

ment to make important inputs into the shaping of our future national security policies.

The level and degree of this interaction is a most delicate problem. Having had the opportunity of testifying before the Pounds Panel in its deliberations on the future of MIT's two off-campus research laboratories, I am keenly aware of the great sensitivities of this issue. There is no question in my mind about the pressing needs to begin to apply our great scientific and technological expertise to the many civilian problems that confront this Nation. However, we must be ever mindful of the need to balance these efforts with those necessary to maintain the national security.

TRANSITION MECHANISMS

Mr. Speaker, there may be some areas of work which have been or are being supported by the Department of Defense that could be more properly supported by the National Science Foundation. Scientific research is a dynamic process subject to continual change. Similarly, agency mission requirements are also subject to change. Our guidelines and criteria for support of research in the mission agencies should, therefore, reflect the dynamic nature of these changing requirements.

Nonetheless, given the present fiscal stringency and the reductions in agency budgets, it is clear that some of the highest quality research will have to be either terminated or transferred. Of course, it is one thing to talk generally about arrangements to effect a smooth and orderly transfer, and another to see that such arrangements actually materialize. One thing required, beyond coordination between the agencies involved, is close collaboration between them and the committees of Congress. We all have an obligation to see that programs worthy of support are transferred and that such transfers are, indeed, planned and not just accidental. Such arrangements should also provide for transfer of projects as on-going entities, complete with funds, equipment and facilities.

For the Defense research affected by section 203 which should be continued in the national interest, and for which the National Science Foundation or other agencies do not have funds in their fiscal year 1970 budgets to take over, it becomes important that the Defense appropriations provide some funds for transfer. Then, adjustments can be made in the various fiscal year 1971 budgets which will be presented to the Congress next month in the President's budget message.

Such arrangements should be possible. Consider, for example, the National Science Foundation. The present statutory authority of the National Science Foundation provides for exactly this eventuality. Section 3(b) of this statutory authority states:

The Foundation is authorized to initiate and support specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to international cooperation or national security by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of scientific activities. Such activities when initiated or supported pursuant to requests made by the

Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense shall be financed solely from funds transferred to the Foundation by the requesting Secretary as provided in section 16(g), and any such activities shall be unclassified and shall be identified by the Foundation as being undertaken at the request of the appropriate Secretary.

Should such a funding procedure be followed on a large scale by the mission-oriented agencies, new statutory authority would probably be desirable. But this does illustrate that there is a feasible procedure for funding mission-oriented research through the National Science Foundation, and that the Congress has favorably considered the issue in the past.

Nonetheless, we should not focus solely upon the question of transferring projects from the Department of Defense to the National Science Foundation. Other agencies, such as the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Transportation, and Commerce need to expand their own research and development efforts.

SUMMARY

No matter how much we may be concerned about the effects of section 203, it is now a matter of law. How it is administered by the Defense Department and how the Congress and the General Accounting Office will oversee its implementation are the matters now before us.

It is critical that any transfers be effected in an orderly, time-phased manner. When necessary, these should extend over a number of years.

Fiscal year 1970 is virtually half gone and the Defense appropriations are not yet made. Even were the bill signed into law this afternoon, the Bureau of the Budget and the departments would still need time to allocate the funds to the research administrators. By the time this is done, we will be well into the third quarter of the fiscal year.

I further propose as a matter of policy that the Congress relate section 203 to the fiscal year 1971 budget, which is even now being prepared, rather than to expect it be given full effect in the remaining quarter of this fiscal year.

The problem we are faced with is far too serious and far too long range to be dealt with summarily. This is especially so since budget cuts already made have caused intensive review of science programs, and further action should be carefully accomplished with long-range objectives in mind.

BLACK PANTHERS—THE RED CANNON FODDER

(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, within the past few days we have heard from all the spokesmen and bleeding hearts of the left, both new and old, in support of a sinister organized crime gang—the so-called Black Panthers.

These criminals, bent on guerrilla revolution in the cities in support of the larger scale Communist plan to take

over the United States from within, have suddenly been lofted into the role of folk heroes of the revolution.

One of the national television networks chimed in this morning with the frank admission that the failure of the diversionary tactics of the so-called peace movement would lead in 1970 to a student and "intellectual" attack on the practice of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa and on civilized government in the Republic of Rhodesia.

It is plain that the Black Panthers are being used—for the benefit of the very leftists whom they should most fear—in an effort to set up a diversionary attack intended to tie down the local police and occupy the attention of the people of the Nation, while the more nefarious operations of the left resume.

Testifying before an Appropriations Committee of the House this spring, J. Edgar Hoover called the Black Panthers one of the most active of the black extremist groups. Unite this revolutionary group with such organizations as the theoretical Republic of New Africa and the Black Muslims; and then supply the internationally indoctrinated leadership, which such groups have never been able to produce internally, and there is a real and significant threat to the internal security of the Nation. I don't care what the news media may say to explain away this violent threat to our people.

It is paradoxical that some who denounce Arabs as Communists would rush to the defense of Black Panthers—an identified Communist front.

This is the reason for the sudden interest of the left in the Panthers, in open warfare against our police, and in the further destruction of the few remaining sections of the Internal Security Act.

Americans would do well to pay attention.

I include in my remarks several current and pertinent news clippings:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Dec. 16, 1969]

PANTHER SLAYINGS: "CURFEW" AND PROBE—
CITIZENS' ACT

(By William Grieder)

An extraordinary citizens' "commission of inquiry" to investigate the violent clashes between police and Black Panthers was announced yesterday by 28 prominent civil rights leaders, legal figures and church officials, including former Attorney General Ramsey Clark and former Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg.

The citizens' group intends to direct "a searching inquiry" into incidents in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Detroit and other cities where local police and the militant black organization have battled in recent months.

Goldberg and Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, told a New York press conference that the 28 "conveners" of the inquiry "are profoundly disturbed" by the events. The most recent clashes in Chicago and Los Angeles, their statement said, "have raised grave questions over the whole range of civil rights and civil liberties as applied to the Black Panthers."

The Black Panthers contend that 28 of their leaders have been slain in what they charge is a systematic series of raids on Panther headquarters in various cities staged by local police with help from federal officials.

ing of the company 10 years later. Similarly, the future of this Nation cannot rest upon an accidental, ad hoc science policy. We have to plan and make provisions for the future. This is the *raison d'être* for our faith in and support of basic research.

OUR DECENTRALIZED SYSTEM

Since World War II we have successfully relied upon the principle that each department and agency which needs science and technology shall both carry on the short-term research and development to resolve immediate problems and also sponsor and conduct the exploratory research which can well shape its future. We have always thought it more healthy for our agencies and for the health of American science that each agency fund a certain amount of high-quality future-oriented research without regard for an immediate connection with present problems. Our own investigation shows that such involvement is necessary and vital. Our agency heads are responsible not only for meeting the issues of the day, but for preparing to meet the issues of tomorrow. For this, they have to look and work ahead.

Dr. Lee DuBridge, the President's Science Adviser, testified recently before my subcommittee:

We encourage every agency which has major technological enterprises under way to spend a portion of its funds to support fundamental science. Such agencies select those areas of fundamental science which appear to be most relevant to their agency missions, although the term "relevance" needs to be interpreted broadly since the results of science are always in part unforeseeable.

The pluralistic system of supporting science has served us well. That system has in many ways provided an open market place where ideas could compete for attention. We do not claim that it is free from fault. But it does have many years of success behind it. So far, no other system suggested to replace it has received tangible support.

It would be a national tragedy were other Federal agencies to adopt the theme of section 203 and find their research limited to short-term, well-defined, highly visible needs. This was the fate of the buggy whip makers and the wagon craftsmen who kept on working to improve their whips and wagons long after the internal combustion engine had arrived. Our departments must continue to sponsor and carry on future-oriented research that can and will respond to the new discoveries and progress in science.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR RELEVANCE

If "relevance" is to be emphasized, an appropriate question is: who should have the responsibility for determining the degree of relevance of research to the goals, objectives and functions of our Federal agencies?

I believe this the the first responsibility of the mission-oriented agencies themselves. It is they who must continue to assume the primary responsibility for demonstrating the functional relevance of the research they support. This point was emphasized by Mr. Elmer Staats, the Comptroller General, in his recent testimony before Congress—

I believe that the determination on individual research projects, after these guidelines have been established, has to be made pretty much within the Defense Department. We may want to test some of these . . . but it is somewhat a subjective kind of judgment in many cases.

While I agree that outside advice may be needed for questioned projects, I doubt if it is a proper role of the National Academy of Sciences to place itself in an adjudicating position with regard to relevance—an idea that has been suggested by the distinguished Senate majority leader. Perhaps the Secretary of Defense should request, as an alternative, that the Academy make a review in collaboration with the already constituted Defense Science Board, which does have extensive knowledge of defense needs. Or, for that matter, the President could decide to convene a special study panel from among the members of his President's Science Advisory Committee to undertake such a review. And this Congress should most certainly be involved in the determination—having made the recommendation to which we have referred.

The point is, however, that as we go about apportioning our national resources for scientific research, we must continue to realize that "relevance" itself needs to be interpreted broadly. And I repeat again—it is the primary responsibility of the individual mission-oriented agency to make the judgment, according to its own view as to its future needs and potential problems. This does not mean improvement should not be fostered. The hearings of our subcommittee into the way in which our science resources are administered and organized is, in fact, aimed in this very direction.

A TIME OF TRANSITION

Today, our mission-oriented agencies account for some 80 to 85 percent of the total Federal support for basic research. This is, in itself, largely the result of historical circumstance.

The National Science Foundation, when it was established in 1950, was conceived as the principal agent for the support of fundamental research in the Federal Government. However, from its earliest days, the Foundation never received funds to carry out this role adequately. Instead, while the NSF was being formed and, afterwards, as it grew, basic research being performed in mission-oriented agencies was jealously guarded. Much of this work would have been done in the NSF had it been formed earlier. But it was not, and thus our philosophy of decentralized science support took form, with the Defense agencies becoming a major source of funds.

Now we are in a period of transition. Many of the mission-oriented agencies are beginning to retrench in their support for basic research. This retrenchment is caused not so much out of belief that basic research is no longer relevant to their functions or missions, but is the result of severe budgetary stringency. In this process, much good has come, and, as anticipated, the National Science Foundation is playing a key role.

Already the National Science Foundation has been asked to take responsi-

ity for \$19 million in research projects, largely from the Department of Defense. In addition, and estimated \$20 to \$30 million in projects is also being considered for transfer to the Foundation because of mission agency budget cutbacks. It is apparent that the total could easily reach \$200 to \$300 million in the near future.

Section 203 not only compounds this problem, but presents two very serious potential dangers.

First, it is clear that American science is already in an unhealthy situation. It is rapidly being backed into a situation whereby no "new starts" will be possible. Because of the present decline in funding for research, Section 203 has the potential of encouraging not only the Department of Defense, but other mission-oriented agencies, to cut back their support for university research more heavily than they might otherwise under the same circumstances. As a result: improvements in the quality of our college and university science departments and curricula must be terminated or delayed indefinitely; scientifically excellent projects are continued at the expense of new and innovative projects; and our most promising and talented young students are discouraged from entering the scientific profession. These are things the Nation can ill afford to let happen.

Second, there is the dangerous effect of creating an even more intense polarization between the Defense Department and the university community. The Senate majority leader has pointed out that the intention of section 203 is not to "ban the Defense Department from sponsoring research in universities." Nonetheless, the seed has been sown. And such a polarization would work to the detriment of both the Defense Department and the universities.

We must recognize that much current criticism is against military participation in research. At the same time, many of these programs are necessary to the country, and our research effort should not suffer simply because a military label has been attached. There must be a gradual adjustment here in the best interests of the country—as we on the Science Committee have stressed time and time again.

The interaction between the Department of Defense and the university-based research community is of profound significance and importance to the Nation and its future defense position. The unique resources of scientific excellence in the university community are of critical importance if we are to meet effectively the increasing complexity of our national security problems.

It is obvious that if this relationship is not continued the Department of Defense will necessarily move elsewhere to fill the need. In turn, this will have the effect of removing the academic community from its critical role of informally monitoring such activities and through which it has provided balance and judgment in the past.

Similarly, the universities themselves have a unique opportunity through interaction with the Defense Depart-

The Justice Department has denied any role in the shootouts and has initiated a preliminary investigation under its Civil Rights Division. The local police departments involved have all contended that the Black Panthers started the shooting during legal searches of the Panther quarters.

As a citizens' group, the "commission of inquiry" will have no legal standing and no power of subpoena to gather evidence on the cases, but it will be supported by funds from civil rights organizations and the services of some prominent lawyers.

Jack Greenberg, director-counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, said the group will meet Saturday to decide on its procedures.

The probe may include public hearings and field investigations. Norman Amaker, first assistant counsel of the Defense Fund, will serve as staff director. All 28 signers are available to serve on the commission, but a smaller number will probably be chosen, Greenberg said.

In addition to Goldberg, Wilkins, Clark and Greenberg, the signers include Clifford Alexander, former chairman of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; Richard G. Hatcher, mayor of Gary, Ind.; Louis Pollak, law dean at Yale University; Cynthia Wedel, president of the National Council of Churches; Sam Brown, coordinator of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee; Phillip Hoffman, president of the American Jewish Committee; Georgia State Rep. Julian Bond; A. Philip Randolph, vice president of the AFL-CIO; John Pemberton, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, and Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the Urban League.

Both Greenberg and Goldberg avoided any suggestion that the inquiry has been initiated out of a fear that the federal authorities or local law enforcement officials would not make a thorough investigation.

"There is room for a citizens' inquiry to satisfy everybody that there isn't any question that the rules of law are being observed," Goldberg said in a telephone interview. "This would be a reassurance to people on all sides."

Alexander, now an attorney in Washington, said the Justice Department has had the Black Panther organization under surveillance and "they're looking at it from a different viewpoint obviously than this group might."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 16, 1969]

UNITY IN ADVERSITY: PANTHERS WIN SYMPATHY

(By Mary McGrory)

In adversity, the Black Panthers, a sort of underworld in the civil rights movement, is accomplishing something that no other group has been able to do. They have united the black community in outrage and white liberals in concern.

A citizens' committee of inquiry announced yesterday in New York shows that the outcasts have acquired, perhaps too late, possible friends of the most impeccable respectability.

Arthur Goldberg and Roy Wilkins are co-chairmen of the committee. Neither could be accused of militancy or even previous sympathy for the least beguiling of the extreme black organizations.

REGULARLY REVILED

Others on the committee have been regularly reviled by young black militants who rather admire the ranting, gun-toting Panthers.

Sociologist Kenneth Clark is a member. So is A. Philip Randolph, who mourned before a Senate committee a summer ago that he could not go into the ghetto and talk to the young blacks.

The American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish Congress are also repre-

sented, perhaps signaling a moratorium on black-Jewish hostility recently chronicled in New York. Former Atty Gen. Ramsey Clark; Louis Polak, dean of the Yale Law School, and George Lindsay, brother of New York's mayor, are others on the 26-man panel who could not be suspected of fostering lawlessness.

All accepted with alacrity the invitation to investigate the pre-dawn shootouts in two American cities on the theory that the Panthers, whatever their views and habits, have constitutional rights like other citizens.

NEW RESONANCE

The "genocide" charges that figure so largely in extremist rhetoric have acquired a new resonance in the ghetto. The fear is that the black community, which has been quiescent and divided since the riots following the death of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., can be radicalized by incidents in two cities with enthusiastic advocates of law and order, Mayors Sam Yorty of Los Angeles and Richard J. Daley of Chicago.

The Nixon administration, which has announced a breakthrough welfare program, has not addressed itself otherwise to the black citizenry. Its recent moves to delay school integration and dilute voting rights have not been particularly reassuring.

Julian Bond, the young member of the Georgia State Legislature, who is a member of the inquiry committee, put the worst black suspicions about the Black Panther raids to a group of students at George Washington University yesterday:

"The Black Panthers are being decimated by political assassination arranged by the federal police apparatus." He said later that the police, who are known as "pigs" to the Panthers, were carrying FBI warrants to search for guns.

A Washington lawyer active in civil rights said, "when the police move against a group, injustices to individuals almost always result."

ONE OF FIRST TASKS

One of the first things the committee will have to do is to find out the size of the Panther organization. Accounts vary from a maximum of 5,000 with 35 chapters to 1,500 with probably 10 chapters. The leader, Bobby Seale, is in jail.

The top spokesman, Eldridge Cleaver, is in exile in Algiers.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover once described the group as "the greatest threat to the internal security of the country" among civil rights groups.

There are facts available, some of them in a staff report issued by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, headed by Milton Eisenhower. That report stated:

"The Panthers were founded in Oakland, Calif., in 1966 as the 'Black Panther party for Self-Defense.' They advocate armed patrols. They despise authority, especially the police, and one of their demands is for U.N. observers in the ghetto to observe the actions of police. They have a history of violent confrontation with the police, having been attacked by off-duty officers in Oakland and Brooklyn last year."

The report quoted Oakland Panther leader Huey P. Newton, who was convicted of shooting a white policeman, as saying, "The Panther never attacks first, but when he is backed into a corner, he will fight back viciously."

ROMANTIC APPEAL

Newton also told staff interviewers that the Panthers had their gentler side.

They have been serving ghetto breakfasts, and they have a romantic appeal to angry young blacks.

Newton described a street school for the Panther Youth Corps, for boys from 10 to 13. They were not taken into the headquarters because of the prevalence of guns and other weapons, but were instructed out-

side in black history or mathematics, and to maintain membership had to show good report cards.

The report credits the Panthers with helping keep Oakland cool after the King assassination "not from any desire to suppress black protest—rather it stemmed from a sense that the police are waiting for a chance to shoot down the blacks."

Now with fears mounting that the Panthers seem about to be exterminated, they have aroused a rather wide range of black and white citizens to demands that they be allowed to exist.

"When," asked a successful, moderate black, "did the government ever move this way against the Mafia?"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 16, 1969]

CHICAGO BLACKS SET "CURFEW" BARRING WHITES

CHICAGO.—Spokesmen for a coalition of black groups in Chicago have proclaimed an unofficial curfew barring whites from Negro areas of the city from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., but several black leaders have denounced the move.

The curfew announced yesterday, is part of the reaction to the deaths Dec. 4 of two Illinois Black Panther party leaders, Fred Hampton, 21, and Mark Clark, 22, who were shot during a raid by police searching for illegal weapons.

And in New York yesterday, an unofficial commission to investigate allegations of a national extermination plot against the Black Panthers was announced by former Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg and Roy Wilkins.

RECENT CLASHES CITED

Citing recent clashes between Black Panther militants and police in Chicago and Los Angeles, Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said:

"If the Panthers are at fault, our investigation will bring it out. If the police are at fault, the investigation will bring it out."

Goldberg, former ambassador to the United Nations and onetime U.S. Supreme Court Justice, said he hoped for cooperation from Panthers and law enforcement agencies, although the commission would have no official government sanction. He promised an "orderly, dispassionate inquiry."

JUSTICE ORDERS PROBE

The Justice Department has ordered an investigation into the Chicago shootings.

Both the Justice Department and the FBI have denied a Panther charge that there is a national conspiracy of law enforcement against the party.

The Rev. C. T. Vivian and Earl Doty declared the Chicago curfew in the name of the newly created United Front of Black Community Organizations, which claims 100 members groups.

Vivian said, "No whites will be permitted to enter the black community during these hours and those who are in the black community will be expected to leave by the 6 p.m. deadline."

He said the new front includes the group he leads, the Coalition for United Community Action, composed of some 60 organizations which last fall shut down construction sites to press demands for more black jobs in the building trades unions.

Police said no incidents connected with the curfew were reported last night.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 14, 1969]

CLEAVER SEEKS ENTRY TO UNITED STATES TO ASSUME PANTHERS ROLE

Self-exiled Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver is trying to arrange his return to the United States where his armed revolutionary party—reeling under police pressure—is hurting for leadership.

Twenty-four hours after two Panthers were slain in a shoot-out with Chicago police, sources said Cleaver contacted U.S. diplomatic officials in Algiers and asked for a passport to return to the United States where he is wanted on a fugitive warrant.

Cleaver didn't get the passport, the sources added, but in later discussions was told he could get a certificate of identity that would allow him to travel to the United States.

As Cleaver was making the inquiries in Algiers, there were signs that the Panthers are revolutionaries on the ropes.

LEADERS JAILED

A police raid on Panther headquarters in Los Angeles Monday resulted in a four-hour gun battle that left three policemen and three Panthers wounded. A score of Panthers were arrested.

Two Panther leaders—Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale—already were in jail. Stokely Carmichael quit the party last summer and Dave Hilliard, Panther chief of staff, faces trial on a charge of threatening the life of President Nixon.

If Cleaver returns to California, he faces imprisonment as a parole violator and for jumping bail on charges of assault with intent to kill and assault with a deadly weapon. But the deepening Panther-police crisis presumably has increased pressure on him to give up his self-proclaimed exile.

NEED FOR LEADER CITED

Black leaders say the police raids have brought an upsurge in sympathy for the group, yet the Panthers are without the widely known leaders needed to take full advantage of it.

"No matter what kind of following you've got, if you can't keep a leadership, you can't keep an organization together," said radical lawyer Terence "Kayo" Hallinan of San Francisco. "It just keeps flying apart."

[From testimony of John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, on April 17, 1969]

BLACK PANTHER PARTY

Mr. HOOPER. One of the most active black extremist groups is the Black Panther Party. It originated in Oakland, Calif., in 1966 and now has extended its activities to numerous cities throughout the United States.

Its members gained notoriety initially because of their practice of carrying rifles and pistols in plain view on the streets of Oakland while on "defense patrols" to prevent alleged police brutality.

On May 2, 1967, a group of Black Panther Party members armed with rifles, shotguns, and handguns invaded the chamber of the California State Assembly, while that body was in session, to protest pending gun legislation.

More recently its "minister of defense," Huey Newton, is appealing his conviction on Sept. 8, 1968, for having shot and killed an Oakland police officer who had stopped him in connection with a motor vehicle violation in October 1967.

On still another occasion, eight other members of this black extremist organization were arrested for complicity in a gun battle with Oakland police on April 6, 1968, during which one Black Panther Party member was killed. Thirteen rifles, four handguns, and four shotguns were confiscated from the participants.

Leroy Eldridge Cleaver, minister of information of the Black Panther Party, achieved notoriety rivaling that of Stokely Carmichael during 1968. A parolee who was freed in December 1966 after serving 9 years in California prisons, Cleaver was returned to prison in April 1968 due to his involvement in a gun battle with Oakland, Calif., police. He was again released after 2 months following a court ruling that his parole had been im-

properly revoked for political activity. This decision was overruled by higher California courts and Cleaver was scheduled to return to prison on November 27, 1968. He failed to appear and on December 10, 1968, a Federal fugitive warrant was issued charging him with unlawful flight to avoid confinement.

Cleaver ran as presidential candidate of the Peace and Freedom Party and in this capacity made a series of speeches on college campuses. These received widespread publicity because of their extreme obscenity and calls for revolutionary action by black people.

Another active Black Panther Party leader is George Mason Murray, minister of education. He is also a member of the Central Committee of the San Francisco State College Black Student Union. The latter organization has been deeply involved in the campus agitation which has plagued that college during the current school year.

The political philosophy of the Black Panther Party is based in part on the writings of Mao Tse-tung of Communist China. It advocates that its members study the teachings of Mao Tse-tung. Instructions have been given to members on the making and the use of Molotov cocktails. Members have also been instructed in guerrilla warfare tactics in preparation for a showdown with established authority. It is reported that in the near future scheduled training sessions in California will teach guerrilla warfare tactics to selected members from all parts of the United States.

PRESIDENT TO BE LET DOWN BY AIDES

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is about to be let down by some of the people he employs to advise him. So are the American people. A group of his aides plan to meet this weekend on our national goals—a research study he established shortly after taking his oath of office. Their houseguests will curl your hair.

Our Nation's future depends, Mr. Speaker, on the vision of those who peer into it and who, in turn, give the President the benefit of their 20-20 foresight. I cannot believe he will get a true picture of this Nation's needs, Mr. Speaker, from a group of bleary-eyed malcontents invited to the White House to represent the District of Columbia, all of whom have uttered various dissertations on public affairs which range from sabotage to revolution.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the likes of Julius Hobson, an avowed Marxist-Leninist; Marion Barry, a SNCC graduate now under investigation by a grand jury; and Mrs. Willie Hardy, whose latest venture in establishing our national goals was a trip to Canada to confer with our enemy from Hanoi. These three, and perhaps others of like ilk have been invited by Presidential aides to confer this weekend on White House grounds about our future well-being.

Not only is the President being sabotaged, Mr. Speaker, but the American people as well, when a group of his aides find it necessary or convenient to turn to the likes of a Hobson, a Barry, or a Hardy for advice and consent on what lies ahead for the American people. This trio of malcontents, Mr. Speaker, is dis-

ruptive, disdainful, and destructive to the common good. And I consider it a public service to inform the President of the political puerility of his staff aides who have invited them to the White House.

THE 1969 FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM CATALOG

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have again developed in my office up-to-date information on Federal assistance programs. This catalog, which is far more complete than the one we prepared last year, will be delivered next week to the office of each Congressman.

As I state in the foreword, I believe this 1969 listing is the most comprehensive compendium of Federal assistance programs ever compiled. I found by our definition that there are 1,315 programs, 225 more than I reported to the House last year.

All the agencies, especially the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were most cooperative this year in supplying the data for this catalog, as were the vast majority of them last year. The principal difference is that we were able to get full information on HEW's 392 programs.

My reason for collating this information has been threefold. First, I wanted to gather data that would be of assistance to my State and local officials. In fact, as an illustration of the critical need for better information on Federal programs, I understand there has been a great demand for these catalogs in the executive branch itself: HEW has ordered 1,800 copies of the listing, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development has ordered 2,000 copies; the Department of the Interior has ordered 100 copies, and the Department of Transportation has ordered 250 copies. If the principal agencies have placed such substantial orders, it seems clear to me that there is not even an adequate flow of information within the Federal Government itself.

The second reason I have assembled this information is to prove that such data could be prepared rather easily. I have, of course, introduced the Program Information Act, H.R. 338 and S. 60 in the other body, which would require the executive branch to publish this catalog yearly with periodic updating. If one congressional office can complete the task, it seems to me such an undertaking should not prove too burdensome to the Federal Government.

I hope that next year we can succeed in getting action in committee on the Program Information Act so that it can be brought to a House vote. More than 180 Congressmen and 14 Senators have already cosponsored this legislation.

Finally, and most important, I think anyone who will take the time to examine the 1,315 programs in the catalog will see there is a serious need for consolidation and restructuring of much of our Federal aid. The taxpayer's dollar is not being used effectively, and it is