLIAM T. MURPHY, Democrat, of Illinois.

LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan.

JAMES G. O'HARA, Democrat, of Michigan.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., Democrat, of Massachusetts.

RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, of New York.

CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida.

BERTRAM L. PODELL, Democrat, of New York.

TOM RAILSBACK, Republican, of Illinois.

THOMAS M. REES, Democrat, of California.

OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York.

HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York.

PETER W. ROBINO, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.

FRED B. ROONEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York.

PHILIP E. RUPPE, Republican, of Michigan.

WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, of New York.

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

FRED SCHWENGLER, Republican, of Iowa.

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Republican, of Vermont.

J. WILLIAM STANTON, Republican, of Ohio.

LOUIS STOKES, Democrat, of Ohio.

ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Republican, of Ohio.

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of California.

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.

ROBERT O. TIERNAN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

JOHN V. TUNNEY, Democrat, of California.

MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona.

CHARLES A. VANIK, Democrat, of Ohio.

JEROME R. WALDIE, Democrat, of California.

LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Republican, of Connecticut.

G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, Republican, of Virginia.

LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

CHARLES H. WILSON, Democrat, of California.

LESTER L. WOLFF, Democrat, of New York.

JOHN W. WYDLER, Republican, of New York.

SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat, of Illinois.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people form one of the oldest and largest of the Slavic ethnic groups. They are known as one of the most peace loving and industrious peoples in Eastern Europe, but for centuries they have not been allowed to live in peace, nor

have they been permitted to reap much benefit from their hard work. The reason for this misfortune is that, except for the short but happy 2-year period of independence in 1918-20, the Ukrainian people have been suffering under the alien Russian yoke for more than three centuries.

Up to the mid-17th century the Ukrainians were able to overcome and survive the onslaughts of invading Asiatic hordes. Then in the year 1654 the Ukrainian leaders signed a compact with the Russian czar by which they meant to unite the two countries. Soon Ukrainian leaders learned that they were tricked into a trap. Before long the wily autocrat of Russia succeeded in nullifying the terms of this compact and put an end to the Ukraine's independence. Nearly all of Ukraine's subsequent misfortunes seem to have stemmed from the deliberate misrepresentation of the terms of that compact by the Russians.

For some 250 years Ukrainians lived and worked under the oppressive yoke of the czars, but when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, the Ukrainians felt free and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. But the new state thus born was surrounded by foes, all of them prepared to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. That cruel task was performed by the Red Army in 1920; the country was invaded and overrun, and its independence shattered. Thenceforth the Ukraine was incorporated into the Soviet Union and so it remains to this day. There Communist totalitarian tyranny reigns supreme and some 42 million Ukrainians are suffering under the grinding steamroller of the Kremlin. But the irrepressible free spirit of the Ukrainian refuses to be chained, and the people still long for their richly deserved freedom. On the observance of their 51st Independence Day let us all hope and pray for their eventual freedom and national independence.

#### RECENT DELIVERY OF SUPER-PLUSH GULFSTREAM II PRIVATE EXECUTIVE JET TRANSPORT TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to observe the pronouncements of the press were the Congress to appropriate approximately \$3,000,000 for a superplush "Flying Palace" executive jet aircraft to be used for travel of its Members. Obviously the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. RIVERS, could very well use this aircraft, as could the Speaker and other Members of Congress. However, the Congress has been very concerned about the expenses of running the Government and certainly has not authorized or contemplated the authorization of such an exorbitant expenditure for plush executive travel of its Members.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard, whose mission is to protect our

shores and save lives, has recently had delivered a superplush Gulfstream II private executive jet transport.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of the interior furnishings of this flying palace, as provided in the original contract price was \$162,181, enough money to build 10 \$16,000 family dwellings. Yet, I was absolutely appalled to find that even \$162,181 was not enough money to make the interior of the aircraft plush enough for the Coast Guard and Department of Transportation Federal employees who will be traveling in the aircraft. They felt it necessary to increase the spending for the interior of the airplane by an additional \$41,848. This super-plush executive jet airplane with its original super-plush interior costing \$162,181 was modified, at the Coast Guard's request for an additional \$41,848 to provide more luxuries and the following changes in the interior of the airplane for the comfort of our DOT and Coast Guard executives:

First. Improved cabin and lavatory lighting.

Second. Relocated radio operator position from the cabin to the cockpit area.

Third. Added flight attendant seat to the galley area.

Fourth. Increased soundproofing material under the plush carpet.

Fifth. Improved the quality of materials on the bulkheads for better appearance and soundproofing.

Sixth. Increased carpet weight to improve appearance and soundproofing.

Seventh. Changed seating from one swivel and five nonswivel single 19-inch and three double 19-inch seats to six swivel single 21-inch seats and two double 21-inch seats and a two-place divan.

Eighth. Added one conference table and two foldout desks.

Ninth. Removed partition between forward four single berthable seats to provide more privacy.

What a waste of our taxpayers' money. I am absolutely appalled that our Government employees who will use this airplane would have the gall to spend an additional \$41,848 after \$162,181 was already spent on the interior furnishings, according to the GAO report.

In summary, inasmuch as DOT and the Coast Guard are so vitally interested in safety, it is curious to note that the money totaling \$2,876,000 spent for this one airplane could provide installation landing systems for approximately 20 airports, or control towers at approximately six airports, or bright tube displays on control towers radar displays at approximately 85 locations, or approximately 115 visual approach slope indicators to provide visual glide slope guide for jets on runways not equipped with instrument landing systems or backup systems to insure service in high density areas when failures occur in power supply, radar and communications equipment, or air terminal area automation with alpha-numeric displays and associated equipment, or terminal area radar for approximately five airports—terminal area radar could probably have prevented the mid-air collision which cost the life of the Secretary of the Navy recently.

Mr. Speaker, if the Coast Guard and

DOT are truly concerned in protecting and saving lives, perhaps they should not have such great concern for the physical comfort and luxury of their traveling executives in their own super-plush private jet liner but more concern about safety aids.

I include, in full, the General Accounting Office report to me confirming the above information:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., January 6, 1969.

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: As requested in your letter of October 11, 1968, the General Accounting Office has obtained information regarding (1) the purchase of a Gulfstream II "super-plush" executive jet transport aircraft by the Department of Transportation (DOT) and (2) executive aircraft owned by all agencies of DOT and based at Washington National Airport. You also stated in your letter that an evaluation of DOT's air transportation needs is warranted. We agree with your conclusion and, as discussed with your administrative assistant, Mr. Richard A. Ashworth, we will make an evaluation of DOT's air transportation needs at the earliest practicable time.

With regard to the purchase of the Gulfstream II, on April 3, 1968, the U.S. Coast Guard awarded a contract to the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corporation, Bethpage, Long Island, New York, for the purchase of a long-range jet transport aircraft, Grumman Model G-1159, to be used primarily for executive transportation. The total contract price, as amended, is \$2,876,486. According to the contract specifications, the aircraft was designed for the transportation of 12 passengers and a crew of four. At the time of our review, the aircraft was with a subcontractor—Atlantic Aviation Corporation, Wilmington, Delaware—for interior and exterior finishing and was scheduled for delivery to the Coast Guard in December 1968.

With regard to the interior of the aircraft, the April 1968 contract price included \$162,181 for furnishings and their installation. Subsequent to the award of the contract, the Coast Guard revised the specifications for the interior of the aircraft. The revision resulted in increasing the contract price by \$41,848. According to information furnished to us by the Coast Guard, these changes (1) "improved the cabin materials and hardware quality and arrangement so as to provide a functional interior of acceptable corporate aircraft quality and appearance" and (2) were made because the "initially proposed interior was considered to be functionally inadequate and austere for this type aircraft and its intended mission." The nature of the changes is shown in enclosure I. The original specifications for the flight deck and cabin accommodations and the interior lighting are shown in enclosure II. Subsequent revisions made to these specifications are shown in enclosure III.

The Coast Guard currently has three aircraft based at Washington National Airport—two Martin 4-0-4's and a Grumman Gulfstream I. Coast Guard officials have informed us that the primary mission of these aircraft is for executive travel. In addition, we have been informed that these aircraft are used for flight training needed to support this mission. The following schedule shows flight hours recorded for the three aircraft during fiscal year 1968.

	Executive travel	Flight training	Total
Grumman Gulfstream I, . . .	549	191	740
Martin 4-0-4 (2 aircraft), . . .	806	420	1,226

Coast Guard officials have estimated that the Gulfstream II, which will eventually replace the two Martin 4-0-4's, will be flown about 800 hours annually. In justifying the procurement of the Gulfstream II during fiscal year 1968 appropriation hearings, Coast Guard officials stated that one modern turbine-powered aircraft instead of two 15-year-old aircraft would meet the agency's requirements for executive transport at a substantial increase in efficiency.

In addition to the three aircraft owned by the Coast Guard, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) operates nine aircraft based at its Hangar 6 facility at Washington National Airport. Eight of these aircraft are owned by agencies of DOT and the other aircraft is leased. FAA classifies these aircraft as job performance aircraft and considers, as job performance time, flight time expended in the following categories:

1. *Mission accomplishment.*—Flights in support of assigned agency programs and missions, i.e., air traffic evaluation, airport inspections, flights to scenes of accidents, etc.

2. *Pilot proficiency.*—Aircraft transition, and time utilized for preparation and accomplishment of annual and semiannual checks, performed in job performance aircraft.

3. *FAA programs familiarization.*—Administrative and similar flights for accomplishment of FAA programs.

4. *Flight test.*—Job performance aircraft only.

An FAA official informed us that any flight time for administrative travel would be recorded as program familiarization (item 3 above). The following schedule shows, for fiscal year 1968, flight time recorded in FAA's records as program familiarization and total flight time for each aircraft. We did not analyze the flight time recorded as program familiarization.

Aircraft type	Flight hours		Program of familiarization flight hours total
	Program familiarization	Total	
Lockheed Jetstar 1329.....	313.7	515.5	61
Grumman G-159.....	244.7	877.3	36
Douglas DC-3.....	299.6	935.4	56
Beechcraft BE-55.....	184.2	1,203.6	43
Beechcraft BE-80.....	525.8	1,203.6	44
Beechcraft BE-80.....	609.2	1,380.8	44
Piper PA 32-260.....	29.2	214.9	14

1 Includes 2 aircraft.

2 Aircraft leased in February 1968.

We visited FAA's facility at Washington National Airport and found that four of the nine aircraft based at Hangar 6 were on various missions. The four aircraft which were not at the hangar during our visit included:

(1) the Lockheed Jetstar 1329, being used by the Secretary of Transportation to attend the 24th annual meeting of the International Air Transportation Association in Munich, Germany, (2) the Douglas DC-3, being used for a program familiarization flight to Atlantic City, New Jersey, (3) a Beechcraft BE-80, being used for an annual flight check of an FAA pilot, and (4) the Piper PA 32-260, being used for a program familiarization flight to Hagerstown and Frederick, Maryland.

We trust that the information presented herewith will serve your purpose. We plan to make no further distribution of this report unless copies are specifically requested, and then we shall make distribution only after your agreement has been obtained or public announcement has been made by you concerning the contents of the report.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,  
Comptroller General  
of the United States.

#### CHANGES TO INTERIOR OF AIRCRAFT

- Improved cabin and lavatory lighting.
- Relocated radio operator position from the cabin to the cockpit area.
- Added flight attendant seat to galley area.
- Added increased soundproofing material under carpet.
- Improved quality material on bulkheads to improve appearance and soundproofing.
- Increased carpet weight and quality to improve appearance and soundproofing.
- Changed seating from one swivel and five nonswivel single 19-inch and three double 19-inch seats to six swivel single 21-inch and two double 21-inch seats and a two-place divan.
- Added one conference table and two fold-out-type desks.
- Added removable partition between forward four single berthable seats to provide some privacy.

NOTE.—The above information was furnished by the U.S. Coast Guard.

#### ORIGINAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR INTERIOR LIGHTING AND FLIGHT DECK AND CABIN ACCOMMODATIONS

7.9 Interior Lighting: Space and power provisions for interior lighting and emergency lighting shall be provided.

(a) Entrance, Companionway and Life Raft Compartment Lights: A dome light shall be located in the companionway headlining. Three lights shall be located in the step risers of the main entrance air stair door. Lighting shall be provided in the life raft stowage compartment. The battery-operated exit light over the main entrance door shall be utilized. An aisle light shall be installed at the top of the main entry stairs.

(b) Main Cabin Lights: Reading lights shall be provided for each passenger place and the radio/navigator station. Indirect lighting, including controls with a dimming feature, shall be provided throughout the cabin. A flush-down light shall be installed over the fold-down desk. Passenger ordinance lights (Fasten Seat Belts, No Smoking and Oxygen) shall be installed adjacent to each passenger place. A chime shall be added to the tone generator system to sound when the signs are activated. Impact exit lights shall be installed over each escape window and over the forward cabin door. Additional exit lighting shall be provided throughout the cabin, in accordance with attached Grumman drawing 1159F207 P. Adequate work lights shall be provided for the radio/navigator console. A light shall also be installed in the aft clothes compartment.

(c) Galley Lights: Adequate work lighting shall be provided in the galley.

(d) Lavatory Lights: A dome light shall be installed in the headliner. "Return to Seat" and "No Smoking" warning lights shall be installed above the vanity counter. Lights shall also be mounted on each side of the vanity.

(e) Baggage Compartment Light: An explosion-proof, protected dome light shall be installed in the headliner.

(f) Night Lights: Four near floor level aisle lights shall be distributed throughout the aircraft.

(g) Switches: Switches and controls for all lights shall be conveniently located.

#### 13 FLIGHT DECK AND CABIN ACCOMMODATIONS

13.1 Flight Compartment: The flight compartment shall include a full complement of instruments and controls necessary to permit full operation of the aircraft by either pilot or copilot. See Section 12. Two fresh air outlets, two glass holders and two ash trays shall also be installed.

(a) Soundproofing and Installation: The flight compartment shall be soundproofed and insulated in accordance with attached Grumman Gulfstream II General Outfitting Specification No. AE-159-I-21. Briefly, this

specification calls for an anti-vibration sound damping foam, which shall be applied to the inside surface of the skin. Fiberglass insulation panels, enclosed in vinyl-coated nylon material, shall be installed over the sound damping foam, completely filling all the bays in the cockpit. An inner sandwich acoustic liner, consisting of Scottfelt, fiberglass and Coustifab, shall be installed on the inboard side of all bell frames.

(b) Materials: Materials used to finish the cockpit interior shall be chosen for their durability and ease of maintenance, with weight also a major consideration, and shall conform to appropriate F.A.A. regulations. Sample color schemes and finish materials shall be submitted to the United States Coast Guard for approval.

(c) Headliner: A fabric-backed vinyl material shall be installed in panels in a manner facilitating removal for maintenance.

(d) Side Walls: A fabric-backed vinyl material shall be installed in panels below the windows and on the side walls. The panels shall be easily removable for maintenance.

(e) Floor Covering: A lightweight, vinyl-covered, aircraft-type floor covering (Durug or equivalent) shall be installed throughout the flight compartment along with a one-eighth inch foam underpad. The covering shall be removable independent of the seats.

(f) Night Curtain: A sliding night curtain shall be installed behind the cockpit entryway.

13.1.1 Crew Seats: The crew seats shall be covered with a soft, wear-resistant material, fabricated and installed in accordance with appropriate F.A.A. regulations.

13.1.2 Restraint System: The pilot and copilot seat shall be equipped with a restraint system consisting of a safety belt, shoulder harness and a harness reel with a control. The safety belt shall be adjustable and equipped with a quick-release-type buckle.

13.1.3 Crew Station Consoles: The equipment installed in the flight compartment is listed in Section 12 and arranged in accordance with Grumman drawing 1159F208 P.

13.1.4 Jump Seat: One jump seat, approved for take-off and landing, shall be installed under the radio rack just aft of the cockpit. A color-coordinated safety belt shall also be provided.

#### 13.2 Lighting

13.2.1 Flight Compartment Lighting: Engine instruments shall be integrally lit with white natural lights. Edge light panels shall use white lighting. Instrument panel flood lighting shall be white. There shall be no direct glare and all controls shall be arranged for crew convenience.

13.2.2 Instrument Lighting: All primary engine instruments shall be integrally lit with white natural lights. The controls for these lights shall be installed in the forward sloping portion of the side consoles.

13.2.3 Instrument Panel Flood Lighting: The secondary illumination for the instrument panel shall be provided by a series of light fixtures installed in the glareshield. These lights shall be white and shall have individual controls for the pilot and copilot.

13.2.4 Edge Light Panels: The overhead control panels, the glareshield panel and the center console panel shall be white edge lighted. Controls for these lights shall be located on the side console control panels.

13.2.5 Map Light: A white adjustable map light shall be provided for each pilot. It shall be mounted on a flexible shaft located on the outward window ledge.

13.2.6 Spare Lamps: A spare lamp container shall be provided and shall contain an adequate supply of spare lamps.

13.3 Main Cabin: The cabin interior shall be completed and arranged in accordance with Grumman drawing 1159F207 P. The materials used to finish the interior shall be chosen for durability and ease of maintenance, with weight also a major consideration, and shall conform to appropriate F.A.A.

regulations. Sample color scheme and finish materials shall be submitted to the United States Coast Guard for approval. All materials which do not inherently meet F.A.A. fireproofing requirements shall receive a permanent-type fireproofing treatment.

(a) Basic Construction Materials: All bulkheads, doors and cabinetry shall be fabricated from lightweight balsa core or aluminum honeycomb sandwich panels. The use of sheet metal screws shall not be permitted, unless approved by the customer.

(b) General Trim: Fine hardwoods, and anodized aluminum shall be used for trim. Silver, gold satin finish anodizing, plating, natural stainless steel or paint may be used as required.

(c) Bulkhead Coverings: A decorative treatment utilizing soft materials such as cork or padded fabrics shall be used on the bulkheads to provide supplementary soundproofing.

(d) Furniture Finish: All surfaces shall be 1/2" thick aircraft weight formica or equivalent. All molding and other wood parts shall be solid, fine hardwoods to match the predominant wood-grained formica.

(e) Soundproofing and Insulation: The main cabin area shall be soundproofed and insulated in accordance with Grumman Gulfstream II Specification No. AE-159-I-21, except that Coustifab (lead vinyl material) shall not be installed under the rug.

13.3.1 Passenger Area: The passenger area shall be arranged in accordance with Grumman drawing 1159F207 P and completed as follows.

(a) Headliner: A fabric-backed vinyl material shall be installed throughout the entire passenger area. The headliner in the entrance and companionway shall be installed in a transverse manner, either separate from, or attached to, the acoustic inner liner.

The headliner covering the overhead radio rack terminal panels shall be removable for easy access to the terminals.

The headliner in the cabin shall be installed in a longitudinal manner, extending from just above the duct on one side to the same point on the opposite side. The headlining material in the cabin area shall be installed separately and shall not include the inner liner. It shall be installed with typical aircraft extruded snap-in molding isolated from the aircraft structure. The overhead exhaust ducts shall be covered with identical material used in the cabin headlining.

(b) Side Wall: A fabric-backed vinyl material, similar to that installed in the headlining, may be installed on all side wall surfaces. The installation may be separate from, or attached to, the acoustic inner liner.

(c) Dado: A fabric-backed vinyl material similar to that described above shall be installed in the cabin. This installation may be separate from, or attached to, the acoustic inner liner. If the installation requires a hard-backed surface, these panels shall then be isolated from the aircraft structure.

(d) Floor Covering: A lightweight aircraft-type carpet (one half pound per sq. ft. max.) shall be installed in the airplane with provisions for removal independent of the seats. Three-eighths inch thick polyurethane foam shall be used as underpadding. The carpet may be retained by Velcro tape. Cutouts around all cabin blow out covers shall also be installed.

(e) Main Entrance: An acoustic folding door shall be installed, closing off the main entrance stair. This door shall be installed so as to preclude acoustic leaks along the sides, top, and bottom. Jacking fittings shall be stowed on the side of the air stair.

(f) Radio Rack Cover Panel: A radio rack cover panel shall be installed to close off the radio rack equipment. The panel shall be removable or shall be easy to open for the purpose of servicing the electronic equipment.

(g) Mid-Relay Compartment: The mid-relay compartment shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the left side of the cabin between stations 169 and 181. A door shall enclose this area and swing aft. A portable oxygen bottle shall be stowed on the aft bulkhead.

(h) Survival Equipment Stowage Compartment: The survival equipment stowage compartment shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the left side of the cabin between stations 181 and 202. Stowage and tie down provisions only shall be supplied for a life raft (19" diameter, 36" long) in the lower portion of the compartment. A shelf shall be installed above the life raft for stowing life vests for passengers and crew. A separate door with a positive latch shall be installed to prevent shifting of life jackets. A folding-type door shall close off this area from the aisle. The forward cabin door shall be located on the forward bulkhead of the compartment. The door will hinge on the right side and shall open forward. The door shall incorporate a lock and decompression blow out features. A portable oxygen bottle and a water fire extinguisher shall be installed on the aft side of the compartment.

(i) Radio/Navigator Station: The radio/navigator station encompasses that portion of the fuselage on the right side of the cabin between stations 181 and 221. The equipment therein shall be installed in a console against the forward cabin bulkhead on the right side. This equipment is listed in Appendix A and Section 12, Space and power for an ASB 32 teletypewriter and necessary controls shall be provided. An intercommunication system shall be provided.

Space provisions and the necessary controls and indicators shall be provided for Loran. This equipment shall be covered with a ridged surface which folds down providing an 18 x 24 inch desk top. The teletypewriter shall be stowed forward of this surface and shall slide aft when required.

A 12 x 18 x 24-inch stowage space for books, charts and the like shall be provided below the desk surface. Additional stowage space for charts, maps, a cup holder, and an ash tray, shall be provided in an outboard console.

Provisions for instruments, controls, switches and circuit breakers shall be installed in the upper portion of the console. A pull-out drawer shall be installed on the lower inboard side of this console, near the floor. This drawer, when closed, shall be positively locked. It shall open into the aisle for easy access to a tool box attached to the lower portion of the drawer itself.

The radio/navigator seat shall be installed to allow proper operation of all controls, switches and instruments.

(j) Desk: A desk cabinet fabricated of the same materials specified in paragraph 13.3

(d), shall be installed just aft of the radio/navigator station on the right side, and shall be fabricated into a partition separating the two stations. The desk shall be of the pull-out type (providing a smooth surface of 18 x 24 inches), sliding into the cabinet when not in use. It shall include an ash tray and cup holder. A telephone shall also be incorporated in the radio/navigation station.

(k) Console Table: One console table shall be installed between the first and second windows on the left side of the cabin. The table shall be the pull out-type, sliding into a console when not in use. Incorporated in the console top shall be an ash tray and a cup holder for each occupant.

(l) Seating:

Swivel Seat: One upholstered swivel chair shall be installed behind the desk. It shall be capable of tracking fore and aft, and reclining. Both arm rests shall be made to stow into the seat cushion. A plug-in head rest and a seat belt shall also be incorporated.

Fixed Crew Seat: One single, fixed upholstered seat shall be installed behind the

radio/navigator console. This chair shall have a maximum recline of 15° and both arm rests shall be capable of stowing into the seat cushions. A plug-in head rest, combination seat belt and adjustable shoulder harness shall also be installed. Both the shoulder harness and seat belt shall be locked into position by a single buckle attachment.

Aft Facing Seat: One upholstered, single aft-facing seat shall be installed in the forward end of the cabin, left hand side, adjacent to the first window. This chair shall have reclining features and both arm rests shall be capable of stowing into the seat cushion. A plug-in head rest and a matching seat belt shall also be provided.

Forward Facing Seat: Four single, forward-facing, upholstered seats shall be installed as shown on Grumman drawing 1159F207 P. These seats shall be fixed and shall have reclining features. All arm rests shall be capable of stowing into the seat cushion. Plug-in head rests and a matching seat belt shall also be provided with each chair. The single seats located on the right hand side, adjacent to the third and fourth windows, shall also have a folding food tray incorporated in the aft portion of the seat back. The seat adjacent to the third window shall be supplied with a food tray which will plug into the forward portion of the arm rests.

Double Seats: Three double forward-facing, upholstered seats shall be installed as shown on Grumman drawing 1159F207P. All these seats shall be fixed and shall have reclining features. All arm rests shall be capable of stowing into the seat cushion and shall be equipped with ash trays. Plug-in head rests and matching seat belt shall also be provided for each passenger place. The seats adjacent to the third and fourth windows shall have folding food trays incorporated in the aft portion of the seat back. The seat adjacent to the third window shall also be supplied with food trays which will plug into the forward portion of the arm rest.

All seats shall be approved for take-off and landing, and shall meet all F.A.A. requirements. The weight of these seats shall not exceed the weights spelled out in paragraph #3.

(m) Passenger Coat Closet: A coat closet shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the right hand side of the cabin between station 458 1/2 and station 500 1/2. A removable shelf shall be installed in the upper portion of this compartment. Suspended from this shelf shall be a lightweight coat rod. An adequate number of quality coat hangers and adequate hat space shall be provided. A lightweight pull curtain shall be installed on the aisle side of the coat closet.

(n) Carry-on Baggage: A compartment for carry-on baggage shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the left hand side of the cabin between stations 500 1/2 and 539 1/2. One shelf and retention netting shall also be provided. Two 114 cu. ft. passenger oxygen bottles shall be installed under the shelf of this compartment.

(o) Hand Rail: A hand rail shall be installed as part of a valance panel, and located just above the cabin windows. It shall run the entire length of the cabin on each side of the passenger area. The valance shall house recessed cold air outlets, reading lights, passenger oxygen stowage bins and the individual passenger ordinance lights. The valance shall also conceal the cabin indirect lighting and the top curtain track. Emergency exit lights and emergency exit instructions shall also be incorporated in this valance over each of the four exit windows.

(p) Window Curtains and Shades: Fixed window curtains shall be installed between all cabin windows. Tinted roll-up window shades shall also be installed to cover each cabin window.

(q) Window Frames: Window frames shall

be installed at each cabin window and shall be acoustically treated in accordance with Grumman Gulfstream Outfitting Spec AE-159-I-21.

(r) **Aft Cabin Bulkhead:** A lightweight honeycomb bulkhead door shall be installed at station 458%. This door shall incorporate a lock and decompression blow out feature. The door shall be hinged on the left hand side and swing aft. A partition shall be fabricated forward of this bulkhead on the right side to stow the tow bar.

(s) **First Aid Kits:** A first aid kit shall be provided adjacent to the jump seat.

13.3.2 **Galley:** An "U" shaped step-in galley shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the cabin between station 458% and station 500%. This galley shall be equipped to serve hot or cold meals to 12 passengers and a crew of four.

(a) **Liquid Containers:** Two hot or cold one-gallon capacity tanks shall be included.

(b) **Oven:** One six-tray warming oven with thermostatic controls shall be installed.

(c) **Hot Cups:** Two hot cups shall be installed with typical timer controls.

(d) **Tray Carriers:** Dinner service trays, plastic dishes and stainless steel tableware shall also be provided for 16 passengers.

(e) **Ice Container:** One ice container shall be installed. It shall be self-contained and removable from the aircraft for servicing.

(f) **Paper Cup and Towel Dispenser:** One paper cup and towel dispenser shall be provided.

(g) **Storage Area:** Adequate drawers and shelves shall be provided for miscellaneous galley supplies.

(h) **Sink and Drain:** A sink, which can be manually drained overboard, shall be provided in the counter top.

(i) **Control Panel:** A control panel shall be installed for all component controls in the galley.

13.3.2 **Lavatory:** The lavatory shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the right hand side of the cabin between 500% and the factory-installed bulkhead at station 539%. A door shall be hinged on the forward end of this compartment and shall swing inboard.

(a) **Toilet:** A single flush-type chemical toilet shall be installed. This unit shall include a cover and a shroud and be easily removable for servicing. A vent to the overboard exhaust system shall be provided.

(b) **Water Tanks:** Two one-gallon capacity water tanks shall be provided and connected by flexible plumbing to a faucet assembly on the counter and over the sink.

(c) **Sink and Drain:** A sink, which can be manually drained overboard, shall be provided in the counter surface.

(d) **Paper Dispensers:** Paper Towel and self-contained toilet paper dispensers shall be provided.

(e) **Trash Containers:** One self-contained trash container with a spring-loaded access door shall be built into the vanity cabinet.

(f) **Vanity Cabinet:** A vanity cabinet and counter shall be installed in the lavatory. It shall contain the sink, paper and towel dispenser and the trash container and shall have adequate storage provisions for miscellaneous lavatory supplies. An oxygen mask storage bin, a self-contained ash tray and a 28-volt electric razor and outlet shall also be provided.

(g) **Mirror:** A lightweight mirror shall be installed.

13.4 **Baggage Compartment:** The baggage compartment encompasses that portion of the fuselage between the bulkhead at station 539% and the pressure dome. It shall be finished in wear-resistant materials. A door shall be installed at station 539%, opening hinged on the left hand side and swinging aft. Tie-down cargo provisions shall be installed in the floor. The floor shall be covered with a vinyl coated fabric such as Durug or its equivalent. A smoke detector system, com-

prised of an electrically-actuated air evacuation motor, shall be plumbed to an eyeshell air outlet above the pilot's head in the cockpit. A circuit breaker for this system shall also be installed in the cockpit. Overnight engine plugs and an engine pressure orler shall also be provided.

#### REVISIONS TO SPECIFICATIONS Preface

Following herein are amendments to the Grumman Model 1159 Detail Specification for the United States Coast Guard Long Range Transport, designated LRT-1, dated February, 1968. Each paragraph supersedes an identically-numbered paragraph in the basic specification or represents an item to be specifically added or deleted at the request of the U.S. Coast Guard. At no time are changes to be made unless specified in this addendum or the revisions thereto.

7.9 **Interior Lighting:** Lighting shall be provided as follows:

(a) **Entrance and Companionway:** An entrance light directed at the floor is located on the bulkhead inside the boarding door. A dome light shall be located in the companionway headliner. Three (3) step lights shall be installed in the airstair door. The battery-operated exit light over the main entrance door shall be utilized.

(b) **Main Cabin Lights:** Indirect incandescent lights shall be installed behind the service duct panels on both sides of the aircraft. These are controlled by a switch which allows off, low, or high intensity. Separate controls shall be installed for lighting the foremost cabin compartment. Fluorescent lights shall be installed in the galley, lavatory, and the afts decks. Passenger reading lights shall be provided at each passenger place. Passenger warning lights with chime (FASTEN SEAT BELTS and NO SMOKING) shall be located on the forward and aft bulkheads. These fixtures shall also include exit lights. Battery-operated, impact-actuated exit lights shall be located over each escape window and door. A flush spotlight shall also be provided over the conference table.

(c) **Galley Lights:** Adequate work lighting shall be provided in the galley.

(d) **Lavatory Lights:** Fluorescent lights shall be located on each side of the lavatory. A "Return to Seat" warning light shall be installed above the vanity cabinet.

(e) **Baggage Compartment Light:** An explosion-proof, protected dome light shall be installed in the headlining.

(f) **Night Lights:** Four (4) blue tinted night lights shall be distributed throughout the aircraft.

(g) **Switches:** Switches and controls for all lights shall be conveniently located, and shall be identified with a placard or engraving.

(h) **Desk:** Fluorescent lighting shall be provided for the desk.

#### 13.0 FLIGHT DECK AND CABIN ACCOMMODATIONS

13.1.4 **Jump Seats:** Two jump seats shall be installed, one under the radio rack just aft of the cockpit, and one immediately behind the aft cabin bulkhead, left hand side. These seats shall be approved for take-off and landing. A fold out work table and chart storage space shall be installed convenient to the operator at the forward jump seat.

13.3 **Main Cabin:** The cabin interior shall be completed and arranged in accordance with Grumman drawing 1159F217P "A". The materials used to finish the interior shall be chosen for durability and ease of maintenance, with weight also a major consideration, and shall conform to appropriate F.A.A. regulations. Sample color scheme and finish materials shall be submitted to the United States Coast Guard for approval. All materials which do not inherently meet F.A.A. fireproofing requirements shall receive a permanent-type fireproofing treatment. Burn

test results on all material used shall be submitted to the customer.

(a) **Basic Construction Materials:** All bulkheads, doors and cabinetry shall be fabricated of lightweight materials equivalent in weight to honeycomb sandwich panels. One-quarter and one-half inch thickness shall be used as required, reinforced where necessary. The use of sheet metal screws shall be permitted only by approval of the customer.

(b) **General Trim:** Fine hardwoods and anodized aluminum shall be used for trim. Silver, gold satin finish anodizing, plating, natural stainless steel or paint may be used as required.

(c) **Bulkhead Coverings:** A decorative treatment utilizing wood-grained formica, as selected by the customer, shall be used on the bulkheads to provide supplementary soundproofing. Decorative emblems of the Department of Transportation and the U.S. Coast Guard shall be installed on either side of the bulkhead, as determined by protocol. Sample emblems shall be submitted. A decorative, twelve-hour clock shall be installed on the forward cabin bulkhead L. H. side. Provisions for a crew name plate shall be made on the R. H. bulkhead.

(d) **Furniture Finish:** All surfaces shall be 1/2" thick aircraft weight formica or equivalent. All molding and other wood parts shall be solid, fine hardwoods to match the predominant wood-grained formica.

(e) **Soundproofing and Insulation:** The main cabin area shall be soundproofed and insulated in accordance with Grumman Gulfstream II General Outfitting Specification No. AE-159-I-21, except that Coustifab (lead vinyl material) shall be installed under the rug between Stations 204 and 459 only.

13.3.1 **Passenger Area:** The passenger area shall be arranged in accordance with Grumman drawing 1159F217P "A" and completed as follows.

(a) **Headliner:** A fabric-backed vinyl material shall be installed throughout the entire passenger area. The headliner in the entrance and companionway shall be installed in a transverse manner, either separate from, or attached to, the acoustic inner liner. The headliner covering the overhead radio rack terminal panels shall be removable for easy access to the terminals. The headliner in the cabin shall be installed in a longitudinal manner, extending from just above the duct on one side to the same point on the other side. The headlining material in the cabin area shall be installed separately and shall not include the inner liner. It shall be installed with typical aircraft extruded snap-in molding isolated from the aircraft structure. The overhead exhaust ducts shall be covered with identical material used in the cabin headlining.

(b) **Side Wall:** A fabric-backed vinyl material, similar to that installed in the headlining, may be installed on all side wall surfaces. The installation may be separate from, or attached to, the acoustic inner liner.

(c) **Dado:** A fabric-backed vinyl material, similar to that described above, shall be installed in the cabin. This installation may be separate from, or attached to, the acoustic inner liner. If the installation requires a hard-backed surface, these panels shall then be isolated from the aircraft structure.

(d) **Floor Covering:** A lightweight aircraft-type carpet (3/4 pound per sq. ft. max.) shall be installed in the airplane with provisions for removal independent of the seats. Three-eighths inch thick polyurethane foam shall be used as underpadding. The carpet may be retained by Velcro tape. Cutouts around all cabin blow out covers shall also be installed.

(e) **Main Entrance:** An acoustic folding door shall be installed, closing off the main entrance stair. This door shall be installed so as to preclude acoustic leaks along the sides, top, and bottom. Jacking fittings shall be stowed on the side of the air stair.

(f) Radio Rack Cover Panel: A radio rack cover panel shall be installed to close off the radio rack equipment. The panel shall be easy to open for the purpose of servicing the electronic equipment.

(g) Mid-Relay Compartment: The mid-relay compartment shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the left side of the cabin between Stations 169 and 181. The same acoustic folding door used to close off the main entrance shall be used to close off this compartment. A portable oxygen bottle shall be stowed in this compartment on the bulkhead at Station 181.

(h) Storage and Coat Closets: Two areas shall be provided as closets. They shall be located between the bulkhead at Stations 181 and 204. The closet on the left hand side shall have a removable coat rack to enable the area to be used for survival equipment on overwater flights; mounting provisions only for three seven man rafts (P/N MR-7) shall be installed. A water fire extinguisher shall be installed on the aft side of this compartment.

(i) Seating: Seats shall be provided for a maximum of twelve (12) passengers and four (4) crew members as follows:

(1) Single Swivel Seats: Six (6) single swivel seats shall be provided in the cabin, four forward and two aft. They shall be manufactured by Custom Products and shall have recline and swivel provisions. The forward four-seat arrangement shall provide sleeping accommodations for two passengers, one on either side of the cabin. To accomplish this, the seats at Station 279½ shall be capable of tracking forward and aft with full berthable recline. The two seats aft in the cabin shall also be capable of tracking forward and aft and shall recline, though not to a berthable position.

(2) Double Seats: Two (2) double seats shall be installed, one forward-facing and one aft-facing. These seats shall be styled in the same manner as the swivel seats, and manufactured by Custom Products. They shall include recline provisions and removable, adjustable head rests.

(3) Divan: A two-place divan shall be installed on the right hand side opposite the conference table and shall be approved for take-off and landing. The consoles on both sides of this divan shall be an integral part of this installation. Stowage provisions for blankets shall be made under the divan.

All seats shall be upholstered with materials selected by the customer. The fabrication of this installation shall also be approved by the customer. All seats shall be approved for take-off and landing, and shall meet all F.A.A. requirements. Mounting and space provisions for life jackets (P/N AV-2A) shall be installed under each seat convenient to all passengers.

(j) Hand Rail: A hand rail shall be installed as part of a valance panel, and located just above the cabin windows. It shall run the entire length of the cabin on each side of the passenger area. The valance shall house recessed cold air outlets, reading lights, call buttons, and passenger oxygen storage bins. The valance shall also conceal the cabin indirect lighting and the top curtain track. Emergency exit lights and emergency exit instructions shall also be incorporated in this valance over each of the four exit windows.

(k) Window Curtains and Shades: Typical pleated and lined curtains mounted top and bottom with nylon anchor tabs shall be fabricated and installed between each window. Tabs shall be snap mounted for ease of removal. A second set of curtains shall also be furnished by the Distributor. Each main cabin window shall be equipped with one roll-up shade. The shades shall be infinitely adjustable from full open to full closed, and when open shall be retractable to a concealed position. The shades shall be installed so that the soundproofing installation shall not be compromised.

(l) Window Frames: Window frames shall

be installed at each cabin window and shall be acoustically treated in accordance with Grumman Gulfstream II Outfitting Specification No. AE-159-I-21, and shall be so installed as to preclude acoustic leaks.

(m) Aft Cabin Bulkhead: A lightweight honeycomb bulkhead door shall be installed at Station 458½. This door shall incorporate a lock and decompression blow out feature. The door shall be hinged on the right hand side swing aft.

(n) First Aid Kits: A first aid kit shall be provided adjacent to the aft jump seat.

(o) Folding Tables: Two (2) folding tables shall be installed. Between the two sets of forward single seats. These tables shall pivot to a vertical recessed position against the dado when not in use.

(p) Fold Out Desks: Two (2) fold out desks shall be installed against the aft bulkhead. The writing surface shall pivot to a vertical position against the bulkhead when not in use. A side shelf, recessed in the dado, shall be incorporated. A fluorescent light shall flood the writing surface when in use. A handset shall be located in the right hand desk side console. A control panel, containing switches for the cabin indirect lights and a tape volume control, shall be installed in the left hand desk unit.

(q) Conference Table: One conference table shall be installed on the left side of the aircraft between the two double seats. Folding leaves shall permit easy access to the inboard and outboard seats. The underside of the leaves shall be especially padded so that the table will remain in place upon take-off and landing. Two glassholders and one ash tray shall be installed on both the inboard and outboard ends of the table. The surface of the table shall be finished with a decorative panel. A special formed leg shall be installed to support the inboard end of the table.

(r) Utility Cabinets: Utility cabinets shall be provided fore and aft of the two-place divan and shall form the enclosure for the divan. The forward section of the cabinet shall include storage drawers. The storage drawer shall be supplied with a lock and key. The aft cabinet shall include provisions for storage of liquid refreshments, soft drinks, glasses, ice and utensils and miscellaneous supplies. Access shall be through lift-up, slide-back lids. This cabinet shall also be supplied with a lock and key.

(s) Magazine Racks: Two (2) magazine racks shall be installed, one on each side below the second window.

(t) Ashtrays/Glassholders: Ashtrays and glassholders shall be conveniently located for each single seat; for double-seat occupants, they shall be installed in the conference table.

(u) Cabin Partition: A partition shall be installed at Station 297 between the four forward swivel seats and the grouping of double seats at the conference table. The lower portion of this partition shall be fixed to the aircraft and shall contain provisions for two (2) waste containers. The upper portion shall be a removable opaque decorative panel. A tight fitting curtain shall be installed over the opening.

13.3.2 Galley: An "L" shaped step-in galley shall encompass that portion of the fuselage on the cabin between Station 458½ and Station 501½ R. H. side. This galley shall be equipped to serve hot or cold meals to 12 passengers and a crew of four. All equipment required for galley service shall be located within this compartment unless otherwise specified.

Items (a) through (l) remain as in the Detail Specification.

13.3.3 Lavatory: The lavatory shall encompass that portion of the fuselage between 503/4 and the factory-installed bulkhead at Station 539½. A door shall be hinged on the right-hand side of this compartment and shall swing aft. All equipment for the

lavatory shall be located in this compartment unless otherwise specified.

(a) Toilet: A single flush-type chemical toilet shall be installed. This unit shall include a padded cover and a shroud, and shall have overboard service capabilities. A vent to the overboard exhaust system shall be provided.

(b) Water Tanks: Two one-gallon capacity water tanks shall be provided and connected by flexible plumbing to a faucet assembly on the counter and over the sink.

(c) Sink and Drain: A sink, which can be manually drained overboard shall be provided in the counter surface.

(d) Paper Dispensers: Paper towel and self-contained toilet paper dispensers shall be provided.

(e) Trash Containers: One self-contained trash container with a spring-loaded access door shall be built into the vanity cabinet.

(f) Vanity Cabinet: A vanity cabinet and counter shall be installed in the lavatory. It shall contain the sink, paper and towel dispenser and the trash container and shall have adequate storage provisions for miscellaneous lavatory supplies. An oxygen mask storage bin, a self-contained ash tray and a 60-cycle AC razor and outlet shall also be provided.

(g) Mirror: A lightweight mirror shall be installed.

13.4 Baggage Compartment: The baggage compartment encompasses that portion of the fuselage between the bulkhead at Station 539½ and the pressure dome. It shall be finished in wear-resistant materials such as rug. A door shall be installed at Station 539½, hinging on the right hand side and swinging aft. Two shelves shall be installed, one against the pressure dome, the other on the right hand side extending from Station 539½ back to the aftmost shelf. These shelves shall be approximately 18" from the floor. The outboard shelf shall be made removable for storage of large equipment. A one-piece retention net shall be installed to contain all baggage. This net and attaching hardware shall be easily removable, and shall be capable of withstanding the required loads. The floor shall be covered with a vinyl coated fabric such as Durug or its equivalent. A smoke detector system, comprised of an electrically-actuated air evacuation motor, shall be plumbed to an eyeball air outlet above the pilot's head in the cockpit. A circuit breaker for this system shall also be installed in the cockpit. Overnight engine plugs and an engine pressure orler shall also be provided.

#### PERSONS OVER 65 DESERVE UNLIMITED MEDICAL AND DRUG EXPENSE DEDUCTIONS

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the spiraling cost of medical care, including drugs, hospital care, and doctor bills, hits elderly and retired persons especially hard. Their incomes are fixed and do not increase with the cost of living to meet rising medical costs.

Under present law, only those medical expenses which exceed 3 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income, plus 50 percent of health insurance premiums up to \$150, are deductible expenses. Only those drug costs which exceed 1 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income are included in determining the 3-percent medical care deductible expenses.

Persons over 65 previously could deduct all medical and drug expenses, but the law was changed by the 89th Congress to



impose the 3- and 1-percent floors on persons over 65, just as they apply to persons under 65.

I am today introducing a bill which would restore to persons over 65, the unlimited medical and drug deduction. The bill would also permit a taxpayer, under 65, who pays medical or drug bills for his dependent parents or spouse over 65, the same unlimited deduction for these items to be granted persons over 65.

Mr. Speaker, the persons over 65 who have contributed immeasurably toward making our country the great and bountiful Nation it is, deserve this tax relief. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and give it early approval.

#### CURBING THE CENSUS BUREAU

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my colleague from Ohio (Mr. BETTS) in sponsoring legislation to curb the prying eye of the Census Bureau. I want to commend the gentleman for the fight that he has led so well against the all-inclusive census form Americans will face next year.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed census form that all Americans will face in 1970 is long. It is detailed. It is complex. It is all encompassing. Worst of all, answering is mandatory.

The proposed census questionnaire contains 67 categories and some 120 questions—all requiring answers under the threat of fine or imprisonment. The bill I have introduced repeals the jail sentence entirely and also removes the \$100 fine from all but six categories of questions. Those categories—requiring answers under threat of fine—are the following: First, name and address; second, relationship to head of household; third, sex; fourth, date of birth; fifth, marital status; and sixth, visitors in home at the time of census.

Wading through the latest informational copy of the U.S. census makes me bristle. If I am merely to give my name and address and other vital information such as sex and date of birth—I do not mind in the least. But when I am told in a national census that I am forced, under threat of fine or imprisonment, to answer with whom I share my shower—that, Mr. Speaker, dampens my whole outlook.

When the census form, which to my way of thinking is basically a survey of the American home and its occupants, takes on the gargantuan proportions of an epistle requiring a great deal of time to go through, I think the emphasis has become misdirected. The American people are not going to have the interest or patience to answer the numerous and complex questions asked. I do not think either the type of questions asked on the census form, or their number, justifies making nonanswering a crime subject to fine and imprisonment. Questions relating to the value of the property, the equipment in the home and the appliances, do nothing but clutter the important and vital questions a census is supposed to answer.

If questions other than those six categories named in my bill are going to be asked, such as with whom I share my shower, how I enter my home, and where I lived in October of 1962, they should appear on a separate form and should be voluntary. If the Government, research organizations, and the academicians want a complete sociological survey done, let it be done at the convenience of the American dweller and not under force of law requiring a mandatory answer.

Plans for the 1970 decennial census are now being finalized, and the Census Bureau officials have ruled out changes in the form. This attitude forces the Congress to assert its hand in revising and reforming the mandatory features of the census form. I, for one, hope that when Census Day U.S.A.—April 1, 1970—rolls around, Americans will not be forced under threat of law to submit to these extensive questions. The progress of this legislation last session, when the Senate passed a bill repealing the jail sentence penalty on all questions, speaks well for the outlook of this bill. But Congress must act with dispatch to assure that the mandatory nature of the questions, on all but the six listed categories, will be removed.

I hope Congress will give this legislation early consideration.

#### THE NIXON INAUGURAL ADDRESS

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

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the inauguration of President Richard M. Nixon last Monday noon provided a most inspiring hour for all Americans. The quiet eloquence of our new President's address was the highlight of the historic ceremony. As the Minneapolis Tribune commented on Tuesday:

The address was a splendid way for the 37th President to begin his administration. With peace at home and abroad its central theme, the speech reflected the idealism and spirit of conciliation Mr. Nixon has said he hopes to impart to the presidency.

The Minneapolis Star for January 21 reads:

He was deliberately low keyed, refraining from the soaring promises which too often in the past have laid the foundations for future disappointments. There are limits to what the government can do, he said, and by saying this he should have laid to rest the fantasies of those Americans who believe miracles can be accomplished in Washington.

And with his calm delivery, and his reference to a "fever of words," President Nixon attempted to quiet the loud and angry shouting of protesters and dissenters.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Paul Pioneer Press on Tuesday concluded its laudatory editorial on President Nixon's inaugural address with these words:

How wonderful it could be—for a change—if we could meet some of these problems as exciting challenges, if we could become a rational society, if we could replace some of the present grimness with something close to an era of good feeling. As our new President suggested, we have the means; the will

is there to be expressed; the heart of America is good.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these three editorials be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Jan. 21, 1969]

#### PRESIDENT NIXON: THE BEGINNING

The soft-spoken and eloquent inaugural address of Richard M. Nixon Monday was a splendid way for the 37th President to begin his administration. With peace at home and abroad its central theme, the speech reflected the idealism and spirit of conciliation Mr. Nixon has said he hopes to impart to the presidency. Absent were the slogans and catch phrases so common to his past speeches.

In his "summons to greatness," Mr. Nixon offered some pledges and challenges to the American people:

A pledge to give the highest priority to the cause of international peace.

A pledge to press urgently forward in pursuit of "full employment, better housing, excellence in education, in rebuilding our cities and improving our rural areas, in protesting our environment and enhancing the quality of life."

A pledge that government will listen "to the injured voices, the anxious voices, the voices that have despaired of being heard."

A challenge to Americans to listen more and shout less.

A challenge to Americans, individually, to reach out to their neighbors, "helping, caring, doing."

A challenge to Americans "to give life to what is in the law, to ensure at last that all are born equal in dignity before God, all are born equal in dignity before man."

But the ideas and "the better angles of our nature" to which Mr. Nixon referred must also be translated, on many occasions in the next four years, into specific proposals to Congress and into specific executive decisions. It is one thing to talk of a willingness "to reduce the burden of arms"; it will be quite another to override the demands and pressures of the Pentagon and its allies in Congress and the military-industrial establishment of which Gen. Eisenhower warned in his farewell message. It is one thing to talk of "black and white together, as one nation"; it will be another matter to fund enforcement of anti-discrimination laws or to do away with the causes of ghettos.

To questions like these, another four years remain for Mr. Nixon to give his answers. Right now it is enough to say that our new President has begun well.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Jan. 21, 1969]

#### RICHARD NIXON'S INAUGURAL

The transition has been completed. The President-elect is now the President. And with the change has come a change in the tone and pace of the nation's leadership.

Richard Nixon set that tone in his inaugural address. He was deliberately low keyed, refraining from the soaring promises which too often in the past have laid the foundations for future disappointments. There are limits to what the government can do, he said, and by saying this he should have laid to rest the fantasies of those Americans who believe miracles can be accomplished in Washington.

And with his calm delivery, and his reference to a "fever of words," President Nixon attempted to quiet the loud and angry shouting of protesters and dissenters. There will be more listening to the voices of anguish and despair in his administration, he prom-

ised, and less "inflated rhetoric." This would be a welcome change from a period when too many voices have been raised—angry, unreasonable, empty voices—and too few people have really been listening.

The President will be a "listener," too, in the field of foreign affairs, he indicated. He called for open lines of communication to the rest of the world, hinting he would be willing to talk, and listen, to all nations. But as if to calm those who fear for the nation's safety, he pledged that the United States will be "as strong as we need to be for as long as we need to be."

It was, as Robert Finch, his long-time associate and Cabinet appointee, remarked, "pure Nixon." It was a pragmatic, deliberate inaugural message, with none of the emotional appeals characteristic of the Kennedy and Johnson speeches on the same occasion. That may be what the nation needs at this moment in history—a period of calmness that will permit the healing of wounds and an end to divisiveness.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press,  
Jan. 21, 1969]

#### THE HEART OF AMERICA

That was the voice of the moderate, somewhat dismayed but hopeful and well-intentioned American I heard throughout the nation Monday. That is who he is like. In a day of putting great emphasis on telling, it like it is, and doing this with a throbbing incoherence that betrays the intent, President Richard M. Nixon told it like it is and how it ought to be with a quiet eloquence that America—most of it—has been longing to hear.

In his short inaugural address, shielded by bullet-proof glass, the District of Columbia aswam with police and other assorted security guards, the new President seemed determined to lay out a course toward a revival of "goodness, decency, love (and) kindness," the sort of thing that can't be legislated.

As homey as mom's apple pie? Well don't knock it until we've tried it for a while. Nixon used a particularly apt example to contrast the deflated spirit of today with that of a few generations ago.

"Standing in this same place a third of a century ago," Nixon said, "Franklin Delano Roosevelt addressed a nation ravaged by depression and gripped in fear. He could say in surveying the nation's troubles: 'They concern, thank God, only material things.'

"Our crisis today is the reverse.  
"We have found ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit; reaching with magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord here on earth."

On the other hand, he wasn't giving up. "No people has ever been so close to the achievement of a just and abundant society, or so possessed of the will to achieve it."

And its achievement wouldn't be a grim task, he said, but could, instead, be "a high adventure—one as rich as humanity itself, and exciting as the times we live in."

Strangely, though the two men are at opposite ends on many matters of policy, one could almost imagine Hubert Humphrey reaching out with a similar plea to America. Particularly this:

"We have endured a long night of the American spirit. But as our eyes catch the dimness of the first rays of dawn, let us not curse the remaining dark. Let us gather the light."

Humphrey was bombed, of course, (not by Nixon) when he announced his candidacy last year, for suggesting that there was goodness in America and that its problems could be confronted with joy and verve. It has been the style to promote the notion that the nation is rotten. Such, in fact, is considered chic. If Nixon can succeed in turning this about, if he can cool down a country getting slightly unhinged, he will have earned a

place as a great President, for the country does not need healing.

We have suffered, as he said, from a fever of words, from inflated rhetoric, from angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds, this last passing these days as a thing called "dialogue."

"We cannot learn from one another," Nixon said, "until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."

Very good. Very difficult. The problems, such as an unwanted war, inflation, well-intended social programs that are administrative nightmares, poverty, the increasing racial polarization, remain.

But how wonderful it could be—for a change—if we could meet some of these problems as exciting challenges, if we could become a rational society, if we could replace some of the present grimness with something close to an era of good feeling. As our new President suggested, we have the means; the will is there to be expressed; the heart of America is good.

#### PROGRESS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last week the newspapers and the outgoing Johnson administration in Washington conveyed definite optimism over what appears to be progress toward peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war.

And certainly all the world is happy that the Paris negotiators finally decided what kind of seating arrangement they could accept.

But last May when the Paris talks started, and again a few days before the November election, the hopes of Americans and the world were raised to high levels.

The impression was given that peace might be achieved soon. These hopes of course, gradually proved to be unrealistic. It would be a mistake to let the same thing happen again now.

It seems to me that the main message of the American people when they went to the polls last November was that they wanted a change in the way Washington is handling the Vietnam war.

The voters said, in effect, "We have taken the Government's word that the war is justified, and have given it enormous support. But we are not satisfied that enough is being done to get an honorable settlement. Maybe an early peace is not possible, but we have a right to know more about the plans for peace, and a right to know that progress is being made."

I very much hope that President Nixon will give the country greater satisfaction in this regard. It is very important that he do so.

We should know, for example, why during 1968 no fewer than 67 ships flying the British flag carried cargoes to North Vietnam. England ought to be able to bring a stop to this after all these years, or else the American people should know the reason why she cannot.

We should also end the official silence on the Russian ships and supplies going to Hanoi and the fact that the North Vietnam war effort is highly dependent on Russia's help.

Maybe there is little we could do to

stop it, but to ignore it is to give tacit approval to a vital fact that by itself prolongs the war.

Washington should highlight this Russian supply program vigorously and often. We should inject it as an issue in the peace negotiations. I believe this would help to clear the air all the way around the world.

We should also coordinate our military activity in the field in Vietnam with the diplomatic effort at Paris. The other side can be made to want peace a little more if we plan our military action with that in mind.

Our operations to this time do not seem to have recognized that. In fact, they may have done just the opposite. Some people feel Hanoi will move faster at the peace table if we announce troop withdrawals. All the evidence I have points in the other direction.

We also have to remember that the Saigon government, whatever imperfections it may have, is not only our ally but is our main hope as the foundation for non-Communist stability in South Vietnam.

One of Hanoi's basic tactics, in fact perhaps her best hope, is to drive a wedge between Washington and Saigon. They know if they can succeed they could win their objectives whatever happens on the battlefield.

Therefore Washington officials cannot openly criticize Saigon.

We also have to keep a proper perspective on what we are trying to do in Vietnam. We seek no new colonies, no new real estate to put under the American flag. We do not even want guaranteed markets or permanent military bases.

We certainly do not want a country so devastated that it can survive only with massive American aid over a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, all we want and need to do is demonstrate to the Communists that they cannot attack their neighbors and get by with it. We want an end to Communist terrorism and subversion in South Vietnam and in Laos so the people are not forced against their free will under the control of Hanoi.

We need to show that Hanoi cannot succeed with armed aggression. And when we do it will be in the interests of free people everywhere.

#### THE SO-CALLED PEACE PROTESTERS

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the young people who over these past few days engaged in protests in connection with the inaugural are apparently very angry at what they feel is the stifling of dissent.

They wish to make their expression in opposition to what they feel is oppression of individual freedom, repression of free political organization, and the use of force in maintaining an unjust Government in power.

On the same day these people staged what they called a "counterinaugural" in Washington, a 21-year-old Czechoslo-

vak student died in Prague as the result of his own act protesting the political controls gradually being tightened in his country by its neighbor, the Soviet Union.

This young man, and a second young Czechoslovak who made the same kind of ultimate protest yesterday, and many thousands of their colleagues, know a great deal more about the stifling of dissent than those who demonstrated here in Washington.

I want to suggest, and I believe many of our colleagues in this Chamber will agree with me, that young Americans who really want to highlight political oppression will turn their attention to Czechoslovakia today.

If, for example, they should organize a rally or other meeting to bring the tragic Czechoslovak issue to public attention, and to pay honor to students and young workers who today are seeing their high hopes for greater freedom going down the drain—if they want to fight oppression where it exists in greatest measure—I am convinced they will have the enthusiastic support of many in this Government, and perhaps in this Chamber.

When the Russian tanks thundered into Czechoslovakia last August to put down the meager and hesitating steps of the Prague government toward political independence, we heard only muted reference to it from those in this country who profess such a deep commitment to this same cause.

That was in August, and today we hear nothing at all from these people. It is just as though Czechoslovakia had never happened.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of freedom of dissent is an important cause in which all of us have a vital stake. That cause, and all that it means, is being fought out today in Czechoslovakia, in East Germany, in Poland, and Rumania, and other oppressed countries where people are struggling against almost impossible odds for a measure of freedom.

Let those who believe in freedom of dissent stand up to fight oppression where it really exists, and I will give that effort my full support. But what we witnessed this past weekend from the so-called peace protesters was revolting.

#### HOUSE SCHOLARS GALLERY

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

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, in the 90th Congress I introduced a resolution which provided for the setting aside of 12 spaces in the Visitors Gallery for the use of certain scholars studying the operation of the Congress. As I pointed out at the time I introduced the resolution, many of the courses taught on our campuses fall short in their effort to familiarize the students with the functions and the operations of the Congress. This is not the fault of the faculty, but rather due to the absence of resource material which adequately deals with the operation of the Congress, particularly with respect to floor action.

It is encouraging to note the beginning

of change in this respect, with a marked increase in the number of scholars studying the Congress. Also, there has been a good deal more acceptance of and cooperation with the scholars by the Members.

However, there is one significant problem area for the scholars, and that is the absence of adequate facilities for them to view the floor actions in the House.

Under present provisions they are required to abide by the same rules as the general public in the Visitors Galleries. This means, of course, that they are not allowed to take notes, and during the peak visitor season, they are rotated out of the gallery every so often. This is obviously very disruptive of any scholarly study of the floor actions in the House.

The resolution which I previously introduced and which I am reintroducing today offers a simple, inexpensive solution to this problem. The resolution would change the rules of the House to set aside 12 seats in the gallery for the use of scholars. The Speaker, with the aid of an advisory committee of political scientists would screen the applicants desiring to use these seats. The resolution does not call for the expenditure of any funds to implement its provisions.

This resolution will cost us nothing and it will be an effective method by which we can correct the present inequity. It is high time that Congress again became more aware of the need for a closer relationship with the academic community. This resolution will increase the interest of our scholars and make it much easier for them to better understand the legislative process and write more accurately and adequately about Congress.

In the past we have been too slow to recognize, and more important, make use of the talents of our political scientists and other scholars in this area. When we are struggling along in this modern age with 18th-century legislative machinery, we could well afford to have some of the scholars take very close looks at our operations and procedures. This resolution comes as close to "getting something for nothing" as we will ever come. I urge you to give your most serious consideration and support to this resolution.

#### ORPHANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to reintroduce the Orphan's Educational Assistance Act. This measure provides funds for the higher education of the children of civilians who are killed while assigned overseas as a result of war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action. As you are aware, the children of military personnel killed while overseas are covered under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act. I feel that it is only fair that the children of civilian personnel who die in service to their country receive the same benefits as military personnel who die in the line of duty.

This entire matter was originally brought to my attention by one of my constituents. She informed me that her husband was one of the first civilians to be killed in Vietnam. The gentleman was a safety officer attached to the Agency for International Development who was training South Vietnamese police forces. While out on patrol in November of 1960, he was killed in an ambush. Presently, her two children are approaching college age, and, as a widow, she is finding it very difficult to finance the continuing education of her children.

In light of the fact that only 28 civilians have been killed in Vietnam, and of this number 10 were killed during the Tet offensive, I feel that no great cost for the Federal Government would be involved. Furthermore, this measure would cover civilians who could possibly be killed because of mob violence or similar hostile action in a foreign country where they serve as technical advisers or Embassy personnel.

When I introduced this measure during the last session, I had wide bipartisan support. Again, this time I find that many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle are joining me in introducing this measure. The cosponsors of the bill are Congressmen HUNT, BROWN of Michigan, CARTER, TIERNAN, WHITEHURST, DENNY, QUIE, HORTON, EDWARDS, LUKENS, WILLIAMS, BUCHANAN, ADDABO, WOLFF, PERKINS, FARSTEIN, POLLOCK, HALPERN, SCHWENDEL, BINGHAM, BROWN of California, HELSTOSKI, OTTINGER, BUSH, FULTON of Pennsylvania, BROWN of Ohio, GRAY, PODEL, PRICE of Texas, RYAN, McCLOSKEY, and Congresswoman HANSEN of Washington.

Today, I am calling upon the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to immediately investigate this matter. I hope that the House will be able to consider this bill in the near future.

#### SMALL BUSINESS COMMUNITY NEEDS HELP

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the small business community needs help. The small business that is marketing its product in interstate commerce is plagued with multiple, conflicting, and overlapping tax laws.

The Congress has recognized the problem. The Congress has studied the problem. The Congress now must complete its task.

Seldom is the need for legislation as thoroughly documented as this. Four volumes of hearings and a four-volume report eloquently argue the case for congressional action. Last year, the House agreed—agreed overwhelmingly, by a vote of 284 to 89—to place reasonable limits on interstate taxation.

But time ran out, and the work of the Special Subcommittee on Interstate Taxation never became law.

Last 8 years of thorough study and the overwhelming endorsement by the House

all be in vain, I am reintroducing and cosponsoring the interstate tax bill together with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and 12 other members of that committee. The fact that seven members of both parties have joined together to cosponsor this legislation is one more proof that this legislation has always enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

Moreover, I am glad to report that the junior Senator from Maryland, CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., has today introduced identical legislation in the other body. He was an undaunted champion of the interstate taxation bill in this body and it is comforting to see him continue his efforts in the other body.

I will not attempt at this time to explain the intricacies of the problem. But I will try to bring into focus the overall picture.

At present, each taxing jurisdiction is seeking to reach beyond its own boundaries and impose its own nationwide tax system.

That system cannot be enforced. At the most, such interstate enforcement is erratic. The results are unfair and harsh.

The small businesses are not complying with the tax laws of jurisdictions outside of those in which the businesses are actually located. And why? Because it is impossible for small businesses to comply with that complex maze of tax laws and continue doing business.

Thus the interstate tax bill tells the States that they are no longer permitted to collect taxes that they are not in fact collecting. The States will not lose revenue but the businesses will be certain of their tax fate.

On May 21, 1968, Mr. Willis introduced a summary of the study of the Special Subcommittee on Interstate Taxation showing that the States would not lose revenues through the enactment of this legislation, which was H.R. 2158 in the 90th Congress. I again offer those facts here:

#### EFFECTS OF H.R. 2158 ON STATE REVENUES

Following is a summary of the estimated effects of H.R. 2158 on the relevant taxes of each of the states. The estimate for each tax is described as a percentage of gain or loss of the state's total revenues from all of its taxes. The estimates are based on an evaluation of: data on revenue described in Chapters 16, 19, 29, 32 and 36 of the four-volume study published by the Committee; data on compliance and enforcement described in Chapters 10, 24, 31 and 36; hearings held in 1961, 1962, and 1966; on subsequent correspondence with officials in some states, and on the most recent publications of the Bureau of the Census.

In the Income Tax area it is assumed that each state will apply the formula in Title II of H.R. 2158 to all of the corporations covered by that title.

In the Sales and Use Tax area a number of states will realize insignificant losses. However, for purpose of comparison and evaluation, 0.23% of sales and use tax revenues is considered to be the maximum loss possible. This figure is based on a study conducted by California's tax officials, and on their anticipated loss for the first year under current business practices. Since California has the most extensive administrative facilities, and maintains large audit staffs in other states, the relative loss to California would obviously be greater by far than that of the other states—most of which currently maintain no auditing staffs beyond their

own borders, and do not have a vigorous enforcement program comparable to that of California.

In evaluating the "losses" set forth in the following estimates, it should be kept in mind that no consideration has been given to the increases in revenues realized as a result of the economic growth which will be stimulated by the removal of the trade barriers currently impeding interstate commerce. Likewise, no consideration is given to increases in state revenues realized as a result of the greater ease of enforcement and compliance which will be obtained under the uniform standards established by H.R. 2158.

#### ALABAMA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### ALASKA

Corporate income tax: 0.12% loss.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### ARIZONA

Corporate income tax: 0.07% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### ARKANSAS

Corporate income tax: 0.06%.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### CALIFORNIA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Sales and use tax: 0.07% loss.

#### COLORADO

Corporate income tax: 0.07% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

#### CONNECTICUT

Corporate income tax: 0.13% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.

#### DELAWARE

Corporate income tax: 0.3% gain.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### FLORIDA

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### GEORGIA

Corporate income tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### HAWAII

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### IDAHO

Corporate income tax: No effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### ILLINOIS

Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.

#### INDIANA

Corporate income tax: 0.08% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

#### IOWA

Corporate income tax: 0.18% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

#### KANSAS

Corporate income tax: 0.02% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### KENTUCKY

Corporate income tax: Insignificant loss of substantially less than 0.01%.

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

#### LOUISIANA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant effect.

#### MAINE

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### MARYLAND

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

Corporate income tax: 0.04% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.04%.

#### MICHIGAN

Corporate income: No significant loss.  
Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.

#### MINNESOTA

Corporate income tax: 0.08% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Corporate income tax: 0.02% loss.  
Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### MISSOURI

Corporate income tax: 0.05% loss.  
Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

#### MONTANA

Corporate income tax: 0.06% loss.

#### NEBRASKA

Corporate income tax: No significant loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.

#### NEVADA

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE

This State does not impose any of the taxes covered by H.R. 2158.

#### NEW JERSEY

Corporate income tax: 0.06% gain.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

#### NEW MEXICO

Corporate income tax: 0.01% loss.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

#### NEW YORK

Corporate income tax: 0.1% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Corporate income tax: Loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Capital stock: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

#### NORTH DAKOTA

Corporate income tax: 0.04% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.06%.

#### OHIO

Capital stock tax: Insignificant gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

#### OKLAHOMA

Corporate income tax: Loss of substantially less than 0.01%.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

## OREGON

Corporate income tax: 0.01% loss.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain of less than 0.01%.

Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

## RHODE ISLAND

Corporate income tax: 0.03% loss.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.08%.

## TENNESSEE

Corporate income tax: 0.02% loss.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.09%.

## TEXAS

Capital stock tax: 0.25% gain.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.

## UTAH

Corporate income tax: Insignificant gain of less than 0.01%.

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

## VERMONT

Corporate income tax: 0.06% gain.

## VIRGINIA

Corporate income tax: 0.01% loss.  
Capital stock tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.1%.

## WASHINGTON

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 1.01%.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Corporate income tax: No effect.  
Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.05%.  
Gross receipts tax: No significant loss.

## WISCONSIN

Corporate income tax: No significant effect.  
Sales and use tax: No loss.

## WYOMING

Sales and use tax: No significant loss; maximum possible loss cannot exceed 0.07%.

The threat of tax laws which are impossible to obey does impose a burden on interstate commerce. But since no particular tax law is itself unconstitutional, the remedy must be legislative, not judicial. Congress is expressly empowered by the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce. It alone can overview the problem of multiple and conflicting State taxation and legislate to preserve the American common market.

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 18, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 6:15 p.m. on Friday, January 17, 1969, and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the first annual report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

## FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING—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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, as required by law, the First Annual Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1969.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 18, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 6:15 p.m. on Friday, January 17, 1969, and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the first annual report on national housing goals, as required by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

## FIRST ANNUAL REPORT ON NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-63)

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 and ordered to be printed.

## To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting today the first annual report on National Housing Goals, as required by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

That Act affirmed the national goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." It determined that this goal can be

achieved by constructing or rehabilitating 26 million housing units in the next decade, 6 million of which will be for low- and moderate-income families.

This report lays out a plan for housing production to meet this goal. It also identifies the potential problems that may be faced in the coming year.

—It notes the sensitivity of residential building to credit conditions.

—It reviews the long-run need for adequate labor, land and materials to maintain an increasing level of construction.

The housing goals of the 1968 Act are firm national commitments. I urge the Congress, State and local officials, and concerned individuals to give careful consideration to this report.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1969.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 18, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 6:15 p.m. on Friday, January 17, 1969, and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits the 1968 and 1967 annual reports of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

## TRANSMITTING 1966-67 ANNUAL REPORTS OF DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-80)

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 and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

## To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 1966 and 1967 Annual Reports of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Reports record a number of important events in both years. They were momentous years in legislative enactments as well as in progress toward providing decent housing for all Americans and in the efforts to improve the quality of urban life.

In 1966, Congress enacted the legislation authorizing the Model Cities Program, one of the most important legislative events in the long chronology of Federal actions aimed at curing the physical and human blight in the Nation's urban areas.

During the period, the programs administered by the Department were continuing at an accelerated rate, while at the same time HUD was seeking and finding new directions and redirections in its programs.

We have developed good housing pro-

grams spanning the whole range of American economic life—from FHA insurance for moderate income families to rent supplements and low-rent public housing for the poorest families. Urban renewal programs are rebuilding vast sections of our cities. Programs are available and working for whole metropolitan areas to improve transportation and planning, to preserve and create open spaces, to install water and sewer systems.

The Nation can be proud of the beginning steps that have been taken in these past few years to deal with the serious problems of our urban areas. I commend these reports to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1969.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 18, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 8:15 p.m. on Friday, January 17, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President wherein he transmits the sixth annual report on activities and accomplishments under the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

#### SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS UNDER COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT OF 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-61)

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Under section 404 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, I hereby transmit the sixth annual report on this program.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1969.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 20, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 3:15 p.m. on Sunday, January 19, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President wherein he transmits the fifth annual report on the status of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

#### FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-58)

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 Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Fifth Annual Report on the status of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Wilderness is at the heart of America's heritage. It has had immeasurable impact on our nation's character, and on those who made its history. Its beauty and majesty have enriched the nation's spirit.

Forty-three years ago, conservationist Aldo Leopold said:

Wilderness certainly can not be built at will, like a city park or a tennis court . . . Neither can a wilderness be grown like timber, because it is something more than trees . . . If we want wilderness, we must forego our want and preserve the proper areas against the encroachment of inimical uses.

In 1964, Congress recognized this need and established 54 National Forest areas as the nucleus of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

During the 90th Congress, I submitted recommendations for 30 additions to the System. Action was completed on four of these during the last year. Another was added in connection with legislation for Washington's North Cascades. Altogether, some 800,000 acres were placed under the permanent protection of the Wilderness Act.

I am now sending to the Congress 13 additional wilderness proposals. One would designate about 323,000 acres within the Ashley and Wasatch National Forests of Utah as the High Uintas Wilderness. The remaining 12 proposals would create wilderness areas within several different wildlife refuges. I am also transmitting the results of Interior Department review of the Bear River Wilderness proposal. The Secretary of the Interior does not recommend wilderness status for this area, and I concur in that recommendation.

I urge early and favorable action on the new proposals as well as on those I submitted previously.

The future character of America depends on what constructive actions we take today. We can destroy our country by neglect, just as surely as we can save its great, God-given beauty by showing true concern.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 18, 1969.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 20, 1969.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 3:15 p.m. on Sunday, January 19, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President wherein he transmits the third annual report of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

#### THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—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 Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress this Third Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The Report describes the many ways in which the Endowment, though in operation for only three years, is helping scholars extend the knowledge and wisdom needed for human understanding, and helping teachers develop better ways of making the humanities meaningful to their students. The Report shows that in Fiscal Year 1968 the Endowment supported the Humanities with grants to individuals and institutions in 44 States and the District of Columbia.

I commend this Report to the Congress, with satisfaction that a real beginning has been made in increasing Americans' awareness of their priceless cultural heritage.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 18, 1969.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 20, 1969.

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

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 3:15 p.m. on Sunday, January 19, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President wherein he transmits the annual report of the Appalachian Regional Commission for fiscal year 1968.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS.

Clerk U.S. House of Representatives.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-59)

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 Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Annual Report of the Appalachian Regional Commission for Fiscal Year 1968.

This marks the halfway point in a six-year development program intended to close the economic gap between the Appalachian Region and the rest of the Nation.

In many ways the Appalachian program has been an experiment. At the end of this third year, it is possible to say that that experiment has proven itself successful—even if it is not possible to fully measure the impact of all its provisions.

Throughout the mountains and valleys of the thirteen Appalachian States, the three-year results of this program are highly visible—not only on the landscape but in the new hopes of its people.

There are 116.5 miles of new highways completed, with another 357.4 miles under construction—drastically reducing isolation and opening up new opportunities to the people of the region.

There are 36 new or expanded airports, assuring many communities of the commercial and developmental advantages of the air age.

More than 160 vocational education schools are training thousands of students who might have been dropouts—giving them modern skills to secure employment.

Over 170 new or improved hospitals and health facilities are providing modern health care to a people who have long been denied the basic health service which most Americans have taken for granted.

There are 127 institutions of higher education which have been assisted—and they are on the way to giving the best education possible to the young people of Appalachia.

All this and more—libraries, low and moderate income housing projects, educational television stations, water and sewer systems: hundreds of separate projects are at work to reclaim lives and enhance the land that was ravaged by erosion, strip mining, underground mine fires and floods.

The story of Appalachia is a story of growing hope.

I hope the 91st Congress will continue and strengthen the Appalachian Program.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 18, 1969.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JANUARY 20, 1969.

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

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 8:45 a.m. on Monday,

January 20, 1969, and said to contain the Manpower Report of the President.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk, U. S. House of Representatives.

MANPOWER REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-62)

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

It is with great pride that I submit this, the final Manpower Report of my Presidency. It describes the most favorable employment record in many years and the policies and programs that have made this progress possible. It also sets forth the agenda for further improvements in the use of the Nation's manpower and for continued economic prosperity.

This Report records the Nation's ability and continuing progress to meet one of the most basic needs of its people and represents a valid gauge of the Nation's essential strength.

The overriding significance of the Report is found in its concern for people, the most precious resource of this Nation—teenagers with futures to build, men and women with families to feed and house and educate, elderly citizens with productive years still ahead.

I commend this Report to your careful attention as the profile of America at work today. It is a record of promises made, of achievements and of hopes aroused. A new sense of dignity, a new chance for fulfillment, a new vision of the future have touched the lives of many millions because of what these pages tell.

Although there is ample cause for satisfaction in this Report, there is none for complacency. What we have accomplished helps to describe the dimensions of what is still undone. But those achievements, incomplete as they are, also serve to show us what can be done.

With a strong economy as the lifeline, special manpower programs—those we have tried and those still to be tested in the years ahead—can help men and women whom the economy would otherwise by-pass.

The road we are on is a long one. But the milestones we have already passed tell us it is the right road.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1969.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, can the Speaker tell us whether the President's economic report to the Nation has been filed and, if so, when?

The SPEAKER. In response to the inquiry, the Chair will state that the report has been received, and it has been re-

ferred to the Joint Economic Committee on January 16.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair.

JAMES P. B. DUFFY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments of our colleagues' time to recall and honor the service of a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

James P. B. Duffy, who served in the 74th Congress as Representative from Rochester, N.Y., passed away earlier this month.

Jim Duffy was not a nationally known figure, in politics or government, but, perhaps more than any other man, he exemplified very real dedication to public service to the people of his community.

He died on January 8, at the age of 90, after a long, active, and useful life—useful to the legal profession, the community and his church. His list of unselfish services included 28 years on the Rochester School Board, a term in Congress, service as a New York State Supreme Court justice, as a member of the New York State Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, and the New York State Probate Commission.

He served in active trusteeships with the Rochester Chamber of Commerce for 52 years, the Rochester Community Chest for 35 years, the Rochester Chapter American Red Cross for more than 20 years, the Rochester Savings Bank for 30 years, and St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church for 49 years.

In 1966, he received from the New York State Bar Association its distinguished service award.

His unselfish life represented the highest traditions of the legal profession and his example in public life as well as in his busy private law practice has been a constant source of inspiration to his brother lawyers and to the bench.

The Monroe County Bar Association expressed to me sorrow at the loss of one of its most distinguished, active, and loyal members.

Duffy, a bachelor, had made his home in the now closed Manger Hotel, on Clinton Avenue, South, in Rochester. He became a St. Anne's Home resident several months ago.

He was a member of the law firm of Duffy, Kaelber, Neville, & Juroe which he joined after being graduated from Harvard Law School in 1904.

Judge Duffy was a Democratic Congressman from 1934 to 1936 and a member of the State supreme court in 1937.

At the time of his death he was a member of the board of directors of the Automobile Club of Rochester and was a past president of the club.

He was a founder of the United Charity which later became Family Services of Rochester. He received his bachelor of arts degree from Georgetown University.

He served as a director and legal adviser of the local American Red Cross chapter for 10 years and was a commissioner of the Rochester Museum and Science Center.

Duffy is survived by a brother, J. Paul Duffy of Waterloo, N.Y., and a number of nephews and nieces.

A tribute to our late colleague appeared in a Brighton-Pittsford, New York Post editorial January 16. I would like to share it with my colleagues:

JAMES P. B. DUFFY

In an age of the anti-hero, an age in which we seem to see nothing except feet of clay on everything and everyone, the life of the late James P. B. Duffy has particular meaning, especially for youth.

Mr. Duffy, who died last week at 90, was, in a sense, a member of the established order in this metropolitan area. For many years he performed distinguished service as head of the Rochester School Board. He also served as a Congressman and as a Supreme Court justice, and he held a multitude of civic posts.

But if anyone were to suggest that these positions and responsibilities removed him from a warm and human concern for his fellow man, they just didn't know Jim Duffy.

What an unending amount of warmth and sensitivity this wonderful man had! What a desire to know what troubled and concerned other people, and what determination to do whatever he could to make their lives happier. What unreservedly honest a respect he had for every human being who crossed his path. And what never-failing grace and courtesy.

Can anyone remember an instance in which this man acted out of meanness, or bitterness, or selfishness? The answer, as true and clear as a church chime, is of course, no.

The word saint in our modern age is pretty square and old-fashioned. But as surely as the sun rises so did we have one among us during the 90 years that this remarkable man lived in Monroe County.

In a troubled time, in which everyone is blaming everyone else for the ills of society, we could learn much from Judge Duffy, if we would only take the time to learn the lessons he taught us so unassumingly.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my fellow New Yorker, Mr. CELLER, the senior Member of this House, who joins with me in paying honor to Mr. Duffy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I remember well our former colleague, James P. B. Duffy, of Rochester, N.Y., who served with me on the Judiciary Committee while he was in the House of Representatives.

He was a dedicated public servant, both in and out of office, and devoted much of his life to humanitarian endeavors. He leaves a good and honorable name.

I join his many friends in extending to his family my sincere sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

#### HALT NORTH VIETNAM AID

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. FOREMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1967, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 was amended by Public Law 90-137. Section 620 of that law states:

No loans, credits, guarantees, or grants or other assistance shall be furnished under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which sells or furnishes to North

Vietnam, or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from North Vietnam, any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as the regime in North Vietnam gives support to hostilities in South Vietnam.

The intent of Congress is clear in the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended. Yet, since November 1967, a total of 164 ships flying the flags of free-world countries have delivered goods to North Vietnam. All the while, of course, the war rages on. In the same 14 months, nearly 16,000 Americans have died in the hostilities, and, according to information furnished me by the Department of Defense, approximately 100,000 of our men have been wounded.

So long as hostilities in Vietnam continue, so long as Americans are fighting and dying in a foreign land, it is immoral—it is unconscionable—and it is un-American not to use every available means to stop vital supplies from reaching the enemy, and flowing through channels provided by countries receiving American tax dollars in aid and grants. That is why I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which calls upon our President to immediately halt all U.S. aid and trade with countries assisting North Vietnam.

I introduce this resolution—in addition to it being just plain, good common sense—because even though the law has been on the books since November 14, 1967, it has not been effectively implemented to bring the flow of goods and supplies to the enemy to a halt.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that a bipartisan group of our colleagues in this body have seen fit to join me in the introduction of this resolution. I include the resolution, and a listing of our colleagues joining me in the sponsoring of this resolution, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H. CON RES. 89

(Mr. Foreman (for himself, Mr. Baring, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Haley, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Collins, Mr. Grover, Mr. Smith of California, Mr. Watson, Mr. Lujan, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Waggonner, Mr. Price of Texas, Mr. Utz, Mr. Frey, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Gross, Mr. Dowdy, Mr. Camp, Mr. Lipscomb, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. King, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Hall, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Landgrebe, and Mr. Langen).)

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States shall abide by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Sec. 620 (n), as amended by Public Law 90-137, and shall immediately terminate loans, credits, guarantees, or grants or other assistance under this or any other Act to any country which sells or furnishes to North Vietnam or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from North Vietnam, any equipment, materials, or commodities, or by any means gives any form of assistance to North Vietnam.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days to submit their remarks in the RECORD in support of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CORMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

#### THE THREAT OF CONTINUED RELIANCE ON FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATES

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

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, today we are confronted with a crisis of fundamental importance to the health and well-being of every American. The need for greatly increased medical services and manpower to provide the highest quality medical care for every person commands our immediate attention. Between now and 1975, it is estimated that there will be an increase of approximately 25 percent in the demand for physicians' services. Population growth, changes in the age-sex distribution, urbanization, migration, rising levels of income, increased education, and medicare account for this tremendous increase.

The crisis America faces today is an overwhelming shortage of competent medical manpower to cope with increased demand for health care services. In simple terms, the number of highly qualified physicians available has not kept pace with the greatly increased needs. Based on figures available in 1960, the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation indicated that if the entire country were to enjoy the high-quality medical services that it so desperately needs, almost 60,000 additional physicians must be found. However, knowledgeable estimates of the present medical manpower shortage indicate that in 1969 our Nation remains with a deficit of over 50,000 medical doctors.

The supply of physicians is augmented in two main ways: graduates of American medical schools and alien doctors admitted to this country to practice medicine. In recent years around 7,500 American medical students have graduated each year. In addition, over 2,000 foreign medical graduates have been added to the medical professions here each year. The American Medical Association indicates that in 1965, 11,474 interns and residents serving in approved hospitals in the United States were graduates of foreign medical schools. As such, these doctors account for 28% of all interns and residents employed in approved hospitals.

Even more startling is the fact that in fiscal year 1967, for the first time, the number of foreign medical graduate immigrants plus medical exchange admissions—approximately 8,000—exceeded the number of U.S. medical graduates—approximately 7,600.

Alien medical doctors enter this country in one of three ways. Physicians admitted to this country for permanent residence from the Eastern Hemisphere enter pursuant to section 203(a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This section accords a third preference immigrant visa to certain qualified immigrants of exceptional ability in the sciences whose presence in this country will substantially benefit the welfare of the United States. Also, a labor certificate averring the absence of sufficient, able, willing, and qualified doctors in the place of the alien's intended employment is required by section 212(a) (14). At the



present time, alien doctors from the Eastern Hemisphere must wait at least 15 months time between the time their third preference petition is approved and the time their immigrant visa is issued.

Alien doctors entering the United States for permanent residence from the Western Hemisphere are admitted as "special immigrants" under section 201(a) (27). A "special immigrant" physician is also required to obtain a labor certification under section 212(2) (14). Currently, alien doctors from the Western Hemisphere experience a delay of approximately 2 months between the time their petition is approved and their immigration visa is issued.

In addition, temporary H-1, H-2, and J-1 visas for workers of distinguished merit and ability, workers performing services unavailable to the United States, and exchange visitors, are available under sections 101(a) (15) (H) (i), 101(a) (15) (ii), and 101(a) (15) (J), respectively. The temporary stay, envisioned by these visas, can be lengthened into permanent residence through an informal administrative practice of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Under the logic of the immigration and nationality law, while a visitor, holding a temporary visa is in this country, he may not apply for permanent immigration visa because, the Service feels, such activities would be inconsistent with the purposes of his entry. However, medical doctors, in the United States for temporary purposes, are permitted to file a petition for a third preference visa and remain here until their quota number is reached. Presumably, this informal procedure would be available even if the doctor entered the country illegally.

In my judgment, this country's reliance on foreign medical graduates to fill the partial vacuum of medical manpower is a shortsighted, inadequate policy with dangerous ramifications for all of us. Tremendous risks are readily apparent from our continued reliance on these medical doctors. In the first place, the continued supply of the doctors is uncertain. Second, employment of these physicians represents a staggering manpower drain on foreign, and particularly, underdeveloped nations who, perhaps to an even greater extent, need medical personnel to provide health services. Moreover, continued reliance on foreign medical graduates could decisively undercut the effect of the millions of dollars of foreign aid which we annually provide these developing nations.

Another disturbing feature of this policy is the inferior quality of the medical and health services provided American citizens in American hospitals by these foreign medical graduates. In a comprehensive study recently completed by the American Medical Association, foreign medical graduates serving here as interns and residents were compared with their American counterparts. The physicians were evaluated in 15 main areas: acclimatization; discipline; general duties; history-taking; physical examination; basic medical sciences; doctor-patient relationship; doctor-staff relationship; personal relationship; libraries; supervision; learning processes;

independent learning; teaching staff and house staff; potential for medical practice. The results were startling: whether viewed collectively or individually, the foreign medical graduate intern or resident manifests a level of professional knowledge and competence significantly below graduates of American medical schools. The only exception was in the ability to make effective use of the library where the foreign medical graduates were rated approximately equal to American graduates. Particularly in the four crucial areas of professional competence—knowledge of basic medical sciences; effect on hospital teaching staff; capacity for independent learning; and potential as practicing physicians—the great inferiority of foreign medical school graduates is manifest. In effect, they rated poorest in the most important aspects of medical knowledge critical for their development as physicians and for the service they render to the patients they encounter.

I am further convinced that another consequence of our reliance on foreign medical graduates has been to detract from the ability of our Nation's medical schools to produce practicing physicians. In short, by permitting our health care system to draw upon foreign medical manpower, medical schools in the United States have been relieved of public and government demands for an increase in the production of U.S. medical graduates. In the absence of such demands, it appears that U.S. medical schools have oriented their operations largely toward pursuit of Federal research grants. Paradoxically, the AMA and many schools have defended their preoccupation with research by the argument that intensive scientific research is necessary to maintain high caliber and quality standards of medical education.

Thus we are confronted with a terrible dilemma. We have a great shortage of well trained physicians. We have adopted a stopgap procedure of employing alien doctors to partially fill this vacuum. But experience has shown that these doctors have not and cannot give the public the quality of medical service which is desperately needed and expected. Moreover, it appears that this policy has actually deterred domestic production of medical graduates. In short, our stopgap procedure has been a failure with grave implications for the future if the practice is continued.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, we cannot permit perpetuation of the low grade medical care provided by these doctors, nor can we permit our Nation's medical schools to neglect their function of educating trained physicians. It is time to rethink our shortsighted schemes and formulate policies to insure long-term attainment of the high quality of medical care that we need. We should expand our present medical school facilities and enrollment to insure a ready reservoir of competent medical talent to meet the challenge of our ever increasing health needs. We must reevaluate the dangerous priorities accorded medical research in the perspective of the present threatening medical manpower shortage.

In the interim, I am convinced we

should immediately stop the entry of foreign physicians into this country unless we can guarantee that they have the minimum standards of quality and potential that we expect of our own physicians. To implement this policy I urge that foreign medical doctors be admitted for permanent residence and ultimate citizenship only after they have passed an examination designed to indicate that they have the equivalent quality training and potential of graduates of medical schools in this country.

As recently pointed out by President Johnson's Advisory Commission on Health Manpower, the fundamental criterion of professional qualification in this country is graduation from an accredited medical school. Since it would be impracticable and costly to establish a system of accrediting foreign medical schools, no similar mechanism exists for evaluating the professional qualifications of foreign medical graduates.

However, at present, foreign medical graduates are required to pass a standard examination administered by the Educational Council on Foreign Medical Graduates, a body designated by representative groups within organized medicine, in order to become eligible for hospital training or for State licensure. I would emphasize:

First. That passage of this examination is not a prerequisite to issuance of an immigrant visa;

Second. That the examination is not sufficiently difficult to insure the American public of adequate quality medical care.

As reported by the President's Advisory Commission:

Those who administer the examination consider it to be easier than that of the National Board (which must be taken by United States graduates). The quality of preparation of foreign medical graduates seeking to come to the United States is indicated by their scores on the Educational Council on Foreign Medical Graduates examination. On examinations which were passed by ninety-eight percent of United States graduates, only forty percent of the foreign medical graduates achieved a passing score. Furthermore, the scores of those who did pass were clustered just above the passing mark rather than spread out through higher scores like those of United States graduates.

I would therefore urge admission under immigration laws based on successful completion of an examination which will more adequately reflect whether a visa applicant has the equivalent quality training of U.S. medical schools.

I would further advise that I have today introduced legislation that makes issuance of an immigration visa to foreign medical doctors contingent upon satisfactory completion of such an examination.

In accordance with recommendations of President Johnson's Advisory Committee the examination is to be administered and formulated by the National Board of Medical Examiners. However, under my bill the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to waive this requirement where, because of their distinguished prior experience, aliens manifest sufficient competence to practice medicine in the United States.

In my judgment, this legislation is absolutely necessary to reverse a trend which has continued to shortchange our Nation's health and medical service needs.

#### MICHIGAN'S HOLLAND CHRISTIAN BAND PERFORMED MAGNIFICENTLY IN INAUGURAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT) is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Holland Christian High School Band from my Ninth Congressional District in the inauguration parade was magnificent.

Each band member reflected the goodness, decency, and unselfishness of a strong young America that will take up the torch of greatness to carry our Nation toward new glory in the challenging future.

I join the State of Michigan, the city of Holland, parents, schoolmates, and all those associated with the band in saluting the young musicians not only for their personal conduct but for a flawless performance as they marched into history along Pennsylvania Avenue on Inauguration Day, 1969.

In a heartwarming and swift response to the need for financing the band's trip, the community of Holland raised an estimated \$15,000.

Henry P. Vander Linde, band director, expressed the gratitude of the band and others in this special message on the eve of the Washington trip:

The trip to the Inaugural Parade in Washington, D.C., is not only a great honor, but also a great responsibility. Many hours of planning, work, and money have gone into making this trip possible. Therefore, we should reward this with our very best effort and conduct.

We are now in the attention of the entire state as their representatives, and they expect from us the best.

It has been the desire of the Planning Committee and the Band and Orchestra Parents to make this historic occasion an unforgettable educational and musical experience. We are deeply indebted to every committee member, contributor, and worker on this project. The cooperation of the School Board, Administration, faculty, student body, parents, and community has been overwhelming. Their concern and prayers are with you.

Use this opportunity to be a witness of Christian Education and the best qualities of Christian citizenship.

The choice of Holland Christian High School Band to represent Michigan in the inaugural parade was a cooperative effort. I worked closely with the Michigan Republican State central committee and George Romney, Governor at the time and now Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The five-day journey was much more than a trip to Washington for the band. It was an action-packed, interesting, and lively experience.

En route to the Capital, the band visited Gettysburg for a tour of the historic battlefields.

Upon arriving in Washington at mid-afternoon on January 18, I welcomed the band in the House Chambers before taking them on a tour of the Capital, in-

cluding a visit to the suite of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK, whose staff was most helpful in arranging to permit the young visitors from Michigan a view of his personal office. It was a wonderful experience for the high school students, whose interest in government was deepened because of seeing the Speaker's office and much of the Capitol.

With members of my staff acting as guides, the buses toured Washington, including the Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial, Jefferson Memorial, and the downtown area.

Midway during the tour the band saw motion pictures of the Apollo 8 flight to the moon. The Science and Astronautics Committee, of which I am a member, through its staff helped arrange the showing of the film in the Rayburn Building. Capt. Robert Freitag, field director for the manned space program of the NASA organization, was directly responsible for obtaining the film. He made an excellent speech to the band, which was applauded with youthful enthusiasm.

On January 19, the band traveled to Annapolis to attend chapel with the midshipmen. After dinner in a fine restaurant overlooking the Severn River, band members were taken on escorted tours of the area by members of the Annapolis Historical Society. A vesper service in the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Annapolis concluded a very special day for the visitors from Holland.

On Inauguration Day while the band was preparing for the parade, chaperones were guests for luncheon in my Longworth Building office. Also, they were my guests at the inaugural ceremonies.

Radio, television, and newspaper coverage of the band's trip was outstanding. Holland radio stations carried many broadcasts prior to the band's departure and during the Washington trip.

Time-Life Broadcast in Washington recorded the band's tour of the Capitol for the televising next day.

The Holland Sentinel published page 1 stories of the band's activities in Washington with photographs.

A copy of one of the Sentinel's pre-trip stories follows:

#### CHRISTIAN BAND GETS PARADE RULES

Complete parade instructions for the Holland Christian High School band which will be Michigan's music entry in the Inaugural parade for President-Elect Richard M. Nixon on Jan. 20 were received today by Henry P. Vander Linde, director.

The 75-page instruction packet was prepared by the Department of the Army, headquarters military district of Washington which is in charge of arrangements, along with crowd control and medical supervision.

Holland Christian's 141 piece band will march early in the fifth division of the parade which is slated to get underway at 2 p.m. (EST). The order of march for the fifth division is headed by the United States Navy Commander and Staff, along with the U.S. Navy band. Following in order are the floats of Maine and Missouri, along with their bands. Then follows the Missouri and Arkansas units just ahead of the Holland Christian band. Following is the Michigan float and the units from Florida, Texas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas and West Virginia to round out the fifth division.

The first division includes, parade personnel and marshals, President and Mrs. Nixon, Vice President and Mrs. Spiro Agnew,

Chief Justice and Mrs. Earl Warren, Senator and Mrs. Everett Dirksen, Congressman and Mrs. Gerald Ford of Michigan, former President and Mrs. Dwight Eisenhower and other party officials. Members of the new Cabinet and their wives complete the first division, along with the governors of the various states.

Then follows the one band and one float from each of the 50 states, marching in the order in which the states were admitted to the Union. The lone exceptions are the states of California and Maryland who will head the other states in honor of the new President and Vice President.

Vander Linde said that parade instructions call for all bands to maintain a cadence which will assure forward movement of 100 yards per minute. Bands must maintain their original formation throughout the parade and special formations are prohibited in the Inaugural parade.

Bands must maintain a formation such that the width will not exceed 17 yards and the overall length of the unit will not exceed 24 ranks. Vander Linde has done some shuffling of his 141 piece outfit in rehearsals in the new Christian High gym and reported that the Christian band will march 16 ranks including the majorettes, color bearers and drum major.

All bands will play while passing the Presidential reviewing stand in front of the White House. The Maroon band director reported that the local band will play, "The Victors," fight song of the University of Michigan while passing in review.

Only Armed Forces bands will render "Honors" in front of the Presidential stand. "Honors" consists of four ruffles and flourishes followed by appropriate military music.

The parade route will extend from the Capitol to the White House.

Plans call for the Holland Christian band to leave for Washington on Friday Jan. 17 and return home immediately following the parade with scheduled arrival at noon on Tuesday Jan. 21.

The Grand Rapids Press published a full page picture-text story the week before the band came to Washington. Text matter of the story follows:

#### NIXON INAUGURAL EAGERLY AWAITED—HOLLAND CHRISTIAN BAND HITS A HIGH NOTE

(By Bob Burns)

HOLLAND.—It was 29 degrees and the rain landing in front of the Civic Center on West 8th Street was coating the pavement with a sheet of ice.

Inside the building, all kinds of empty musical instruments cases were on the floor near the entrance.

Then you could see Henry VanderLinde in a maroon jacket. He would take a few steps along the aisle above the basketball floor, stop and comment:

"I'm not pleased with this at all."

Then he would strut and say:

"March into the rhythm. Da-Da-Da Da Da—then come back in."

#### BAND PLAYS ON

He would take a few more steps.

"You've got to be together," his voice would boom. "Okay, let's try 'The Victors' again."

Then the Holland Christian High School Maroon Marching Band blared away while VanderLinde, the director, looked and listened for more minor flaws.

The reason for practice during Christmas vacation is the band will represent the state at President-elect Richard M. Nixon's Inaugural parade Jan. 20 in Washington, D.C.

"We started at 8 this morning and there's still plenty of work to do," VanderLinde said.

Suddenly the music stopped.

"You drummers had a little fiasco there," VanderLinde yelled in the direction of the 141-piece maroon-and-white clad band.

"One-two, now the chord. Now the last chord. Now, that's a good, full sound."

"Okay, let's try 'March America.'"

The band sounded off again.

After more pacing and more comments, VanderLinde said:

"At ease. Rest. Don't move out of place!"

VanderLinde, who was elected band director of the year in Michigan last January, took time out himself to talk about how the band became the only one selected to represent Michigan at the inaugural.

"It's really a long story," he said. "It started when the band played at a cracker-barrel rally several weeks ago. It was suggested to U.S. Rep. Guy Vander Jagt (R-Cadillac) that it would be an honor if the band could march at the inaugural.

"Finally, on Dec. 10, the school got a phone call. We had two hours to accept or reject the invitation, but the superintendent of schools, Mark VanderArk, made the decision to go. It was announced that night at a basketball game."

#### CAMPAIGN IS ON

In the last 19 days, a campaign has been waged to finance the trip for a party of 164 including chaperones.

"We need more than \$10,000," VanderLinde said.

VanderLinde, who has been director of instrumental music in the Holland Christian schools for 18 years, is proud of the record his bands have achieved. "We have established a good reputation in state music festivals," he said. "Last year we were the only band given a unanimous rating by four judges in the festival."

VanderLinde is a strong believer of pride, spirit and loyalty. "Any boy or girl who has these qualities has the key to success," he said.

After talking with several band members, it is obvious that VanderLinde is a popular director.

Mary VanderHooping, a junior clarinet player, said, "Going to Washington will be a great experience for the band and an honor for Mr. VanderLinde and Holland." Mary said she is looking forward to "seeing everything" in the nation's capital.

Kris DeGraaf, a junior majorette, echoed Mary's sentiments about the band and the director. "He really deserves it," Kris said. "I've never been there before and I'm really looking forward to the trip, especially a chance to see President Nixon."

Tom Freeman, only a sophomore but the fellow who will lead the band as drum major, is confident everything will turn out just fine. "I'm a little nervous," he said. "But we can handle it. All of us need a little more practice, but the nice thing is that everyone is willing to work. They listen to the director and I know everyone is going to do a good job."

Like Kris, Tom said he's anxious to see the next president. "And I'd like to see the monuments, too," he said.

#### PRESIDENT OF BAND

Steve VanderPloeg, a senior trombone player and president of the band, thinks the trip will be a good thing for the students and the school. "I hope I can see Arlington Cemetery and the Pentagon," he said.

Sue Hulst, a senior who plays the tenor saxophone and is the band librarian, also hopes to visit Arlington. "My sister's husband guards the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier," she said. Sue, who lives in East Saugatuck, said she hopes "we can represent Michigan as well as any other band could. That's why I don't mind practicing during Christmas vacation."

Ron Klynstra, a senior who resides in Zeeland and plays the tuba, may be a little more anxious to make the trip than most. "I've never been out of the state," he said. "It's a wonderful opportunity. I'm proud to go."

Hilda Berghoef, secretary of the band and a senior clarinet player, has a long list of

places to visit during the four-day trip. "Let's see," she said, "there's the Pentagon, White House, Smithsonian Institution, Capitol and Lincoln Memorial. It's great, just great that this happened."

Randy Vogelzang, a junior cornet player, thinks the trip will be very educational. "There's the Capitol—just so much to see," he said.

Fred Strenberg, a senior baritone player, said, "I haven't really thought much about the trip. But the visit to Gettysburg should be a lot of fun."

Craig VanderBie, a junior bass drummer, still can't get over being part of the band that was selected by Gov. Romney and Ely Peterson, state GOP chairman.

#### PICKED OVER TIME

"When you realize that only a few high school bands in the country will be there and that we were picked over the University of Michigan band then it becomes more like a once-in-a-lifetime thing," he said. "And how often do you get to see a president inaugurated?"

Nancy Hietbrink, a junior trombone player, said, "It's more fun than Christmas. What else can I say?"

Sue Tinhot, a junior majorette, said she hasn't thought about too much other than seeing President Nixon.

"I'm just going to get in as much practice with the baton as I can," she said.

It was now a little past 10 a.m. and the last of the band members left the building carefully stepping over the ice.

During the parade, the band was seen by an international television audience as the musicians marched past the White House reviewing stand with President Nixon and others in his official party applauding the outstanding performance. I have sent letters of appreciation to each band member. One of them follows:

Your band is a source of great pride for all of us. Congratulations for your performance in Washington during the Inauguration of President Richard M. Nixon.

I have spoken my praise in the House of Representatives. My comment is printed in the enclosed copy of *The Congressional Record*, which you may want to keep as a memento of your trip.

The pictures were taken, as you may recall, in the Capital during our brief, but interesting, tour of the building.

We enjoyed your visit, your wonderful music and marching and the opportunity to be of service.

My staff and I thank you for your thoughtfulness in your gifts of honorary band member certificates and the wooden shoes.

Thank you for representing Michigan and your home city in a manner that brought applause and praise wherever the band appeared.

A letter thanking Mark Vander Ark, school superintendent, which I wrote follows:

Recall that President Nixon in his inaugural address said: "We see the hope of tomorrow in the youth of today."

Thanks to the dedication, hard work, imagination and skill of educators like yourself, the "hope" Mr. Nixon spoke of is stronger and brighter.

You brought a wonderful group of young people to Washington. They captured the hearts of everyone they met. The training and education they have received under your guidance were reflected in their attitudes, performance and personal conduct.

Thank you for all the help you gave my staff. We are very grateful for your cooperation and assistance.

It was a special pleasure to see you and the other adults who made the journey to Washington, which we hope was a pleasant and unforgettable one.

To express my appreciation to the nearly 500 members of the Band Parent Organization, I sent each one of them the following letter:

DEAR HOLLAND CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL BAND PARENT: Time does not allow me to send personal letters to each of many hundreds of you. So, please accept my apology for using this form of communication.

I thought you might like to have this copy of the page in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* on which my remarks praising the band for its outstanding performance in Washington were printed.

Thanks to hard work and support, the band had the backing it needed to make the trip. I congratulate you for a wonderful contribution.

I include herewith a list of the names of the talented young musicians who represented Michigan in the 1969 Inaugural Parade:

#### HOLLAND CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL BAND PERSONNEL ROSTER 1969

##### FLUTE

Nancy Ribbens, Peggy Ribbens, Arlyn Dozeman, Bonnie Keen, Gayle Kamer, Marilyn Ver Hoef, Marcia Vander Ploeg, Nancy Todd, Mary Deur, Nancy Sikkel, Pat Hoffmeyer, Sandi Smith, Jane Voss, Audrey Raak, Kathy Plaggenmarch, Marcia Schout, Mary Overweg, Gretchen Otten, Linda Coornbos, Sandy Ter Horst, Evonne De Freil, Gwen Rypma, Lisa Vander Poppen, Luanne Vanden Bosch, Sheryl Van Kampen, Sara Vander Kolk, Evonne Deur, Peggy Vander Kool, Eileen Dozeman, Sandy Hop.

##### OBOE

Gay Kaashoek (Banner), Sheryl Hulzenga (Banner), Phyllis Van Noord (Bells), Sally Wyngarden (Bells).

##### CLARINET

Bill Swieringa, Hilda Berghoef, Mary Vander Hooping, Evelyn Vander Kolk, Gienna Vander Bie, Helen Fredricks, Helen Dykstra, Vonnie Heckman, Linda Rooks, Linda Ter Horst, Nancy Ten Harmel, Nancy Yf, Diane Klekover, Sue Frieswyk, Ken Bos, Fete Brouwer, Wm. De Waard, Wanda Grotenhuis, Ena Berghoef, Bev Molder, Margo Van Slot, Sue Frens, Mark Van Zanten, Cherie Raterink, Charlene Rotman, Joan Manting, Mary Medema, Karen Den Bleyker.

##### BASSOON

Dawn Boertman (Cymbals).

##### ALTO CLARINET

Mary Peeks.

##### BASS CLARINET

Dorothy Hoekstra, Craig Wieringa.

##### CONTRA BASS CLARINET

Jeanne Boeve (Clarinet).

##### ALTO SAXOPHONE

Linda Oetman, Laurel Louwsma, Sheryl Deur, Beth Brinks, Bob Steenwyk, Rich Moesher, Pam Meygaard, Brian Boeve.

##### BARTONE SAXOPHONE

Curt Mans, Kirk Vander Ploeg.

##### CORNETS

Randy Vogelzang, Tim Leep, Terry Slenk, Glenn Homkes, Doug Zoerhoff, Steve Oostdyk, Dan Holweda, Rick Kieklintveld, Rex Kieklintveld, Marge Gritter, Sally Brinks, Tom Smith, Rusty Michmerhuizen, Dan Boerman, Steve Brieve, Doug Nienhuis, Pete Hoekstra, Randy Schrottenboer, Chuck Tubergan.

##### TENOR SAXOPHONE

Sue Hulst, Maxine Ten Harmel.

##### HORNS

Joann Houseward, Cal Vanden Brink, Ken Visser, Carl Bergman, Jack Heyboer, Chuck Steenstra.

##### TROMBONES

Steve Vander Ploeg, Bob Nienhuis, Dan Gritter, Nancy Hietbrink, Len Vogelzang, Roy Navis, Sam Gredyanus, Tom Swieringa, Tom Freeman, Ken Schierbeek, Tom Hoeksema.

## BARTONES

Dave Den Ouden, Fred Sterenberg, Paul Keeps, (T.C.), Gary Schutten (T.C.), Jerry Phillips (T.C.), Mark Genzink, Rick Slenk, Joe Zwier, Brad Stensenz.

## BASSES

Ron Klynstra, Mark Van Reken, Steve Hekman, Jim Vanderby, Cory Knoll.

## STRING BASS

Jane Vreeman (Bells).

## PERCUSSION

Rich Postma (Snare Drum), Mary Brouwer (Cymbals), Larry Klein (Snare Drum), Wayne Hop (Bass Drum), Jerry Hamberg (Snare Drum), Nancy Bartels (Bells), Craig Vander Bie (Bass Drum).

## MAJORETTES

Peggy Van Wyke, Anita De Nooyer, Betty Kamer, Sue Tinholt, Kris De Graaf.

## DRUM MAJOR

Tom Vreeman.

Accompanying the band was the following entourage of school officials, parents, staff, and specialists, all of whom are to be congratulated for their work:

## SCHOOL BOARD

Rev. and Mrs. Steenstra, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Vannette, Mr. and Mrs. Kon Marcus.

## ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Ray Holwerda, Mr. Mark Vander Ark.

## BAND PARENTS

Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Van Noord, Dr. and Mrs. Frieswyk, Mrs. Elsie Teusink.

## STAFF

Mr. Hero Bratt, Mrs. Marie Kruthof, Mr. Art Tuls.

## SPECIALISTS

Mr. Don Stoltz (Vander Jagt Huisson), Mr. Art Wyma (moving pictures), Miss Kathryn Fredericks (treasurer), Mr. and Mrs. Clare Pott (news coverage), Mr. Gus Vanden Berge (photography), Mr. and Mrs. Henry Vander Linde (director).

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I quote from the inaugural speech of President Nixon:

What has to be done, has to be done by government and people together or it will not be done at all . . . with the people we can do everything.

To match the magnitude of our tasks, we need the energies of our people . . . we can build a great cathedral of the spirit—each of us raising it one stone at a time, as he reaches out to his neighbor, helping, caring, doing.

It was this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that came to Washington with the Holland Christian High School Band. It was the energy of those at home who helped make the trip possible.

Holland has a slogan, Mr. Speaker,

that seems especially appropriate in saluting the band. According to the slogan:

Half the fun of having something wonderful is sharing it with others.

## ELIMINATE FARM TAX ADVANTAGES TO WEALTHY NONFARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation in the House of Representatives to eliminate the tax advantages which benefit wealthy nonfarmers who enter farm loss operations to offset their nonfarm income.

Five of my colleagues in the House have joined me in sponsoring the measure—Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. REUSS.

The bill is similar to H.R. 19916 which we cosponsored in the 90th Congress, and identical to the measure which was introduced yesterday in the other body by a bipartisan group under the chief sponsorship of Senator METCALF, who has assembled extensive and convincing evidence as to the abuses which our present tax laws allow in this area.

Our existing tax structure encourages wealthy nonfarmers to invest in farm loss operations for the tax advantages they receive, and in doing so they distort the agricultural economy, at the expense of legitimate farmers and the average taxpayer. Not only do they bid up the price of farmland beyond that which would normally prevail, but they force the genuine farmer to compete in the marketplace with owners who may consider a farm profit unnecessary for their purposes.

The bill is written to assure that legitimate farmers are not penalized, even though many of them may be forced to hold jobs in town to supplement their farm income. A ceiling has been established which will permit farm losses to be offset in full against nonfarm income up to \$15,000, for those whose nonfarm income does not exceed that amount. Taxpayers with higher nonfarm income may still use farm losses to offset that income, but at an amount reduced dollar for dollar for income over \$15,000.

In addition, the bill contains carry-over and carryback provisions which

would be available to absorb large one-time losses, allowing losses to be offset against farm income for the prior 3 years and the subsequent 5 years.

In no event does the legislation prevent the deduction of farm losses as they relate to taxes and interest, since these are generally deductible whether or not they are attributable to income-producing activity. Nor does it include casualty losses or losses from drought, since these are clearly beyond the control of the farmer.

The limitation on farm loss deductions would not apply to the taxpayer who is willing to follow accounting rules which apply generally to other taxpayers; that is, if he uses inventories in determining taxable income and treats as capital items—subject to depreciation in most cases—all expenditures which are properly treated as capital items rather than treating them as expenses fully deductible in the current year.

Mr. Speaker, since this legislation was first introduced in the 90th Congress, it has gained steady support. The major farm organizations—the National Farmers Union, the National Farmers Organization, the American Farm Bureau, and the National Grange—all have endorsed the principles of the bill.

A seminar of more than 500 farm and church leaders from 30 States, meeting in Des Moines earlier this month, recommended passage of the legislation.

Both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Treasury have cited the need for this type of corrective action.

The Treasury Department has presented an analysis of internal revenue statistics which demonstrates the clear predominance of farm losses over farm gains among high-bracket taxpayers with income from other sources.

They found that in 1965, for example, taxpayers with income below \$50,000 reported farm profits over farm losses at a ratio of 5 to 2. In the income bracket from \$50,000 to \$500,000 profits and losses were in an approximate 1-to-1 ratio. But among taxpayers with adjusted gross income over \$500,000, the losses reported were 7 times greater than profits from farm operations.

At the request of Senator METCALF, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Service has prepared a table which gives further evidence of the extent of the problem. With unanimous consent I place this table at this point in the RECORD:

NET FARM LOSS, NUMBER OF RETURNS AND AVERAGE NET FARM LOSS, BY AGI CLASS, TAXABLE RETURNS, 1964, 1965, AND 1966

AGI classes (thousands)	1964			1965			1966		
	Number of returns	Net loss (thousands)	Average loss	Number of returns	Net loss (thousands)	Average loss	Number of returns	Net loss (thousands)	Average loss
\$0 to \$5	222,910	\$236,049	\$1,059	197,762	\$203,526	\$1,029	171,410	\$167,024	\$974
\$5 to \$10	314,346	340,867	1,084	319,741	334,943	1,048	324,312	349,196	1,077
\$10 to \$15	70,351	112,499	1,599	79,564	123,177	1,548	104,539	142,655	1,365
\$15 to \$20	17,969	48,817	2,717	23,843	60,292	2,529	31,667	35,370	2,230
\$20 to \$30	29,394	152,693	5,195	30,380	133,187	4,384	36,861	154,263	4,185
\$30 to \$50	6,865	63,526	9,254	7,424	76,852	10,352	8,883	76,402	8,620
\$50 to \$500	2,546	53,608	21,056	2,874	54,872	19,093	13,741	160,789	118,756
\$500 to \$1,000	145	5,295	36,517	170	6,625	38,971	193	7,566	39,202
\$1,000 and over	76	4,500	59,211	103	7,630	74,078	88	3,555	40,398

† Greater detail available for 1966:

AGI classes (thousands)	Number of returns	Net loss (thousands)	Average loss
\$100 to \$200	2,350	\$36,202	\$15,448
\$200 to \$500	891	24,487	27,483

In other words, in 1966, the average farm losses reported by 88 millionaires were in excess of \$40,000—that is seven times as much as the average Iowa farmer earned in total net income last year.

Last year, the Departments of Agriculture and Treasury submitted to the Senate Finance Committee their comments on an earlier version of this legislation, introduced by Senator METCALF as S. 2613 and by me as H.R. 17478.

Both Departments cited the need for the legislation, but each suggested changes to better carry out the purpose of the bill. Those changes have been incorporated into the measure which I am introducing today.

Because the departmental comments offer further insight into the problem and additional explanation of the legislation, with unanimous consent I include them at this point in the Record:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1968.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your request for the Treasury Department's views on S. 2613, a bill "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that farming losses incurred by persons who are not bona fide farmers may not be used to offset nonfarm income", as it would be amended by Amendment No. 529. I note that S. 3443, while differing in many respects, is designed to deal with the same subject and has been referred to your Committee.

The objective of S. 2613 is to eliminate the provisions which presently grant high bracket taxpayers substantial tax benefits from the operation of certain types of farms on a part-time basis. These taxpayers, whose primary economic activity is other than farming, carry on limited farming activities such as citrus farming or cattle raising. By electing the special farm accounting rules which were developed to ease the bookkeeping chores for ordinary farmers—these high bracket taxpayers show farm "tax losses" which are not true economic losses. These "tax losses" are then deducted from their other income resulting in large tax savings. Moreover, these "tax losses" frequently represent the cost of creating a farm asset (i.e., the cost of raising a breeding herd) which will ultimately be sold and the proceeds (including the part representing a recoupment of the previously deducted expenses) taxed only at lower capital gains rates. Thus, deductions are set off against ordinary income, while the sale price of the resulting assets represents capital gain. The essence of the bill is to deny high bracket part-time farmers the ability to use the generous farm tax accounting rules to reduce taxes on their non-farm income.

When a taxpayer purchases and operates a farm for tax purposes, it inevitably leads to a distortion of the farm economy. The tax benefits allow an individual to operate a farm at an economic breakeven or even a loss and still realize a profit. For example, for a top bracket taxpayer, where a deduction is associated with eventual capital gains income, each \$1.00 of deduction means an immediate tax savings of 70 cents to be offset in the future by only 25 cents of tax. This cannot help but result in a distortion of the farm economy, especially for the ordinary farmer who depends on his farm to produce the income needed to support him and his family.

This distortion may be evidenced in various ways: For one, the attractive farm tax benefits available to wealthy persons have

caused them to bid up the price of farm land beyond that which would prevail in a normal farm economy. Furthermore, because of the present tax rules, the ordinary farmer must compete in the market place with these wealthy farm owners who may consider a farm profit—in the economic sense—unnecessary for their purposes. Statistics show a clear predominance of farm losses over farm gains among high-bracket taxpayers with income from other sources.

The Treasury Department supports the objective of S. 2613, but suggests certain modifications in its operation. There is attached a memorandum which, in more detail, describe the problem involved, the reasons for the Treasury's position and its recommended changes.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,  
Assistant Secretary.

#### AN ANALYSIS OF S. 2613 AND THE FARM LOSS PROBLEM

The objective of S. 2613 is to remove certain unjustified tax benefits available to high bracket taxpayers whose primary economic activity is other than farming through the operation of cattle and other farming activities on a part-time basis. This memorandum describes the general tax problem involved; and then discusses the remedy offered by S. 2613.

The Treasury Department supports the objectives of S. 2613, but suggests certain modifications in its operation.

##### 1. GENERAL BACKGROUND

*Methods of accounting*—There are two principal methods of accounting used in reporting business income for tax purposes. In general, those businesses which do not involve the production or sale of merchandise may use the cash method. Under it, income is reported when received in cash or its equivalent, and expenses are deducted when paid in cash or its equivalent.

On the other hand, in businesses where the production or sale of merchandise is a significant factor, income can be properly reflected only if the costs of the merchandise are deducted in the accounting period in which the income from its sale is realized. This is accomplished by recording costs when incurred and sales when made, and including in inventory those costs attributable to unsold goods on hand at year's end. Deduction of the costs included in inventory must be deferred until the goods to which they relate are sold and is not permitted when the costs are incurred. Thus, under this method of accounting, income from sales of inventory and the costs of producing or purchasing such inventory are matched in the same accounting period thereby properly reflecting income.

Farmers, however, have been excepted from these general rules. Even in those cases where inventories are a material factor, they have historically been permitted to use the cash accounting method and ignore their year-end inventories of crops, cattle, etc. This has resulted in an inaccurate reflection of their annual income since expenditures are fully deducted in the year incurred, notwithstanding the fact that the assets produced by those expenditures (inventories) are not sold, and the income not reported, until a later year.

The sponsor of S. 2613 has also offered Amendment No. 529. The proposed amendment is a minor technical change which does not affect the substance of the bill. The amendment has been considered in this analysis.

*Capitalization of costs*—Farmers are also permitted another liberal tax accounting rule. In most businesses, the cost of constructing an asset (including maintenance of the asset prior to its being used in the business) is a capital expenditure which may not be deducted as incurred but may be recovered only by depreciation over the useful life of the asset. In this manner, the cost of the asset is matched with the income earned by the asset. Farmers, however, have been permitted to deduct some admittedly capital costs as they are incurred. For example, a citrus grove may not bear a commercial crop until 6 or 7 years after it has been planted. Yet, the farmer may elect to deduct as incurred all costs of raising the grove to a producing state even though such expenditures are capital in nature. Similarly, the capital nature of expenditures associated with the raising of livestock held for breeding may be ignored and the expenditures may be deducted currently. These premature deductions frequently result in artificial tax losses.

*The problem*—These liberal deviations from good accounting practices were permitted for farm operation in order to spare the ordinary farmer the bookkeeping chores associated with inventories and accrual accounting.

However, many high bracket taxpayers, whose primary economic activity is other than farming, carry on limited farming activities such as citrus farming or cattle raising. By electing the special farm accounting rules which allow premature deductions, many of these high bracket taxpayers show farm losses which are not true economic losses. These "tax losses" are then deducted from their other high bracket income resulting in large tax savings. Moreover, these "tax losses" which arise from deductions taken because of capital costs or inventory costs usually thus represent an investment in farm assets rather than funds actually lost. This investment quite often will ultimately be sold and taxed only at low capital gains rates. Thus, deductions are set off against ordinary income, while the sale price of the resulting assets represents capital gain. The gain is usually the entire sales price since the full cost of creating the asset has previously been deducted against ordinary income.

*Examples*—Under the present rules, if the taxpayer has chosen not to capitalize raising costs and also does not use an inventory method of accounting, he may deduct as incurred all the expenses of raising a breeding herd. These include breeding fees, costs of feed, and other expenses attributable to the growth of the herd. During the development of the herd, there is relatively little income realized to offset these expenses with the result that "tax losses" are incurred which may be used to offset the taxpayer's non-farm income. When the herd has reached its optimum size, a taxpayer seeking the maximum tax savings will sell the entire herd. If he does, he may report the entire proceeds of the sale as capital gain.

The dollars and cents value of this tax treatment can readily be seen through a simple example. Assume that the expenses of raising the herd are \$200,000. If the taxpayer is in the top tax bracket, the current deduction of these expenses will produce a tax savings of \$140,000. On the sale of the herd, however, the entire sales price, including the \$200,000 representing the recovery of these expenses, will be taxable only at the 25 percent capital gains rate. The capital gains tax on \$200,000 is \$50,000; or less than half the tax savings realized in the earlier years. Thus, the taxpayer in this situation would realize a \$90,000 tax profit from a transaction which economically is merely a break-even.

In the typical situation, the taxpayer will then begin the entire cycle again by starting a new breeding herd which produces more

losses and which is later sold at capital gains rates.

Similar advantages are available to one who develops citrus groves, fruit orchards, vineyards, and similar ventures. These assets require several years to mature; however, the development costs, such as the costs of water, fertilizer, cultivation, pruning, and spraying may be deducted as incurred and before the venture produces any income. When the operation has reached the stage where it is ready to begin producing on a profitable basis, the orchard, grove, or vineyard is frequently sold in a transaction which qualifies for the lower capital gains tax rates. Meanwhile, the expenses incurred in the years prior to the sale have been used to create "tax losses" which have been offset against high-bracket ordinary income from other occupations.

**Effect of tax benefits on farm economy.**—When a taxpayer purchases and operates a farm for tax purposes, it leads to a distortion of the farm economy. The tax benefits allow an individual to operate a farm at an economic breakeven or even loss and still realize a profit. For example for a top bracket taxpayer where a deduction is associated with eventual capital gains income each \$1.00 of deduction means an immediate tax savings of 70 cents to be offset in the future by only 25 cents of tax. This cannot help but result in a distortion of the farm economy especially for the ordinary farmer who depends on his farm to produce the income needed to support him and his family.

This distortion may be evidenced in various ways: For one the attractive farm tax benefits available to wealthy persons have caused them to bid up the price of farm land beyond that which would prevail in a normal farm economy. Furthermore because of the present tax rules the ordinary farmer must compete in the market place with these wealthy farm owners who may consider a farm profit—in the economic sense—unnecessary for their purposes.

**Scope of the problem.**—Statistics show a clear predominance of farm losses over farm gains among high-bracket taxpayers with income from other sources. The simplest statistics are: In 1965 among taxpayers with less than \$50,000 of adjusted gross income, total farm profits were \$5.1 billion and total farm losses were \$1.7 billion; about a five-to-two ratio of profits to losses. Among taxpayers with adjusted gross income between \$50,000 and \$500,000, profits and losses were in an approximate one-to-one ratio. However, among taxpayers with adjusted gross income over \$500,000, total farm profits were \$2 billion and total farm losses were \$14 billion, a more than seven-to-one ratio in the other direction—that is, losses to profits.

**Conclusion.**—These data demonstrate the scope and seriousness of the problem. The fact is that our tax laws have spawned artificial tax profits and have distorted the farm economy. S. 2613 is one avenue to a solution to this problem. The Treasury Department supports its objectives and the general approach it takes. The bill does, however, present certain operational problems discussed below. Where appropriate, we have suggested an alternative to overcome the difficulty.

#### 2. AN ANALYSIS OF S. 2613

The essence of the bill is to deny wealthy part-time farmers the ability to use the generous farm accounting rules to reduce taxes on their non-farm income. To accomplish this, the bill would add a new section to the Internal Revenue Code which, in the case of taxpayers who are not "bona fide farmers"

as defined in the bill, would disallow as an offset to other income in any taxable year, the excess of all deductions attributable to the business of farming over the aggregate gross income derived from the business of farming in that year.

A bona fide farmer is defined as an individual (A) whose principal business activity is the carrying on of farming operations or (B) who is engaged in the business of farming as the principal source of his livelihood or (C) who is the spouse of an individual who falls under (A) or (B). A corporation would be considered a bona fide farmer if 80 percent or more of its stock were owned by individuals who are also bona fide farmers.

**Definitional problems.**—The bill thus would limit the tax benefits of farm losses to a defined group. In the Treasury Department's opinion, this approach will lead to administrative difficulty because the meanings of the defining phrases such as "principal business activity" and "principal source of livelihood" are not susceptible of precise definition, and therefore, will inevitably lead to much controversy and perhaps litigation.

As an alternative, we suggest placing a ceiling on the amount of nonfarm income which could be offset by farm losses in any one year. If there were excess farm losses, they could be carried backward and forward to offset farm income, but no other income, of other years. If part of a taxpayer's income for a year consists of capital gains, his carryover of excess farm deductions would be reduced by the excluded half of his capital gains income. No matter what the source of the nonfarm income, excess farm deductions arising from the special farm tax accounting rules would not be permitted to offset it. On the other hand, the ordinary farmer incurring a loss would be protected under this approach in two ways: First, by allowing a limited deduction for farm losses, an ordinary farmer who must take part time or seasonal employment to supplement his income in a poor year in his farm operations would not be deprived of his farm loss deductions. Second, the carryover and carryback provisions would be available to absorb large one-time losses. In other words, the provision would, in operation, only affect taxpayers with relatively large amounts of non-farm income, that is, individuals who do not have to depend on their farm income for their livelihood.

**Corporate farmers.**—In his floor statement Senator Metcalf, the bill's author, noted that corporations were moving into farming at an increasing rate. While he was disturbed by this trend, he did not propose to prohibit corporate farming in this bill. Instead, the purpose was to "eliminate the possibility of corporations getting Federal tax rewards for engaging in loss operations in the farming field." The bill would achieve this goal by denying corporations the right to offset non-farm income with farm losses unless 80 percent or more of the corporation's stock is held by bona fide farmers. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part 23, page 30702.

The Treasury Department defers to the Department of Agriculture on the question of the desirability of corporate farming. However, whatever the decision on that matter, the corporate provisions in the bill do not appear to represent an effective approach to the issue. On the one hand they would deny the tax benefits of a farm loss on the basis of the make-up of the shareholders and not the nature of the corporation's activities. Thus, the farm loss abuse would still be available to a limited group of individuals who are able to arrange their farming and

non-farming business so as to qualify as "farmers" based on their non-corporate activities although they would not be based on both their corporate and non-corporate activities. For example, if a taxpayer has two farming operations, but is primarily engaged in a non-farming business, he would not be entitled to deduct any farm losses (or, under the Treasury alternatives, only a limited amount). However, by transferring his non-farm business and one farm operation to a corporation and retaining the other farm business, he would qualify as a farmer since his only remaining business activity is farming. As a result, his corporation would be excused from the farm loss limitations. This result seems clearly inconsistent with the purpose of the bill.

On the other hand, as a discouragement to corporate farming, the provisions would affect only loss operations and not profitable ones which likewise seems somewhat inconsistent. Thus, it does not appear that a proposal concerning "tax losses" is an appropriate vehicle for dealing with the general issues of corporate farming. It is therefore suggested that, in lieu of the corporate rules in the bill, corporations be covered in the same manner as individual farmers and farms run by a partnership.

**Capital gains.**—Under the bill, a taxpayer would be permitted to measure the amount of his allowable farm expense deductions for a taxable year by the full amount of any long-term capital gains for that year arising from sales of farm assets although, in fact, he receives a deduction equal to 50 percent of these gains in computing his income subject to tax. Thus, in this situation, the taxpayer will in effect receive a double deduction against his capital gain farm income. This is an important problem because of the special capital gain treatment allowed on the sale of farm assets such as draft and breeding livestock, and citrus groves. This problem could be solved by providing for an adjustment that would limit the measure of allowable farm deductions to the taxable one-half of capital gains.

**Special treatment for certain losses and expenses.**—On the other hand, it would seem appropriate to except some kinds of farm expenses from the disallowance provisions. One category of farm expenses would include taxes and interest which are generally deductible whether or not they are attributable to an income producing activity. A second category would include casualty and abandonment losses and expenses and losses arising from drought. These events are generally not in the taxpayer's control and disallowance of the loss or expense could create an undue hardship to the taxpayer since they may be catastrophic. These same expenses and losses are now excluded from the operation of section 270 which excludes losses in connection with a hobby operation.

**Scope of the bill.**—As noted at the outset, the farm loss problems at which the bill is aimed arise from the use of accounting methods which do not properly match income and expenses, such as the failure to use an inventory method where goods on hand at year end are a significant factor. Consequently, there would seem to be no reason to subject a taxpayer who adopts a proper method of accounting and capitalizes expenses to the restrictive rules of this bill. There is, in fact, a positive advantage in encouraging the adoption of sound accounting practices. Therefore, we recommend that the scope of this bill be limited to those taxpayers who, with respect to their farming operations, do not elect to use inventories and to capitalize all expenditures which should be capitalized under generally recognized tax accounting principles.

As indicated, these are not changes that go to the heart of the bill. We thoroughly agree with its objective and general ap-

\* Taxpayers who were not bona fide farmers when a farming enterprise was acquired but who became bona fide farmers by the end of the second taxable year following the year of acquisition would qualify as such from the time of acquisition. There are also ex-

ceptions for a farming enterprise acquired from a decedent, acquired by foreclosure, or acquired in the ordinary course of carrying on the trade or business or buying or selling real property.

proach. Our suggestions are generally to improve its efficiency.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., July 5, 1968.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of November 2, 1967, for a report on S. 2613, a bill "To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that farming losses incurred by persons who are not qualified farmers may not be used to offset nonfarm income;" to your request of February 19, 1968, for a report on Amendment No. 520, a technical amendment to S. 2613; to your request on May 9, 1968, for a report on S. 3443; and to your request of June 30, 1968, for a report on Amendment 853 to S. 3443. S. 3443 has purposes similar to S. 2613 but differs in some of the details.

These bills are designed to capture some of the taxes avoided by some individuals with sizeable income from sources other than agriculture, who operate farm enterprises at a loss and deduct farm losses from their income from other sources. It would accomplish this objective by providing that taxpayers engaged in the business of farming, but who did not have farming as their principal business activity as defined in the law, could deduct farm expenses only to the extent of their gross farm income.

The Department of Agriculture is certainly in agreement with the objectives of these bills. We believe that there are serious problems in the area of the tax treatment of farm income, and that these problems can be remedied. However, we feel that certain modifications in these bills would help to achieve their objectives more effectively, and at the same time would minimize other potential problems.

Perhaps the most important problem under these bills would be the effect on low-income farmers. Many of these farmers also hold nonfarm jobs, and off-farm income is often their most important source of livelihood. Under the proposed legislation, it would appear that these farmers would not be permitted to offset farm losses against income from their nonfarm jobs in years in which they lost money on the farm. Such a provision would have serious effects on present efforts to ameliorate rural poverty.

We believe the objectives of this bill could be accomplished more effectively if certain modifications were made. We recommend placing a reasonable ceiling on the amount of nonfarm income which could be offset by farm losses in any one year. If there were excess farm losses, they could be carried backward and forward to offset farm income, but no other income, of other years. Thus, no matter what the source of the nonfarm income, excess farm deductions arising from the special farm tax accounting rules would not be permitted to offset it. The ordinary farmer incurring a loss would be protected under this approach in two ways: First, by allowing a limited deduction for farm losses, an ordinary farmer who must take part-time or seasonal employment to supplement his income would not be deprived of his farm loss deductions. Second, the carryover and carryback provisions would be available to absorb large one-time losses. In other words, the provisions would, in operation, affect only taxpayers with relatively large amounts of nonfarm income, that is, individuals who do not have to depend on their farm income for an adequate living standard.

It would seem appropriate, however, to exclude from the definition of farm losses some kinds of farm expenses. One group of such expenses would include taxes and interest, which are generally deductible whether or not they are attributable to an income-producing activity. A second group would in-

clude casualty and abandonment losses and expenses and losses arising from drought. These events are generally not in the taxpayer's control and disallowance of the loss or expense could create an undue hardship for the taxpayer. These same losses and expenses are now excluded from the operation of Section 270, which excludes losses in connection with a hobby operation.

The special position of farm losses for tax purposes which this bill is designed to change arise from the use of cash accounting procedures by individuals and corporations with large incomes from nonfarm sources who also engage in farming. The cash accounting method does not properly match income and expenses for these firms and individuals. For example, the failure to use an inventory method where goods on hand at a year's end are of considerable value can significantly overstate losses. However, the present farm tax advantages do not apply to a taxpayer who adopts an accrual method of accounting and capitalizes expenses. Therefore, we recommend that the scope of this bill be limited to those taxpayers who elect to use the cash accounting procedures.

This Department is now studying the problem of corporation activity in agriculture, with the objective of obtaining better information on both its extent and its probable effects. We do not believe, however, that it is necessary to wait for the completion of this study to recommend modifications in the tax treatment of corporations engaged in farming. Simple equity would seem to us to dictate that corporations be covered under this proposed legislation in the same manner as are individual farmers and farms run by a partnership. To do otherwise would be to open up new possibilities for tax avoidance through changes in legal form of organization, and raise the danger of attendant problems of distortions in our economic organization due solely to attempts to claim tax advantages.

This Department is informed that the Treasury Department is making similar recommendations with respect to changes in the language of S. 2613. We strongly urge passage of legislation which eliminates existing "farm tax havens" for individuals and corporations with substantial nonfarm incomes.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to join in sponsoring this legislation, and, with unanimous consent, place it at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 4257

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items not deductible) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 277. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTIONS ATTRIBUTABLE TO FARMING.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a taxpayer engaged in the business of farming, the deductions attributable to such business which, but for this section, would be allowable under this chapter for the taxable year shall not exceed the sum of—

"(1) the adjusted farm gross income for the taxable year, and

"(2) the higher of—

"(A) the amount of the special deductions (as defined in subsection (d) (3)) allowable for the taxable year, or

"(B) \$15,000 (\$7,500 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return), reduced by the amount by which the taxpayer's adjusted gross income (taxable income in the case of a corporation) for the taxable year attributable to all sources other than the business of farming (determined before the application of this section) exceeds \$15,000 (\$7,500 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).

"(b) EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS USING CERTAIN ACCOUNTING RULES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a taxpayer who has filed a statement, which is effective for the taxable year, that—

"(A) he is using, and will use, a method of accounting in computing taxable income from the business of farming which uses inventories in determining income and deductions for the taxable year, and

"(B) he is charging, and will charge, to capital account all expenditures paid or incurred in the business of farming which are properly chargeable to capital account (including such expenditures which the taxpayer may, under this chapter or regulations prescribed thereunder, otherwise treat or elect to treat as expenditures which are not chargeable to capital account).

"(2) TIME, MANNER, AND EFFECT OF STATEMENT.—A statement under paragraph (1) for any taxable year shall be filed within the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for such taxable year, and shall be made and filed in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations. Such statement shall be binding on the taxpayer, and be effective, for such taxable year and for all subsequent taxable years and may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) CHANGE OF METHOD OF ACCOUNTING, ETC.—If, in connection with a statement under paragraph (1), a taxpayer changes his method of accounting in computing taxable income or changes a method of treating expenditures chargeable to capital account, such change shall be treated as having been made with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate and, in the case of a change in method of accounting, shall be treated as a change not initiated by the taxpayer.

"(c) CARRYBACK AND CARRYOVER OF DISALLOWED FARM OPERATING LOSSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The disallowed farm operating loss for any taxable year (hereinafter referred to as the "loss year") shall be—

"(A) a disallowed farm operating loss carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the loss year, and

"(B) a disallowed farm operating loss carryover to each of the 5 taxable years following the loss year, and (subject to the limitations contained in paragraph (2)) shall be allowed as a deduction for such years, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, in a manner consistent with the allowance of the net operating loss deduction under section 172.

"(2) LIMITATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The deduction under paragraph (1) for any taxable year for disallowed farm operating loss carrybacks and carryovers to such taxable year shall not exceed the taxpayers' net farm income for such taxable year.

"(B) CARRYBACKS.—The deduction under paragraph (1) for any taxable year for disallowed farm operating loss carrybacks to such taxable year shall not be allowable to the extent it would increase or produce a net operating loss (as defined in section 172(c)) for such taxable year.

"(3) TREATMENT AS NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYBACK.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a disallowed farm operating loss carry-

back shall, for purposes of this title, be treated in the same manner as a net operating loss carryback.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ADJUSTED FARM GROSS INCOME.—The term 'adjusted farm gross income' means, with respect to any taxable year, the gross income derived from the business of farming for such taxable year (including recognized gains derived from sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property), reduced, in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, by an amount equal to 50 percent of the lower of—

"(A) the amount (if any) by which the recognized gains on sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property which under section 1231(a) are treated as gains from sales or exchanges of capital assets held for more than 6 months exceed the recognized losses on sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property which under section 1231(a) are treated as losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets held for more than 6 months, or

"(B) the amount (if any) by which the recognized gains described in section 1231(a) exceed the recognized losses described in such section.

"(2) NET FARM INCOME.—The term 'net farm income' means, with respect to any taxable year, the gross income derived from the business of farming for such taxable year (including recognized gains derived from sales, exchanges, or involuntary conversions of farm property), reduced by the sum of—

"(A) the deductions allowable under this chapter (other than by subsection (c) of this section) for such taxable year which are attributable to such business, and

"(B) in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), whichever is lower.

"(3) SPECIAL DEDUCTIONS.—The term 'special deductions' means the deductions allowable under this chapter which are paid or incurred in the business of farming and which are attributable to—

"(A) taxes,

"(B) interest,

"(C) the abandonment or theft of farm property, or losses of farm property arising from fire, storm, or other casualty,

"(D) losses and expenses directly attributable to drought, and

"(E) recognized losses from sales, exchanges, and involuntary conversions of farm property.

"(4) FARM PROPERTY.—The term 'farm property' means property which is used in the business of farming and which is property used in the trade or business within the meaning of paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of section 1231 (b) (determined without regard to the period for which held).

"(5) DISALLOWED FARM OPERATING LOSS.—The term 'disallowed farm operating loss' means, with respect to any taxable year, the amount disallowed as deductions under subsection (a) for such taxable year, reduced, in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, by an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), whichever is lower.

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) BUSINESS OF FARMING.—A taxpayer shall be treated as engaged in the business of farming for any taxable year if—

"(A) any deduction is allowable under section 162 or 167 for any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer with respect to farming, or with respect to any farm property held by the taxpayer, or

"(B) any deduction would (but for this paragraph) otherwise be allowable to the taxpayer under section 212 or 167 for any

expense paid or incurred with respect to farming, or with respect to property held for the production of income which is used in farming.

For purposes of this paragraph, farming does not include the raising of timber. In the case of a taxpayer who is engaged in the business of farming for any taxable year by reason of subparagraph (B), property held for the production of income which is used in farming shall, for purposes of this chapter, be treated as property used in such business.

"(2) INCOME AND DEDUCTIONS.—The determination of whether any item of income is derived from the business of farming and whether any deduction is attributable to the business of farming shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, but no deduction allowable under section 1202 (relating to deduction for capital gains) shall be attributable to such business.

"(3) CONTROLLED GROUP OF CORPORATIONS.—If two or more corporations which—

"(A) are component members of a controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563) on a December 31, and

"(B) have not filed a statement under subsection (b) which is effective for the taxable year which includes such December 31, each have deductions attributable to the business of farming (before the application of subsection (a)) in excess of its gross income derived from such business for its taxable year which includes such December 31, then, in applying subsection (a) for such taxable year, the \$15,000 amount specified in paragraph (2) (B) of such subsection shall be reduced for each such corporation to an amount which bears the same ratio to \$15,000 as the excess of such deductions over such gross income of such corporation bears to the aggregate excess of such deductions over such gross income of all such corporations.

"(4) PARTNERSHIPS.—A business of farming carried on by a partnership shall be treated as carried on by the members of such partnership in proportion to their interest in such partnership. To the extent that income and deductions attributable to a business of farming are treated under the preceding sentence as income and deductions of members of a partnership, such income and deductions shall, for purposes of this chapter, not be taken into account by the partnership.

"(5) TWO OR MORE BUSINESSES.—If a taxpayer is engaged in two or more businesses of farming, such businesses shall be treated as a single business.

"(6) RELATED INTEGRATED BUSINESSES.—If a taxpayer is engaged in the business of farming and is also engaged in one or more businesses which are directly related to his business of farming and are conducted on an integrated basis with his business of farming, the taxpayer may elect to treat all such businesses as a single business engaged in the business of farming. An election under this paragraph shall be made in such manner, at such time, and subject to such conditions as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations.

"(7) SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS AND THEIR SHAREHOLDERS.—

"For special treatment of electing small business corporations which do not file statements under subsection (b) and of the shareholders of such corporations, see section 1379.

"(8) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

SEC. 2. (a) The table of sections for part IX of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 277. Limitation on deductions attributable to farming."

(b) Section 172(l) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For limitations on deductions attributable to farming and special treatment of disallowed farm operating losses, see section 277."

(c) Section 381(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(24) FARM OPERATING LOSS CARRYOVERS.—The acquiring corporation shall take into account, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the disallowed farm operating loss carryovers under section 277 of the distributor or transferor corporation."

(d) (1) Subchapter S of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1379. ELECTING SMALL BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ENGAGED IN BUSINESS OF FARMING.

"(a) SEPARATE APPLICATION TO FARMING INCOME AND DEDUCTIONS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, an electing small business corporation which is engaged in the business of farming during its taxable year (other than a corporation which has filed a statement under section 277(b) which is effective for such taxable year), and the shareholders of such corporation, shall apply the provisions of sections 1373 through 1378, separately with respect to—

"(1) income derived from the business of farming by such corporation and deductions attributable to such business, and

"(2) all other income and deductions of such corporation. In computing the taxable income and undistributed taxable income, or net operating loss, of such corporation with respect to the business of farming, no deduction otherwise allowable under this chapter shall be disallowed to such corporation under section 277.

"(b) SHAREHOLDERS TREATED AS ENGAGED IN BUSINESS OF FARMING, ETC.—For purposes of section 277—

"(1) each shareholder of an electing small business corporation to which subsection (a) applies shall be treated as engaged in the business of farming,

"(2) the undistributed taxable income of such corporation which is included in the gross income of such shareholder under section 1373 and is attributable to income and deductions referred to in subsection (a) (1), and dividends received which are attributable to such income and deductions and are distributed out of earnings and profits of the taxable year as specified in section 316 (a) (2), shall be treated as income derived from the business of farming by such shareholder, and

"(3) the deduction allowable (before the application of section 277) to such shareholder under section 1374 as his portion of such corporation's net operating loss attributable to income and deductions referred to in subsection (a) (1) shall be treated as a deduction attributable to the business of farming.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES OF SECTION 277(e) APPLICABLE.—For purposes of this section, the special rules set forth in section 277(e) shall apply."

(2) The table of sections for subchapter S of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 1379. Electing small business corporations engaged in business of farming."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that for purposes of applying section



277(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the first section of this Act) with respect to disallowed farm operating losses of any taxpayer for taxable years beginning after such date—

(1) such amendments shall also apply to the 3 taxable years of such taxpayer preceding the first taxable year beginning after such date, and

(2) in the case of a taxpayer to whom section 1379(b) of such Code (as added by section 2(d) of this Act) applies for any of his first 3 taxable years beginning after such date, section 1379 of such Code shall apply with respect to the electing small business corporation of which such taxpayer is a shareholder for the 3 taxable years preceding each such taxable year of such taxpayer, but only with respect to any such preceding taxable year for which the corporation was an electing small business corporation.

#### WILBUR COHEN AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Wilbur Cohen this month completed 34 years of association with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its predecessor agencies. It is fitting that he capped this outstanding record by serving as Secretary of this great Department, which so intimately touches our lives in so many important ways.

Those of us who have, over the years, watched the development of our social security system, of its medicare supplement, of Federal aid to education, and of our Federal welfare programs, know how significantly Wilbur Cohen has contributed to their formulation. His understanding of the problems in these areas, his sensitivity to the proper Federal role in meeting the needs, and his awareness of ways to secure the necessary Federal, State, and local cooperation—all of these have been vital factors in helping us meet our health, education, and welfare responsibilities to the people of our Nation.

Just prior to his departure, Secretary Cohen submitted to President Johnson the annual report of the Department for fiscal year 1968. This summary, together with the Secretary's recommendations for future action, deserve our careful attention. Some of us may not agree with all of the recommendations, but it will be hard not to agree with most of them. But in any case, I salute Wilbur Cohen's dedicated service to his country and I applaud his imaginative determination to seek new solutions for old and persisting problems.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I attach the first three sections of Secretary Cohen's report, including that on health, "The Last Health Hurdles," and urge their careful review by my colleagues. It is my intention to present the final sections—on education, welfare, and the financing of these programs—to the House next week.

The first three sections of the report follow:

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, FISCAL YEAR 1968

##### SECRETARY'S INTRODUCTION

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith, in accordance with law, the Annual Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The Report describes the major programs and activities of the Department and outlines some of the major recent accomplishments. It also touches on some of the important challenges which lie ahead.

With this report I complete 34 years of close association with the Department and its predecessor agencies. I have tried to summarize my experiences and observations in the initial section of the Report. I wish to acknowledge the strong support you have given to the work of the Department and the leadership you have shown in expanding the capacity of the Department to assist in improving the health, education, social security, and welfare of the American people.

There is much we have done in the last eight years; there is much yet to be done.

I have appreciated the honor you bestowed upon me in making it possible to have the responsibility of directing the work of this great Department this last year.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,  
Secretary.

##### I—THE STEWARDSHIP

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare holds a demanding, versatile, important, exciting and intensely human job. His is a splendidly rich and gratifying stewardship.

He is the only national official paid by all the people whose full-time job is to guard and strengthen the people's health, education and social opportunities. His Department handles the major portion of Federal grants-in-aid funds for social programs. He administers the largest insurance program in the world. So the shape, direction and style of Department programs in many ways set the course for State, local and non-governmental agencies.

The health, education, and welfare of the American people has become big—and urgent—business. As our Nation grows and expands, every sign points to its becoming bigger and more urgent business still.

In 1968 about \$163 billion, or roughly 20 percent of our Nation's entire gross national product, went for health, education and social services. These were not, of course, all Federal dollars, but a mix of State, local, Federal and private funds. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is not charged with responsibility for all these funds and the programs they make possible. Far from it—HEW expenditures represent somewhat less than a quarter of our total national social effort in these fields. A large and growing population, and ever more complex social forces will—and should—combine to make this figure go up in the coming decade.

The Secretary is necessarily concerned with large, sensitive issues of public policy. The Constitution gives major policy responsibility to the President and to the Congress. The Congress is the Board of Directors of the Health, Education, and Welfare Corporation; the President is Chairman of the Board; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is the Executive Officer. Congress takes action by enacting laws. New needs constantly demand new laws; old laws constantly require

repeat or change; programs demand efficient imaginative and dynamic administration. To achieve such administration, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must review and approve budgets, allocations, priorities. He must approve and issue innumerable reports and recommendations on topics ranging from prescription drugs, to smoking, to the desegregation of schools, to the payments made to people in need.

What's more, the Secretary must listen, must talk, and must consult about emerging national needs—with the President and with other Cabinet members, with the Director of the Budget, Civil Service Commission Chairman and members of Congress of both political parties. He must necessarily argue for increased appropriations because no budget is ever adequate to meet all the health, education, and welfare needs of a great and growing Nation. Many men and women, many young people concerned with social problems bring him their views. For him they are a valuable source of fresh approaches to existing problems, and a way of identifying emerging ones. His door and his mind must never be closed to new ideas, new priorities, new approaches.

As head of the Department which accounts for the largest part of the domestic budget, the HEW Secretary is one of the Nation's chief communicators. He must tell his fellow Americans about everyday health, education, and welfare problems—how to halt danger to their health—or how to improve their children's schooling—or how to restrain rising medical costs. They don't always listen—but they must have the chance to have the facts the Government obtains through their taxes. So the Secretary must be able to read and digest innumerable reports, memos, newspapers, and magazines, testify repeatedly before Congressional committees, answer all kinds of questions in letters, testimony and press conferences, propose new solutions to problems that have been with us since biblical times, and in general report to the American people he serves on his stewardship.

No one can fill this stewardship according to a public administration text.

The Secretary must see and react to physicians, scientists, and other men and women rendering brilliant service to mankind. He also sees and reacts to the narrow jealousies of professional groups as they vent their parochial views on large and important issues. He watches the efforts of Congress as it works hard to meet national needs. He also watches Congressional conflicts or misunderstandings which may delay action on programs and money affecting the very life blood of his Department—and of all Americans.

He must be deeply concerned with the pages of statistics he receives regularly reflecting gaps in the Nation's medical care, education, social security, and welfare. He must be just as deeply concerned with the pen and ink letter on lined paper from the sick man, the student or teacher, the retired widow, and the mother with six children on welfare. They write him when they do not receive help elsewhere.

Urgent telephone calls and letters from Governors and Mayors and business and labor leaders give the Secretary their needs and views. At the same time he hears each day from a husband who wants to know how to pay for his wife's medical bill, from a mother whose child has been in a dispute with school authorities, and from parents and husbands or wives who want their loved ones to enter the Clinical Center at Bethesda, in a last effort to save their lives. Sometimes these calls come to him in the middle of the night; his telephone never stops ringing.

The clock ticks fast in the United States—and at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Every day almost 10,000 babies

are born, over 10,000 young persons turn 21, and over 4,000 men and women cross the mysterious line labeled "age 65." There are over 5,000 marriages and about 1,500 divorces. Each month the mail brings a social security check to over 24 million people and a welfare payment to 8,500,000 persons.

On an average day over 5,000 die, including over 200 infants. Almost 9 million persons are sick or disabled—2 million of them confined to hospitals or nursing homes. On an average weekday some 57 million boys and girls go to class in schools or colleges.

Every one of these people and every one of these events is of concern to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There have been seven Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have served the shortest period—less than one year. But I have watched, and studied, and participated in the programs of this Department for over 34 years. When I first reported for duty in 1934, I was paid \$1,540 a year. I have worked under five Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—with different programs and different styles, or ways, of achieving these programs.

This report then, attempts to distill and bring together some of the results of this experience, some of the conclusions reached and recommendations arrived at. It is submitted with humility, and with full respect for the complexities and demands of public office in a Democratic society. It is submitted in partial repayment of the opportunity to have learned and to have participated in the leadership of this society.

#### II—IS HEW MANAGEABLE?

In the early days of the Republic, the settlers hungered for the great freedoms—to speak, to think, to write as they pleased. This brought about a society unmatched in ability to learn, and to earn. Today, we strive to add to individual freedom by creating fuller opportunities in which it can be exercised.

The mission of this Department is the creation of these fuller opportunities for individual Americans. This mission calls for a unified approach to the problems of individuals, individual families, and individual neighborhoods. You cannot consider a child's health apart from his education, you cannot further a family's welfare apart from its health—or education. Fragmenting the Department would only fragment its capability to deal with whole human problems.

Most of the vastly expanded health, educational and welfare services that are now provided by government—Federal, State and local—are designed to supplement and to strengthen the family. Government now provides the education services that each family once provided for itself—and government provides infinitely richer and better education. Government provides a wide variety of health services—health education, health research, the elimination of pollution, the construction of hospitals, the administration of Medicare—and thus greatly adds to what each family can buy for itself. And government provides that security of income—either through social security or public assistance—that assures the welfare of the family. The family is the basis of American society and its well being is the central objective of government social programs.

Still, from time to time, outstanding leaders in Congress or the different professions tell us that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is unmanageable and should be "broken up."

Broken up how? A separate, cabinet Department of Education has its ardent advocates. So does a cabinet Department of Health, a Department of Human Conservation, and a Department of Consumer Protection.

I do not share the view that the Department should be broken up.

Those who would split HEW into separate parts feel their field of interest—education or health—is so vital to the national interest that it deserves more visibility and prestige. They want to have a voice in the highest councils of government. But if cabinet offices of narrower compass were created, each with its separate constituencies, the President would have to do work now performed by the HEW Secretary—balancing priorities, weighing alternatives, and making decisions about various programs for people. This would add burdens to an already overburdened Presidency.

If more cabinet offices were set up, the President would have more top officials reporting to him, and we would have to add more staff in the White House to deal with them and coordinate their views and problems. Anonymous staff in the President's office or the Bureau of the Budget—no matter how able or how experienced—should not be and cannot be responsible to the Congress and the public for major policy decisions. So it might eventually become necessary to elect an Executive Vice President to work directly with Cabinet members and other high ranking officials in the administration of domestic programs.

Those who argue for a Departmental umbrella covering more, not less, territory, stress that HEW's interests range far and wide. I think suggestions for a Department of Human Conservation—or something like it—are valid and should be carefully considered. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—often referred to as the Department of the People—should in any case operate in a larger orbit of total concern for human needs.

We must beware of endless quests for different, cleaner separations and neater classifications for the formidable problems of human welfare. The trouble is that such problems do not yield to easy compartmentalization. They won't go away just because you put them in a separate box on a new organization chart. Like executive departments and agencies, Congressional committees and their harder and harder to maintain jurisdictional niceties when they are considering health and welfare legislation.

#### Scope, size, diversity

To support the view that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is unmanageable, one would have to argue that the General Motors Corporation is unmanageable, or that the Governors of New York and California cannot possibly manage their states.

The operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare compare favorably with those of any large enterprise, public or private. Social security is administered as efficiently as any private insurance company. The National Institutes of Health fund difficult research as efficiently as any business or university. The Rehabilitation Service has a return of \$35 for every \$1 it spends on a rehabilitated person.

It is not the size or number of products of an institution which makes it manageable or unmanageable. It is the lack of common purpose. It is the lack of competent staff. It is the lack of intelligent, able leadership. It is the lack of flexibility. It is the lack of a constant flow of new ideas and people willing to change, to experiment, to try new ways.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has a unifying purpose, and has a cohesive concept pulling its several parts toward a common end—improving the quality of life for all Americans, increasing their options and so their freedom.

The Department has able and dedicated staff: including a Nobel Prize winning geneticist; a half-dozen Rockefeller Public Service Award winners; and innumerable winners of other national awards. There is no doubt that as their programs grow, HEW's person-

nel can handle increased responsibilities. I do not believe there is any substantial merit in the argument that the scope, size, or diversity of the Department make it unmanageable. But the Secretary and his staff need additional help to lead and manage HEW effectively. I recommend:

That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be selected by the President from among men and women who do not intend to seek other elective public office or judicial appointment. The decision-making responsibility for health, education, and welfare (including such matters as civil rights) is so important that it should not be based even in part upon possible impact on the Secretary's political future.

That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare not be a professional specialist in one of the fields of the Department's work. He should be a well-informed generalist who does not lean toward any individual specialty or group.

That the Secretary have enough staff assistants so that he can realistically carry out his important responsibilities. The Secretary's capability was much improved with the addition of three Assistant Secretaries in 1965. But the Department's top management is still inadequate. The Department needs:

Three Under Secretaries to deal with substantive program matters in health, in education and in social opportunities.

A new Under Secretary for Management, skilled in managing large enterprise, who should be a permanent career official. He would give the Department continuing managerial competence through political transitions. The present position of Under Secretary should be retained to provide the Secretary with a top level assistant and to aid him in handling policy matters.

Two more Assistant Secretaries: one for Public Affairs; another for International Programs.

That the Congress substantially increase the salary scale for senior personnel if the Department is to attract and retain qualified and able scientists, physicians, actuaries and administrators. Since these men and women can get much higher incomes outside of government (often for jobs with much less responsibility), the Department cannot compete fairly for them in the economic marketplace. This is an urgent need.

#### The need for flexibility

The Secretary must be able to organize and run his own shop.

Every Secretary faces pressure from organized groups outside the Federal establishment. If there is a special unit in the Department which deals with its concerns, that pressure group usually wants to raise the unit up the status ladder, to report directly to the Secretary or an Assistant Secretary. Children's groups want the Children's Bureau reporting to the Secretary, and senior citizens want the same for the Administration on Aging. Mental health advocates have urged that the Secretary move the National Institute of Mental Health out of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, to report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs. This internal competition is based on the notion that the more "visible" a unit, the more money it will get from Congress, and the more time and attention it will get from the Secretary.

All these proposals have merit within their individual narrow domains. But no group of professionals, or advocates of any one program—no matter how worthy—should be able to freeze HEW's structure. If he is to do his job, the Secretary must be able to organize the whole Department so it can work in coordinated, effective and balanced ways, in the entire public interest. After all, the Secretary's decisions are subject to review and revision by the President, the courts, the press, and various committees of

both Houses of Congress—legislative, investigative, and appropriations.

Public policy should not be determined by a bureaucratic pecking order. Priorities should be set by the Secretary, the President, and the Congress in terms of national needs. Substituting administrative rigidity for flexibility hampers the Department's ability to deal with changing situations as they arise.

Just as the Secretary should not have his organizational hands tied by outside pressure groups, so he must not be tied lock, stock and barrel by the legislative branch. Over 200 specific limitations and directions on spending in the HEW appropriation act this year limit his discretion. Many more such directions in committee reports and legislative history of debates limit it further. Some directions specifically concern minor details, others broadly delegate policy decisions.

Congress must always have the last say. Realistically, the Executive Branch of Government must share with the Legislative Branch the broad responsibility for directing programs. But the very least that Congress could do to make this sharing process work is to give the Secretary needed flexibility to meet changing circumstances, emergencies, or new priorities.

What's more, the Secretary himself must not have his hands tied by his own bureaucracy. He must be able to continue strengthening the Department's regional offices—out where the people are. The nine regional HEW directors serve as his personal representatives in the communities where Americans live, and where their problems proliferate. Regional offices should have more authority and more responsibility for decision-making, more power to earmark funds, and to make certain grants and contracts for vital projects. Our best men in Washington should take pride in accepting assignments in the field. A field command is regarded as an asset to the career of any army officer, and a post abroad is an asset to any diplomat. So work in the field should be the mark of a well-rounded HEW employee.

Therefore, I recommend:

That the Secretary have authority to organize and reorganize the Department internally from time to time. In doing so, he would aim for efficiency, economy and efficacy. He should not be stymied by organizational entities required by existing laws—the 1912 laws relating to the Children's Bureau, for instance, or the 1965 law relating to the Administration on Aging.

The return of the Elementary and Secondary Education program to regional decentralization, and more regional staff of all kinds so that the regional offices can work closely with city and State officials, empowered to help them strengthen grass roots government.

Legislation which would authorize the Secretary to use up to \$25 million of unexpended appropriations under existing laws to meet needs which are not specifically provided for in the Appropriation Act, and which arise from emergencies, or changing circumstances. Instead of 200 appropriation items, there should be no more than 100 groupings—leaving both the Congress its proper role in money matters and more flexibility for the Secretary.

#### *Relationships with the Office of Economic Opportunity*

The Office of Economic Opportunity has pioneered with a number of bold and important anti-poverty programs. Now good management and efficient administration demand that those poverty programs that have been tested and proved should be tied in more closely with ongoing programs in the Cabinet Departments. This is the only way they can enter into and affect our systems of government.

As administrator of the Nation's largest anti-poverty programs, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will naturally

fall heir to many OEO programs. Therefore, I recommend:

That Head Start be administered along with the day care programs administered by the Children's Bureau; that the Neighborhood Health Services and family planning services be administered along with the health activities in HEW; and that OEO programs for senior citizens be put in HEW's Administration on Aging.

That OEO remain as an overall unit watching and reporting on all programs affecting the poor, starting new programs and initiating new approaches. It should get out of the day-to-day business of running large-scale programs.

#### *Model cities*

The Model Cities program, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has become an important and effective part of our anti-poverty efforts. Under it neighborhood residents have joined with city officials in planning to improve their destinies. State, regional and national officials have helped. In Washington, a genuine and strong Model Cities interdepartmental effort is underway. This effort should be strengthened. The Model Cities program offers great promise for progress in our inner cities.

#### *Minor thoughts about major relationships*

No report of this size and nature could possibly cover all HEW's managerial problems. Just as the Department does not cause all of these problems, so they are not all within its ability to resolve.

Some of the kinks in the HEW-Congressional relationship could be ironed out by reorganization of the Congress itself—no means task. Expansion and improvement of Congressional committee staff, for instance, could improve HEW programs.

Many shorthanded Committees allow members and staff to charge their official travel to the Department's budget. The Congress should avoid this practice, which may result in troublesome obligations. Congressional committees should have sufficient travel funds and should observe normal accounting practices.

The Congressional practice of announcing the release of Department grants to the public usually works out reasonably well. Occasionally, a senior member, or important Committee member with special influence gets a jump on his colleagues—or "scoops." This may simply annoy his colleagues. Or in the case of politically evenly divided State delegations, or future rivals for political office, it may result in disputes which the Department cannot handle to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Members of Congress who vote Federal funds should be able to get some of the credit for those projects they make possible. Sole credit should not go to those of our fellow citizens who are always walling about Federal expenditures and supposed Federal waste, but support strongly the Federal appropriations and expenditures which help their narrow constituency, their favorite interest group, or their special purpose program. Therefore, I recommend:

That the announcement of every construction grant and every project financed even in part by Federal funds, should show the public conspicuously that this is so, and that when the project is underway, the public continue to be informed that it is operating because of Federal financing.

HEW cannot move to strengthen the hands of its masters in the Congress. But it can and must move to strengthen hands in State and local government, if it is to meet rising expectations and demands for social services.

That State and local governments throughout the country vary widely is a truism. That they are often weak is a harsh, but fair generalization. City after city finds that because it is completely dependent on the

property tax as a source of revenue, it has not the funds to pay for its children's schooling, or to meet its welfare bill. State and city governments have not historically been able to attract and hold enough highly qualified people. The administration of health and welfare programs by many state departments in many states makes for fragmented service delivery.

The grants-in-aid mechanism has given the Department a tool to use in working toward solutions to national problems, while maintaining a valuable dispersion of national power. But only solid capable State and local governments can assure the gains made by the HEW programs of the past years. Without city and State organizations capable of guiding social planning operations, HEW programs will fail. Therefore, I recommend:

That new forms of financing be developed to free local communities from their reliance on the outmoded, inefficient and unproductive property tax. The property tax should be reduced and eventually eliminated as a basis for financing education and local government services.

That HEW—working through its regional offices—give cities more help in breaking down artificial barriers to dealing with air and water pollution, or waste disposal on a regional basis.

That HEW build on a constructive practice already begun: helping State and local government recruit and keep highly qualified staff.

Modernization of State and local civil service laws to provide more flexible procedures for selecting able people and to assure greater opportunities for poor and disadvantaged men and women.

That State agencies be reorganized to group their activities in a more rational and coordinated way with special consideration to a single State health and welfare agency such as those in Wisconsin, Utah, and California.

The revision and strengthening of the State merit personnel standards established by Congress in 1939 in the Social Security Act in the light of recent experience and new needs. Further consideration should be given to the recommendations in the Report of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Merit System Standards which reported in January 1969, to the Secretary. For instance, employment opportunities for culturally, economically, educationally and physically disadvantaged people should be expanded in State and local programs. Educational requirements should be reviewed and revised to permit State and local agencies to employ creative and innovative men and women.

#### III—THE LAST HEALTH HURDLES

In the past two or three years our Nation has emerged from a necessary—a pioneering—period of concentration on medical research. Looking up, bemused, from our microscopes, we have found great numbers of eager, waiting patients.

As a Nation, we have realized that medical research is a first step only, and gone on to apply ourselves to the difficult task of delivering the results of that research to people. We have realized, too, that good medical care depends not only on scientific knowledge, but on trained men and women, up-to-date hospitals and clinics, sound planning and organization, and proper financing.

Every one of these elements has been strengthened, and we have arrived at the point where large numbers of Americans can indeed get good health care. Yet the HEW Secretary spends a great portion of his time pondering and dealing with the complexities of modern health problems, technological, social and economic: The more people there are, the longer people live, the more income they earn, and the more they know about the astounding possibilities medicine offers, the more their demand for high quality

health care. They will not be satisfied with run-of-the-mill care when society can produce the best. The woman with a kidney disease who watches someone else being treated with an artificial kidney on her television screen will not face death without recourse, nor will her family. The man who reads about heart surgery over his morning coffee will not deny it to his child because he can't afford it. He feels the best health care is not a luxury, but a right.

As demanded for such "best" health care rises, so does the pressure on our understaffed hospitals and clinics, on our doctors and nurses. Trained health workers are in short supply. Medical costs spiral. The Nation invests more than \$50 billion—six percent of its gross national product—on health each year, but it doesn't get a high enough return. What's more, only an infinitesimal fraction of this investment goes toward improving the way our whole system of health care works.

It will not be easy to leap such health hurdles; we may have to climb over them slowly. Current needs point in separate, but overlapping directions. While sustaining and increasing efforts in basic medical and biological research, we must improve methods of delivering and paying for health care. And while we perfect essential programs for the elderly, we must emphasize the neglected needs of children—in health care as in other fields. We must take every possible step to hold down health care costs, including enlarging incentives for efficiency. We must remove obstacles to the efficient use of health resources.

#### Medicare—medicaid

Medicare has lifted a crushing financial burden from the backs of older people and their families. No longer do our older men and women have to delay vital medical attention; no longer do families have to pauperize themselves to get it. Without interfering with the doctor-patient relationship, without burdensome administrative machinery, Medicare is working well and helping to raise the quality of all health care. For this Secretary, who argued its case so long, the proven success of Medicare has been a source of great personal satisfaction. I recommend:

That Medicare now be extended to totally disabled people, no matter what their age. The disabled are faced with the same problem as the aged: heavy medical expenses at a time when their income and earning power are very low. Permanently and totally disabled social security beneficiaries can be included in the Medicare program on a sound basis.

That the doctor bill part of Medicare be put on the same social insurance pre-payment basis as the hospital part. This would make it unnecessary for older and disabled men and women to pay \$4.00 a month for medical insurance out of their retirement incomes.

That at least part of the cost of prescription drugs, which can be unusually heavy for an older or disabled person be covered under Medicare.

That a reasonable cost range for all drugs should be used in all federally supported programs.

The crushing burden of sickness falls most heavily on the poor, who can least afford it, and who suffer it more frequently and more severely than other groups. Poverty helps cause ill health; ill health helps cause poverty. Medicaid, which became law in 1965, has made a start at helping to break the cycle of poverty and ill health among 8 million Americans.

It has also been the tip of the iceberg opening our eyes to the terrible need for health care among the poor. We must not precipitately restrict the program because the costs have been more than were estimated. There have been a number of problems in the administration of the Medicaid program. To ascertain their scope and impli-

cations I arranged for public hearings to be held in nine major cities on the Medicaid program. I have transmitted the record of these hearings to the Congress. I urge they be studied carefully before taking action. Based on my review of these hearings I recommend:

That Medicaid be amended to increase its coverage substantially, so that all who need, but cannot afford, decent health care may have it.

That the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Medical Assistance for the revision of Medicaid be followed to tighten up the program, moderate increased costs, and prevent lax operation in some States.

That health insurance coverage be expanded to reduce the need for Medicaid.

#### The cost of illness

Most Americans carry some form of voluntary insurance, covering at least a part of hospital care. Medicare has substantially increased this coverage. Medicaid has helped the indigent. Still, long-run serious illness with all its high—and rapidly rising—costs, can spell economic disaster for the millions of persons who are not covered, and for those who are inadequately covered.

All American families should be free from fear of such disaster. They should be financially protected against catastrophic illness, and should be able to afford revolutionary and expensive treatments. The economic risks of illness should be spread further through comprehensive insurance protection.

One way in which this could be achieved is through comprehensive health insurance legislation covering all persons who work and their families. Employers and employees would be required to contribute to such comprehensive insurance protection. If the Nation decided to take a Federal-State approach to this problem, the Federal Government could levy a national payroll tax, against which a State would receive a 90 percent offset if it had an approved State health insurance plan. The Federal Government would establish standards for such State plans. Unemployed and non-employed men and women would be covered with Federal funds.

American families should not have to pay exorbitant prices for comprehensive protection. The Nation could save additional amounts if those for whom hospital treatment is not mandatory were treated at home, or in nursing homes, or through periodic visits to their doctors' offices. It has been estimated that if the average cost of general hospitals could be brought down by only 10 percent, savings would total almost \$1 billion each year—and \$3 billion by 1975.

In order to find ways to reduce unnecessary medical costs I have appointed an Advisory Council on Health Protection and Disease Prevention. This Council will study the problem of preventing disease and disability and make recommendations to the Secretary. This should be an important step in conserving scarce resources, preventing the unnecessary utilization of medical services.

The Social Security Amendments of 1967 provide for experiments to assure the fiscal health of the hospital system and at the same time to give purchasers of services full value for their dollars. The Amendments of 1967 provide for experiments with "incentives for economy while maintaining or improving quality in the provision of health services" in connection with reimbursement under such programs as Medicare. Most hospitals and hospital groups are eligible to submit proposals for incentive reimbursement experimental plans.

Therefore, I recommend:

That a Commission on Health Care Insurance, consisting of distinguished representatives of the consuming public, the health professions, and insurance carriers be appointed to recommend the precise form of

comprehensive protection against the economic burdens of catastrophic illness which would result in all persons being covered on an economical and efficient basis.

That while this Commission is completing its study, most of the available private, as well as public, insurance coverage be broadened to provide coverage for a full range of preventive, ambulatory, and diagnostic care, and to cover such health problems as alcoholism or mental illness. If public and private third party payers fully covered preventive and diagnostic services (like outpatient services), patients would use less costly health resources outside of hospitals more and the long-run costs of Medicaid would be reduced.

That hospital incentives to reward efficiency without compromising medical care be rapidly expanded. Once effective means of controlling hospital costs have been demonstrated, they could be extended in Medicare, Medicaid, and Maternal and Child Health Programs. Successful businesses must provide high quality services at the lowest reasonable costs. We should help our hospitals do the same.

That physicians and hospitals should voluntarily restrain price increases in order to avoid restrictive controls.

#### Kiddicare; family planning

In the next ten years, the Nation must place as much emphasis on the health needs of its children as it put in the last decade on the needs of its older people.

Thousands of women in low-income groups do not now have adequate access to comprehensive health services. Tragic results include great numbers of unwanted children—of mentally retarded children—of children with avoidable physical and emotional defects. Competent pre-natal care and competent health care during the earliest part of life can mean the prevention and control of many crippling handicaps. So the case for fuller child health opportunities does not rest alone on present comfort, or hardship, or even damage to the human spirit. It rests on possible irreparable, physical damage to the brain and body. I recommend:

That comprehensive pre-natal care be extended to all women of low-income families, so that, as far as possible, all children be born well.

That family planning be included as a part of comprehensive health care to these women so that every child is born a wanted child. Family planning should no longer be the quiet privilege of the well to do. It must be an integral part of our efforts to reduce poverty, raise educational levels and so give people great freedom of choice. Out of about 5 million medically indigent women who want family planning services, only 500,000 now receive such services. About 450,000 large families would no longer be poor if they had only three children to support.

That medical care for all children in low-income families be provided during the first year of life, placing special emphasis on nutrition, on the prevention or early correction of crippling disabilities and on dental care. Once this program—which we call "Kiddicare"—is established, that it be stretched over a five-year period, so that the children covered would be assured of medical care until they reach the age of six.

That the health activities of the Children's Bureau and the Medicaid program be transferred to the Public Health Service and coordinated with the Neighborhood Health Centers and Family Planning programs to assure unified delivery and financing of medical services.

#### Nutrition and health

It is intolerable that there is even one hungry child in America. We have the ability to wipe out hunger and malnutrition. But we have not yet demonstrated the will.

We are only beginning to discover how widespread malnutrition is among the poor,

the aged, the sick, and the young. But we know enough to say forthrightly that there is malnutrition in the United States, and that it is highly correlated with poverty. We know that food assistance programs do not reach some 14 million of the 22 million poor, and that even when communities have such programs, local administrative barriers often prevent food and funds from reaching those who need them most.

Poverty is the basic, underlying cause of hunger; the changes I have recommended in the social security and welfare systems would go far toward alleviating it. But we need to go beyond this, and even beyond the nutrition problems of the poor. We need to know a great deal more about general relationships between nutrition and health, and the broadest considerations of human development.

Responsibility for nutrition activities has been fragmented throughout the Government: within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, within the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, and within the Congress. Within the Department, I have directed the establishment of a new interdepartmental committee to coordinate at least HEW's nutrition programs.

In 1946, the Nation adopted a new goal: the creation of maximum possible employment. It is now time to establish the elimination of malnutrition as a national goal. To further that end, I recommend:

That the Congress enact legislation declaring the eradication of malnutrition to be a national responsibility, and giving appropriate officials in the Executive Branch the authority and responsibility to carry out this mandate.

The creation of a Federal Interagency Nutrition Council, headed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to outline national policies in all areas of nutrition and to coordinate the activities of the individual departments and agencies.

The creation of the Human Nutrition Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with responsibility for research and evaluation, and expanded and revised food stamp and food distribution programs, including school feeding and other relevant medical-nutrition programs.

That this new Human Nutrition Administration distribute food stamps on a nationwide basis, with eligibility based upon family income determined by the Social Security Administration's national poverty standards, rather than local welfare standards.

#### Mental health and mental retardation

The record of the past years in dealing with the tragedy of mental illness is one of great achievement and great promise. Measured in terms of dollars, we are investing about \$367 million this year in the field of mental health as compared to \$68 million ten years ago. Measured in terms of accomplishments, we can look to a record of expansion in research, the training of skilled manpower, and the development of a new approach to treatment through community mental health centers. I recommend:

That we accelerate our research effort to provide better understanding of mental illness, how it can be prevented and treated.

That we redouble our efforts to provide the trained personnel needed in the fight against mental illness.

That we seek to reach the goal of 500 community mental health centers in operation by 1972.

That we explore methods of providing expert examination of school age children to discover those who may fall victim to mental or emotional illness, so that they can receive needed counseling and treatment at the earliest possible time.

That HEW encourage industry to intensify its efforts to hire mentally retarded as well as other handicapped men and women; that

it encourage its fellow government agencies to adopt similar employment policies.

#### The way services are delivered

Comprehensive group practice—particularly group practice with pre-payment—has proven to be an efficient way of delivering health care. In such plans groups of physicians, working together within the framework of our private health system, can see up to 1/2 more patients, and these patients can get individual care of high quality for 20 to 30 percent less cost. As the President's Advisory Commission on Health Manpower has pointed out, such organizations reduce the use of our overtaxed hospitals and make more efficient use of health personnel.

Other new organizations and reorganization of health services have shown that they can promote good medical care at low prices. "New Careers" programs—training men and women who haven't had enough education or other advantages, for health occupations—offer great promise. In such programs, the poor skillfully fill needed jobs, benefiting themselves and our whole society.

Neighborhood health centers offer a full range of services right in the communities where people live. Some of the hospital outpatient departments now serving as "family doctors" to our inner cities are pioneering in offering comprehensive family-centered care instead of impersonal, episodic, emergency treatment.

Whole communities, under the national Partnership for Health program, have intensified their health service planning. They are beginning to answer questions like how many hospital and nursing home beds they need—or what steps they must take to clean their water supplies—or what rural health needs have priority, far better than Washington officials could.

Therefore, I recommend:

That financial incentives be offered to encourage the development of prepaid group practice groups, expanded community hospital outpatient services, and other plans of expanded promise of greater efficiency, more comprehensive services and the like; and that the reimbursement policies of public and private insurers reflect the increased efficiencies of such providers.

That overly restrictive State laws now impeding the use of new kinds of health manpower be substantially revised so we can properly use the talents of technicians and aides in medicine, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacy.

That Federal help be focused on our big cities' urgent need for construction and rehabilitation of medical facilities, whether they be built as central complexes or in the neighborhoods; and that comprehensive State planning be required as a condition for Federal aid, with priority given a full range of inpatient, outpatient and extended care services serving large numbers of people.

That the programs to combat alcoholism be intensified and expanded.

#### Cigarettes and health

Five years after the American people received their first official warning on smoking and health, cigarette consumption in the United States had dropped by over one billion cigarettes in 1968. Though we number two million more adults, we have increased evidence that more and more adults are giving up smoking and fewer teenagers are taking it up. Still, smoking, a grave problem in 1964, is graver today. To some extent it can be said that cigarette smoking has canceled many of the health gains made in recent years.

Deaths and diseases associated with cigarette smoking continue to rise. In 1964 there were nearly 46,000 deaths from lung cancer; this year there will be over 59,000. Five years ago, emphysema and chronic bronchitis killed 20,000 Americans; twice that number will die this year of these respiratory dis-

eases. Cigarette smoking contributes to coronary heart disease: in 1964 there were 645,000 deaths from this disease; in 1959 the number is expected to be 890,000. What's more, the Nation's workers who smoke cigarettes spend over a third more time away from the job because of illness than those who do not smoke.

Three main obstacles bar our way to reducing the number of persons now smoking, encouraging young people not to start and urging those who continue the habit to use less hazardous cigarettes and less hazardous ways of smoking.

One is economic, involving public revenues, agricultural income, and industrial profits. A second is social acceptability of cigarette smoking and its near addictive hold on many people. A third is the posture of those who insist that the health hazards of cigarette smoking have not been proved, despite the evidence.

Public education, news coverage of smoking and health developments, anti-smoking messages on radio and television, increased concern and activity by health professionals, and health education in schools—all these reduce cigarette smoking. But although the Public Health Service has a total annual budget of \$2.8 billion, only about \$2 million goes for cigarette smoking behavioral research and education.

Last July, I submitted to Congress a report on the Health Consequences of Smoking as required by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965. The report confirmed or strengthened the conclusions of two previous reports published by the Department in 1964 and in 1967. With the 1968 report, I sent four recommendations to strengthen the Department's program. These are included in the following recommendations I now submit:

That the warning statement required by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act be strengthened, as recommended in 1967 by the Federal Trade Commission, to become: "Warning: Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous to Health and May Cause Death from Cancer and Other Diseases." This warning should be moved from the side of the package to the front and the back of the package, and the text should be clearly legible, and should be required to accompany all cigarette advertisements, including those on television, radio, and the press.

That levels of "tar" and nicotine in cigarette smoke be published on cigarette packages, on cigarette vending machines, and in all advertisements. Authorization should be given to add other harmful agents to this listing.

That formal liaison between the government and the tobacco industry, begun by the HEW Secretary in 1968, be supported. It is essential to strengthen such cooperation to deal with the smoking and health problem.

That increased appropriations be made to support research, both basic and behavioral. We must learn more about what elements in tobacco cause harmful effects on human health and how; we must at the same time learn more about why people smoke, how those who want help may be helped to resist the habit, and we must work toward the discovery of a non-hazardous cigarette.

That increased appropriations be made to broaden and expand programs of public information and education. Special efforts are needed to take advantage of improved methods of teaching children about the effects of smoking. The Department should support the training of classroom teachers and the preparation of teaching materials to accomplish this.

That Federal taxes on cigarettes be substantially increased and made uniform throughout the Nation. When the national economy suffers excess illness, disability, work loss and premature death among ciga-

rette smokers, surely a greater use of Federal taxing authority is justified, to help finance necessary research and educational programs.

*Intensified research on service delivery*

In every health program we undertake, we should intensify research on the delivery of services. It is useless to learn the results of cigarette smoking, or to find a new vaccine or surgical technique, if people can't learn about and use them. Research discoveries in the laboratory, until they are applied, save mice, not men.

A Nation which can invent machines to keep a man alive can invent ways of getting man and machine together—and keeping them together as long as necessary. A Nation which knows how to treat alcoholics, or narcotic addicts, can devise ways of getting that treatment to those who need it. A Nation on its way to the moon can overcome the barriers to good health care suffered by the woman who must, to get a doctor, walk five to ten blocks to the nearest bus line—then change buses and pay two or three fares to get to the hospital—then sit for hours in a clinic waiting (and sometimes forego a day's pay).

Failure to deliver services resulting in isolation, the absence of hospitals and clinics—impersonal scattered services, ignorance and lack of understanding of preventive measures, of symptoms and available treatments—misuse and underuse of our resources—and above all high costs—these are the health hurdles before us now.

#### UNCLOUDED VISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the current condition of strife, discord, and confusion afflicting our Nation is the subject of countless highly publicized and highly paid commentators and columnists. Their assessments, their diagnoses, and their prescriptions fill the big city newspapers and get prime time on TV networks. Each has a different view of the situation, and each has a pet idea on which he harps. It might even be surmised that he would prefer to have the country go to the dogs if his own predictions do not come to pass. Myopia is a word which denotes unclear vision. Our commentators may suffer from it.

As has happened in so much of our past, we need to get out of the dust of the city if we want to see clearly. In my opinion, a rural editor, R. H. Ralston, Sr., of the Buckhannon Record, Buckhannon, W. Va., has no dust in his eyes. He rejects all complicated explanations and excuses, and points his finger at the real and only solution to our problems. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it will do us all good to read what he says:

*DO WE KNOW WHAT WE WANT?*

The principal thing that may be said of 1968 is that it was not a particularly felicitous year. It was a year of tragedy, strife, confusion and contradiction. We had continuing prosperity for most people—accompanied by growing domestic dissension. In Vietnam, U.S. observers spoke optimistically about the military situation. At the same time, the patience of the American public with the war appeared to come to an end. For better or for worse, this country's armed opposition to communism in Southeast Asia may be terminated in the not-too-distant future.

It will seem to many, in looking back over

the past year, that much of our trouble stems from a confusion of philosophies and labels—a confusion that has existed for a long time, but in 1968 reached a climax. The confusion is well typified in the career of Mr. Johnson as President. He went into office with the near unanimous support of the people. He carried out his pledge. An unprecedented wave of social legislation became law. Untold billions of federal dollars have been committed to programs of health and welfare, education, urban rehabilitation, a broad war on poverty and environmental improvement. All of these things have been produced under the label of liberalism. In fact, liberalism has become nearly synonymous with the outpouring of governmental tax funds and broad expansion of government powers. This in itself is perhaps the most confusing and contradictory phenomenon of our times. Historically, liberalism is the antithesis of authoritarian government.

Many reasons have been given for Mr. Johnson's eclipse in popularity, of which the Vietnam war ranks high. Yet, he brought into full flower the highly popular philosophy of government responsibility for solving social and economic problems. Some call it the welfare state. There is no reason to doubt that Mr. Johnson was sincerely striving to give the people what they thought they wanted. Measured by legislation, he was largely successful. Logically, he should have looked forward to tranquility and strong support. Instead, he got riots. Before the end of his first full term as an elected President of the United States, he fell so low in popular esteem he was compelled to announce that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

It is difficult to believe the Vietnam war is wholly accountable for the quick reversal of Mr. Johnson's political fortunes. His misfortune—if it may be called that—could be a symptom of national confusion in a day when love of country is considered juvenile by many, patriotism corny, and Presidents are chosen on the strength of their ability to keep everybody happy. The decline in Mr. Johnson's popularity accelerated when the cost, both in inflation and taxes, of the government's increasing dominance began to be felt.

As a new President prepares to take office, we hear a great deal about the task before him of "bringing the country together." Judgment is being withheld until people can see how he performs. Perhaps it might be well in the coming months for the people to look inward and judge themselves. Our country will become what the people make it. Unless we are ready to accept a dictatorship, we should cease expecting the President of the United States to be all things to all men. He is a fellow citizen filling one of the world's toughest and most dangerous jobs.

In the long run, the President can but reflect the philosophy and purpose of the people. We should not ask the new President to perform like a monkey on a stick. We should ask, what is our philosophy? Do we believe in a government of laws? Do we believe in local initiative? Do we believe in the responsibilities, as well as the rights and liberties of the individual? Do we believe in the American system? The future of the country depends on our answers to these questions. The man in the White House cannot answer them for us. Nineteen hundred and sixty-nine may prove to be a year of testing of people, not a President—people who sadly need a renewed sense of purpose based on the ideals and principles of self-government.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, on January 27 and January 28, on account of official business.

Mr. PELL, for the week of January 27, on account of official business.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from January 21, 1969, through February 2, 1969, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FOREMAN, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include a concurrent resolution.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HORTON) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAHILL, for 20 minutes, today.  
Mr. VANDER JAGT, for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. BELCHER, for 1 hour, on January 29.

Mr. HORTON, for 1 hour, on January 30. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHAPPELL) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CULVER, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. COHELAN, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. BINGHAM, for 60 minutes, on January 28, 1969.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. JOELSON.  
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.  
Mr. BROOMFIELD.  
Mr. FRYNDLEY in two instances.  
Mr. WINN in two instances.  
Mr. GUBSER.  
Mr. MORSE in two instances.  
Mr. ESCH.  
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.  
Mr. WHALEN.  
Mr. NELSEN in two instances.  
Mr. MIZE.  
Mr. CAHILL.  
Mr. GOOBING.  
Mr. WEICKER.  
Mr. BUTTON.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. KLEPPA.  
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.  
Mr. CARTER.  
Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio.  
Mrs. DWYER in three instances.  
Mr. HORTON in five instances.  
Mr. ARENDS.  
Mr. ZWACH.  
Mr. SHRIVER.  
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.  
Mr. LANGEN.  
Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. BOW in three instances.  
Mr. KUYKENDALL.  
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.  
 Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.  
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHAPPELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EVANS of Colorado.  
 Mr. RIVERS in two instances.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
 Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.  
 Mr. OTTINGER.  
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.  
 Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.  
 Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.  
 Mr. HENDERSON in four instances.  
 Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in 12 instances.  
 Mr. ROBINO.  
 Mr. OLSEN in three instances.  
 Mr. ANNUNZIO in two instances.  
 Mr. JACOBS in two instances.  
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.  
 Mr. FRASER in four instances.  
 Mr. REES in two instances.  
 Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.  
 Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.  
 Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.  
 Mr. ROONEY of New York.  
 Mr. GILBERT in three instances.  
 Mr. ST. ONGE.  
 Mr. ASHLEY in two instances.  
 Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.  
 Mr. RARICK in four instances.  
 Mr. FRIEDEL.  
 Mr. BENNETT.  
 Mr. BOLAND in four instances.  
 Mr. FEIGHAN in five instances.  
 Mr. HUNGATE.  
 Mr. NICHOLS in four instances.  
 Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.  
 Mr. MIKVA in three instances.  
 Mr. UDALI in two instances.  
 Mr. DULSKI in two instances.  
 Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.  
 Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.  
 Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.  
 The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1969 at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

381. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed budget amendment for the fiscal year 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91-65); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.  
 382. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a copy of the proceedings of the 69th national convention held in Detroit, Mich., August 18-23, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-224 (H. Doc. No. 91-64); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.  
 383. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the first annual report

on operations under the Food Stamp Act of 1964, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90-552; to the Committee on Agriculture.  
 384. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for insured operating loans, including loans to low-income farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.  
 385. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report listing appropriations which have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 664); to the Committee on Appropriations.  
 386. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for grants to States for maintenance payments for the fiscal year 1969, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.  
 387. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for grants to States for medical assistance for the fiscal year 1969, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.  
 388. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of a need for an additional supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, for the fiscal year 1969; to the Committee on Appropriations.  
 389. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act (sec. 3679, Revised Statutes); to the Committee on Appropriations.  
 390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.  
 391. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a proposal to transfer the submarine *Drum* (AGSS-228) to the U.S.S. Alabama Battleship Commission, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.  
 392. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Commission on the Coinage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.  
 393. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the export expansion facility program for the quarter ending December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90-390; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.  
 394. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors in the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on District of Columbia.  
 395. A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of female employees in the District of Columbia," approved February

24, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.  
 396. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of a study of Federal programs regarding educational activities aimed at improved international understanding and cooperation, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90-132; to the Committee on Education and Labor.  
 397. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and improve programs of assistance for education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.  
 398. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend, strengthen, and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.  
 399. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, President's National Advisory Council on Supplemental Centers and Services, transmitting the first report of the Council for 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 309(c) of the 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.  
 400. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting an amendment to the draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Foreign Assistance Act of 1969"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.  
 401. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of disposal of excess property in foreign countries for calendar year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.  
 402. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of Washington internal audit activities of the Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.  
 403. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of financing of community facilities by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.  
 404. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on need for improvements in the automated central payroll system of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.  
 405. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a summary of 1968 activities in the desalting of sea or brackish waters, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-448; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.  
 406. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the Bonneville Power Administration's annual report for fiscal year 1968, including a consolidated financial statement, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-448; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.  
 407. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.  
 408. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first annual report of the Alaska Power Administration for fiscal year 1968; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.  
 409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve an order of the

Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Modoc Point unit of the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

410. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract for passenger carrying service for the public on Lake Mead, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., for a period of approximately 10 years, pursuant to the provisions of 47 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

411. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the duration of the Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

412. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for a U.S. Compendium of Drugs; to provide for a uniform system of coding for the identification of prescription drugs and provide for related label information; to provide for records and reports on experience with respect to articles subject to the act, for improved factory inspection authority, and for authority to require production of evidence; to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

413. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act and related laws to extend and improve the provisions relating to comprehensive health planning and public health services, the construction of hospitals and other medical facilities, and the construction and operation of mental health and mental retardation facilities, to assist in the development of group practice plans providing comprehensive health care, to assist in providing safe drinking water, to improve the provisions relating to advisory councils, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

414. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related facilities in the field of health communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

415. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the second report on progress in the national effort to prevent and control air pollution, pursuant to the provisions of section 306 of Public Law 90-148; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

416. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken by Federal agencies to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to the provisions of title I, section 111(b), of Public Law 90-148; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

417. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the control of aircraft engine emissions, pursuant to the provisions of title II, section 211(b) of Public Law 90-148; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

418. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to arm his employees, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

419. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 406(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to make certain air carriers ineligible for subsidy payments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

420. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report of a study relative to the massive Northeast power failure of November 9 and 10, 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

421. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

422. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to administratively settle tort claims arising in foreign countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

423. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of the American Journal of Nursing, New York, N.Y., against the United States, pursuant to 45 Stat. 413; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

424. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to unify and consolidate the rules for navigation on the waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

425. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

426. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the national requirements and costs of meeting the water quality standards and the economic impact of such expenditures on affected units of government, pursuant to the provisions of section 16(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

427. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 1969 annual report on highway relocation assistance, pursuant to the provisions of section 33 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968; to the Committee on Public Works.

428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

429. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the determination of drug costs under the medicare, medicare, and child health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 21. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 47. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans Affairs to conduct an investigation and study with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 66. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business. (Rept. No. 91-7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 76. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct an investigation and study of the organization, management, operation, and administration of departments and agencies of the government of the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 93. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 105. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services (Rept. No. 91-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 116. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make studies and investigations within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 91-11). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4128. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Duval County, Fla.; to the committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 4129. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4130. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mitchell unit, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 4131. Voluntary Military Service Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 4132. A bill, the threat of continued reliance of foreign military graduates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4133. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern and western districts of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4134. A bill prohibiting the use in



the District of Columbia of firearms in the commission of certain crimes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4135. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize, in the national interest, restrictions on travel by nationals of the United States in certain designated areas of the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4136. A bill that section 481(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 be amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4137. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount allowed as a child-care deduction, and to eliminate the income ceiling on eligibility for such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4140. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COONABLE:

H.R. 4141. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under criminal penalty in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing; to restrict the application of the criminal penalty of fines, and eliminate the criminal penalty of imprisonment, in connection with censuses under such title generally; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4142. A bill to amend section 5724(e) of title 5, United States Code, with respect to the payment of travel and transportation expenses of civilian employees who transfer from one agency to another after satisfactorily completing an agreed period of service outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 4143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum amount of living expenses which may be deducted for income tax purposes by a Member of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4144. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States for establishing and strengthening consumer protection programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4145. A bill to provide for the disposition of estates of intestate members of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Seminole Nations of Oklahoma dying without heirs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 4146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse) for the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and

blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4147. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(1) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALLON (by request):

H.R. 4148. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4149. A bill to provide for the protection of the health and safety of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4150. A bill to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Informative Science; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4151. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4152. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4153. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4154. A bill to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code to toll the running of the statute of limitations against tort claims of persons under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time their claims accrue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4157. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4158. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4159. A bill to provide for the free entry of limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of chemical and industrial lime; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MATSUYAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDEZ, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POBELL, Mr. REDD of New York, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SCHWENGLER, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4160. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4161. A bill to assure every American working man and woman, without exception,

a minimum wage of \$2 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4162. A bill to authorize the Legislative Reference Service to make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4163. A bill to prohibit certain tampering with speedometers on motor vehicles used in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4165. A bill to protect consumers, homebuilders, building material suppliers, lumber manufacturers, and others against false grade marking of lumber, to promote interstate commerce in lumber, to strengthen the standards program of the lumber industry, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4166. A bill to provide compensation for totally disabled local firemen or survivors of local firemen killed or disabled while performing their duties in an area of civil disorder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4167. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4168. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4170. A bill to repeal percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the credit for foreign taxes shall not be allowed in the case of oil royalties paid in any form to a foreign government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself,

Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H.R. 4172. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide additional financial assistance for development and operation costs of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 4173. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the San Gabriel Mission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has had a laryngectomy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit

against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4177. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.  
By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. Celler, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. ST. ONGE, and Mr. WIGGINS):

H.R. 4178. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:  
H.R. 4179. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4180. A bill to authorize banks, savings and loan associations, and other regulated lenders in the District of Columbia to charge or deduct interest in advance on loans to be repaid in installments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4182. A bill to authorize voluntary admission of patients to the District of Columbia institution providing care, education, and treatment of mentally retarded persons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4183. A bill to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4184. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4185. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:  
H.R. 4186. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEEDS:  
H.R. 4187. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, exchange, mortgage, and long-term leasing of land by the Tulalip Tribes of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:  
H.R. 4188. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 to carry out the metric system study; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio (for himself and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with noncapital offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HAN-

LEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHLESER, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. FARSTEIN):

H.R. 4190. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FRIEDL, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. MKVA, Mr. KOCH, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. POWELL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DINGELL and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 4191. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:  
H.R. 4192. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4193. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a minimum civil service retirement annuity of \$100 a month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a minimum primary benefit of \$100 a month (with corresponding increases in the benefits payable to certain uninsured or insufficiently insured individuals); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:  
H.R. 4195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Jefferson-Whitehall unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:  
H.R. 4196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:  
H.R. 4198. A bill to prohibit any State from levying income taxes on nonresidents of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:  
H.R. 4199. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to increase the amount of the annuities payable thereunder to widows and widowers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POEHL:  
H.R. 4200. A bill to disarm lawless persons and assist State and Federal enforcement agencies in preventing and solving gun crimes by requiring registration of all firearms and licenses for purchase and possession of firearms and ammunition; and to encourage responsible State firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4201. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions

limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:  
H.R. 4202. A bill to provide for the control of the alewife and other fish and aquatic animals in the waters of the Great Lakes which affect adversely the ecological balance of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBERTS:  
H.R. 4203. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:  
H.R. 4204. A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:  
H.R. 4205. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriations for the District of Columbia Ball Agency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4206. A bill to increase the penalty applicable to the commission of a crime of violence in the District of Columbia when armed with a dangerous or deadly weapon; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 4207. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:  
H.R. 4208. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:  
H.R. 4209. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:  
H.R. 4210. A bill to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89-774 (80 Stat. 1324); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:  
H.R. 4211. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:  
H.R. 4212. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television or radio broadcasting facilities and the provisions relating to support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4213. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4214. A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT:  
H.R. 4215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without re-

gard to the 8-percent and 1-percent floors, of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:  
H.R. 4216. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:  
H.R. 4217. A bill to consent to the New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:  
H.R. 4218. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:  
H.R. 4219. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:  
H.R. 4220. A bill to enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their market for potatoes by increasing consumer acceptance of such potatoes and potato products and by improving the quality of potatoes and potato products that are made available to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:  
H.R. 4221. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:  
H.R. 4222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 regarding credits and payments in the case of certain use of gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELCHER:  
H.R. 4223. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4224. A bill to name the authorized lock and dam No. 18 on the Verdigris River in Oklahoma and the lake created thereby for Newt Graham; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:  
H.R. 4225. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to confer jurisdiction on U.S. district courts to try certain civilians who are or have been connected with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:  
H.R. 4226. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CARTER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. QUIG, Mr. HORTON, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. EUGENYAN, Mr. ANDRABO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):  
H.R. 4227. A bill to provide educational assistance to children of civilian employees of the United States killed abroad as a result

of war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GRAY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):  
H.R. 4228. A bill to provide educational assistance to children of civilian employees of the United States killed abroad as a result of war, insurgency, mob violence, or similar hostile action; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS:  
H.R. 4229. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself, Mr. POPP, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ARBETT, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MARSH, Mr. SATTERFIELD, and Mr. DANIEL of Virginia):  
H.R. 4230. A bill to revise certain taxing authority of the State of Virginia with respect to Washington National Airport; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:  
H.R. 4231. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4237. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow who has minor children, and is entitled to mother's insurance benefits, may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:  
H.R. 4239. A bill to amend item 802.30, Tariff Schedules of the United States, so as to prevent payment of multiple customs duties by U.S. owners of racehorses purchased outside of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. BURTON of

California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MKVIA, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. KARTH):  
H.R. 4240. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):  
H.R. 4241. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:  
H.R. 4242. A bill to amend the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4243. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4244. A bill to amend section 576 of title 5, United States Code, pertaining to the Administrative Conference of the United States; to remove the statutory ceiling on appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4245. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to conflicts of interest, with respect to the members of the District of Columbia Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4246. A bill to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4247. A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize civilians employed by the Department of Defense to administer oaths while conducting official investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4249. A bill to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests and devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. MKVIA, Mr. MOLLONHAM, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLARK:  
H.R. 4251. A bill for the elimination of health dangers to coal miners resulting from the inhalation of coal dust; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:  
H.R. 4252. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 and \$2,400 (or \$3,600 in the case of a widow with minor children) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:  
H.R. 4253. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4254. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4255. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CULVER (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4259. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4260. A bill to restrict the shipment of unsolicited credit cards in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 4261. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ERLÉNBERG:

H.R. 4262. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act requiring contracts for the construction, alteration, and repair of any public building or public work of the United States to be accompanied by a performance bond protecting the United States and by an additional bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor for the construction, alteration, or repair of said public buildings or public work," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4264. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of certain parts for fuel injection pumps for compression-ignition engines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4266. A bill to require congressional approval before a license may be granted for the construction of any facility for the commercial generation of electricity from nuclear energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 4267. A bill to amend title IV of the

Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4269. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that third-class bulk mail matter be presented for mailing, at the expense of the sender, at the post office of delivery or, if presented for mailing at the post office at the point of origin, be subject to fourth-class mail rates in addition to third class bulk mail rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4271. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4272. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4273. A bill to permit retired personnel of the Armed Forces to receive benefits under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation of Federal employees for work injuries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 4274. A bill to authorize the filling of vacant positions in the National Park Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4275. A bill to designate certain lands in the Seney, Huron Islands, and Michigan Islands National Wildlife Refuges in Michigan, the Gravel Island and Green Bay National Wildlife Refuges in Wisconsin, and the Moosehorn National Wildlife Refuge in Maine, as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4276. A bill to retrocede a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 4277. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to extend its coverage to certain additional counties; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 4278. A bill to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries established by section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4279. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project (California); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 4280. A bill to provide increases in annuities paid under the Civil Service Retirement Act, matching wage and salary increases paid to employees, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MEEDES:

H.R. 4281. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the refusal by the addressee and return to the sender of third-class bulk mail at a charge to the sender prescribed by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 4282. A bill to make certain additional uninsured individuals eligible for hospital insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4283. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4284. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4285. A bill providing for adequate notice to the management of the corporations involved in the case of certain proposed bids for corporate takeovers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 4286. A bill to amend section 273 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces who are members of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States shall be transferred to the inactive status of the Standby Reserve under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4287. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4288. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that women who are 62 years of age or over and are eligible for cash social security (or railroad retirement) benefits shall also be eligible for hospital insurance benefits (and supplementary medical insurance benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 4289. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum monthly benefits thereunder at age 72 for all uninsured individuals, without regard to the time at which such age is attained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. WINN, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 4290. A bill to provide for the election of a delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4291. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4292. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to the Small Business Administration for economic opportunity management assistance and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. ASHLEY):

H.R. 4293. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4294. A bill to assure safe and healthful working conditions for working men and women; to assist the States to participate in efforts to assure such working conditions; to provide for research, information, education, and training in the field of occupational safety and health; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. YARROW, Mr.

SLACK, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. KEE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. GRAY, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. STAGGERS):

H.R. 4295. A bill for the elimination of health dangers to coal miners resulting from the inhalation of coal dust; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4296. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4297. A bill to amend the act of November 8, 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4298. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 4299. A bill to provide for the payment or reimbursement, on a one-time basis, of the expenses incurred by a Member of the House of Representatives for the round-trip transportation of his dependents and household effects between his home State and Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 4300. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from income certain reimbursing expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4302. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, section 753, to authorize payment by the United States of fees charged by court reporters for furnishing certain transcripts in proceedings under the Criminal Justice Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4303. A bill making appropriations for an additional number of assistant U.S. attorneys for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4304. A bill to increase the number of district judges for the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1969, to increase to the full authorized amount the maximum annual interest reduction payments which may be contracted for through the fiscal year 1969 under section 236 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. SCHWEICHER, Mr. VAN DERLIN, and Mr. WOLFE):

H.R. 4307. A bill to authorize participation by the United States in the construction of a dual-purpose electrical power generation and desalting plant in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr.

GAYDOS, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. NIX, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 4308. A bill to authorize assistance under the FHA section 236 program and the rent supplement program with respect to qualified rental and cooperative housing projects financed with aid under State or local programs even though construction or rehabilitation was completed prior to approval for such assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4309. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project (California); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 4310. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, 69 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 4311. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reclassification of employees of Federal agencies in positions of nursing assistant who are licensed as practical nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. RABICK, and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 4312. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold when there is no requirement that gold reserves be held against currency in circulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4313. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BRADEMAN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ERLÉNBERG, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4314. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child care centers for pre-school and school-age dependents of employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 4315. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 4316. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4317. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4318. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4319. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for rehabilitation of the distribution system, Red Bluff project,

Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Labor to make recommendations to Congress to increase employment opportunity for young people and the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to the Congress the power to establish uniform laws for the loss of nationality and citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and related natural resources of Susquehanna River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat, and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers, and duties of such agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FLOOD (by request):

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 289. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Rees, Mr. Roybal, and Mr. Charles H. Wilson):  
H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution proposing and amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a national preferential primary election to select candidates for the office of the President and Vice President and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President by the popular vote of the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. Brothill of Virginia, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Winn, and Mr. Zwach):  
H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for representation in the Congress for the District constituting the seat of government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:  
H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution commending the Cuban "Declaration of Freedom"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:  
H. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. STAGGERS:  
H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:  
H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications and tenure in office of Federal Judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:  
H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOREMAN (for himself, Mr. Hall, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Landgrebe, and Mr. Langen):  
H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that aid to and trade with any country which extends any aid or assistance to North Vietnam shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOREMAN (for himself, Mr. Baring, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Haley, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Collins, Mr. Grover, Mr. Smith of California, Mr. Watson, Mr. Lujan, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Waggonner, Mr. Price of Texas, Mr. Urr, Mr. Frey, Mr. Brown of Texas, Mr. Gosch, Mr. Downy, Mr. Camp, Mr. Lipscomb, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. King, and Mr. Hunt):  
H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that aid to and trade with any country which extends any aid or assistance to North Vietnam shall be prohibited; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:  
H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to the proposed consumption taxes of the European Economic Community on oilseed products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:  
H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:  
H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution

calling upon the President to implement the foreign economic policy of the United States by terminating controls on foreign direct investments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:  
H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:  
H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Ardabro, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Arends, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Biester, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Boland, Mr. Bolling, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Button, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Conable, Mr. Conte, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Corman, Mr. Culver, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Donohue, and Mr. Duncan):  
H. Con. Res. 96. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian Civil War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Esch, Mr. Fasel, Mr. Fish, Mr. Foley, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Fulton of Tennessee, Mr. Gaimo, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gude, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hanley, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hechler of West Virginia, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Horton, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Johnson of California, and Mr. Karch):  
H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian Civil War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Kastner, Mr. Keith, Mr. Koch, Mr. Lukens, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McCade, Mr. McKneally, Mrs. May, Mr. Meskill, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Minish, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Mize, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Mosher, Mr. Murphy of Illinois, Mr. Nedzi, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Podell, Mr. Railsback, and Mr. Rees):  
H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian Civil War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Ruffe, Mr. Ryan, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Schneebly, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Stappford, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Taft, Mr. Teague of California, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Therman, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Udall, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Charles H. Wilson):  
H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian Civil War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Wyder, Mr. Yates, Mr. Romano, Mr. Vank, Mr. Broomefield, and Mr. Edwards of Alabama):  
H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to per-

sons affected by the Nigerian Civil War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:  
H. Res. 144. A resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISHER:  
H. Res. 145. A resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President relative to the rates of pay of certain Federal officials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDERSON:  
H. Res. 146. A resolution providing for the consideration of House Resolution 136, a resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LATTI:  
H. Res. 147. A resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:  
H. Res. 148. A resolution providing funds for the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NELSEN:  
H. Res. 149. A resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself and Mr. Langen, and Mr. Zwach):  
H. Res. 150. A resolution relative to consideration of House Resolution 133; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NIX:  
H. Res. 151. A resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:  
H. Res. 152. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:  
H. Res. 153. A resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:  
H. Res. 154. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to set aside a portion of the gallery for the use of scholars engaged in studies of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. Nelsen, and Mr. Langen):  
H. Res. 155. A resolution disapproving the recommendations of the President with respect to the rates of pay of Federal officials transmitted to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. **ADDABBO**:  
 H.R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Filomena and Marie Alfieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4321. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Bari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Francesco Blondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Lucia and Domenico Cortina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Domenico DiPalo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4325. A bill for the relief of Filippo and Lilla Galletta and minor child, Antonina Galletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Domenica Girgenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4327. A bill for the relief of Gianni and Rosa Giganti and minor children, Madalena and Vincenza Giganti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Girgenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Mary Roberts McFeely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Pantaleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Domenico Pezzano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4332. A bill for the relief of Roslyn Piper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Andrea Ribauda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4334. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Salvo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sguera (also known as Tony Galante); to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Filippa and Giovanni Valchusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 By Mr. **ANDERSON** of Illinois:  
 H.R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Domenico Lo Branco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4338. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Noto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 By Mr. **BARRETT**:  
 H.R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Nunzia Platania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Domenico Sbraccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 By Mr. **BATES**:  
 H.R. 4341. A bill for the relief of Maria LoCicero Shone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 By Mr. **BIAGGI**:  
 H.R. 4342. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Alaimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Dr. Araceli R. Ancajas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4345. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Angeloti, also known as Giuseppina Angeloti Dall'Agnoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4346. A bill for the relief of Vito Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4347. A bill for the relief of Carlo Bassanini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4348. A bill for the relief of Antonio Beninati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Walter V. Biagolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Bonavolonta and his wife Maria Bonavolonta, to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4351. A bill for the relief of Pietro Cacciatore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4352. A bill for the relief of Natale

Cangialosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Stephen O. K. Chen and Ching Nun Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Nicola Cianci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4355. A bill for the relief of Antonino Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4356. A bill for the relief of Angelo Conteduca and his wife Marianna Conteduca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4357. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Correnti and his wife Francesca Di Gregorio Correnti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Carmine D'Apruzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4359. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Di Proscia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4360. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4361. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Favella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4362. A bill for the relief of Luciano Ferrarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ferraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4365. A bill for the relief of certain Filipino nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Maria Garbaz and her daughter Nathalie Garbaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4367. A bill for the relief of George Georgiadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4368. A bill for the relief of Mario Gesuato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Brenda Gill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Grassadonia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Francesco Guglieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Dr. Erol Gursel, his wife, Sevgi Gursel, and their daughter, Sumru Gursel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Iacona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4374. A bill for the relief of Miss Della Iro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Gina Iurato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Dionisia C. Japco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4377. A bill for the relief of Masahiko Kuromoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Sister Angelina Landolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4379. A bill for the relief of Benedetta Larca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4380. A bill for the relief of Antonino La Spesa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4381. A bill for the relief of Choon Ja Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4382. A bill for the relief of Pao Kung Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Miss Santosh L. Magon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4384. A bill for the relief of Calogero Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4385. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Marchesano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4386. A bill for the relief of Giorgios Markopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4387. A bill for the relief of John

Markopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4388. A bill for the relief of Daniele Marmo and his wife, Anna Marmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4389. A bill for the relief of Amor Nazareno Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4390. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Mazzariello and his wife, Teresa Mazzariello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4391. A bill for the relief of Remedios De Guzman Mislang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4392. A bill for the relief of George Niskopoulos and Amalia Niskopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4393. A bill for the relief of certain nurses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4394. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Occhipinti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4395. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Panella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4396. A bill for the relief of Filippo Passantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4397. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Pezzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4398. A bill for the relief of Antonino Raocchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4399. A bill for the relief of Franco Rinaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Angela Antonia Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Rizzo, Angela Rizzo, Vincenzo Rizzo, and Antonio Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Joe Mendes Robalo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4404. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Rubino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4405. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Rusotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4406. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sereno and Orsola Mannino Sereno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4407. A bill for the relief of Keh-Hsin Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4408. A bill for the relief of Maria Antonietta Stornio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4409. A bill for the relief of Perilla S. Taglie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4410. A bill for the relief of Lidia Tagliaferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4411. A bill for the relief of William Tsarouchis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4412. A bill for the relief of Miss Lucia Varon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4413. A bill for the relief of Gino Volpi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Ionnis Yakalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4415. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Aida Yap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4416. A bill for the relief of Ancilla Zeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4417. A bill for the relief of Lillo Zicari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4418. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lo Zito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 By Mr. **BINGHAM**:  
 H.R. 4419. A bill for the relief of Raghunath Deshpande; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 By Mr. **BRASCO**:  
 H.R. 4420. A bill for the relief of Helene Albia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4421. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ambrosio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
 H.R. 4422. A bill for the relief of Ferruccio Bertulli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4423. A bill for the relief of Michael Bono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4424. A bill for the relief of Calogero Caruso and Salvatore Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4425. A bill for the relief of Francesco Castello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4426. A bill for the relief of Filippo Carvito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4427. A bill for the relief of Filippo Chiaravino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4428. A bill for the relief of Agatina D'Aloisio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4429. A bill for the relief of Leonardo DiMaria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4430. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Stefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4431. A bill for the relief of Pietro Filippazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4432. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fioridino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4433. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Lamendola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Leone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Mannino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4436. A bill for the relief of Domenico Musso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Pietro Pepe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Joseph Pirrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Pistone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Graziano Randazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Sutura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Carmine Corrado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Nello Giarelli, Rosa Cafagno Giarelli, Marcel Giarelli, and Isabel Giarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4444. A bill for the relief of Marcello Mallegni, his wife, Lea Nieves Mallegni, their son, Marcello Mauro Mallegni, and their son, Dante Alberto Mallegni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4445. A bill for the relief of Ubaldo Mazzacani and Giorgio Mazzacani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4446. A bill for the relief of Giacomo F. Pettito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4447. A bill for the relief of Ross F. Sage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4448. A bill for the relief of Roshan Rohani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4449. A bill for the relief of Fahim Nimri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4450. A bill for the relief of George W. Payne and Jo Nan Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4451. A bill for the relief of Wain Yoke Fong, Siu Jane (Fung) Fong, and Vincent Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Anastase Politopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Salvatore Surdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Calvin Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Dr.

Sophocles Sakellariou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Matteo Scaduto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (by request):

H.R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Francesco Giuliani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Victor Near; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Parisi, Carmine Parisi, Rita Leonor Parisi, and Franco Nicholas Parisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Marcel Shalom, Andree Shalom, Marietta Shalom, and Silvana Shalom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Maria and Andreas Tselos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4462. A bill for the relief of Miss Avelina Enriquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 4463. A bill for the relief of Francis X. Tuson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gopal Das; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4465. A bill for the relief of Janice Bowman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4467. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Di Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4468. A bill for the relief of Joseph Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4469. A bill for the relief of Sabastiano Bella and Elena Bella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4470. A bill for the relief of the Cuban Truck & Equipment Co., its heirs and assigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4471. A bill for the relief of Chung Suk Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4472. A bill for the relief of Maj. John E. Doran, USAF; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4473. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cascone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4474. A bill for the relief of Ciro DeFlora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4475. A bill for the relief of Carmine Serlet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4476. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cannata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ismay Paulina Mack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4478. A bill for the relief of George Philipotts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4479. A bill for the relief of Raymond P. Guzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 4480. A bill for the relief of John W. Watson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 4481. A bill for the relief of Harold Gilbertson, Raymond Nelson, Lawrence Powell, Marvin Holland, Erling Ellison, Haakon Pederson, Marvel Blix, all of Cathlamet, Wash., and Charles F. Gann, of Westport, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4482. A bill for the relief of Sang Yong Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4483. A bill for the relief of Jose Martin Ruano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Jara Obregon and his wife, Raquel Arceno Obregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4485. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pablo Cordero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4486. A bill for the relief of Rosa P. Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4487. A bill for the relief of Royden P. Goodwin, his wife, Mavia J. Goodwin, and his children, Donna and Cheryl Goodwin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4488. A bill for the relief of Caerina Frattoletto Pettito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4489. A bill for the relief of Alberico Suriano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4490. A bill for the relief of Meheri Amir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4491. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Ahmad Farhood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mirjam Mathe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 4493. A bill for the relief of Maria Irene Bascio and her son, Richard Francesco Bascio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Intilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 4495. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Manuel A. Casca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ivan Dimich and his wife, Dr. Alexandra Bajsanski Dimich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4497. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lourdes T. M. Rao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4498. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4499. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Skanavis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4500. A bill for the relief of Peter Wenzke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Victoria Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Madona Cudjoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNEALLY:

H.R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Onofrio Binanti and Mrs. Rosa Binanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 4504. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 4505. A bill for the relief of Paul Joseph Harph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goze Nakama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESSILL:

H.R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Malinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Musci, his wife Carmela Arton Musci, and their daughter Giovanna Musci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4509. A bill for the relief of Mark and Michael Myszkza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4510. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ruocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mrs. MINK:  
H.R. 4511. A bill for the relief of Crisologo Redondo Campos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:  
H.R. 4512. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Hilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:  
H.R. 4513. A bill for the relief of Rocco DeClants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4514. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Dimaggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:  
H.R. 4515. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Argiro, his wife, Anna Maria Argiro, and their minor children, Natalino Argiro, Aldo Argiro, and Concetta Argiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4516. A bill for the relief of Maria La Valle Arrigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4517. A bill for the relief of Eulogio Navasca Bayna, and his wife, Ligaya Nicanor Bayna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4518. A bill for the relief of Raquel Fainsztein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4519. A bill for the relief of Dr. Giorgio Ingargiola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4520. A bill for the relief of Clifton Oliver Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4521. A bill for the relief of Rosalinda Misagal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4522. A bill for the relief of Patrocino Morales and his wife, Divina Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4523. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Nazzareno Pellicciotta and his wife, Teresa Pellicciotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:  
H.R. 4524. A bill for the relief of Philip D. Jang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4525. A bill for the relief of Kam Oy Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4526. A bill for the relief of Henry Louie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:  
H.R. 4527. A bill for the relief of Milton Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:  
H.R. 4528. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arena, his wife, Anna Arena, and their daughter, Anna Nicoletta Arena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4529. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Favuzza and his wife, Tommasa Favuzza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4530. A bill for the relief of Mariano

Scavuzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4531. A bill for the relief of Amnon Kahane and his wife, Gaila (Paritski) Kahane, and their two minor sons, Hillel Kahane and Lior Kahane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4532. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Tavano and his wife, Natalina Tavano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:  
H.R. 4533. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios P. Tassios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:  
H.R. 4534. A bill for the relief of Angelo DiStefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:  
H.R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Herbert Chan, Szeto Wing Ha Chan, and son, Frank Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4536. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ana Horvat and children, Josephine and Ksenija Horvat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4537. A bill for the relief of Efsthathos (Stephen) Kaunopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4538. A bill for the relief of Michael F. Mouzakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4539. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angelo Zosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:  
H.R. 4540. A bill for the relief of Nicola and Maria Lerario, Vincenza Lerario Favla and Luigi Lerario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4541. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Wojcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:  
H.R. 4542. A bill for the relief of Estrella B. Viray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:  
H.R. 4543. A bill for the relief of Vuong Thi Bick Tuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:  
H.R. 4544. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Armindo Arias-Maldonado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4545. A bill for the relief of Francesco Costanzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4546. A bill for the relief of Anna Del Baglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4547. A bill for the relief of Pietro and Gabriella Bianco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4548. A bill for the relief of Michele Bovenzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Dr.

Paulino A. Claridades and Dr. Lydia A. Claridades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:  
H.R. 4550. A bill for the relief of Henry Joseph Condron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:  
H.R. 4551. A bill for the relief of Dr. Delfina M. D'Alto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:  
H.R. 4552. A bill for the relief of Carl Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:  
H.R. 4553. A bill for the relief of A. J. Fredrickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:  
H.R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sin Sang Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:  
H.R. 4555. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tullio Zanella Cacioppo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4556. A bill for the relief of Mihalj Mesaros, his wife, Rozalija, his daughter, Liofara, and his son, Robert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANK:  
H.R. 4557. A bill for the relief of Peh-An Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEALLEY:  
H.R. 4558. A bill for the relief of Gordon Pak Man Gartner-Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4559. A bill for the relief of Rosa Marigliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:  
H.R. 4560. A bill for the relief of Sa Cha Bae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:  
H.R. 4561. A bill for the relief of the estate of Capt. John N. Laycock, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4562. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Damiano Ranauru; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

32. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Jesse Earl Brown, Atlanta, Ga., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

33. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Ore., relative to the right to petition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

34. Also, petition of Arlie K. Rudel, Sterling, Colo., relative to salary increases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## SENATE—Thursday, January 23, 1969

(Legislative day of Friday, January 10, 1969)

The Senate met in executive session at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has made and preserved us a nation, prosper the consultations of these Thy servants for the honor, safety, and welfare of this Nation and all mankind. Keep us from easy discouragement or weariness, from giving up or giving in too soon.

Grant us this day the grace which is generous, the determination which is steadfast in decision, the perseverance

which endures in all that is good and pure and true.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 22, 1969, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the

Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Walter J. Hickel, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Interior.