

1970

U.S. House Journal of William H. Natcher, vol. 28

Manuscripts & Folklife Archives

Western Kentucky University, mssfa@wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/whnatcher_journals



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Folklife Archives, Manuscripts &, "U.S. House Journal of William H. Natcher, vol. 28" (1970). *U.S. House Journals of William H. Natcher*. Paper 27.

http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/whnatcher_journals/27

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in U.S. House Journals of William H. Natcher by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

JOURNAL

OF

WILLIAM E. HATCHER

MEMBER OF CONGRESS

2ND DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

VOLUME XXIV

July 29, 1970

We are still on the Legislative Reform Act of 1970. We started at noon yesterday and continued until 7:00 last night. This Bill is like Tennyson's "Brook," and it may be that it will require some three or four more days. I have decided one thing definitely and that is if by any chance I was elected Speaker the first thing that I would do is to change the chair that the Speaker sits in in the House. The present chair is straight up and down and the springs jump up at you. I sincerely believe that this is the same chair that Uncle Joe Cannon sat in.

This is a right difficult Bill to preside over and sometimes you feel that you are simply out on an island by yourself and especially when some of your rulings are vigorously contested. Once every so often some Member stands up and says something nice like Andrew Jacobs of Indianapolis, Indiana. He made the following short statement.

"Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say something which is rather unusual. In the normal case, accolades are normally reserved for the conclusion of debate and the conclusion of the passage of a bill and never in midstream, but this has been a pretty long swim, and so I would like to take this opportunity to say how much I admire the way in which the gentleman from California

(Mr. Sisk) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Smith) have conducted the deliberations on this bill.

I have participated in a number of debates, as all Members here have, and I must say that I have never participated in one that seemed more reasoned and where more respect was paid to each individual Member than in the case of the bill which is before us now.

But above all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay my tribute and respect to the gentleman in the chair, the gentleman from Kentucky, because of the evenhanded way in which he has conducted this debate and because of his patience. And when I say "the gentleman from Kentucky," I mean the gentleman from Kentucky."

July 31, 1970

The Washington News today on the front page carries a headline which states -- "Natcher out as D.C. fund czar?" The article which appears on page five is entitled "Natcher to Shift?" This article is as follows:

"The District may not have to contend with Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., the most imposing roadblock to Metro subway funds, next session of Congress, sources said today.

In a shuffle of subcommittee chairs, he is likely to switch from chief of the D.C. subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to head the agriculture unit, they said. The death of Rep. Michael J. Kirwan, D-Ohio, who was chairman of the public works subcommittee started the shifting in motion.

Sources said Rep. Jamie L. Whitten, D-Miss., would give up his agriculture chairmanship to take over public works and Mr. Natcher would move over to agriculture. Rep. Natcher is the next ranking member on agriculture after Rep. Whitten.

The question of a replacement for Rep. Natcher remained, but some observers speculated that Rep. Robert N. Giaino, D-Conn., second in line behind Rep. Natcher might be a logical choice.

There was no confirmation of the possible switch yesterday as Rep. George H. Mahon, D-Tex., chairman of the full Appropriations Committee noted that no new chairmanships would be created until next session. "The situation is still up in the air," he said. "No one has approached me yet on any choices."

Rep. Natcher, who has headed the D.C. subcommittee since 1962, has for the past few years used his power to have Congress withhold subway funds because of what he feels is lack of progress in completing the city highway system.

He has succeeded in keeping any Metro money out of the 1971 D.C. fiscal budget for the same reason. Instead House and Senate conferees added language to the budget bill which promises that Congress will not do anything to impede the continuing construction of the subway.

Leaders on both sides pledged to give the District any supplemental budget requests needed to keep Metro construction on time.

Transit officials have said that they have enough appropriations money in hand to last into the early fall, but will need more by late summer to be able to advertise for bids on future work."

Ray Roberts of Texas is the representative of the District that Mr. Rayburn had for many years. Representative Roberts is a right frank sort of individual and in the Cleakroom today he stated to a number of the Members after reading the article in the Washington News that if the newspapers here in Washington knew Bill Natcher as well as he did, they would stop writing such articles.

August 1, 1970

The local newspapers really have a guessing contest at this time. In today's Washington Post we find an

article entitled "Natcher May Leave Key D. C. Funds Unit." This article is as follows:

Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.), long the symbol of congressional insistence on freeway building in Washington, may be leaving his powerful post as chairman of the House District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee.

A reshuffling of the House Appropriations Committee is pending as a result of the death earlier this week of Rep. Michael J. Kirwan (D-Ohio), formerly the No. 2 man on the Committee and chairman of its Public Works Subcommittee.

The changes, which could include a new post for Natcher, are not likely until January, according to Committee chairman George H. Mahon (D-Tex.). Moreover, it is difficult to calculate what such a shift would mean to local politics.

The Appropriations Committee passes on the budgets of all agencies of the federal government. The D. C. Subcommittee, for example, literally gives a thumbs up or a thumbs down on each line item in the District government's budgets. Members of the Appropriations Committee generally serve on two or more of its subcommittees.

Natcher's Subcommittee, does not,

however, decide what taxes the city can collect or how large the payment to the city from the federal treasury will be. Those matters are determined in legislation passing through the House District Committee, a separate panel.

The scenario that would change Natcher's assignment calls first for Rep. Jamie L. Whitten (D-Miss.) to be the one who takes over Kirwan's Public Works Subcommittee. Whitten would relinquish his current chairmanship of the Agriculture Subcommittee, which Natcher, No. 2 man on that Subcommittee, would assume. The economy of Natcher's Kentucky district is based largely on agriculture.

Natcher, in turn, would step down from the chairmanship of the D.C. panel, a post he has held since 1962. Rep. Robert N. Giaino (D-Conn.) is the No. 2 man on the D. C. Subcommittee.

Reps. Joe L. Evins (D-Tenn.) and Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.) are assumed to prefer to continue as chairmen of the subcommittees they now head rather than take the Public Works post. Evins and Boland outrank Whitten on the Public Works Subcommittee. Evins heads the Independent Offices and HUD Subcommittee; Boland, the Transportation Subcommittee.

Natcher could not be reached for comment yesterday. Whitten, referring to the changes, said he was not about to cross a bridge that was not in sight yet.

If Giaimo and Natcher have differed to a significant degree over policy questions on the D. C. budget, it has not been immediately apparent to readers of the transcript of the panel's hearings. Giaimo declined to comment on the matter yesterday.

August 5, 1970

The freeway - rapid transit battle continues. In yesterday's Washington Post we had an article entitled "Judge Delays Construction of 3 Sisters." This article is as follows:

U. S. District Judge John J. Sirica ordered work halted on the controversial Three Sisters Bridge yesterday until its planning can be brought fully into line with federal laws and regulations.

Judge Sirica ruled that a public hearing must be held on the design of the bridge and that federal and District of Columbia highway officials must deal with unresolved problems of its construction and environmental impact.

Only after these requirements are met, which could take months or even longer, may work on the Potomac River span be resumed, the judge ruled.

In an 82-page opinion containing 58 footnotes, Sirica made clear that he was not ruling against ever building the bridge.

Congress, the judge said, settled the question of building the bridge by including a specific provision to do so in the Highway Act of 1968. It ordered the span constructed promptly "notwithstanding any other provision of law or any court decision or administrative action to the contrary."

The judge wrote: "It is not for this court, or for any court to decide whether a bridge across the Potomac in the vicinity of Three Sisters Islands is needed, or if the bridge as presently planned is a worthwhile project..."

The court's role, Sirica said, is restricted to assuring that all legal provisions are followed.

Under the terms of the ruling, the actual stoppage of work on the bridge would not come until next week at the earliest. Sirica told lawyers in the case to submit the language of a proposed injunction to him by Friday.

The ruling can be appealed to the U. S. Court of Appeals.

Although procedural in its thrust, the decision was a major strategic victory for opponents of the bridge who have pictured every delay as a step toward preventing its construction.

Sammie A. Abbott, publicity director of the antifreeway Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis, said citizens "have gained valuable time to marshal their forces and to move on ... the battle against air pollution."

The lawsuit challenging the bridge was filed last Oct. 3 by the D.C. Federation of Civic Associations and 22 other groups and individuals. The filing followed the city's award of contracts for preliminary work on the bridge's underwater foundations.

The contract was awarded after a long, complicated sequences of events.

The City Council, which had been holding out against building the bridge, reversed itself at a stormy session Aug. 9 under a congressional threat that it would lose money for the Metro subway system.

Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.),

chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the District, agreed to provide the subway funds after he was assured by President Nixon that bridge work would proceed. Ground was broken for the subway Dec. 9.

Since then, however, Natcher has refused new appropriations for the subway in the current fiscal year, contending that the 1968 highway law has not been fully complied with. Metro officials say they will be forced to stop awarding new contracts next month.

The first Capitol Hill reaction to the court decision may come today. The House Public Roads Subcommittee, which originated the 1968 provisions, resumes closed sessions today to put finishing touches on the 1970 Highway Act. It could contain some additional D. C. provisions.

The plaintiffs in the lawsuit contended that the actions of Natcher and other lawmakers last year constituted improper political pressure.

Sirica disposed of this issue before reviewing the other details of the case.

There was no showing, Sirica held, "that the actions of Mr. Natcher or any

other individuals were in any way dishonest, illegal or unusual under the circumstances...

"But if these actions had the effect of causing other officials to disregard obligations imposed on them by statute, then this court must halt construction of the bridge until ... statutory obligations (have been met)."

However, Sirica said it was clear to him that John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, a key defendant in the lawsuit, based his approval of Three Sisters as part of the interstate system "on the merits of the project and not solely on extraneous political pressures."

In several challenged areas, including the usage of shoreline park lands for the bridge project, Sirica ruled that the law had been complied with.

A major lapse, he ruled, was the failure to hold a public hearing on the design of the bridge under a policy procedure established by the Transportation Department's Bureau of Public Roads in January, 1969, the last week of the Johnson administration.

In considering the lawsuit earlier,

Sirica ruled that this was not necessary since the project met all hearing procedures in effect when the policy was invoked.

The bridge foes appealed the Sirica ruling to the U. S. Court of Appeals where a three-judge panel said in April that it believed the new requirement should apply. It sent the case back to Sirica for a trial, which was held in June and took 10 days.

In its decision, written by Judge Skelly Wright, the higher court said a public hearing is similar in some ways to a vote on a project. Wright noted "that public hearings have oftentimes resulted in the abandonment or redesign of ill-conceived projects."

Yesterday's Sirica ruling also held"

That the D. C. Highway department certified routinely to the Bureau of Public Roads that the environmental impact and related issues of the bridge had been adequately considered. It said this was not the case and canceled the certification.

That structural features of the bridge - including even the question of whether the bridge will not collapse - was not fully determined before the D.C.

division engineer for the Bureau of Public Roads approved the spending of federal funds to start work. It said such questions must be fully resolved in advance.

An editorial appeared in today's Evening Star entitled, "Three Sisters Delay." This editorial is as follows:

"Another knot has been added to the District's transportation tangle, but we persist in the hope that the legal twists can be unwound this year and that neither the freeway nor subway projects will be thwarted.

Judge Sirica's Monday decree that froze the Three Sisters bridge work and ordered public hearings on the project does not raise an insuperable barrier. It does delay construction of the vital span, which is a key to completion of the District's interstate arteries, and that is distressing. But the work tie-up may not last long, if city officials move swiftly to appeal Judge Sirica's ruling. They should also have plans ready for the public hearings and the deeper appraisal of the project's environmental consequences which he said are necessary.

They should need no reminder that speed on their part is essential to prevent a dismal hangup of the area's composite transportation plan. The courts

also should be aware that this is a critical public-interest matter that deserves expeditious handling.

Judge Sirica did not rule on the merits of the bridge itself -- only on some procedures through which construction was started. He did not challenge the 1968 act of Congress which ordered the District to promptly construct the bridge "notwithstanding any other provision of law or any court decision or administrative action to the contrary," a stern and clear command that has been tortuously circumnavigated in the drawn-out legal hassle over the project. It did appear to the judge that city and federal officials may have moved too hastily into bridge-building, to avoid a cutoff of subway funds by congressmen who were nettled over the bridge and freeway delays.

That possibility still casts a deep shadow over the Metro's future. Representative Natcher's District Appropriations subcommittee is still sitting on the subway appropriations for the current fiscal year, and a halt next month of Metro contracting is foreseen if the money isn't released. We hope that Representative Natcher will note that Judge Sirica is not attempting to foreclose the Three Sisters span, and will move to prevent the Metro from grinding to a halt in its infancy.

He and his committee should take into

account that District officials and the Nixon administration both have striven in the best of faith to break the bridge-freeway impasse. The new Potomac crossing, the expressways, the subway are all vital components of a balanced system that is needed to rescue the Nation's Capital from traffic chaos. One component shouldn't be scuttled because another has suffered a temporary setback."

An article appeared in the same edition of the Star entitled, "Transit Line of 7 Miles?" This article is as follows:

Hatcher Blocks Funds

Unless the District freeway controversy is resolved, the Washington area may be left with a subway system that services the downtown commercial area but will not reach many people.

With its remaining funds, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority can build only about seven miles of rapid transit line--a far cry from the planned 98-mile regional system.

The approximately seven miles will be built with \$245 million in federal funds appropriated for the 1970 fiscal year and \$85 million more due in local contributions matched by federal funds. The cost of the entire regional system is estimated at \$2.5 billion.

Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., chairman of the House District Appropriations subcommittee, has refused to release any more subway money until the District government proceeds to build more freeways.

A U.S. District Court order handed down Monday that stops construction on the controversial Three Sisters Bridge until more public hearings are held clouds the freeway picture and contributes to the uncertainty over the release of subway money.

District officials have indicated they may appeal the court ruling.

Although Natcher has not specifically listed what road he wants built, Capitol Hill sources say the required freeways include the bridge and the controversial North Central Freeway, both ordered by Congress in the 1968 Highway Act.

The House Public Works Committee now is drafting a 1970 Highway Act and is expected to once again order the city to build the roads in the new legislation.

WMATA officials said yesterday they will not seek bids for new construction contracts after this month unless additional money is released by Natcher.

With contracts already awarded and several to be awarded shortly, the area

will have six miles of rapid transit line running in a semi-circle between Dupont Circle and Rhode Island Avenue NE and an extension running west from Farragut Square, under the Potomac River to Rosslyn.

While this system would provide access between different parts of the commercial area and a relatively small (in terms of the metropolitan region) residential section of Northeast, hundreds of thousands of commuters would be left without rapid transit service."

August 7, 1970

The Postal Reform Bill was finally approved in the House yesterday. The vote was 339 to 29. Under this legislation the Post Office Department no longer will be operated as it is today by the Federal Government. In the future, the Department will be operated by a Board of nine members who in turn select the Postmaster General and all appointments for postmasters, rural carriers and all other postal employees will no longer be political and will be based strictly on merit. Recommendations from Members of Congress will no longer be in order. The purpose of the legislation that finally passed, and will be sent to the President for his signature next week, is to make the postal system more efficient by removing it from Congressional politics and turning over the operation to professional business-type

management. It will be operated similar to the operation of TVA and the Board of Governors, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, would operate the system through the Postmaster General which they will appoint. Salaries would be set by collective bargaining with the postal unions and rates to be set by an independent rate commission which could be overruled only by a unanimous vote of the Governors or by a court appeal. Along with this Bill we approved a salary increase for postal employees. I understand that within the next few months the six cent stamp will go to eight cents and maybe this new organization can prevent the Post Office Department from creating a billion dollar deficit each year. I voted for the bill.

About 14 years ago Sam Rayburn, the Speaker of the House, called and said he wanted to talk with me about the vacancy on the Ways and Means Committee. I went to his office and he requested that I take the vacancy on the Committee. This, of course, would have to be approved by the Democratic Caucus and by the House of Representatives. I explained to my friend the Speaker that I did not want to give up my assignment on the Committee on Appropriations and go on the Ways and Means Committee. These two Committees are the best Committees in the House and it all depends on which Committee you serve on as to which is the best. I recommended John C. Watts, the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District

of Kentucky for this vacancy. Mr. Rayburn asked me to send John over to talk with him about the assignment. In addition, he then asked me to talk with Wilbur Mills the Chairman of the Committee which I did, and some 10 days later the Democratic Caucus in the House voted to place John C. Watts in the vacancy on the Committee on Ways and Means.

For a period of five years now I have worried some about Congressman Watts' actions as a Member of this Committee. I have heard some things that disturb me and was not too surprised to read the article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal concerning Representative Watts and former Representative Sydney Herlong who also served on the Ways and Means Committee and who is now a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The article went on to state that a company that had a very important matter before the Ways and Means Committee had one of their representatives go to Watts and Herlong and offer to purchase stock for each of the two Congressmen in the Company. A blank note for \$37,000 was signed by Watts and Herlong according to the Wall Street Journal and the stock was purchased and sold within a matter of a few weeks with a profit of some \$13,000 obtained and turned over in cash to each of the two Congressmen. The facts contained in this article were well documented and the article stated that when Representative Watts was called by telephone to give his version of the story,

he simply stated to the Wall Street Journal's correspondent that it was none of their damn business.

This is one incident in a long line of incidents which in my opinion will destroy a number of the present Members on the Ways and Means Committee and a number of those who have previously served. I am informed that Life Magazine has for months now had two or three of their correspondents searching for evidence against the Members of the Ways and Means Committee and that before too long a story would be published setting forth some right unusual information.

John Watts is an able man and certainly is too smart to get involved in such transactions. Several months ago he had a series of slight strokes which affected his hearing and eyes, and I now have my doubts that with the circulatory impairment that he has that he is mentally and physically able to make important decisions.

I attended a dinner given by the Ways and Means Committee some five or six years ago and after looking around and seeing who was paying the bill it then occurred to me that a number of the Members of this Committee were skating on thin ice.

A Bill is now pending before the House and Senate which would give the District of Columbia a non-voting delegate

in the House of Representatives. The City Council and a number of organizations in the city are making every effort to see that this Bill is enacted during the present session of Congress. Several years ago we passed a similar bill after an amendment was added providing for a non-voting delegate in the Senate. This incensed those Members of that great group to the extent that they refused to pass the bill because they wanted all non-voting delegates confined to the House. We may have the same situation this year.

I am always amused when I hear the Senate referred to as the Upper Body. Back in the beginning in Philadelphia, the facilities for the Congress were not large enough for both Houses to meet on the same floor and the large room on the main floor was turned over to the House of Representatives which, of course, at that time was the most important body. The section above the House of Representatives which was much smaller and hard to get to, was turned over to the Senate. Then we had the expression of the Upper Body which, in reality, was nothing but a glorified storage room. The United States Senators were not elected at that time and, of course, were not until the year 1913 and our founding fathers together with the majority of the people in this country at that time relied mainly on the House of Representatives who were elected each two years by the people.

Albert Gore of Tennessee defeated an unknown opponent yesterday in the primary by a little over 20,000 votes. Some 207,000 votes were cast and this clearly indicates that Gore is in serious trouble. His opponent in November will be Representative Brock who has been in the House now for about 10 years.

The Federal Water Quality Administration recently issued a statement indicating that some 20 States had inland waterways which were highly polluted as a result of mercury from industries dumped into the streams. One of the 20 States is Kentucky and the section involved mainly is the Tennessee River. Below the dam is Kentucky Lake where the large chemical plants are located. The fish in Barkley Lake, Kentucky Lake and in all the rivers in this section of Kentucky according to the Federal Water Quality Administration contain mercury to the extent that consumption would be detrimental to the health of those who eat the fish. Such mercury contamination has caused severe brain damage in a number of small children. Following the announcement, eight large companies were sued in federal court with injunctions requested prohibiting the companies from dumping mercury and other matters into the streams in this country. This is really a serious matter.

For a number of years now I have fished in Kentucky Lake and Barkley Lake as well as the rivers involved and certainly must now select another fishing location.

An unusual cartoon was carried in the Washington Post today. Herblock, the cartoonist for this paper, is one of the best in this country and today's cartoon shows a number of people at typewriters in the White House simply distraught and typing fast with their desks marked with such signs as: College Students A to Bums, Statements made concerning Trials underway in Criminal Court, which particularly applies to the Manson Case, School Desegregation Policy, Vietnam War, Reasons for Cambodia Bombing, and Reasons for the ABM. Above the cartoon are the words announced by a radio announcer standing in front of the desk -- "You have just heard the President of the United States. Please stay tuned for the clarifying statements."

We are winding up the legislative program just before the recess period which starts on Friday, August 14. We will be in recess from August 14 until September 9.

The Kennedys are back in the news. Robert Kennedy, Jr., the son of the assassinated Senator, along with his first cousin Sargent Shriver, III were arrested in Hyannis Port, Massachusetts,

on marijuana possession charges. A Hearing was held yesterday before the Juvenile Court in Massachusetts and the Judge placed each one of the boys on a year's continuation of the charges with the understanding that the charges would be dismissed at the end of a year if the two boys remained out of trouble. You can tell by the expressions on the faces of the mothers of these two boys that they are very much disturbed. Eunice Kennedy Shriver is the mother of Sargent Shriver, III, and Ethel Kennedy, the widow of Robert Kennedy, is the mother of Robert Kennedy, Jr.

An article appeared in the Washington Post today entitled, "Need for Nixon's Help on Metro Funds Seen." This article is as follows:

"President Nixon's direct intervention will likely be needed again this year to break the renewed subway-freeway impasse that threatens subway construction, Metro transit officials told a Senate subcommittee yesterday.

They warned that on-and-off financing of the subway by Congress imperils the sale of \$835 million in revenue bonds that form a major feature of the 98-mile system's financial plan.

Without those bonds, the officials said, the full \$2.5 billion system could not be financed.

The flow of District of Columbia

funds to the Metro was halted two months ago by Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.,) chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the District.

He contended that the city has not obeyed fully the Highway Act of 1968, and his Subcommittee refused to provide the requested \$38 million.

Money Held Back

Last year, citing a similar lack of compliance, Natcher held back the money needed to start digging the subway. He released funds to permit a Dec. 9 ground breaking only after receiving a personal assurance from the President that free-way construction would proceed.

The future of the road system was further clouded Monday when U.S. District Judge John J. Sirica ruled that work must be halted on the Three Sisters Bridge, one of the key projects, because of procedural flaws in its planning.

Sirica is expected to sign an injunction today setting precise terms for the stoppage.

Joseph P. Yeldell, board chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and Jackson Graham, the metro authority's general manager, were scarcely settled in their chairs at the Senate hearing before the question of the road impasse was raised.

Sen. Alan Bible (D-Nev.), presiding over the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, questioned them closely about the stalemate, although his unit is not directly involved in the issue. Bible, author of the original subway authorization bill, asked how it can be resolved.

"It can only be resolved this year at the highest levels between the administration and Congress," Graham said.

"We Have Complied"

Yeldell was more specific. "Being a member of the District government (as a member of the City Council), I feel we have complied with the '68 Highway Act. It's well above our heads to handle..."

"The move to break the impasse will have to be....between the President and the chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee (Natcher)."

Earlier in the day, Graham told the Metro board of directors at its weekly meeting that "one or two or three people (on the White House staff) are working on this actively."

But, it was understood from other sources, the President's advisers are reluctant to involve Mr. Nixon prematurely in the situation.

During yesterday's Senate hearing, Graham testified that the effect of Natcher's refusal of the \$34 million will be multiplied by resulting restrictions on matching funds from other sources.

Cutbacks Foreseen

Without the funds, Graham said, the Metro will stop letting contracts next month and start deciding where to cut back on its program. Subway digging under way would continue."

The Evening Star carried an article today that is entitled "Subway Aid Plea Made to President." This article is as follows:

"Area subway officials have asked President Nixon to step into the local freeway-subway impasse again.

Another agreement between the President and Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on the District, may be needed to get Natcher to release the \$34 million in District subway funds he has held up until there is additional highway system progress here, the general manager of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority says.

The general manager, Jackson Graham, testified at a Senate Appropriations subcommittee hearing late yesterday. Other

WMATA officials said later that an appeal to the White House has been made.

Last year, President Nixon helped WMATA get initial construction funds by assuring Natcher that suits against a highway project, the Three Sisters Bridge to Virginia, would be vigorously defended. A suit is now delaying construction.

Meanwhile, the House Public Works Roads subcommittee has grown increasingly impatient regarding the controversial, long-delayed North-Central Freeway into Maryland. The subcommittee may report a bill next week that would order the city to move ahead with this project."

August 10, 1970

So far the changes in the House and the Senate are as follows:

Retiring

Rep. E. Y. Berry (R. S.D.)
Rep. William Dawson (D. Ill.)
Rep. Mike Kirwan (D. Ohio) (now dead)
Rep. John McCormack (D. Mass.)
Rep. William Murphy (D. Ill.)
Rep. Maston O'Neal (D. Ga.)
Rep. Ben Reifer (R. S.D.)
Senator Spessard Holland (D. Fla.)
Senator Eugene McCarthy (D. Minn.)
Senator John Williams (R. Del.)
Senator Stephen Young (D. Ohio)

Defeated in Primaries

Rep. Jeffery Cohelan (D. Calif.)
Rep. Glenn Cunningham (R. Neb.)
Rep. Leonard Farbstein (D. N.Y.)
Rep. Michael Feighan (D. Ohio)
Rep. Jacob Gilbert (D. N.Y.)
Rep. Adam Clayton Powell (D. N.Y.)
Senator Ralph Yarborough (D. Texas)

Running for Other Offices

Rep. J. Glenn Beall (R. Md.)
Rep. William Brock (R. Tenn.)
Rep. Laurence Burton (. Utah)
Rep. George Bush (R. Texas)
Rep. William Cramer (R. Fla.)
Rep. Emil Daddario (D. Conn.)
Rep. Thomas Kleppe (R. N.D.)
Rep. Clark MacGregor (R. Minn.)
Rep. Tom Meskill (R. Conn.)
Rep. Richard Ottinger (D. N.Y.)
Rep. Howard Pollock (R. Alaska)
Rep. William Roth (R. Del.)
Rep. Richard Roudebush (R. Ind.)
Rep. Robert Taft (R. Ohio)
Rep. John Tunney (D. Calif.)
Rep. Albert Watson (R. S.C.)
Rep. Lowell Weicker (R. Conn.)
Rep. John Wold (R. Wyo.)

Defeated in Bids for Other Offices

Rep. George Brown (D. Calif.)
Rep. Richard McCarthy (D. N.Y.)

Assured of Re-Election

- Rep. Thomas Abernethy (D. Miss.)
- Rep. Jackson E. Betts (R. Ohio)
- Rep. Jack Brinkley (D. Ga.)
- Rep. Omar Burleson (D. Texas)
- Rep. Williams M. Colmer (D. Miss.)
- Rep. John Dowdy (D. Texas)
- Rep. Thomas N. Downing (D. Va.)
- Rep. Daniel J. Flood (D. Pa.)
- Rep. John J. Flynt (D. Ga.)
- Rep. L. H. Fountain (D. N.C.)
- Rep. Kenneth J. Gray (D. Ill.)
- Rep. Abraham Kazen (D. Texas)
- Rep. Phil M. Landrum (D. Ga.)
- Rep. George H. Mahon (D. Texas)
- Rep. James R. Mann (D. S.C.)
- Rep. G. V. Montgomery (D. Miss.)
- Rep. Thomas E. Morgan (D. Pa.)
- Rep. William H. Natcher (D. Ky.)
- Rep. J. J. Pickle (D. Texas)
- Rep. W. R. Peage (D. Texas)
- Rep. Robert D. Price (R. Texas)
- Rep. Charlotte T. Reid (R. Ill.)
- Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D. S.C.)
- Rep. Ray Roberts (D. Texas)
- Rep. Robert G. Stephens (D. Ga.)
- Rep. Frank A. Stubblefield (D. Ky.)
- Rep. W. S. Stuckey (D. Ga.)
- Rep. Charles M. Teague (D. Calif)
- Rep. Joe D. Waggoner (D. La.)
- Rep. William C. Wampler (R. Va.)
- Rep. Jamie L. Whitten (D. Miss.)
- Rep. James C. Wright (D. Texas)
- Rep. John Young (D. Texas)
- Senator John Stennis (D. Miss.)

August 12, 1970

On Monday of this week the House passed a bill providing for a non-voting delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives. In addition, we passed another bill that provides for a non-voting delegate in the House and the Senate for the District of Columbia, but this bill will not be accepted by the Senate. The Senate is adamant in that it will not accept a non-voting delegate in the Senate. I voted for this bill and hope that this system will work out satisfactorily.

On the same day the Equal Rights Amendment which has been dormant in the House for 47 years was passed and sent to the Senate. The Women's Equality Bill passed 350 to 15 and the Amendment simply stated that equality of rights under law, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. The Amendment further provided that Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. Three-fourths of the States must now ratify the Constitutional Amendment and it may be some time before the Amendment becomes effective.

We had another United States official kidnapped in South America this past weekend and, in this instance,

the American, Dan A. Mitrione, was killed. The guerrillas seized Mitrione in Uruguay and since he was killed it is now apparent that the lives of a Brazilian Consul and an American agricultural expert may end up with the same result.

The President is up to his old tricks. Yesterday, he vetoed two appropriations bills and I presume this is the all time record. He vetoed the \$4.4 billion Education Appropriations Bill and the \$18 billion Independent Offices Appropriations Bill which contains the money for Housing and for 23 other independent agencies. Late last night the veto message was read in the House and we voted to call up the vetos on Thursday of this week and at that time the House will attempt to override. The House may override the veto of the Education Bill but the odds are not too good for Independent Offices. This year we cut education out of the \$19 billion Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations Bill and brought in a separate bill on Education to speed up the appropriating process. We spent seven weeks in hearing witnesses on this Bill and at the time the Bill reached the President for his signature, it was a little over one-half billion dollars more than the President requested. Most of this money was added by the Senate.

September 9, 1970

The House recessed on August 14th and we are now back in Washington ready to start again today. The Senate is some seven weeks behind and since we were simply twiddling our thumbs in the House, it was agreed that we should recess for a few days. It now appears that both the House and the Senate will recess during the month of October and after the November election is over, return to Washington and continue on until Christmas Eve.

During the recess period I traveled some in my District and made a few speeches. The weather was simply awful and it was impossible for me to get into all 20 of my Counties.

During the time that I was home, Virginia and I were honored by having our nephew, Chuck Reardon, stop by and have dinner with us. Chuck is a good boy and is doing quite well at Vanderbilt. He still has his famous Russian PUC dog--the PUC means "picked up on campus." This is just a dog and during the summer recess he took his dog home with him. Virginia and I have quite a bit of fun over this particular animal because he is simply a dog and appears to be a combination of six or seven different breeds.

Last week the EVENING STAR carried the following editorial:

"In The President's Lap"

The most vital part of the \$103-million supplemental appropriation proposal now before the City Council is a \$41.3-million item to continue the regional subway. Ironically, this item also is in severe jeopardy of failing to win Congress' approval. And no Washingtonian should underestimate the gravity of that dilemma.

Boiled down to plain language, the facts are these: While some \$255 million has been spent or obligated on the subway during the past eight months, the system's delicately balanced financing schedule would be blown sky-high if the \$34-million appropriation should fail to pass this year. At best, in that event, construction would drastically slow down, raising the total costs. At worst, the entire program might be lost. And the prospect of congressional approval of the \$34 million appears so dismal, at this moment, that nothing short of the swift, direct intervention of President Nixon is apt to save it.

This is not the first time we have urged such White House intervention. The necessity, however, in terms of time, has never been as great.

The crux of the problem, as everyone must know by now, is that the subway money is being held hostage by influential

members of Congress because of the continuing impasse over District freeways. What everyone may not know is that this barrier has not relaxed. It appears more formidable right now, and more discouraging, than ever.

One would never guess that is the case from the lackadaisical, business-as-usual attitude of District and Department of Transportation leaders. According to the grapevine, an announcement is imminent, most probably this afternoon, on the city's response to a federal court order which has blocked construction of the Three Sisters Bridge--perhaps the key project in the highway dispute. But that slight sign of movement will not be enough to make a serious dent in the real stalemate.

The single ray of hope is, in fact, that a year ago the status of the 1969 subway appropriation was virtually identical. And the funds were freed on that occasion only through an agreement, spelled out in a letter dated August 12, 1969, from President Nixon to Representative Natcher, pledging that freeway construction would indeed proceed in accordance with Congress' demands for a balanced system of roads and transit. Three months ago, however, when Natcher reimposed the subway freeze, he accused administration officials of failing to comply with the agreement--despite the best intentions of the President. At

that time, Washington area congressmen pleaded with Natcher to release the hostaged subway money -- as we similarly urged. But those pleas were to no avail in the absence of freeway progress, and it is wishful thinking to imagine that the situation has changed significantly since then.

The simple truth is that Natcher -- and it is important to understand that he is not alone in the position -- does not trust the officials possessing the power to expedite highway construction to do so on their own.

The only realistic hope of changing that position is a repetition of last August's performance: A new agreement through which President Nixon would firmly commit his administration to specific highway actions in order to free the transit money.

Yesterday, the Editorial entitled "Transit In Trouble," appeared in the EVENING STAR and this Editorial is as follows:

"In pleading with President Nixon last week to intervene personally in the congressional impasse which is threatening funds for Washington's subway, Representative Gude was talking to the right man at the right time.

Within the next few days, the city government will send Congress a supple-

mental budget request -- some \$34 million of which represents funds that are crucial to maintain the rapid transit program's carefully developed construction schedule. Last June, however, this same request was put aside in the House, as the result of Representative Natcher's dissatisfaction with progress in ironing out snarls in the District's freeway program. While we wish it were not the case, developments since June hardly have moved with breathtaking speed.

Construction of the Three Sisters Bridge recently was halted by a court ruling, involving the adequacy of design hearings on that project. To be sure, just a few days ago, Mayor Washington and Transportation Secretary Volpe proposed to attack that legal hurdle by scheduling the contested public hearing this fall. But apart from that, the question is whether enough else has happened to persuade Natcher, and those in the House who agree with him, to release the hostaged transit money in the brief period remaining before Congress adjourns.

A year ago, when roughly the same situation prevailed, Natcher cut loose a transit appropriation only after President Nixon's personal assurance of his administration's "firm commitment" to complete projects ordered by Congress in the 1968 Highway Act. The real issue now is the good faith of Mr. Nixon's subordinates -- specifically Washington and

Volpe -- in fulfilling that commitment. In view of their lackadaisical performance, Representative Gude is quite right in advising the President that nothing short of another personal intervention, coming to grips with problems as they now exist, is apt to provide the required assurances. And the Maryland congressman has not overstated the case in warning Mr. Nixon that the real threat is "a total loss of our rapid transit program."

During my travels in the District and especially at a Labor Day Weekend speech in Bowling Green, I talked about the problems now confronting the United States Congress.

We are still working on the budget for FY 1971 which totals 200 billion eight million dollars. Our National Debt is approximately \$386 billion and the interest required for this debt each year is \$19 billion, 7 million. In the budget we have \$71.8 billion or 36 percent of the total for Defense. Since World War II our country has expended one trillion dollars for Defense. The Space Agency is requesting \$3.4 billion for FY 1971, \$32.9 billion of the total budget is for anti-poverty programs and this is 16.4 percent of the total budget. The Education request totaled \$10.6 billion. Crime requests total \$1.3 billion and the request for pollution programs call for \$1 billion. For research throughout the different departments of our Government

we have requests totalling \$5.9 billion.

People are demanding that more money be spent for housing, health, education, welfare, and pollution. We receive daily demands from mayors of large cities, governors, students, health authorities, and educators.

We have never been more concerned about education, civil rights, or social justice. More is being done about housing, slums, education, anti-poverty programs and health than at any time in our history. A country that can land astronauts two times on the moon in one year, must spend considerable money and, of course, this achievement clearly indicates that our country is the greatest country in the world.

Notwithstanding our prosperity, we are confronted with inflation, high cost of living, tight money, and high interest rates.

In order to spend more money on the demands of the day we must bring the War in Vietnam to a close, bring inflation under control, have a good welfare reform program started, cut back the space program wherever possible, and cut defense costs as much as possible. It is imperative that we keep our 77 million people employed and we must continue to be able to furnish 35,000 new jobs each week.

We are having problems now with imports. I believe that trade must be free, but at the same time, fair. Textile imports are causing us considerable difficulty.

As we go along, our American farmer must be protected. Certainly this is no time to turn our back on the farmers.

Our society, of course, is not perfect and we have been adopting to change since 1791. The Constitution was accepted with the understanding that the 10 Amendments which, of course, are our Bill of Rights, would be adopted. At that time our people were not in favor of delegating powers not provided for in the Constitution.

The Census just completed is being criticized throughout the 50 States. In my opinion several hundred thousand people were missed. In Kentucky we will end up with about 3,160,555 people. The District that I represent increased from 421,346 to 456,618. Only the second, fourth, and sixth districts will comply with the population requirements under the new Census. With seven districts, the average must be about 451,500. The first, third, fifth, and seventh districts in Kentucky are considerably too small, and must obtain more people from the other three districts. For instance, the fifth district lost 34,375 people and the seventh district lost 46,225 people. During the past five years we

have sent into the seventh district about \$650 million of federal money and now the Census shows that they lost almost 50,000 people.

Martin Sweig, accused of misusing his position as Administrative Assistant to House Speaker John W. McCormack was sentenced on September 3rd to 30 months in prison and fined \$2,000 for perjury. The Federal Judge who imposed the sentence said that he would be derelict if he did not impose a substantial prison sentence. Sweig immediately appealed his case and is now on bond.

September 10, 1970

For some eight years now we have engaged in a battle over freeways and rapid transit here in our Nation's Capital. Our Committee in the beginning endorsed a balanced transportation system for the District of Columbia and in 1955 approved of the amount expended to make a study concerning the balanced system with the study recommending both rapid transit and freeways. If our Committee had been against rapid transit certainly we would never have approved of the amount which recommended rapid transit in addition to freeways. Some of the editorials and articles in the Washington papers are simply hilarious and some of the writers appear to take great delight in coloring the facts to such an extent that it would appear that the Highway Act of 1968 passed by the House

and the Senate and signed by the President was not in existence. Occasionally a story is written which accurately sets forth some of the facts. One of these stories appears in the August 22nd issue of the WASHINGTON POST entitled, "The Three Sisters -- and How They Grew." This story is as follows:

"For something like 13 years, it has been possible in this town to say two words that can stop, start or totally destroy a conversation about local affairs: "Three Sisters."

It has nothing to do with the three weird sisters of "Macbeth," except, perhaps, for their observation: "Fair is foul, and foul is fair: Hower through the fog and filthy air." For when you see "Three Sisters" in the page one headlines, it refers to a bridge that one cannot see but which one can feel very strongly about. And its implications touch politics, home rule, money, planning, conservation, freeways, subways, housing and Presidents of the United States -- among other things.

Any chronological explanation must go back to an old Indian legend about three maidens who either drowned or leaped into the then-clear waters of the Potomac River, and whose spirits are somehow embodied in three tiny islands (rocks, really) that you can see in the river today if you look from Key Bridge

up to Chain Bridge. It is there that Congress has ordered our city to build a Three Sisters Bridge.

What has become such a raging and complicated issue, began rather simply in the Eisenhower era with work on a Mass Transportation Survey for what was quite a different metropolitan area. There were fewer than 2 million people in the area then; federal employment was dropping; more than half the District's transit riding took place in streetcars; automobile congestion was already considered a problem; and the highway planners were drawing up a network of "legs" for an Inner Loop to get auto traffic moving. Getting money to build this loop was the problem at the time; real citywide protests didn't exist, since little was happening except on paper.

Congress came through with the funds -- 90 cents of every dollar -- in the Interstate Highway Act which calls for a coast-to-coast freeway system. The city government (then three commissioners) hailed the event, endorsed a complete freeway system (inner loop and two legs connecting it all with Maryland, plus a new bridge connecting it with Virginia) and began building the first part of this system, a west leg through Foggy Bottom (where you'll notice today, just below Pennsylvania Avenue at Rock Creek, some magnificent

stubs that go nowhere).

Maryland and Virginia went to work on what is now the Capital Beltway with all its new shopping centers, office complexes and demographic offshoots. And it wasn't long before the business establishment began pushing for the freeway connections, the legs between the Inner Loop and the Beltway that would link the downtown area with the growing suburban population. During this period, the dream of a subway for Washington began to be talked about more and more.

As the subway talk increased, however, the highway "lobby" became pitted against the subway "lobby", each side claiming that achievement of its goals would reduce the need to accomplish the other's. The area was not big enough, the argument went, to need both a freeway system and a subway system.

Meanwhile, Dulles Airport was born, and a new superhighway in Virginia, Route 66, was inching toward the Potomac with no place to go but across -- some way -- into the city. Which way became the issue.

The Highway men decided that the best way must be a new bridge, preferably at the Three Sisters site. The announcement of that decision ignited public outrage against more urban freeways, particularly those which would travel through

good residential districts or parklands. Among the people upset were Georgetowners, conservationists on both sides of the river, the National Park Service and Senators Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) and John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.), whose wives and friends had taken up the fight against more freeways.

By 1962, there was another development that served as ammunition for the antifreeway, antibridge forces. President Kennedy had selected C. Darwin Stolzenbach to head a new subway planning group, the National Capital Transportation Agency (now Metro, or the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority). Stolzenbach urged cutting back the entire freeway system and combining two proposed links to Maryland into one -- the North Central Freeway, which today is the other headliner in the freeway battle -- and eliminating the Three Sisters Bridge.

That bridge, he stated flatly in a report to the President, was "not required." The traffic on the new Route 66 in Virginia could cross the river on the new Theodore Roosevelt Bridge along with the traffic on Route 50. New flurry of activity; renewed arguments between subway, big-freeway-system and little-freeway-system proponents; new studies; and -- enter center stage, Congress.

Congress, with the controls over money for freeways, subways and anything else that this city wants or doesn't want -- had been watching the conflict with evident interest. And by 1966-67, the legislators thought the dust was settling; the city's highway department, the National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission had more or less agreed on a compromise "balanced system" (a subway and a reduction of the freeway system that included some sort of "Potomac River crossing" on or around the Three Sisters site).

Watching it all since the early 1960s had been the member of the House with the most influence over Washington's year-to-year, item-by-item spending, Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky), chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on the District (not to be confused with the House District Committee.) Firm in his belief that a freeway program for the city was essential, fed up with a decade of bickering over where, if anywhere, the city's freeways would be built, and always careful in his wording, Natcher had, in 1963 and annually thereafter, issued a not-very-veiled warning: No freeways, no subway money.

He was not alone in his sentiment. Members of the House Public Works Committee, which authorizes federal money for highways, agreed. Here was the District of Columbia, the nation's capital,

not yet building or even acting as if it would build the freeway system that other cities were building and that highway builders and civic planners had agreed should be built. Moreover, the apparent compromise seemed to be coming apart with proposals by Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd, National Capital Planning Commission Chairman Elizabeth Rowe and others aimed at eliminating the bridge proposal.

President Johnson, by 1965, had given the subway agency a new management that had stopped blasting at freeways and had managed to convince Congress that the subway system was needed. Court battles and citizen efforts had continued to be directed at the freeway program, however, and Hatcher's warning had been generally ignored. Plans for the subway went ahead, as did plans for the freeways, but, save for a freeway through the Southwest, neither was being built. Nobody could decide anything once and for all.

Congress seethed in 1968. The legislators approved a federal highway act, which among other things, instructed the Secretary of Transportation and the city government to build the Three Sisters Bridge. This was Congress, out of patience with the quarrel, deciding to settle the question by (1) ordering the bridge and (2) calling for a study within 18 months of alternate routes and

plans for the rest of the system, including the North Central Freeway.

By this time the adversaries weren't simply the subway supporters versus the highway backers. When President Nixon and his new transportation secretary, John A. Volpe, inherited the chaos, it was the anti-freeway forces (who were prosubway through not all prosubway forces were antifreeway) against the Congress -- an all-out mismatch, with Mayor Walter E. Washington and then-Deputy Mayor Thomas W. Fletcher now in the middle, searching frantically for a posture different from that of their commissioner predecessors. And, like clockwork, there was Natcher's annual warning, by now including the demand that highway projects be under way "beyond recall" if the city wanted money for the subway.

Yet even within city hall, sentiment in the City Council -- a government arm born in 1967 -- seemed on the side of the freeway foes. In 1969, members, including the latest chairman, Gilbert Hahn, Jr., were speaking fervently and regularly against the bridge, against the North Central Freeway and against the whole principle of Congress ordering the District around.

But by then, support in Congress for Natcher's position had grown, not so much from a love for freeways, but more because Congress had passed the 1968 law

saying "build that bridge" and the city was not building; after all, many members agreed, if you let one city ignore the law, why, soon all the states might start doing it. The way to compel obedience to "the law of the land," Congress decided, was to back up Natcher: no bridge, no subway money.

Why did the North Central Freeway stick out so during this hassle? That freeway, once planned through the predominantly white Wisconsin Avenue corridor, had been shifted on the drawing board to a mostly black area of Northeast Washington, running along the B&O railroad tracks through the Brookland-Catholic University area out to Silver Spring. Under an umbrella group called the Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis, citizens and citizen organizations began demonstrating against the freeway system in general and North Central in particular, for they saw this freeway as destroying communities, removing houses, encouraging more cars, polluting the air and necessitating still more land clearance to park a new onslaught of autos. And poignantly, they decided the action of Congress in doing unto a voteless city what a voteless city was legally powerless to undo; set local policy and make it stick.

Mayor Washington, through Fletcher, entered into quiet, informal negotiations on Capitol Hill, centering on an agreement to build the Three Sisters Bridge

and to take a further look at other parts of the freeway system. When news of this leaked, however, there were vehement protests from the antifreeway forces, new fears on the part of the subway supporters and this time, genuine furor in Congress over the Council's failure to bite the bullet promptly and approve the bridge while buying some time on the rest of the freeways. The general ugliness of mood, fed by the impending deadline for subway money, impelled the White House to help bring pressure on the Council to go along with Congress.

Meanwhile, opponents of the North Central had united solidly with opponents of the Three Sisters Bridge for this latest stand against the Hill.

The showdown finally came a year ago, when on a hot Saturday morning, the Council met to vote formally for approval of the bridge. A majority had decided, distasteful as it was to some of the members, that they could not in conscience murder the subway while spitting both the Congress and the administration, not to mention prolonging the inevitable cave-in. The meeting was a model of chaos -- people hurled chairs at police and each other, an ash tray at Chairman Hahn and epithets at everybody before arrests put an end to the disruption.

In time, the first visible work began on the bridge, but not without more brief disorders at the scene, actions in court and more eloquent, last-ditch pleas from citizens to please not do it. Many experts said -- and still say -- that the bridge isn't really needed, that accesses to the bridge would be esthetic disasters no matter how they were built or routed, and that you can't trust the planners to do what they say they're going to do once a plan is approved. Other experts said -- and still say -- that the bridge will be needed, that in 10 years, even with a subway system, the existing bridges will be hopelessly overcrowded.

Earlier this month, U.S. District Court Judge John J. Sirica revived the whole issue as a newsmaker, calling a halt to the bridge construction, this time until planning can be brought fully into line with federal laws and regulations. He ruled that a public hearing must be held on the design of the bridge and that federal and city officials must deal with unresolved problems of its construction and environmental impact -- things that could take months or longer. Bridge foes and antifreeway forces cheered, vowing to renew their battle with vigor -- and that's where Three Sisters sits today, with some early construction equipment idling out there on the old rocks.

Still simmering on the back burner is the North Central Freeway, something that Congress has not forgotten but that city officials would like to. It, like the bridge, is a project that Congress can insist on, whether the administration, the city officials or the people want it or need it. The subway is in new jeopardy with the Old Natcher warning: Again this summer, Congress approved a municipal budget for the current fiscal year -- without that subway money. Again, Rep. Natcher and his colleagues want action. And again, the Metro faces serious construction troubles. And the bleat goes on.

That's about the size of it, and the White House is said to be well aware of it -- and of the need to do something very soon.

There are rumors that (1) the White House will simply announce to Natcher, the city and everybody else that the North Central Freeway is going to be built; (2) that the 1970 Highway Act will emerge with language geared to accelerate the bridge, the freeway and any other problems that the public works committees see in their way; and (3) that the makeup of the city council may in time be changed, by moving some members into judgeships and replacing others when their terms expire.

Yet in this apparently endless, multimasterminded, emotional set of

developments over the years, rumors -- like real reports -- tend to be short-lived and shaky. In this newspaper's library of clippings, for example, there is one dated Nov. 8, 1967, that begins: "The Three Sisters Bridge is out." An astute library assistant has added a succinct commentary in large, red letters all across the item: "DO NOT USE."

September 11, 1970

Today is my birthday and I am 61 years old. I feel real good and, in fact, do not feel like I am 61.

The rapid transit highway battle still continues, and in today's WASHINGTON POST appeared a story entitled, "Construction Delay Likely On Subway." This story is as follows:

"Chances are fading fast that Congress will provide the money this year to keep Metro subway construction on schedule, a key Capitol Hill source declared yesterday.

The source, who insisted upon anonymity, said the latest subway-free-way impasse has reached the crisis stage and may have to be resolved personally by President Nixon within about a week. He said there has been no sign at the Capitol of direct White House concern.

The time for maneuvering, which many thought would extend into November, has been foreshortened by the announced congressional adjournment goal of Oct. 15.

Another federal official, equally committed to breaking the impasse, said Washington's city government still has a slim chance of getting the money. He said it must convince Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) that it is earnestly trying to build the controversial roads.

"That," the official added, "would be uphill sledding."

Natcher, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the District, has said he would continue to withhold \$34.2 million in city funds for the subway until the Highway Act of 1968 is fully complied with.

That law required building the Three Sisters Bridge and several other interstate freeways, and called for new recommendations on the North Central Freeway.

By a chain reaction involving other sources of funds, a congressional refusal to provide the \$34.2 million would slash the Metro's work program for the current fiscal year from a planned \$376 million to \$168 million, Metro general manager Jackson Graham said.

The Capitol Hill source said Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe made the subway financing less likely by deciding not to appeal the recent court-ordered halt of work on the Three Sisters Bridge.

Volpe called instead for a new public hearing on the bridge design, tentatively set for Nov. 17, and the city government went along with the decision.

His action has set off a backstage debate among pro-highway officials over the best strategy to get the road program moving again."

In last night's **EVENING STAR** appeared an article entitled, "Subway Service by July '73 In Doubt, Graham Concedes." This article is as follows:

"The general manager of the area subway system today acknowledged publicly that rapid transit train service may not start on schedule in July 1973.

Jackson Graham told the board of directors of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority that the agency staff now is preparing a new work schedule to be put into effect if \$34.2 million in District of Columbia subway funds is not released soon by Congress.

Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., chairman of the House District appropriations subcommittee, has refused to agree to release the subway money until work on freeways here proceeds to his satisfaction.

In a related move today, Carl L. Shipley, Republican national committeeman for the District, urged the city to build the controversial North Central Freeway and other freeway segments to obtain the release of the funds.

Graham told the board that if the funds are not released by the time Congress adjourns for election campaigning next month, a new construction schedule may have to go into effect, delaying the awarding of big contracts.

He said he is hopeful that the delay in start of service over the first six miles of subway between Dupont Circle and Rhode Island Avenue NE would not be more than a few months. Graham was responding to questions about a report published in The Star last week that subway staff members were studying the possibility of putting off service until 1974.

Graham said that Natcher has not made clear exactly what would have to be done to obtain the release of funds.

He referred to the situation as this year's "ransom."

Last year Natcher held up release of subway funds until the city agreed to build the Three Sisters Bridge and other freeway segments and President Nixon assured the congressman that work on the freeways would proceed. However, work on the bridge has been suspended by a court order.

Shipley said the District City Council "must stop playing games and comply with the 1968 Highway Act."

He added that this "means the District government must start at once with good faith in construction of the North Central Freeway and the East Leg Freeway so it connects with the North-east Freeway to allow Interstate 95 to pass through the District, as required by Congress in the 1968 law.

The 1968 Highway Act permitted the District to make recommendations about the route of the North Central, a freeway which has sparked protest demonstrations in the streets of Brookland. The city suggested that the freeway be scrapped.

In his statement, Shipley also criticized City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn, Jr., a fellow Republican.

"...There is no longer any excuse for D.C. City Council Chairman Hahn and other council members to stand like

George Wallace at the schoolhouse door and think up first one excuse and then another to evade the requirements of Congress as a condition to getting subway money," he said.

Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., has asked President Nixon to intervene once again in an effort to obtain release of the subway funds."

Ray J. Madden, Representative of the First Indiana District from Gary, Indiana, serving his fourteenth term, is a right able man. When he was first elected in 1943 he served on the Committee on Education and Labor and several years later was placed on the Rules Committee. Shortly after his election and while a Member of the Committee on Education and Labor, two freshman Members entered the House of Representatives and were both assigned to his Committee. These Members were John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon. At that time, according to Ray Madden, neither one of the two made any impression on the other Members of the Committee and were not considered hard working Members of the Committee. In fact, John F. Kennedy permitted Carl Perkins and others to carry his proxy which was used time after time when the full Committee met to mark up a bill. Ray Madden told us today in the Dining Room at the Capitol that at the time these two new Members were placed on the Committee on Education and Labor he would have bet anything

within reason that neither one of them would ever run for President or be placed in a position of having any chance for this office. I presume at that time that the Committee on Education and Labor was not the Committee that either one of these two gentlemen preferred serving on and for that reason were not too much interested in the Committee generally.

On Friday of each week the Members Private Dining Room is closed and on this day a great many of us who generally eat in the Private Dining Room go into the Main Dining Room and sit around a large round table. Here we tell big tales and listen to bigger tales from other Members.

Ray Madden told us another story today concerning John Rankin of Mississippi, the old rebel who served in the House for a great many years, and Adolph Sabboth, the Chairman of the Rules Committee who served for a great many years from one of the Chicago Districts. Mr. Sabboth at the time of his death was some 85 years of age and was the oldest Member in the House. It seems that Mr. Sabboth and John Rankin got into a very severe argument on the Floor of the House and the argument continued on out into the Speaker's Lounge. Sabboth was just about the size of a peanut and John Rankin is not too much larger. By the way, I met John Rankin and saw him on a number of occasions

here in Washington after he was defeated by Tom Abernethy at the time when these two fighting Members were placed in the same District.

When the argument continued out in the Speaker's Lounge these two men squared off at each other and made all kinds of moves like they were going to fist fight. Several Members pulled them apart and Ray Madden swears no blows were struck. The next day when the Rules Committee met, and with Ray Madden being a Member of that Committee, Mr. Sabboth, the Chairman, whispered that his right hand was still sore. He showed him the knuckles on the first three fingers and, in addition to having the knuckles mercurochromed right well, he said that his hand was still sore and caused him trouble all night long. He maintained that he really hit John Rankin a good blow and Ray Madden said not a blow was struck and that the old man just imagined that he had hit John Rankin and his imagination was just too much for him.

September 14, 1970

Finally we have one article which indicates that the Highway Act of 1968 is still the law, and a few of us are in favor of the District of Columbia complying in full with this law. This article entitled, "Natcher Holds D.C. Subway Systems Hostage to Freeway Program" is as follows:

"The sleek silver-gray Metro subway train that everybody thought was just around the bend has once again been headed off at the impasse.

In what has come to be an annual ritual, Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) has carried out a threat to hold up funds for the subway, making it hostage to assure progress on Washington's controversial freeway program.

Last year, the impasse was broken by presidential intervention barely in time for a scheduled Dec. 9 subway groundbreaking.

At the very least, key Metro officials say a failure to break the renewed impasse before Congress adjourns would delay the start of limited subway service now scheduled for July, 1973.

At the worst, one insider said guardedly, the system's delicate and complicated financial structure could topple, leaving the city with \$100 million worth of concrete-lined tunnels lacking both tracks and trains.

Nobody, however, will admit to expecting the worse.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority already has invested \$55 million in plans, real estate and facilities.

It has obligated \$154 million in contracts, including \$10 million for digging the subway from Union Station to Rock Creek Park.

It has additional commitments of \$142 million, a grand total of \$351 million of the ultimate \$2.5 billion.

Work under way will not be affected by holding up further funds, Metro officials say, but new commitments would be scaled down drastically.

Although only \$34.2 million is directly involved in Natcher's threat, its withholding would trigger a loss of other funds forcing a cutback of the Metro work program this fiscal year from \$376 million to \$178 million.

Of this drop, \$135 million would be in revenue bonds that the Metro hopes to sell and repay from future fare collections. Ultimately it expects to sell \$835 million worth.

Metro officials privately acknowledge that they are nervous over their ability to market these bonds if the uncertainty over congressional appropriations persists.

As usual, efforts to break the impasse are occurring in the shadows, with the central figures disguising all moves except the final decision from public view.

Since those involved rarely will permit themselves to be quoted, newsmen must reluctantly depend upon informants who insist upon anonymity. These informants usually give only one side of the situation. However accurate these portrayals, the picture that emerges is like a view of one side of the moon without being able to see what is on the other.

So it was last week when a reliable but admittedly profreeway source on Capitol Hill warned that the coming week may be crucial in breaking the impasse.

The timing of a solution has become critical, the Capitol source said, because of the newly announced goal of Oct. 15 for congressional adjournment. The subway money, if it is to be made in the year's final supplemental appropriation bill, which must clear both House and Senate before the adjournment.

Metro and city officials admit to being badly frustrated in trying to grapple with the issues in the impasse. They say they don't know the price that Natcher and the House Public Works Committee will exact before agreeing to release the subway money.

They also keep a wary eye on the city's antifreeway groups, which include many people who insist that the city ought not to knuckle under to congressional pressure and ought to be willing

to accept a halt on the subway if that is necessary.

The Public Works Committee originated the Highway Act of 1968 that called for prompt construction of some freeways and new studies of others. Natcher, while not a member of that Committee, has insisted that the city obey the law.

Mayor Walter E. Washington and City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn Jr. have insisted that the city has obeyed the law.

In blocking the second year subway construction funds, Natcher added a subtle new condition: To obey the spirit of the highway law as well as its letter.

What this means, sources on both sides of the issue said last week, is that the city is expected to build the North Central Freeway to Silver Spring and its Northeast Freeway branch, a missing link in Interstate Rte. 95 between Washington and Baltimore.

The city violated the spirit of the law in Natcher's estimation, these sources said, by recommending to Congress that the highways be eliminated altogether from the city plan. City officials say their suggestion met the law's requirement for studying and making recommendations on the roads.

Another key issue is the Three Sisters Bridge, a part of Interstate Rte. 266. Construction was recently halted by a U.S. District Court order on grounds that procedural requirements had not been met.

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, a key defendant in the lawsuit filed by a coalition of freeway critics, decided the fastest way to resolve the issue was to call a public hearing on the bridge design that would meet key parts of those procedural requirements. The city concurred, and the hearing has been tentatively set for Nov. 17.

This decision opened an unexpected rift between profreeway lawmakers on Capitol Hill and equally profreeway officials in the Department of Transportation.

Volpe's advisers agreed with the hearing idea, but the lawmakers, according to their anonymous spokesman, believed the case should have been appealed, to the Supreme Court if necessary. They see the case as a test of the constitutional role of Congress as the lawmaking body for the District of Columbia.

Moreover, Natcher is understood to feel that President Nixon violated his public pledge of last year to provide full and vigorous defense of all

lawsuits challenging the road system. This, according to his purported view, would include full appeal.

It was only after the presidential pledge was given last year that Natcher granted the funds permitting the Metro groundbreaking.

Natcher, asked for his views on the current situation, responded with his usual answer: "No comment."

Several days ago I read an article which said that a good newspaper is one that seeks to enlighten, expose, expound, confound, explore, suggest, contest, probe, prod, praise, and otherwise provoke and inform the people.

September 16, 1970

For the first time since 1823, a Catholic priest will serve in the Congress. Philip J. Philbin of the Third Massachusetts District now serving his fourteenth term was defeated by a Jesuit priest in the Massachusetts primary yesterday. Representative Philbin is a devout Catholic and the Jesuit priest is one of two priests who were making races for Congress, and this entry into politics, of course, did not meet with the approval of the Catholics generally in Massachusetts. Philbin is in his seventies and is the ranking Majority Member on the Committee on Armed Services. He, for the past five

years, has been very much of a Hawk concerning the War in Vietnam and this was the main issue in his District. I have always liked Phil Philbin and he is a perfect gentleman from the old Massachusetts school. I know that he must be in a state of shock.

One of the races that took place yesterday in the Maryland primary which might surprise some people was the primary election in which George H. Fallon, the Chairman of the Public Works Committee and a man who is serving his thirteenth term in the House was engaged. I have heard now for months that Fallon was in trouble politically in his District and apparently was doing nothing about it. Fallon's predecessor was Charles Buckley of New York City and, after serving for a number of years as Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, Buckley was defeated by Eleanor Roosevelt's candidate. I have seen one or two other Chairmen but will not be surprised if Fallon fails to overcome the six or seven hundred that he is behind this morning.

Thomas Hale Boggs, Jr., the son of the Democratic Whip in the House from New Orleans, was also a candidate for Congress in the Eighth Maryland Congressional District. Apparently, he is the winner and will take on Representative Gude in November.

Senator Joseph Tydings apparently will defeat George O. Mahoney, perennial

candidate in the Maryland primary, by a few thousand votes, and this, of course, means that Tydings is in trouble for the November election.

Hubert H. Humphrey was an easy victor in the Minnesota primary for the U.S. Senate seat vacated by Eugene McCarthy.

When Speaker John W. McCormack announced that he would not seek re-election, Louise Day Hicks and two other candidates immediately entered the race for Congress in this District. This woman is presently serving as a councilwoman on the Boston City Council and is quite controversial. According to reports this morning, Mrs. Hicks is the winner, and, since this is a large Catholic Democratic District, will apparently be sworn in as the Representative of the old McCormack District in January of next year.

You are surprised many times when prominent Members of the House either die or are defeated when you take a look at their successors.

September 17, 1970

The Committee on Public Works in the House and the Senate has full jurisdiction over the interstate highway system in this country. This Committee reported out the Interstate Highway Act of 1954 and the Bill was enacted and

signed into law. Our Capital City is under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States and not under the jurisdiction of the looters and the burners who have no respect for this city. The Public Works Committee, after watching for a period of some six years the failure of the District of Columbia officials to carry out the Interstate Highway provisions of the original act which are of great importance to connecting States such as Maryland and Virginia as well as other States on the Eastern seaboard, decided in 1968 that the Highway Act would force compliance by the District of Columbia. This decision was correct and according to law. For years now I have served as the scapegoat due to the fact that I do not intend to repudiate the Public Works Committee and am still insisting that the law be complied with in full.

Yesterday, the Public Works Committee again took action concerning the freeway system here in our Nation's Capital. An article appeared in the EVENING STAR entitled "Order Central Freeway Built, Hill Unit Asks." This article is as follows:

"The House Public Works Committee's subcommittee on roads today called for a congressional order to the District of Columbia to build the North Central Freeway as part of a 1970 Highway Act.

In the bill, which was to be formally introduced in the House today, the subcommittee also asked Congress to remove the District's South Leg Freeway from the Interstate Highway System.

Rep. John C. Kluczynski, D-Ill., subcommittee chairman, said the city must build the North Central, which has sparked protest demonstrations in the streets of Brookland, in order to obtain release of \$34.2 million in subway construction funds.

HATCHER'S BLOCK

Rep. William H. Hatcher, D-Ky., chairman of the House District Appropriations subcommittee, has blocked release of subway money for the second consecutive year until work on freeway proceeds to his satisfaction.

The subcommittee's action went against recommendations of the city government, which had suggested that the North Central be scrapped, and the U.S. Department of Transportation, which had proposed a 16-month study of the road.

A 12-month study of a North Leg Freeway and construction of an East Leg Freeway north of Bladensburg Road also were proposed by the subcommittee in its bill. The subcommittee is expected to vote on the bill tomorrow.

Although the 1968 Highway Act authorized construction of the East, North and South Legs and the North Central, the city was permitted to make recommendations on their exact routes. The new legislation says the routes must be those authorized in the 1968 act.

NO SUBWAY SYSTEM

"If the District government doesn't want to do it, there won't be any subway system," Kluczynski said.

"I love this city and I'm trying to do what's best for it," he said. "I can't understand why the city council and the mayor have listened to a Communist like Sammie Abbott (leader of anti-freeway forces here) and refused to build the freeway."

At a House committee hearing in 1954, Abbott was asked if he had been involved in activities of the Communist party.

Anti-freeway groups contend that adding freeways in the District would only encourage more automobiles to use clogged roads, add to air pollution and destroy established communities and parklands.

The District had no immediate comment on the subcommittee's action.

The Three Sisters Bridge is not included in the new bill. Its con-

struction was ordered in the 1968 act. The building of the bridge has been suspended by a court order until a public hearing on its design is held.

NORTH CENTRAL ROUTE

The North Central would run from the general area of Rhode Island Avenue NE, west of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad tracks to the Capital Beltway in Silver Spring near Forest Glen road.

A branch of the North Central, called the Northeast Freeway, would run east from Galloway Street NE to Prince Georges County, where it would connect with the portion of Interstate Route 95 that the Maryland highway department plans to build inside the Capital Beltway.

In 1969, work began on the North Central but after protests in Brooklands, a middle-class area where homes belong to blacks were being taken, Mayor Walter E. Washington halted construction. The homes were then renovated by the city for occupancy again.

The South Leg originally was planned to connect the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge with the Southwest Freeway.

Under the new legislative proposal, only a portion of the South Leg would be built as a ramp from the Roosevelt Bridge. It would be considered a spur of Interstate Route 66. Running in a

1,300 foot tunnel under Lincoln Memorial Plaza, it would surface to link up with Independence Avenue.

The North Leg would link the Potomac Freeway, along the Georgetown waterfront, with the East Leg, which would connect the Southeast Freeway with the North Central in a loop pattern.

NORTH LEG OPPOSED

Original plans for the North Leg called for it to run along the Florida Avenue - U Street NW corridor. That route was strongly opposed and the city suggested a route further south.

The city also had suggested to Congress that the East Leg, north of Blandensbury Road be abandoned and replaced with an Anacostia River Parkway.

Although Natcher has never spelled out exactly what he wants the city to do with the freeways to obtain release of subway money, Kluczynski's comments seem to confirm the belief of those who say the North Central would have to be built to satisfy Natcher.

Last year Natcher held up subway funds until he obtained assurances from President Nixon that roads would be built.

BILL GETS PRIORITY

The highway bill is expected to receive priority from both the Senate and the House in the remaining weeks of this congressional session."

In this morning's WASHINGTON POST appeared an article entitled, "Bill Orders City to Build North Central Freeway." This article is as follows:

"Legislation ordering prompt construction of the controversial North Central Freeway to Silver Spring was introduced in the House yesterday by a majority of the influential Public Works Committee.

One sponsor, Rep. John C. Kluczynski (D-Ill.), chairman of the unit's Roads Subcommittee, declared flatly that the building of North Central is part of the price for continued financing of Washington's Metro subway system.

The Roads Subcommittee will meet today to approve the measure formally, sending it to the full Committee for expected early action.

The measure would kill another Washington freeway, the south leg of the Inner Loop past the Lincoln Memorial and the Tidal Basin, which has been a special target of park officials and conservation groups.

The Washington provisions are part of a national measure, called the Highway Act of 1970, that would extend and broaden the federal road program. The measure's general nature heightens the likelihood of House passage.

Before passage, the measure also must clear the Senate, which has no comparable provision in its proposed highway bill and which has been less receptive to attempts to legislate a specific road program for Washington.

Although antifreeway leaders quickly condemned the House proposal, it was too early yesterday to predict whether public or official opinion could be galvanized — either to oppose the edict, or to urge its acceptance to move the troubled subway program ahead on schedule.

An aide to Mayor Walter E. Washington said the mayor had not seen the measure and had not comment. City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn, Jr. was out of the city.

Introduction of the measure ended growing speculation over how Public Works members would seek to enforce construction of a project that has been a major target of the freeway critics and a major goal of freeway advocates.

In addition to the route to Silver Spring, the House measure calls for

construction of the Northeast Freeway, a missing link in Rte. 95 to Baltimore and beyond.

Construction of the North Central-Northwest project was halted by a court decision in early 1967 and never resumed. Since then, the U.S. District Court also has halted work at least temporarily on the Three Sisters Bridge, a project the same House Committee required in the Highway Act of 1968.

The law also required the city government and Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe to make new recommendations to Congress on the North Central. The city's recommendation was to eliminate the road, Volpe's to study it some more.

The City Council at first resisted the 1968 measure, but eventually complied when faced with a threat of losing money to start building the subway.

Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles the city's budget, is an ally of the Public Works Committee on the roads issue. This year he refused again to grant \$34.2 million to continue subway work, an action that would trigger a total loss of \$198 million in construction funds from all sources.

Metro officials say the funds must be appropriated by the time Congress adjourns to avoid cutbacks in the program. The adjournment goal is Oct. 15.

The House bill's provisions also would require the construction of part of the east leg of the Inner Loop to link with the North Central near Blandensburg Road NE.

It would provide for a one-year study of the north leg of the Inner Loop, an east-west crosstown route that probably would be located somewhere between K and U Streets NW-NE and possibly involving tunnels beneath existing streets.

The measure also would authorize \$25 million to build the Palisades Parkway from the Three Sisters Bridge site to the Montgomery County line east of Glen Echo and \$65 million to widen the federally owned portion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to six lanes. Financing would be up to the Appropriations Committees.

The bill also would authorize the elimination of all grade crossings on the Penn Central Railroad's Metroliner tracks between Washington and New York, and between New York and Boston."

Within the next three years, another committee will take action which

will confirm the action of my Committee on Appropriations and the action of the Committee on Public Works. The provision which will be written into another bill will be one that the District officials must comply with or else receive no federal payment.

September 18, 1970

We finally finished the Legislative Reform Act of 1970 last night. This Bill almost set a record in the House from the standpoint of time consumed in the Committee of the Whole. Before we finished General Debate and again when the Committee rose, a number of Members were exceedingly nice in their commendations to me on the manner in which I presided during the General Debate. For instance, the Majority Leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma made the following statement:

"Mr. Chairman, now that we are nearing the end of a bill which has consumed more time than any other bill in several years in the House of Representatives, may I take the time to commend the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Sisk), for the courtesy, the diligence and the ability with which he has managed this very important and complicated bill. I congratulate him and his distinguished and able counterpart on the Republican side of the aisle, and the committee. I congratulate all

the members of the Committee on Rules.

I believe the Members of the House are to be congratulated on the interest they have shown in this matter, on the patience that the House has demonstrated. We have had fine debate. We have considered many amendments. We do not all agree on all of them, but I believe every Member can say that everyone has had his day in the House if not in court.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down may I say the House owes a deep debt of gratitude for the patience and skill with which the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has presided over the many sessions on this bill. His conduct in the chair has set high standards for those who will follow him in presiding over the Committee of the Whole."

Representative Sisk of California was the Member of the Rules Committee in charge of the Bill and he also made a statement concerning the manner in which I presided. His statement is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to express our deep appreciation to all Members of the House for the cooperation that we have had from all sources, the chairman and the individual Members of the House. At this time particularly I want to express my

personal appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the present occupant of the chair, for his patience with what at times I am sure have been rather amateurish efforts on my part. I wish to thank him for bearing with us. I appreciate his courtesy and appreciate the manner in which the Committee of the Whole has been chaired during the past many weeks. So I particularly want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky."

We have been confronted with the highjacking of planes by guerrilla groups in Jordan and Egypt. A number of planes highjacked and forced to land in Jordan have been destroyed and hostages are being held with demands made that prisoners be released by Israel. Prime Minister Golda Meir is on her way to present to President Nixon Israel's border terms which she will accept in the peace talks now underway in the United Nations. King Hussein of Jordan appears to be in serious trouble and may be ousted. The Jordanian Army is now fighting the Jordanian guerrillas in the streets of Jordan and especially in the Capital City. Jordanian Army troops and Palestinian guerrillas are now engaged in battle. The trouble in this part of the world is more serious today than it has been at any time since the Six-Day War.

An article appeared in the WASHINGTON POST this morning concerning the

Congressional Reform Bill entitled "Congressional Reform Passes House, 326-19." This article is as follows:

"A congressional reform bill designed to increase efficiency and fairness and end some secrecy passed the House yesterday after an 11-day debate stretching over two months.

This was more than the House has devoted to a bill in 20 years and the first time since 1946 it had considered a major bill to update congressional procedures.

The bill was passed by a vote of 326 to 19 and sent to the Senate. Action is expected there, but if the bill should get lost in the Senate's end-of-the-session rush, parts dealing only with the House could be put into effect by repassage as a simple House resolution.

The bill deals with every aspect of congressional life, but to the young reformers, the most important provisions are those to end secrecy in the House.

One provision added on the House floor would require that all votes taken in closed committee meetings be made public, listing how each member voted. Another, which reformers count as their biggest victory, would end the non-record voting by which most issues are

decided in the House.

The House does most of its voting while sitting as a committee of the whole where no roll call votes are permitted. When the body reverts to the House for final votes, no roll calls are permitted on amendments that were defeated in the committee of the whole. So members can hide behind the anonymity of a non-record vote to help kill amendments which they might feel politically required to vote for if put on the record.

The House voted to end this practice followed since Congress' beginning -- by providing that votes in the committee of the whole may be recorded. This would permit voters to know where their congressmen stand on all issues. The Senate permits record votes on all motions.

Defeated was an attempt to open all House committee meetings to the public, unless a majority votes to close it.

But the House did vote to admit television cameras to committee hearings for the first time, under certain limitations. The Senate had admitted TV for 20 years.

One section of the bill is aimed at improving sources of information

available to Congress to help it do its job. The bill would strengthen the Congressional research and legal staff and would require the executive branch to provide more information, such as a five-year cost estimate on new programs proposed.

But a proposal to create a joint Congressional committee to develop a computer program providing instant information was defeated.

A subcommittee headed by Rep. Joe D. Waggoner, Jr. (D-La.) has been at work for nearly two years on plans to provide a computer system for the House. Waggoner laid a letter to Senate leaders last year, asking if they wished to join in, wasn't even answered. So if a joint committee took over, the work of his committee would be wasted, Waggoner said. He plans to send a computer proposal to the House soon.

The reform bill contains two provisions aimed at stopping dilatory practices in the House. One would shorten the 30 minutes now devoted to quorum calls by stopping the call of the roll once a majority of members answer to their names. The other would end the seldom-invoked practice by which a single member can force the reading of the often lengthy journal of the previous day's session.

But some other provisions, aimed at protecting members' rights, would slow proceedings. The bill requires that House members be given three days to study reports on bills or conference reports before a vote is taken. Committees would be required to give dissenting members three days to file minority views on bills reported to the House.

A minimum of 10 minutes would be allowed in the House to debate motions to recommit (kill) bills and to debate any amendment despite agreement to cut off debate.

Just before it passed the bill, the House reversed, 187 to 156, an earlier action that would have banned all proxy voting in House committees. As passed, the bill forbids one member to give another blanket authority to cast his vote, but would permit proxy voting on specified issues.

The bill would protect minority-party members on House committees by assuring them time to present witnesses at hearings, assigning them part of the committee's professional staff and giving them one-third of each committee's budget. The minority would also control half the time for floor debate on conference reports -- final versions of bills. The one hour of debate is now controlled by the majority party member

in charge of the bill and is allocated as he pleases.

Attempts to end or modify the rigid seniority system that automatically elevates senior members to committee chairmanships were defeated, on grounds that this should be handled by the two party caucuses which are studying the issue. Also rejected was a proposal forbidding members to rewrite their floor remarks before printing in the Congressional Record.

The bill orders a study of whether to enclose the visitors gallery in glass and authorizes construction of a school and dormitory for congressional pages, to be named for retiring House Speaker John W. McCormack."

Representative Joel Broyhill, R-Va. stated to the EVENING STAR reporter today that when the District of Columbia Revenue Bill comes up before the Congress next week a clause will be added which provides that no part of the federal payment may be received by the District of Columbia until the city acts on highways. This time the provision will be written in such a manner as to be a permanent restriction on funds and should go a long way toward solving our problem. The article is entitled "Broyhill Asks D.C. Aid Freeze." This article is as follows:

"Rep. Joel Broyhill, R-Va., says he will introduce legislation designed to prohibit any federal payments to the District until the city complies with the 1968 Federal Highway Act by starting to build the North Central Freeway.

Broyhill said yesterday that it took similar action by the House District Committee last year -- the freezing of the \$105 million federal payment -- to get officials moving on some construction. The issue then was construction of the Three Sisters Bridge.

The next chapter in the fiscal tug-of-war will begin on Tuesday, when a House District subcommittee continues revenue hearings.

METRO FUNDS FROZEN

Broyhill pointed out that \$34.1 million to continue construction of the subway has been frozen by Congress this year until the city acts on highways.

Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., chairman of the House District Appropriations subcommittee, has said subway funds will be released as soon as the city moves on highways.

Broyhill said he will offer an amendment to the revenue proposal on Tuesday designed to prohibit future federal payments to the city until it complies with the highway act and with

any additional conditions that may be imposed by the House Public Works Committee.

A Public Works subcommittee yesterday included in the proposed 1970 Highway Act a condition that the District must build the North Central Freeway to Silver Spring.

FUQUA BACKS PLAN

Rep. Don Fuqua, D-Fla., chairman of the House District subcommittee, said he supports the Broyhill amendment. He predicted it would be included in the revenue bill.

Broyhill said that although he can't speak for the committee chairman, Rep. John L. McMillan, of South Carolina, he feels McMillan generally supports his amendment. McMillan could not be reached for comment.

The federal payment to the District has been a flat \$105 million, but District officials yesterday asked the committee to approve a new formula which would give the city an extra \$26.7 million this year.

30% OF TAX REVENUES

The formula would be based on a federal payment equal to 30 percent of the city's tax revenues.

Although the Senate already has approved the measure, chances are slim

that the formula will be approved by the House District Committee.

But judging by the reaction of committee members yesterday, a one-shot additional payment of some sort will probably emerge from the hearings. It's too early to predict the size.

Broyhill stressed that although he is sympathetic toward the need for additional federal payment, the need for following Congress' will must be brought home to District officials.

Freezing the subway funds penalizes the suburbs more than the District government, he said. Withholding revenue that the city needs should spur officials to the necessary action, he added.

Though he doesn't approve of "hostages," Broyhill said, Congress already has made the subway a hostage to the highway program.

As the hearings opened yesterday, Mayor Walter E. Washington made an impassioned plea for continued cooperation of Congress in a "partnership" to build a better Nation's Capital. The District budget, which Congress cut because there wasn't revenue to balance it, is "completely inadequate" and has sharply jeopardized the city's ability to deliver essential services, the mayor said.

September 21, 1970

Apparently President Nixon has changed his Southern strategy policy. For months now he and Attorney General Mitchell have clearly indicated that they would continue maintaining the policy of enforcement of civil rights legislation but would not penalize the South. This philosophy tied in with a strong Western Republican drive seemed to be the strategy which would be followed by this Administration on through to the 1972 election. Of course, President Nixon knows that the Labor vote is Democratic and the vote in the large cities is ordinarily against the Republican Party. A number of decisions from the Supreme Court and rulings from federal circuit court of appeals judges are right difficult to handle in the Attorney General's office with the Southern strategy being the guide. The President has made one or two trips to the South and in his speeches and press conferences, has endeavored to console the Southern States, but the Southern Governors Conference which will meet within the next few days in the deep South apparently is of the opinion that Nixon has turned away from the Southern strategy and is now looking to the East and big cities and attempting to woo Labor for his strength in 1972. You can see a distinct and clear change and apparently the election of George Wallace for Governor again of the State of

Alabama has had a great deal to do with the change in political strategy.

The visit of Golda Meir to this country concluded this past weekend and apparently Mrs. Meir was unable to convince President Nixon that there would be any chance to have the missiles removed from the Egyptian side of the Suez territory at this time and the position that Israel now takes is that there will be no peace talks until the Egyptians removed the missiles and discontinue the moves for further preparation for war, apparently did not meet with the approval of President Nixon. According to my information, the President informed Mrs. Meir that he would take this matter up concerning the removal of the missiles with the Soviet Union but had no hopes of success.

We have warned Syria not to participate in the uprising in Jordan. Jordan's fourth day of strife yesterday was marked by battles between King Hussein's forces and Syrian-based tanks. The United States is making every effort to save King Hussein and has warned Syria that such irresponsible and imprudent intervention could broaden the war in the Middle East and must stop immediately. The State Department informed the top men in the Soviet Embassy here to pass the word back to Moscow. It was the Soviet Union that supplied the tanks to Syria in the first place.

Just before leaving this country Premier Meir addressed a closed television circuit of dinner meetings held throughout this country for fund raising purposes for Israel. There may be no report as to the amount reached but it will total many millions. The rich Jews in this country have down through the years given unstintingly to Israel and will continue, and at the same time criticize this Administration and any other Administration who fails to take a hawkish position in regard to Israel.

We have more ships in the Mediterranean today than we have had for many months and United States infantrymen in West Germany have been alerted to stand by for possible use in evacuating Americans from Jordan. Should things go badly within the next day or two for King Hussein's 55,000 man army, threatening the security of Americans in Jordan and forcing a decision to evacuate, United States 7th Army Troops stationed in Europe would become the prime means to secure the airport at Amman and an escape route for civilians from the downtown area.

Sometimes I listen to television programs concerning the District government which are right amusing. Yesterday, Councilman Yeldell, who by nature of being a member of the Council also serves as Chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority,

said that if the City Council were forced to vote to build the North Central Freeway in order to obtain a federal payment, then he would resign as a member of the Council. He said that a number of members of the Council notwithstanding the fact that the District of Columbia is under the control of the Congress, believed that the Council had been pushed around too much by the Congress. He very vigorously and emphatically stated that if such a vote was called again, he would resign. He very piously stated that the vote on August 9 of last year which brought about a capitulation on the part of the Council and start of construction on the Three Sisters Bridge was as much as he could take and that he did not intend to capitulate again. Now the funny part about this whole story is that Yeldell is a Democrat and his term expires on February 1st of next year. He knows full well that under no circumstances will President Nixon reappoint him, and when he goes out of office then this is the last of Yeldell as far as all of the publicity that he has received during the past four years is concerned. Just to be real cute he might resign prior to February 1st because he too knows full well that his chances of being reappointed as a member of the Council, since he is such a controversial figure, are just as slim as his request was to be named Superintendent of Schools of our Capital City.

We have very little in the House this week. Today we have 11 bills under suspension with none of them controversial to any great extent. On Tuesday, we have a joint meeting of the House and the Senate at which time a number of wives of prisoners of the Vietnam War will be present to appear before the joint meeting and with some of them to make statements concerning the necessity of our country to take more vigorous action for release of war prisoners. After the joint meeting we will have four little bills from that point on only to adjourn over again on Thursday night until next Monday.

Notwithstanding the fact that there are a great many Members who believe that we will be here until about Christmas Eve, we still adjourn over on Thursday night to take care of the Tuesday and Thursday club when we should be meeting on Fridays and Saturdays a number of weeks which would permit us to adjourn a little sooner.

George Fallon of the 4th Maryland District is the last of the five Members who were shot in the House by the Puerto Ricans on March 1, 1954, to serve in the House and in the primary last week was defeated. He waited until the last minute to announce for re-election and apparently did not care too much as to whether or not he won. He was Chairman of the Public Works Committee and was defeated by 400 or 500 votes. Cliff

Davis died several months ago and Bentley and Jensen are dead with the only two surviving Members being Fallon and Kenneth Roberts of Alabama. Roberts is now practicing law in Alabama and here in Washington and was defeated in his primary several years ago.

September 22, 1970

John A. Volpe the former Governor of Massachusetts and now the Secretary of Transportation is quite a man. He scares easily and is a fast talker, hoping that talk will solve all of the problems and, in fact, that they will just disappear. He is one of the weak members of the President's Cabinet and has survived longer than I expected. In our dealings with him on the freeway-rapid transit system impasse we have on the Hill found him to be very unreliable. He has a bad habit of calling Members of Congress and in a general way saying nothing and then later issues statements to the press that he has gone into detail very carefully with this particular Member about the problem involved. This is, of course, a very unusual way for a Cabinet member to transact business. Finally, we have driven him out of the hole again in the freeway-rapid transit matter and now we will see just how he will operate with the three committees confronting him with an ultimatum concerning this impasse.

The three committees, of course,

are the Appropriations Committee, the District of Columbia Committee, and the House Public Works Committee.

In today's WASHINGTON POST there is an article entitled, "Volpe Seeks to Break Roads-Metro Impasse." This article is as follows:

"Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe disclosed here today that he has intervened personally in an attempt to end the freeway-subway impasse that again threatens the financing of Washington's Metro rapid transit system.

Volpe said he met last Friday with Mayor Walter E. Washington and other city officials in a previously unpublicized effort to resolve differences with the House Public Works Committee over construction of the North-Central Freeway to Silver Spring.

He said other contacts are being made with members of the Committee.

The Committee's Roads Subcommittee voted last week to require prompt construction of the controversial North Central, including a link to Interstate Rte. 95 to Baltimore and beyond.

Volpe ruled out dropping the North Central from the city's road system but said there is still room for changing its route or design. The city's last proposal was to put it alongside the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad tracks.

"It's got to be built somewhere," Volpe told a reporter after discussing the subject generally at a press conference at the American Transit Association's annual meeting here, "but you just can't slam it through without proper consideration."

The comments were Volpe's first on the subject since the Subcommittee approved the proposed Highway Act of 1970 last Thursday. Volpe clearly was reluctant to talk about the matter in detail because he said, of the "delicate stage of the negotiations that are going on."

"It would do little good to comment ... on how and what we're coming up with," Volpe said at the press conference.

The events sketched by Volpe follow the scenario of a year ago, when Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) was holding up money to start work on the 98-mile transit system.

Natcher, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees the city budget, is an ally of the Public Works Committee on the freeway program.

Last year, personal assurances by President Nixon on the freeway program were needed to break the subway money loose. The big issue then was an assurance of work on the Three Sisters Bridge

as required by the Highway Act of 1968 and now suspended by court order.

The 1968 law also required the city and Volpe to submit recommendations on the North Central, setting the stage for the now-renewed impasse.

The city's report urged elimination of the North Central. Volpe called for a new study. Natcher said the city position violated the spirit of the law, presumably in trying to eliminate a road that Congress clearly wanted.

Natcher's refusal to grant \$34.1 million would drastically curtail subway construction work in the coming year.

Meanwhile, in Washington, City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn, Jr. said today the North-Central issue was closed as far as the Council was concerned.

Hahn said that if Congress wanted to order the city to build the freeway the matter would not have to be voted on by the Council.

In August, 1969, the Council did have to vote its approval of the Three Sisters Bridge across the Potomac.

Hahn said no such vote is required now because the city is in compliance with federal highway law. That was not the case in 1969, he said, when the law

required the city to build Three Sisters and the city refused.

Hahn's statement that the Council could not take action on North Central was immediately disputed by freeway foe Sammie A. Abbott, chairman of the Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis. Abbott broke in at Hahn's press conference to tell reporters that "no freeways can be built in the District of Columbia without Council approval. They have the power to tell Congress you can't build these freeways."

Abbott also challenged a statement by Councilman Joseph P. Yeldell that Yeldell would resign before voting for North Central. Abbott said the Council members should stay and hold office, vote "no" on the freeways and mobilize the citizens against it.

Chairman Jennings Randolph (D-W.Va.) another speaker at today's transit meeting in Boston, said he opposes the House Subcommittee's North Central provisions, just as he objected to the Washington directives in the 1968 law.

But he refused to speculate on whether the House position would prevail if, as expected, it must be worked out in a joint Conference Committee with the Senate."

President Nixon's proposed visit to the Mediterranean reaffirms our interest in that crucial area. It will also warn Moscow which has joined Cairo in violating its cease-fire pledges to the United States not to take Washington's efforts for peace as a sign of weakness.

When I read the many articles that appear now in our papers concerning violence on our campuses, I again agree with most of our people that violence and terror have no place in a free society. I know that which corrodes our society even more deeply than violence itself is the acceptance of violence by our people.

We had a Joint Session of Congress today. Frank Borman, the astronaut in the Apollo VIII Mission addressed the Members of Congress. For the past several weeks Mr. Borman has traveled into 20 odd countries discussing the situation concerning our American prisoners now held in North Vietnam. The North Vietnamese will not release a list of those held and for over six years now has failed to comply with all of the provisions of the Geneva requirements concerning prisoners of war. He could say very little and, in fact, said no more than we read daily in our newspapers. The situation is serious because we know that a number of the prisoners were severely beaten and died as a result of the beatings.

The Apollo VIII Mission was the first mission to orbit the moon. There was no landing at that time but this mission paved the way for the Apollo XI and XII Missions.

With all of our trials and tribulations occasionally it does you good to read one of Art Buchwald's columns in the WASHINGTON POST. He is simply hilarious and the one that appeared in today's WASHINGTON POST entitled, "A Hairy Problem" is simply out of this world.

"A new book soon will appear on the market which will cause a sensation in scientific circles. It is titled "The Naked Man" and it was written by Frederick the III, a chimpanzee attached to the Rockefeller Institute. Frederick the III was involved in some enzyme experiments at the Institute which took up only a few hours of his day. Because he was restless, the directors gave him a typewriter to play with. You can imagine their surprise when instead of just messing around, Frederick wrote a book..

Frederick's book, and this is the shocker, claims that all chimpanzees, monkeys and apes evolved from man. He says that man was the first primate, before there were apes of any kind.

Frederick is not certain when man first appeared on earth, though he

suspects it was at least 30 million years ago. As time went on and man went through many stages, he started to develop many apelike qualities until today it is easy for apes to identify with man and realize how much they have in common.

Many apes and chimpanzees are horrified to think they resemble man in any way and a chimpanzee named Treetop, with the National Institute of Mental Health, has written a paper denouncing Frederick the III's thesis. Treetop maintains that although in some respects man is looking more and more like apes, the ape could not have possibly evolved from man. He has attacked Frederick the III's research on the grounds that, except for the few men he has come into contact with at the Rockefeller Institute, the only other men he has observed are flower children in the park that he can see from his caged window.

Frederick says in his book that the similarities between apes and man are greater than one might think. Man today is behaving like apes used to behave before they were civilized. Man puts great emphasis on territory and seems to be willing to kill to protect his turf. As a lower form of ape, man is unable to deal with any situation without screaming and shouting. Frederick cites examples where men have been

placed in large apartment buildings for lengths of time and have gone berserk.

Treetop says that man's behavior is more similar to rats than to apes, and while man behaves irrationally in almost any situation and may resort to extreme measures when endangered, it does not follow that just because men beat their chests and growl they belong in the ape family.

Frederick thinks that the primitive personality traits of man have been adapted by apes. Having studied man under laboratory conditions, Frederick has discovered that the eating habits and sex life of the homo sapiens follow a pattern similar to those practiced by modern apes. Survival seems to be the basic principle in man's jungle, and while apes do not resist to violence unless provoked, man has not evolved yet to a point in his development where he can tell why he behaves the way he does.

Treetop disagrees. He maintains that man has gone as far as he'll ever go, and hasn't changed from the day he was born. The instinct in men to destroy is so strong that it is slander to classify them in any way with apes.

Frederick's response to that is to cite King Kong's destruction of the Empire State Building as something man might do.

Treetop says King Kong was an exception to the rule, and it's unfair to use one gorilla's behavior as a sample.

In any case, when the book comes out there will be a continuing controversy about it. On one side will be the apes who would hate to acknowledge they have inherited any characteristics from man. On the other side will be those monkeys, chimpanzies and gorillas who will admit that some of their traits are possibly man-evolved, and will now try to deal with the problem in an apelike way."

September 23, 1970

When Representative Addonizio of New Jersey left the House to run for the office of Mayor of Newark, the word got around here in Washington that he had made up his mind to get rich. After being elected Mayor, he had only served a short time until there were rumors to the effect that he and others were receiving payments from contractors who were dealing with the city. Indictments followed and after a lengthy trial Addonizio was found guilty and yesterday was sentenced to 10 years in prison and fined \$25,000. This man, while serving in Congress, was a very quiet Member who appeared to vote and apparently was working hard to take care of his District. I recall that he was a good shortstop

and for five years we played together on the Democate Baseball Team in the House. He was much better than the average college ballplayer and made the team each year without any difficulty.

We are faced with a power shortage here in our Capital City and this shortage has swept up along the East Coast clear to the Canadian border. For years now we have received all kinds of opposition in Congress each time that we attempted to build dams which contain power units and also in the atomic energy program where reactors were to be used scattered throughout the United States. It seems to me that we are about 10 years behind with our power supply and next summer will be considerably worse than at the present time.

The sixth day of Jordan's war appeared last night to have been a standoff between King Hussein's forces and the Palestinian guerillas. The Palestinians claim that at least 10,000 had been killed and that Amman is burning. Here in Washington there was no word of any military intervention or of any new appeal from King Hussein. The White House calls the situation complicated, fluid and still serious. I do hope that King Hussein is saved once again because this is one of the few Arab countries that has indicated any opposition to the Soviet Union.

Believe it or not the freeway - rapid transit impasse continues. An article appeared in this morning's WASHINGTON POST entitled, "Mayor: City Will Build North Central Freeway if Ordered." This article is as follows:

"Mayor Walter E. Washington said yesterday that the city will build the controversial North Central Freeway if Congress orders it to do so.

But, the mayor argued at a House District Subcommittee hearing, the wishes of local citizens are being ignored by Congress, even though the city has complied with earlier federal highway legislation.

When Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.) said he did not think Washington was being treated differently from other cities on the freeway question, Mayor Washington replied heatedly:

"We came up with a local decision for an alternative to the North Central that Congress doesn't agree with. Now the subway and possibly the federal payment are being held hostage. Now, you tell me in what other city in this country you find this."

The mayor's comments came on the eve of action by the House Public Works Committee on a bill ordering prompt construction of the North Central route

to Silver Spring. The project was halted by a court decision in 1967 and then ordered restudied by the 1968 Highway Act. The city's study recommended eliminating the North Central in favor of an industrial highway paralleling New York Avenue NE.

Rep. William H. Natcher, (D-Ky.), chairman of the House D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee, has since insisted that the city is not complying with the spirit of the 1968 law. He has held up \$34.2 million needed to continue building the regional subway system until he is satisfied the city is complying.

Last year, Natcher delayed the city's subway funds until City Council agreed to build the Three Sisters Bridge—a project ordered constructed by the 1968 law.

Testifying yesterday at a hearing on the city's requests for \$28 million in new revenue, the mayor said repeatedly that the city is complying with the 1968 law. Work on the Three Sisters Bridge has been halted temporarily by a court order until public hearings are held on its design.

"How much longer should Congress wait?" Broyhill asked. "At some point, whether it's in 1990 or the year 2000, the city has got to move on with its highway program."

Broyhill has said that he will offer an amendment holding up approval of an increase in the annual federal payment to the city until the current freeway impasse is resolved.

He said he talked yesterday to Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, who is trying to break the deadlock, and he urged the mayor to "find out from Natcher where the misunderstanding is."

The EVENING STAR carried an article yesterday entitled, "Administration Moving To Free Metro Funds." This article is as follows:

"The Nixon administration has intervened in efforts to convince Congress to release Washington subway construction funds that for the second successive year have been frozen in a controversy over freeways.

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe said yesterday that he met Friday with Mayor Walter E. Washington to discuss strategy to obtain \$34.2 million in subway funds bottled up by the House District Appropriations subcommittee.

Federal Highway Administrator F. C. Turner also attended the meeting and Volpe said his office is in communication with the House Public Works

Committee. Its roads subcommittee last week approved a bill that would require the District to build the controversial North Central Freeway that has caused protest demonstrations in the streets of Brookland.

Although Volpe attempted to free the subway funds last year, Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, released them only after President Nixon assured him that construction would begin on freeway segments.

Natcher has again withheld the funds because of dissatisfaction with freeway construction. Some officials believe only personal intervention by Nixon again will free the money.

One member of the District City Council, Joseph P. Yeldell, has said he will resign if placed in the position of having to vote for the North Central to obtain release of subway money. Yeldell also is chairman of the area subway agency.

District City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn Jr. yesterday said the city government is powerless to stop construction of the road, if Congress really wants it built. Hahn refused to say whether he attended the meeting with the mayor and Volpe."

The Soviet Union's unmanned moon probe Luna 16 made a controlled soft landing in the Sea of Fertility on September 20. Luna 16 was launched on September 13. This was the first luna landing reported since the Apollo XII carried two men to the moon for an actual landing on November 11, 1969. This is the ninth in a series of luna probes by the Soviet Union and so far the Soviet Union has been unable to make a manned landing on the moon. Our Apollo XI and Apollo XII Missions really carried us to the top of the world space leadership.

Julian Barber, one of the newscasters for WJAL Television 7 from time to time interviews people on the street here in our Nation's Capital. Last week during one of these interviews the question was "Who is the most important person in Washington?" A number of persons stepped up to the microphone and said President Nixon was, and others said that Walter Washington the Commissioner of our Nation's Capital was the most important person. On one street corner a lady stepped up to the microphone and upon being asked the question, emphatically stated that Congressman Natcher from Kentucky, of course, was the most important person in Washington. A number of my colleagues have kidded me about this interview taking place and one of them asked me just today as I stepped off the little train

coming from the Capitol Building if I knew who the lady was. I immediately stated that I did -- it was my wife. Virginia may not think this is funny.

September 24, 1970

Several years ago I decided that we should have a new Central Library in Washington. At that time the Library Board of Trustees was composed of outstanding men and women and our Librarian, Mr. Peterson, was recognized throughout the United States as a good Librarian. At first, I had difficulty with the Senate Appropriations Committee but finally succeeded in placing into the bill that I am Chairman of, an adequate amount to start the new Central Library under construction. This building is a beautiful building and is almost completed. It will take the place of the old Central Library which was constructed in 1903 with Carnegie funds. We succeeded in selecting an outstanding architect and the building will be one of the most beautiful in Washington.

Yesterday, a woman by the name of Lola Singleterry, a Southeast Washington community leader was sworn in as a member of the District of Columbia Board of Library Trustees to fill an existing vacancy. Mrs. Singleterry was appointed to the nine member Board by Mayor Walter Washington to replace Dr. Albert W. Atwood, the 91-year-old Chairman, who

retired this year. Martin Scaller, the Executive Secretary to Mayor Walter E. Washington, administered the oath of office to Mrs. Singleterry. Mrs. Singleterry insisted upon and used a copy of the autobiography of Malcolm X instead of the Bible. Just as soon as the oath had been administered, Mrs. Singleterry said -- "For the life of Malcolm -- right on."

Of course, Washington knew better than to select such a person to fill the vacancy on this Board, but he is afraid and is subject to the whims and demands of the dissidents of this city. He would render a great service to our Capital City if he would resign tomorrow as Commissioner. He gave himself the title of Mayor and certainly has demonstrated no leadership since assuming this office and is more interested in attending social functions at the embassies where he is wined and dined than in confronting the serious problems facing our Capital City.

An invasion force of tanks and artillery from Syria was pulled out of Northern Jordan yesterday as a major Jordanian offensive appeared underway. It now appears that our alarm over the Jordan War has eased somewhat since King Hussein's army appears to have won its confrontation with Syrian tanks. I do hope that we are not confronted with an Executive Order from the President

sending our boys into Jordan for any purpose.

Yesterday the Public Works Committee in the House approved the Highway Act of 1970. A positive stand was taken concerning the freeway impasse here in the District of Columbia. An article appeared in this morning's WASHINGTON POST entitled, "House Unit Backs City Freeway Bill." This article is as follows:

"The House Public Works Committee yesterday approved a bill ordering Washington's city government to start building the North Central Freeway to Silver Spring.

Compliance by the city with the bill's requirement is believed to be the price for release of \$34.2 million to continue building the regional subway system. The money is being withheld in the latest phase of the city's subway-freeway deadlock.

Mayor Walter E. Washington said earlier this week that the city will build the controversial freeway if Congress orders it to do so.

The Public Works Committee's action, which included the North Central requirement as part of a new national highway bill, is expected to be upheld by the House. House passage of the bill is, in turn, expected to produce

a replay of the battle between the House and Senate Public Works Committees over the 1968 Highway Act.

The 1968 law ordered the city to build the Three Sisters Bridge over the Potomac and to restudy the North Central Freeway.

Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) refused to grant money for the subway until the D.C. City Council voted in August, 1969, to build the bridge. Natcher is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee that approves the city budget and has aligned himself with the Public Works Committee.

After the city government last February recommended dropping the North Central, Natcher said the city was not complying with the "spirit" of the 1968 law and withheld further subway funds.

Since then, Mayor Washington and Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe have been trying to negotiate a solution with Natcher and the House Public Works Committee.

In addition to requiring the freeway route to Silver Spring, the bill approved yesterday also calls for construction of the Northeast Freeway, a link between the North Central and Interstate 95 to Baltimore. Work on both projects is to begin "not later

than 30 days after the date of enactment of this act," according to the bill.

The bill would eliminate the proposed south leg of the Inner Loop, a route that was to have gone by the Lincoln Memorial and the Tidal Basin.

It also states that the city government and Volpe are to study another controversial project -- the parth leg of the Inner Loop -- and report back to Congress within a year.

Earlier in the day, D.C. City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn made clear to a House District Subcommittee that he didn't think some congressmen understood the freeway building requirements they themselves had placed on the city."

An article appeared yesterday in the Washington DAILY NEWS entitled, "Mayor, Broyhill Debate Revenue." This article is as follows:

"Mayor Washington intent as the congressman told him city officials "should be in constant contact" with House committees, on the freeway dispute, said, "Mr. Broyhill, don't you think we have tried to do just that? No one in this Congress has told us where we are not in compliance."

With the Mayor insisting that the District has complied with the 1968 Highway Act and Rep. Joel T. Broyhill arguing that it has not, the freeway dispute -- currently the pivotal factor in the city's revenue and transportation future -- received its fullest airing yet on Capitol Hill yesterday.

Rep. Broyhill has said he will seek to make a federal payment increase which the District is requesting contingent upon the city's building the North Central Freeway, in order to free Federal money for Metro.

The subway funds are being held hostage by Rep. William H.atcher, D-Ky., chairman of the House District appropriations subcommittee, who has withheld the money for the second year because of dissatisfaction with road construction.

Rep. Don Fuqua, D-Fla., chairman of the subcommittee before which the mayor was testifying said Monday that Rep. Broyhill's requirement will be included.

The mayor stood firm in arguing that the city's recommendation that Congress build an industrial freeway along New York Avenue instead of the North Central complied with the 1968 law, which, he said, called for the city to study a proposed route and to suggest alternatives.

The mayor said consideration has to be given to the District's local interests, and the Congress cannot ram an unwanted road down the citizens' throats. In making his strongest public statement on the issue, the mayor said where the highway is built is a "local decision." Now where else do you apply this standard in America of having Congress decide where a road is to run, he asked.

"Well, of course, this is the nation's capital," Rep. Broyhill replied.

"We have no desire to hold up a payment," Rep. Broyhill said. But he added, "You haven't complied yet."

In response to a question from Rep. Broyhill, the mayor said, "I feel we not only should -- but would" comply with legislation that ordered specific roads to be built.

Afterward, Rep. Broyhill said he was "afraid they (the city) won't comply unless we write it into the bill," and said "the objective now is to get the mayor together with heads of the public works committee and Rep. Natcher."

The mayor warned that the city will have to start firing employees unless it receives at least \$13 million to sustain unanticipated mandatory costs during this fiscal year. A city budget

official said if the District receives only a \$13 million federal payment of \$26.9 million it is seeking, "We would have a serious problem."

On Tuesday, September 22nd, a full page add appeared in the Washington EVENING STAR with the top headline reading, "Responsible Americans Can No Longer Be Silent -- These Officials by talk and action have encouraged the enemy to continue the Vietnam war." Then, the following were named in bold type: Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D), Sen. George McGovern (D), Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D), Sen. Albert Gore (D), Sen. Charles Goodell (R), Sen. Birch Bayh (D), Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D), Sen. Mark Hatfield (R), Sen. Edward Kennedy (D), Sen. John Cooper (R), Sen. Frank Church (D), Rep. Allard Lowenstein (D).

September 28, 1970

William Natcher Jirles entered this big wide world last night weighing some 8 lbs. 3 oz. Celeste has three little boys and just simply had her heart set on having a little girl. Darwin is jubilant and Celeste and William are doing just fine. I always wanted a little boy but made up my mind that if we had one, I would give him a little tricky name like Kelly or some thing that would be real easy to remember and never give him a junior

title. Burdening a child with the good and bad of his father has always been to me a mistake, and I made up my mind that if we ever had a boy, I would never name him after me. Nevertheless, I am still real pleased at the fact that Celeste and Darwin wanted this little boy to be named William Natcher Jirles.

President Nixon's air voyage on Saturday to the Mediterranean will be followed throughout the world during the next 10 days. According to my information, the President's trip is to dramatize American power and commitment to peace in what is rapidly becoming the crisis center of the world. The President would like to do this in a low-keyed, friendly visit to five nations of Europe. The first five of President Nixon's eight days abroad will be directed one way or another toward the Middle East. President Nixon will visit elder Soviet statesman President Tito in Yugoslavia and then more briefly go to Madrid to meet the ruler in the Western Mediterranean Generalissimo Franco.

Our daily battle with the freeway and rapid rail transit still continues. An article appeared in yesterday's WASHINGTON POST entitled, "Road Act Repeal Backed." This article is as follows:

Law Required City To Build Freeway Net

The Senate Public Works Committee yesterday voted to repeal the 1968 law that told Washington's city government which freeway projects it had to build.

The action clearly draws a line for a conference battle with the House Public Works Committee. The House group was responsible for the section in the 1968 Federal Highway Act that ordered the city to build The Three Sisters Bridge and restudy the North Central Freeway.

Earlier this week, the House Committee approved a 1970 Highway Act containing the further requirement that the city begin building the North Central route to Silver Spring.

The Senate vote to repeal the 1968 law came as part of approval of its version of a 1970 Highway Act. The section striking the 1968 D.C. provisions was proposed by Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) and adopted unanimously.

Mayor Walter E. Washington and City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn Jr. learned about the Senate bill immediately after a joint morning press conference at which they reiterated their opposition to the North Central Freeway.

It was the city government's refusal to build the Three Sisters Bridge across

the Potomac, as order by the 1968 law, that led to Rep. William H. Natcher's refusal to grant funds to begin building the regional subway system. Natcher (D-Ky.) is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee that handles the city budget and a supporter of the Public Works Committee's position.

The first-year money was released after a vote by the Council to build the bridge and personal assurances to Natcher from President Nixon.

An impasse developed again this year when the city's restudy recommended eliminating the North Central in favor of a highway paralleling New York Avenue NE, and altering the routes of several other projects. The North Central would have displaced families in the residential Northeast area, while the city's proposed route would go through an industrial section. Natcher, charging the city with failing to comply with the "spirit" of the 1968 law, then withheld \$34.2 million in subway funds for the current year.

Cooper Was Opposed

Cooper, the ranking minority member of the Senate Public Works Committee, opposed the section dealing with D.C. highways when it was passed by the House in 1968. The Senate bill did not contain any section on Washington roads, but the House prevailed in the ensuing conference.

Yesterday's decision by the Senate Committee was seen as an attempt to prevent a recurrence of the 1968 conference by providing ammunition that the Senate conferees could bring to this year's negotiations with the House.

Cooper said in a statement after the vote that the decision to repeal the 1968 section "does not oppose or support any particular highway system or any specific part of a system for the District.

"It expresses a principle which had been adhered to by the Congress prior to 1968 -- and that principle is that it is not the function of Congress to prescribe and force upon the citizens of a state or the District of Columbia a particular highway construction program. It is the proper function of the local government to make the original decision and then to submit their plans to the Secretary of Transportation for approval," Cooper's statement said.

Joint Statement

The question was raised in the Committee session as to whether repealing the 1968 law would affect projects--such as the Three Sisters Bridge--on which construction already has started. The Committee decided, according to a spokesman, that the repeal action would not have the effect of halting or starting any specific highway project.

At the press conference in the District Building, the Mayor and Hahn, in a joint statement said, "The City Council . . . and the mayor have approved a comprehensive freeway system for the District . . . this is acceptable to its citizens and approved by the officials appointed to direct them. This system does not include a North Central Freeway."

The mayor and Hahn declined comment on yesterday's Senate action, but Councilman Joseph L. Yeldell, who is also chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, termed it "great." He said the provisions of 1968 Highway Act concerning the District were "basically repugnant."

We have this past week warned the Soviet Union against building a strategic submarine base in Cuba. Our information is that a permanent Soviet missile submarine base is under construction at Cienfuegos, a deep water port on Cuba's southern coast. President Nixon has warned the Soviet Union against such a base, and in doing so, reiterated the United States' policy that was enumerated during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis by President Kennedy who at that time said that peace could be maintained if Soviet offensive weapons were removed from the Caribbean and kept out in the future.

It now appears that Representative Sam Friedel, one of the Representatives from Baltimore, Maryland was also defeated in the primary. The official tabulation released on Saturday shows him some 300 votes behind and since five or six of the machines were not locked during the day when in use by the voters, there will probably be a law suit. The machines that were not locked were in the Black section and Friedel's opponent was a Black man, ~~Parson~~ Mitchell, who by the way is the son of Clarence Mitchell the head of the NAACP. George Fallon, another Representative who has about 1/3 of the City of Baltimore was defeated in his primary and as I pointed out he was the Chairman of the Public Works Committee. Friedel is the Chairman of the House Administration Committee.

For a number of years now Friedel who is a Jew has been one of the great advocates of all of the civil rights legislation and has been very vehement in his criticism of some of the Members who voted against civil rights legislation.

Grandma is on her way. Virginia called me this morning informing me that William Natcher Jirles had arrived, and she can hardly wait to get to Cambridge, Ohio to start rocking this new grandson.

September 29, 1970

President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt, the most powerful leader in the Arab world, died yesterday after a heart attack, at the age of 52. Nasser was struck by a massive and severe heart attack after returning to his home from the Arab Summit Meeting attended by King Hussein and Guerilla Leader Yasser Arafat and others. At this meeting it was generally agreed after the signing of an agreement that fighting in Jordan would cease, and the Palestinian guerillas would cease their action. This death comes at a bad time because it is generally believed throughout the world that the peace talks that are now underway between the Arab countries and Israel might produce results. Certainly this death will delay any agreement which might have been attained at the peace talks and takes out of the picture the one man who might have been able to have kept the other Arab leaders in line. President Nixon and this Administration have worked hard to bring about this peace conference between Israel and the Arab countries, and I know that the President must be really disappointed.

Yesterday President Nixon visited Pope Paul at the Vatican and today is aboard one of our carries in the Mediterranean.

William Natcher Jirles and Celeste are doing just fine and Grandma should arrive during the day.

During the 17 years that I have served as a Member of Congress I have heard a great many speeches on the Floor pointing out the necessity of maintaining a strong Navy, Army, and Air Force, and in making the admonitions from time to time Members have mentioned the Soviet Union. At no time have I seen legislation enacted by the Congress which specifically spells out the danger or points out the fact that the Soviet Union could and probably would be the culprit and for this reason the Congress understanding full well the urgency of maintaining a strong military force knows the part that the Soviet Union is playing today in the Middle East especially which is an ever present danger to world peace. H.R. 17123 which is an act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons which passed the House and the Senate this year and that made its appearance before the House in a Conference Report which was almost unanimously adopted, carries on Page 20 under Title V -- General Provisions, the following language:

"Sec. 501. The Congress views with grave concern the deepening involvement

of the Soviet Union in the Middle East and the clear and present danger to world peace resulting from such involvement which cannot be ignored by the United States. In order to restore and maintain the military balance in the Middle East, by furnishing to Israel the means of providing for its own security, the President is authorized to transfer to Israel, by sale, credit sale, or guaranty, such aircraft, and equipment appropriate to use, maintain, and protect such aircraft, as may be necessary to counteract any past, present, or future increased military assistance provided to other countries of the Middle East. Any such sale, credit sale, or guaranty shall be made on terms and conditions not less favorable than those extended to other countries which receive the same or similar types of aircraft and equipment."

September 30, 1970

The Constitutional Amendment for direct popular election of the President suffered a severe setback yesterday when the Senate by a 53-34 vote refused to cut off a filibuster against the proposal. This was a move to envoke closure and force the Amendment to a direct vote. The election proposal first was sent to the Senate Floor on September 8 and a filibuster developed led by Senator Ervin of North Carolina. This proposal

passed the House last year and since this is the Second Session of the 91st Congress apparently is now dead. The small States object to a direct popular election because they maintain that the vote of the State of New York would control the vote of some 10 or 11 smaller States. Those Senators who have filibustered maintain that the left-wing philosophy of the Eastern seaboard would control this country. I voted for the Constitutional Amendment for direct popular elections last year.

President Nixon has experienced difficulty with a number of the Commissions that he has recently named to study present day problems. The Scranton Commission Report on Campus Unrest fixed a certain amount of the responsibility on the President and according to Vice President Agnew yesterday, any attempt to lay responsibility for ending student disruption at the door step of President Nixon who has only been in office 20 months is scapegoating of the most irresponsible sort. The Vice President says that the President cannot replace the campus cop. Of course, this statement was approved by the White House and since the Commission was right carefully selected, former Representative Scranton and former Governor of the State of Pennsylvania was expected to do better by the President. I believe that the responsibility to curb campus unrest, of course, must lie directly with the campus

officials including the Governor and the Board of Regents. It seems to me that any attempt to place the responsibility upon the President is wrong.

The wartime Journals of Charles A. Lindbergh are now in the bookstores. The author of these Journals, of course, at the time he recorded his thoughts was no longer the national hero and the object of world acclaim. He was rather a man repelled by the adulation of the mob, and very much hurt over the terrible ordeal of a child's kidnapping and death, and very much embittered by the trespass of the press upon his privacy. Throughout his Journal he was confident to the end of the rightness of his own opposition to American entry into World War II. Recently, Mr. Lindbergh stated that upon re-reading his Journals he was of the opinion that we won the war in a military sense but in a broader sense it seemed to him that we lost it for our Western civilization is less respected and secure than it was before. In one of the Journals we have a clear picture of just how secluded and isolated Lindbergh was and especially from opinions which differed considerably from his own. Early in the Journals he came to an opinion that England's military inferiority was certainly evident in 1938 and that this country seemed hopelessly behind in military strength in comparison to Germany. This conclusion, of course, was somewhat correct.

I sometimes wonder about people who keep Journals. As far as I know, this is the only Journal that is being kept by a Member of Congress today and some people years from now may be really amused at some of my conclusions.

October 1, 1970

The Fourth Estate generally and especially the Left Wing Section have for years editorialized the need for a new change in the seniority system in the House and the Senate. They base their opinion on the fact that most of the chairmen are now old men and from safe Districts and States, and that they are no longer able to keep up with the times and operate efficiently. Of course, the main reason for newspapers such as the Washington Post and others who have harped on this idea for years is the fact that these men as a general rule are not subject to the pressures and the threats that come down from the ivory towers occupied by people who are afraid to offer themselves for public office but at the same time want to run this country. The Legislative Reform Bill which passed the House several weeks ago made no radical changes in the selection of committee chairmen. The Republicans have been out of power so long in the House and especially the left-wing rebels believe that the ranking minority member on each committee should not necessarily be the senior member of that particular

committee. We have in the House a man by the name of Barber Conable from the State of New York who has been in favor of abolishing the seniority system ever since he has been a Member. It simply rankles a lot of the freshmen that they are not permitted to occupy positions of seniority and especially today we hear more about this every day from the Republicans in the House. Conable has suggested that the Republican Committee on Committees nominate one member for the top position on each committee, chairman or ranking Minority Member as the case might be, with all of the GOP members casting a secret vote either approving or rejecting the nomination of the Republican Committee. If rejected, then the GOP membership would in turn elect the member to assume the ranking member position or the chairmanship. So far the Republicans have not turned this plan down and may adopt it beginning with the 92nd Congress. The Washington Post and one or two other newspapers are simply jubilant because they hope that if one party took the plunge, then the other would be under heavy pressure to follow. They continue hollering that seniority is really a serious problem since 16 of the Committee Chairmen are from the South, and with only 22 Standing Committees in the House, this is just too much. The radical press and especially its newspapers that go way over on the side that cause a great many of us to wonder just what they do believe in,

- 3830 -

want to run this country and especially dictate to the Congress of the United States. This is not new because all down through history we have instances of where the Congress finally rebels and fights back and this, of course, is the stage that we have now reached again in the operation of the legislative branch of our government.

I have always been glad that I am not a Member of Congress from one of the big city districts. In fact, I do not believe that I could have survived and kept an organization district. Today, during the lunch hour, Leonor Sullivan who represents one of the St. Louis Districts, was talking about how difficult it was now to raise campaign contributions and to stay in office. Her husband, John Sullivan, was in then defeated and back again and then defeated. She is now serving her 19th year and informed us that the organization in St. Louis requires a payment each January of 10 percent of her salary. This, of course, is over \$4,000 and in addition to this payment, she has to make payments each month of \$10 per precinct for each ward in her district. There are some 30 wards in her district. She then has to make up these amounts in campaign contributions to stay alive and according to her conversation today, it has simply been a rat race for several years now.

October 2, 1970

Occasionally one of our columnists writes an article which really is factually correct. Joseph Alsop, in his article today entitled "Cooper-Church Fizzle" describes accurately just what transpired with this publicity stunt which was held in the Senate and consumed, by the way, some seven or eight weeks. Mr. Alsop says that for months the titanic drama of the Cooper-Church amendment absorbed the Senate, convulsed Washington, and covered the front pages with acres of breathless, though not deathless prose. Its final passage by a very narrow majority, was saluted as a decisive trial for the fashionable forces of neoisolationism. Mr. Alsop says further that after this positively Wagnerian clamor, one does not like to be deflationary, but common honesty compels the report that the Senate's passage of the Cooper-Church amendment has now turned out to be the super-non-event of 1970. The amendment is dead. This was brought about by the House of Representatives and Mr. Alsop says that the House is much more remote from the eloquence of editorial pages whose kind words affect most Senators as a dramatic critic's unlooked-for praise affects a broken down actor with died hair and bunions. The real feelings, Mr. Alsop says, of the "great rancid American people" are rather more accurately represented in the House

than in the Senate. I could not agree with Mr. Alsop more.

In the Congress we do not believe in raising prices as a general rule. Public Law 91-276 recently passed by the Congress and signed into law by President Nixon on June 12, 1970, authorized the Public Printer to fix the subscription price of the daily Congressional Record, as approved by the Joint Committee on Printing. Beginning with the first session of the 92nd Congress, the monthly subscription rate will be \$3.75. The subscription rate per year will be \$45 without adjustment. To simplify single copy sales, a set price of 25 cents has been established rather than price each daily edition by the number of pages. The previous rate was set at \$1.50 per month in March 1883. This is the first increase since that time.

Speaking of the Congressional Record, I have in my office a bound set of the First Congressional Record which started with the 43rd Congress in 1874. I have the bound set for the 1st and 2nd Sessions of this Congress. In addition, I have a complete set of the Annals which began in 1789 and a complete set of the Debates which began in 1824 and a few copies of the Globe which followed the Debates. The Congressional Record follows the Globe and in fact I had been a Member of Congress for a

number of years before I found out that the Congressional Record did not start in 1789.

October 3, 1970

Unemployment is today 5.5% and this is the highest level in more than six years. The national unemployment rate is the highest since January 1964, the Labor Department announced today. Total employment in September was 78.2 million.

President Nixon received a tremendous ovation in Madrid, Spain yesterday with the crowd estimated at about one million. The President said later that this was the biggest crowd he had ever seen in any of his trips abroad.

We have another march for victory here in Washington today at noon. Reverend Carl McIntire is leading this march and this is a march for victory. This minister together with a number of other ministers are pleading for a military victory in Vietnam. Police estimate the crowd today at about 50,000.

The Senate has approved the Public Works bill and certain portions of the bill pertain to the freeway system. An article appeared in yesterday's Evening Star entitled "Senate's Okay Expected For Freeway Fund Hold". This

article is as follows:

"A measure that would permit the District of Columbia to stop building controversial freeways was expected to receive swift approval in the Senate today.

As the bill that would repeal 2-year-old legislation ordering the freeways headed for a vote, members of the Senate District Committee considered a proposal--already tentatively approved--to cut off all city freeway funds unless subway funds are released.

The Senate appeared headed on a collision course over freeways with the House of Representatives, where steps are under way to force the city to build the North Central Freeway in order to obtain \$14.2 million in subway construction funds.

Subway Funds Depleted

Directors of the area subway agency were warned by their staff yesterday that they may no longer take any "meaningful" action until Congress settles the subway-freeway impasse.

Already appropriated subway funds will be spent by the end of this month, said Jackson Graham, general manager of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

In a report last night on its highway bill, the Senate Public Works Committee said, "It is essential that Congress not order construction of specific highway segments or bridges in any state."

The report said that for federal highway building purposes, the District is considered a state.

Natcher Stalls Funds

But a House Public Works Committee-approved bill would order the District to build the controversial North Central Freeway through Northeast Washington to Silver Spring.

Committee members say Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., will only agree to release subway funds if work on the North Central begins. Natcher, chairman of the House District Appropriations subcommittee, is blocking release of subway money for the second year in a row because of his dissatisfaction with freeway building.

The Senate District Committee has decided privately to send to the floor for a vote a proposal to cut off freeway funds, if necessary to counter the House moves holding up subway funds.

Specific Language

Sen. Joseph D. Tydings, D-Md.,

committee chairman, is to circulate among the committee members specific language of the measure that would be introduced as an amendment to the District borrowing-power bill.

In the House District Committee, however, Rep. Joel T. Browhill, R-Va., has threatened to introduce an amendment to the city's revenue bill that would withhold federal payment for the District until work on the North Central Freeway begins.

Sen. John Sherman Cooper, R-Ky., in the Senate Public Works Committee report said the 1968 Highway Act has been incorrectly interpreted by House members "to require construction of... highways...without regard to any local or federal laws."

The 1968 legislation, he said, "rather than solve the controversy in the District...has inflamed it."

Work Suspended

Last year, the District agreed to build certain freeway segments--including the Three Sisters Bridge--to persuade Natcher to free the subway money. A court order has suspended work on the bridge.

Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, said he agreed with Cooper that ordering

the District to build roads sets a "dangerous precedent" which might be applied to states.

"The citizens of the District, like the citizens of any state, should be free to plan transportation and highway systems with which they must live," he said."

October 5, 1970

President Nixon returns to Washington tonight. Nasser's death just about destroyed all of the publicity for the President's trip abroad, and it may be that the President's rating, which is now at an all time low, will not go up at all as a result of his trip to Ireland, Yugoslavia, Spain, and to the Mediterranean. This, of course, was the purpose of the trip and I know that the President must be right disappointed.

The freeway builders and proponents have for a number of years now been severely criticized over the type of roads to be constructed and the location. The criticism has been very severe. Now it appears that the Washington Area Subway Planners are really under attack. A report recently released by the National Transportation Safety Board of the Department of Transportation charged that the Metro Agency is building a hazard-filled rapid transit system. The report further goes on to state that the potential for

disaster becomes a formidable possibility because of the proximity of Metro tracks to regular railroad tracks and highways, and further, the absence of emergency exits from tunnels and the design of the cars present a distinct hazard. Now the planners for the Metro system are attempting to defend their planning and the fight continues on and on. One thing that the people here in this country and in Washington generally should understand is that the rapid transit system will not cost \$2.5 billion but nearer \$4 billion and will be the largest single public works project ever undertaken in this country. With all of our domestic matters concerning housing, crime, hunger, education, and pollution, this is a right big undertaking to have underway.

Spiro Agnew is the hatchet-man for this Administration and is now parading all over the country calling the 91st Congress "the do nothing Congress." In most of his speeches he says that this Congress is unable to agree on most of the important matters pending on the calendar. He apparently has overlooked the fact that on a number of bills, which was right surprising to me, all of the Members present and voting, voted one way. For instance, on the bill to improve the program of assistance for treatment of alcoholics, the vote was 369 to 0; to provide a 15% increase in annuities and to change the method of

Computing interest on investments of the Railroad Retirement Fund, the vote was 379 to 0; to improve the judicial machinery of the Customs Courts, the vote was 301 to 0; to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require banks to maintain certain records, the vote was 302 to 0; to amend Clause 19 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives dealing with lobbyists, the vote was 381 to 0; to strengthen the penalties for illegal fishing in the territorial waters and the contiguous fishery zone of the U.S., the vote was 315 to 0; to authorize guaranteed and direct loans to veterans for the purchase of mobile homes, the vote was 297-0; to provide for federal railroad safety and hazardous materials control, the vote was 358 to 0; to regulate the mailing of unsolicited credit cards, the vote was 301 to 0; to improve the operation of the National Park System by the Secretary of the Interior, the vote was 325 to 0; to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the vote was 358 - 0; Agree to conference report to amend the Public Health Service Act, the vote was 377 to 0; to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, to liberalize certain criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for benefits, the vote was 313 to 0; to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, the vote was 337 to 0; to increase rates and income limitations relating to payment of veterans' pensions and parents'

dependency and indemnity compensation, the vote was 314 to 0; Veterans' Home Loan-Life Insurance Act, the vote was 326 to 0; To amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, the vote was 338 to 0; to amend Title IX of the Public Health Service Act, the vote was 364 to 0; and to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the vote was 345 to 0.

October 7, 1970

President Nixon announced yesterday that he will in an address to the Nation at nine o'clock tonight unveil a major new proposal for peace in Indochina. According to rumors here on the Hill the plan will include some form of proposal for a cease fire in the war zone, and will deal with the war in Cambodia and Laos as well as Vietnam. During his trip abroad, the President generally discussed this plan with representatives of the Governments of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos and he said it would be the most comprehensive statement ever made on this subject since the beginning of this difficult war.

The President of Bolivia resigned under pressure yesterday and this now brings on a battle for power between two rival military forces. The President, Alfredo Candia, has only been in a short time and up until the last

several weeks appeared to be right well entrenched as the leader of one of the military factions. Bolivia has really had its ups and downs in the last ten years.

The Senate on a roll call vote of 59 to 5 enacted the Legislative Reform Act of 1970 which passed the House several weeks ago. For a while it appeared that the Senate would not consider this Bill and the fact that it passed without too much difficulty comes as somewhat of a surprise.

Stephen E. Ambrose has recently completed a book entitled, "The Supreme Commander." This book deals with the war years of General Dwight D. Eisenhower and according to some of my friends is a right good book. In one of the local papers we had a book review of this particular book by former General J. Lawton Collins. General Collins was the Army Chief of Staff from 1949 to 1953 and from February 1944 to the end of the war commanded the Seventh Corps under General Eisenhower in Europe. Several years ago I served for three years on the Board of Visitors at West Point with General Collins and during our three day stay at West Point, General Collins, on a number of occasions, informed us that during World War II he was in a position to really judge the abilities of Dwight D. Eisenhower. He inferred that General Eisenhower had, up to the

time that he was chosen as Supreme Commander, commanded no unit larger than a battalion. General Collins stressed this point time after time and in reviewing the book entitled, "The Supreme Commander," General Collins very frankly states that after reading his own review, he was struck with the repeated references to British - American squabbles and disagreements and further, that had it not been for Eisenhower's modesty and warm friendly nature, along with his unquestioned integrity, his leadership would have been contested daily by Montgomery and others instead of just spasmodically. General Collins points out in the review that General George C. Marshall was a staunch defender of Eisenhower's policy as Supreme Commander and, since he succeeded in having him named as Supreme Commander, certainly did everything in his power to defend his every action. General Collins, while somewhat critical in his review, was just a little more magnanimous than he was in making his statements to us at the Board Meetings in West Point.

October 8, 1970

Several months ago we passed the Women's Equal Rights Bill and this followed the signing of a discharge petition by some 220 Members in the House. Martha Griffiths, a Representative from Detroit, Michigan, was the sponsor of the

Bill in the House and has spent several years attempting to get the House to adopt this legislation. I signed the discharge petition at her request and also introduced a companion bill. There are a number of constitutional lawyers in the House and the Senate who are bitterly opposed to this Equal Rights Amendment and maintain that the States will not adopt the Amendment. Such an Amendment, of course, requires a two-thirds vote in the House and the Senate, and heretofore the Senate has adopted a women's equal rights amendment on several occasions, but never the House. Now the Bill is up for General Debate in the Senate and Senator Edward F. Kennedy along with Senator Mathias of Maryland has offered an amendment providing for the election of two senators in the District of Columbia and an appropriate number of representatives according to the population. Senator Kennedy and Senator Mathias, of course, consider this quite a publicity trick and have received a lot of publicity throughout the United States since offering the amendment. Senator Kennedy maintains that he is against the Women's Equal Rights Amendment but if the Senate adopts his amendment concerning the District of Columbia, he, in turn, will vote for the Women's Equal Rights. Mrs. Griffiths is very much alarmed over the amendment that has been offered in the Senate and, on the House Side there are a great many Members who believe that

Manny Celler, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and one of those bitterly opposed to the Amendment at the time it was brought up in the House, will, in a conference, kill or nullify the Bill if it carries the District of Columbia provision. Mrs. Griffiths has received publicity throughout the 50 States and hundreds of thousands of women have backed her all the way. It is true, and I understood fully at the time that I offered a companion bill, that a number of provisions concerning alimony, laws, limitations on women's overtime work, the right to be inducted into the armed services, and a great many other constitutional rights of millions of women, might be affected. I have voted for equal rights as far as race, color, and creed is concerned and the great majority of the women in this country do not believe that adoption of such an amendment by three-fourths of the States would automatically nullify all women's benefit laws and force the drafting of women into the armed services. The battle will continue on for the balance of this Session and unless adopted in the Senate, of course, will die since this is the Second Session of the 91st Congress.

President Nixon last night proposed a cease-fire in place without preconditions to break the logjam in the negotiations for peace in Indochina. The ceasefire was the major new provision

In a five-point program Mr. Nixon described to the Nation in a fourteen minute television address delivered in a calm and unemotional tone. The other points were a call for an Indochina Peace Conference, a willingness to negotiate an agreed time table for a total U.S. troop withdrawal, principles of a political settlement and immediate release of prisoners of war.

A cease-fire in place is right unusual when you consider the fact that in South Vietnam there are no lines defined which our troops have installations and with the enemy on the other side. This is a war of villages. Some villages are controlled by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese and others are controlled by the South Vietnamese. In some instances, during the day time some of the villages are controlled by the South Vietnamese, and at night are under the control of the Viet Cong. This is a jungle war where we are engaged in hundreds of small spots throughout the country. We try to maintain control over the large cities but our efforts have proven in vain on a number of occasions because you cannot distinguish between the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese and the Viet Cong float around during the day time as well as at night. I would not think that there is any hope that North Vietnam and the Viet Cong will leap to accept the Indochina cease-fire that President Nixon offered last

night. At best, it might bring about considerable curiosity on the part of the Communist side to stimulate questions and consume some time at the Paris Peace Talks which are now at a complete standstill.

Another major bill which we passed in the House yesterday by a vote of 341 to 26 gives to the Federal Government, new powers to crack down on organized crime and terrorist bombings. A few Liberal Members in the House, of course, jumped up and maintained that the rights of the defendant were being violated. These Members apparently overlooked the fact that the rights of the innocent are just as precious as the rights of the law violators. This bill along with other things provides that federal judges can impose on a convicted felon an extra sentence up to a maximum of 25 years if it shows that the defendant had two prior felony convictions. The extra sentence, of course, could not be greater than the maximum allowed for the crime for which he was convicted. This section provides that not only the defendant but the Government could appeal the judge's decision to add the additional sentence. This bill seeks to provide racketeers from infiltrating legitimate business by making it unlawful to invest illegal income in business. It would also make illegal gambling a federal offense under certain circumstances. The House added a provision which authorizes the FBI to

investigate college bombings and would require licensing of all who manufacture explosives or carry them across State lines. The bill further authorizes the Government to protect witnesses in organized crime cases and narrows the immunity granted witnesses testifying under compulsion about crimes in which they may have been involved.

October 9, 1970

We passed the Defense Appropriations Bill yesterday in the House and much to our surprise we only had a few amendments offered. The Bill contains \$66.6 billion and all efforts to cut programs in South Vietnam and Europe were defeated. We reduced the Bill \$2 billion before we took it to the House for final passage. Some effort was made to write into the Bill, and especially into the Conference Report, certain policy statements concerning the war in Vietnam and concerning future wars in matters along this line and these proposals were defeated. We always have considerable fun on the Floor when George Mahon, our Chairman, of Texas and Mendel Rivers, the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee have their little clashes. Mendel Rivers is quite a character and he not only wants to recommend the programs and authorize the amounts to be spent, but he wants to fix all of the amendments. This, of course, does not suit my Chairman and

since George Mahon, in addition to being Chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, is the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he vigorously maintains the position of the Committee.

The Defense Department hopes to trim the size of the Armed Forces by 300,000 men by next July and 300,000 more by mid 1972. The cuts will reduce the number of men in uniform from the current total of 3,000,000 to 2,700,000.

The Legislative Reform Act of 1970 Conference Report was adopted in the House last night about nine o'clock. There were very few changes and the House concurred with the Senate changes and we then sent the Bill on to the President for his signature. One provision of this Bill that will keep me moving right fast is the section concerning roll call votes on all teller votes. Heretofore teller votes were votes where the Members simply passed up the center aisle and were counted. Some of the most important provisions of bills were decided on teller votes and since they have never been recorded in the Congressional Record, the public generally never knew just exactly how their congressmen voted on teller votes. Teller Votes follow amendments which are offered during General Debate and before the Bill comes back to the House for final passage. We will have about

20 minutes to be recorded on teller votes and those Tuesday and Thursday Club Members will really have their problems.

The Senate Finance Committee yesterday refused to approve of President Nixon's landmark welfare reform bill. The vote was 14 to 1, and this Committee reported out only a scaled-down measure which permits only limited test runs of the family assistance plan with no specific date for putting it into operation nationwide. This means that some form of a family assistance program bill will reach the Senate Floor after the election recess and will no longer be bottled up in Committee. The White House hopes to have enough votes in the senate when the Bill comes up to change that provision concerning the limited test runs and to make this legislation permanent and in the same form as it passed the House. I voted for this Bill and really voted for it with tongue in cheek.

Today at noon the Speaker stopped by the table where I was having lunch and introduced me to one of the bishops from Boston.

Before leaving to go to the table where they were to have their lunch, Mr. McCormack said to me that he believed the best way to select the members of the Little Hoover Commission, as

provided for under the District of Columbia legislation, was to simply sit down with Walter Washington, the present Commissioner, and let him name the members. The Speaker stated that he had so much confidence in Washington that he believed that this would be the best and simpliest route to take. Here again we have another right good example of the bad judgment which John W. McCormack uses from time to time. In the District of Columbia we had to place a limit on the Commissioner and the District Officials in so far as employees were concerned because the number was well over 41,500. When you consider the fact that we only have 746,000 people in the District of Columbia, 41,500 is a tremendous number of employees; in fact, more than any city in the world. The size of the city of Washington and the limitation placed in the legislation last year forced the District Government to cut off some 700 or 800 employees that were not necessary. Those who know will tell you that the District of Columbia has so many employees that they don't have enough assignments for all of them and in several of the Departments it is simply a matter of keeping out of the way of the Director of the Department. The budget for the District of Columbia now is in the neighborhood of one billion dollars. The Federal grants are running about \$375 million and these grants are not subject to revision or rejection by the Congress. They are automatic in so far

as the District Government is concerned and compose a major portion of the annual budget for our Capital City. The Mayor's chauffeur last year received over \$17,000, which included about \$10,000 of overtime. Night trips to the British Embassy and to the many different functions here in Washington forced the chauffeur to be out late at night hauling the Commissioner and his wife around town. A thousand instances could be cited where money is squandered here in our District Government and in setting up the Little Hoover Commission to investigate the expenditures as well as the needs of our Capital City, the Congress had in mind that those who were selected would be impartial and qualified people. The criticism is directed solely at the Commissioner Walter Washington since he heads the District Government and when you consider the fact that the Speaker believes that the simplest and easiest way to name the members to be selected by the Speaker in conjunction with recommendations from me, as Chairman of the District of Columbia Budget Committee, and John McMillan, Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, it is another good example of just plain bad judgment. Rather than to get into an argument with the Speaker in the presence of his Bishop I simply refused to concur with his statement and just looked at him. When the time comes to discuss the matter in the privacy of the Speaker's Office,

Certainly I will make the point that the Commissioner of the City of Washington should not name the members of the board who are to investigate the officials of the City of Washington and the operation of the Capital City.

October 12, 1970

A number of events have taken place in the offices of certain Cabinet Members or just outside of their offices which to me is simply outrageous. On Friday of last week black demonstrators protesting alleged racial discrimination by the Department of Housing and Urban Development chased Secretary George Romney down ten flights of stairs when he tried to evade them. The chase ended when Mr. Romney slammed his car door in the face of one of the pursuers and the car drove off. Upon leaving his office, the Secretary attempted to use one of the elevators and the demonstrators were in the hallway and all around the elevator entrance. They did not permit the door to close so the elevator could go down and the Secretary finally pushed his way out of the elevator and went down the stairway with the demonstrators shouting obscenities and pursuing him, a former Governor and a former president of American Motors. Secretary Romney certainly, like a great many other outstanding men who from time to time have accepted assignments in our Federal Government, must

now believe that this incident, together with several others, that has occurred simply is too much since life at its very best is short.

Yesterday's WASHINGTON POST editorial entitled, "Lame Ducks and a Crippled City," still clearly indicates that this left-wing newspaper is unable to rule our Capital City and is still crying over its failure to do so. This editorial is as follows:

"As dependent on the whims of Congress as our colonial government must be, the annual packing of the legislative bags does not necessarily make for misty eyes at city hall. After all, the overseers' departure to the hustings gives city officials a chance to breathe a while -- without all that extra breath over their shoulders.

But this year, the signals for any municipal glee are off. For one thing, the big bosses' absence will be temporary; and for another, they're not leaving us any allowance to spend on essential government services. Now Washington has been left low and dry before, but the current fiscal situation has become intolerable. Even if this is just a one-month recess coming up, the effect of inaction now on a desperately needed revenue bill for the city is likely to drag the process right through the first half of the current fiscal year.

In July, which was the beginning of the budget year, we listed a number of important things that were awaiting action in the Congress, with revenue legislation -- authority for tax increases, a higher federal payment and new borrowing -- at the top of the list.

Today, except for passage of a bill providing for a nonvoting delegate to the House, not one of the measures on that list has cleared the Hill, and the need for revenue has become even more desperate. Last month, Mayor Walter E. Washington delivered an exceptionally strong plea for action, stating that "the tightening of our belts is at the point of pinching harder than we can stand." Not only have personnel freezes been put into effect and services cut back (not to mention the inability to provide any new programs), but the local government is being saddled with uncontrollable spending increases due to mandatory salary increases, inflation, police overtime, an unexpected swelling of the welfare caseload and a rise in the number of prisoners at the D.C. Jail and Lorton, to list a few.

Last Thursday, the House District Subcommittee that is considering the City's revenue requests decided not to hold a meeting. Action by that subcommittee would move a bill to the full Committee, which could then scout up a quorum for action. Then there could be floor consideration, generally taken on

" District Day," which after the recess would fall on Dec. 14. Let's see -- then there is the agonizing process of the joint Senate-House conference, passage of a conference report and signing into law by the President. Moving along unsmartly, the congressional cycle could begin again, this time with the appropriations subcommittees, to enact permission and specific directions for the city on how to spend whatever the Revenue bill winds up providing. All of this, you understand, would be taking place with the dedicated, thorough interest generally found in an infirmary of lame ducks from faraway ponds.

It was fortunate, at least, that Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) and Rep. William H.atcher (D-Ky.), chairmen of the two appropriations subcommittees on the District, did move along a half-loaf budget last June, without waiting for the rest of the revenue requirements to be met.

Now, about those other important items on the list:

1. The subway system remains in serious trouble, with no resolution yet of the age-old subway-freeway impasse that has locked funds for one transportation system with directions for the other.

2. The bus system, which seems to get attention only fleetingly in times of

crisis, is sure to roll right into another fare increase because the House has ignored a Senate-passed bill for public takeover of the lines, and because neither house has provided for a continuing public subsidy.

Still another development has occurred that merits urgent congressional attention. George Washington and Georgetown universities' medical schools may be forced to close down unless Congress promptly provides them with money that other medical schools normally get from state governments.

It might have helped things a great deal if the administration had applied its weight more impressively on these local legislation items. That help was there for a nonvoting delegate, and it worked. But the only strong administration pitch we've heard lately was an unfair attack by Attorney General John N. Mitchell on Sen. Joseph D. Tydings (D-MD.) for not immediately producing Senate District Committee approval of all 18 judgeship nominations that were just submitted by the White House. Senator Tydings had made a very reasonable decision to consider 10 of the nominations right away, and now has agreed to hold hearings on the entire list. But Mr. Mitchell, despite some all-too-familiar setbacks on some other high judicial nominations, seemed to think that his stamp of approval should be good

enough for the Senate, without any further checking.

Finally, as we suggested in July (and countless times over the years), if Congress really feels overburdened by all these local matters, it could turn them over to the people, who could elect some leadership with time to care and a mandate to perform."

Representative William Bankhead served for a number of years as Speaker of the House of Representatives. He was an outstanding Congressman from Alabama and was the father of Tallulah Bankhead. My good friend, George Andrews of Alabama, in the House Restaurant today told us a real cute story about Mr. Bankhead while he was serving as Speaker. He wrote his daughter, Tallulah, a letter when she was at the height of her fame and said quite frankly that he had become sick and tired of just being known as Tallulah Bankhead's father. He informed his daughter that in about two weeks the people in their home town in Alabama were going to have a Billy Bankhead Day and thousands of people would be there to pay their respects to their fellow townsman who was holding the highest position in the House of Representatives. He invited Tallulah to be sure and attend and she accepted. The streets were blocked off in a great many sections of Mr. Bankhead's home town and there was a tremendous crowd of people gathering

to pay their respects to Billy Bankhead. A large delegation were at the railroad station to meet Mr. Bankhead when he got off of the train and just before the train arrived, a farmer drove into town with his team and wagon and when he attempted to drive down the usual street that he entered each time that he had to go to town to make purchases, a policeman stopped him and informed him that the street was blocked on that particular occasion due to the ceremony which was to start a few minutes after the train arrived. The farmer inquired as to what the occasion was and the policeman said -- "Why don't you know this is Billy Bankhead's Day, and he is coming home?" The farmer inquired -- "Where has he been?"

While we were having lunch my old friend George Andrews of the Third District of Alabama told us the story about his first election. He was elected in 1945 while serving in the Navy in Honolulu. He was a Lieutenant Junior Grade and all during the war and especially in Honolulu he had been bowing and scraping to admirals and captains and commanders. When the word got out in Honolulu that Lieutenant Junior Grade George Andrews had been elected to Congress from the Third District of Alabama, a big reception was held at the Officers' Club and George was invited. The admirals were there and the captains along with the commanders and they were all very kind and courteous to the new Congressman. The

Ranking member came up and put his arm around George's shoulders and said, "Why, Lt. Andrews, where have you been? I don't recall meeting you since you have been stationed here in Honolulu." George says he wanted to give him a good answer, but he just decided to smile and thank him for his courtesy.

In this particular race, Mr. Blount, the father of the present Postmaster General of the United States was George Andrews' campaign chairman. There were eight running and most of them were in service and this was George's first race for Congress. When the votes had almost been completely counted, Mr. Blount issued a statement as campaign chairman for George Andrews that his candidate had won by 8500 majority. About two hours later Mr. Blount issued another statement that his candidate had won by 3500 majority. Early the next morning Mr. Blount issued a statement that his candidate had won by 1000 majority. Along up toward noon, when the votes had finally been counted with all the absentee ballots in, Mr. Blount issued his final statement -- his candidate, George Andrews, had won by 44 votes. This was the actual vote and George Andrews defeated his seven opponents with the final vote being 44 majority in favor of Andrews. One of George's friends wrote him a letter which he received in Honolulu in a few days after the election in which he stated that it was a good thing that Mr. Blount had stopped issuing statements because he had almost counted him out of the race.

October 15, 1970

Congress recessed yesterday and will return on November 16. This gives those with opposition a chance to make a whirlwind campaign and the rest of us can travel in our District. This is a good time for me to travel because I have no opposition and the people would be very cognizant of the fact if I did not travel extensively this year. I will go home this afternoon and rest up a couple days and then start in.

Secretary Volpe called me yesterday and after a long-winded conversation, said that he would make a loan to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority until we worked out the freeway-subway impasse. Personally I explained to him that this would have no effect on the impasse and that it was just a waste of time because when we return we will have to go right back to the point that we were leaving at the beginning of the recess.

An article appeared in today's WASHINGTON POST entitled, "Subway Funds Offered." This article is as follows:

"Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe yesterday announced his readiness to make \$57 million in emergency loan funds available for subway construction here and thus temporarily sidestep the city's freeway-subway impasse.

The action amounts to a momentary end run around congressional refusal to release subway funds unless a number of freeway projects here are started.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the financially beleaguered subway agency, had estimated earlier it would have to stop advertising construction contracts at the end of this month without a congressional appropriation. It now says that, with the emergency loan, it can continue letting contracts through November for construction lasting for months after that.

"I am today directing the urban mass transportation administrator, Carlos C. Villarreal, to entertain an application for an emergency loan . . . to enable the Metro program to go forward uninterrupted and unimpeded by confusion and controversy over particular freeway projects," Volpe said in a formal statement.

The announcement was met with jubilation by city officials.

Mayor Walter E. Washington and City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn, Jr. said in a joint statement that area citizens "have reason to be grateful."

Joseph P. Yeldell, city councilman and WMATA board chairman, applauded Volpe's action as "extremely timely, thoughtful and innovative."

WMATA spokesman said they expected the emergency loan application and approval to be swift and routine. More money will be needed to continue letting contracts after the beginning of the year.

Yeldell said that the first order of business of the WMATA board, which holds its regular meeting today, will be approval of a resolution authorizing prompt filing of the HUD loan application.

Hahn and Mayor Washington said Volpe's action "protects the \$180 million of area taxpayer and federal money that is already invested in the subway and should enable the subway board to go ahead with a \$130 million bond issue."

Yeldell said the loan is crucial to creating the "proper climate" for the bond sale.

Construction of the 98-mile Metro system has been underway since the beginning of this year, with more than \$100 million already obligated.

Progress has been imperiled on several occasions when Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.), chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, refused to release subway funds unless the city agreed to construct certain specific freeway projects.

Most recently, \$34.2 million in subway funds was deleted from the city's budget. In the Highway Act of 1968, Congress ordered the city to build the controversial Three Sisters Bridge across the Potomac River from Arlington to Georgetown and other freeway projects. The city acquiesced last year and subway funds were released, but construction on the Three Sisters Bridge has since been halted by court order pending further hearings.

This year, a majority of the House Public Works Committee, in its version of the 1970 Highway Act, is demanding construction of both Three Sisters Bridge and the North Central Freeway through Northeast and Northwest Washington. A Senate version provides for repeal of the freeway construction requirements in the 1968 Act.

City officials speculated that the emergency loan may tide WMATA over until nearly the end of the year, and with a new Congress starting in January, a more "favorable" atmosphere may develop with a number of possible and actual House committee membership changes. Natcher may leave his post as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, and Rep. George H. Fallon (D-Md.), who was defeated for re-election, will not return as chairman of the Public Works Committee.

The conjecture about the change of chairmanships probably will not take place

because certainly I have not made up my mind to turn over this chairmanship until after the budgetary matters before our committee are finally settled. I have served on the Appropriations Committee for 16 years and in addition to being Chairman of the District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee, am number two on Agriculture Appropriations and Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mike Kirwan, the Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, died and there will be changes. The Chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee wants to take the chairmanship of the Public Works Subcommittee and then this move would make me chairman of Agriculture Appropriations if I agreed to the move. At this time I do not intend to agree.

November 16, 1970

We recessed on October 14 and will start again today. During the Recess Period I travelled 3700 miles in my 20 counties and received a wonderful reception. With the exception of the last two campaigns, I made the most thorough canvassing of our District that I have made since I have been a Member of Congress.

During the Recess Period Charles De Gaulle died. France is now a widow.

The COURIER-JOURNAL is still editorializing throughout the newspaper and not just on the Editorial Page. To say the least, there is quite a difference between Barry Bingham, the present owner and publisher, and Henry Watterson who published the newspaper for a number of years. I never have placed myself in the position of taking orders from Barry Bingham, and all down through the years he has demonstrated the fact that so far he has been unable to control the Second Congressional District of Kentucky.

An article appeared in the Passing Show of the COURIER-JOURNAL on Sunday, November 8, 1970 entitled "The Natcher Enigma: A Headache for Washingtonians." This article is as follows:

"For a sizable number of the politically unhappy residents of this federal city, the confirmation last Wednesday that William H. Natcher would be returning from Kentucky to his ninth full term in Congress did not help breakfasts digest any easier. For next to a small handful of other powerful legislators who work their will on the voteless, frustrated and Congressionally controlled District of Columbia, William Huston Natcher of Kentucky comes closer than anyone else to being a genuine "bete noire" in these parts.

One view is that of the D.C. Citizens' Referendum Committee, which is at odds with Natcher over his insistence on

starting a freeway system in the city before he unfreezes federal money for a much-needed subway.

Calling him "a run-of-the-mill politician," the committee accuses Natcher of "unabashed extortion" whose freeway position has forced the greatest humiliation on any city "since the Emperor Caligula made his horse a Roman senator."

Strong words, indeed, for a congressman who achieved in last Tuesday's elections a new level of mastery of his own career, a mastery which very probably augurs an even longer grasp on Kentucky's Second Congressional District seat.

Local ill will toward the lean Kentuckian is intensified by his utter refusal to debate the subway issue with Washingtonians and by his traditional unavailability to the press. Shadowy reports of the man's eccentricities give rise to more suspicion.

Natcher was re-elected Tuesday without opposition -- an outcome assured when the primary elections failed to produce a single opponent from either party to run for the seat.

Natcher's achievement of political indomitability put him among the elite 48 representatives who faced no opposition on Tuesday. Among the 48 were names that

truly comprise the power establishment in the House -- Wilbur Mills (Ways and Means), Carl Albert (speaker-to-be), Mendel Rivers (Armed Services), George Mahon (Appropriations) and W. R. Poage (Agriculture).

All happen to be Southerners, and Democrats like Natcher, and all happen to reign in safe districts made seemingly immutable by time, tradition and political wheeler-dealerism. There's something of a difference, however, in Natcher's case.

Natcher doesn't represent what ordinarily would be termed a safe district. Reapportionment has altered its boundaries from time to time. The district is larger by four counties than it was when Natcher was first elected in 1953; fewer than half of the 20 counties he now represents were in that original district.

As redistricting has moved the boundaries farther north to touch Jefferson County and farther east to abut with Franklin County, Natcher has been taken farther from his home base in Bowling Green.

Most theorists agree that coming off a 1968 victory that gave him only 56.4 per cent of the vote to a position in 1970 in which he was unchallenged is a tribute to Natcher's political adroitness.

"It's a phenomenal thing," remarked Earle C. Clements, the former governor

and U.S. senator who once represented the old Second District. "But what you missed is that Bill campaigns the year before the election . . . covers his district. That's the year when people want to see a politician, when he's not asking them for anything, when he shows an interest in what they want. He does it cleverly, intelligently."

Another thing Natcher has going for him, of course, is his essentially conservative voting record, which seems to dovetail nicely with the feelings of the basically rural Second District. He's never too far to the left, nor too far to the right, and although the special-interest groups tend to rate him somewhat to the right of center, he also manages to get good marks from farmers, teachers and labor organizations.

Those who know Natcher and those who sit with him in Congress agree with Clements that there is very little that he does not do cleverly and intelligently—however much they might disagree with his motivation or the outcome of his actions.

Partly by luck, partly by persistence, partly because he knows how to play the game, partly by cleverness Natcher has risen to a position of substantial power and influence in the House of Representatives, although he rarely is in the headlines for anything other than his mystical recalcitrance on the freeway-subway issue here.

His power comes to him largely by virtue of his No. 9 ranking on the 51-man House Appropriations Committee, which holds the purse-strings to all federal spending and which Natcher himself unabashedly (and probably accurately) has called "the most powerful committee in the House."

Because he's brassy enough to pull off such a feat, Natcher got on the committee when he came here (that rarely happens to freshmen) by virtually demanding it. He ingratiated himself with the late Clarence Cannon, who then was chairman, and Cannon agreed that Natcher was needed on the committee.

Eight years later, Natcher accepted, at Cannon's request, the thankless chairmanship of the committee's District of Columbia subcommittee, which in effect makes him finance chief for the nation's capital. He ranks No. 2 in seniority on the subcommittee for agriculture appropriations and No. 2 on the subcommittee for Health, Education and Welfare and Labor Department appropriations.

As second-ranking man, Natcher has become increasingly involved in those subcommittees' activities, often acting as chairman of hearings and carrying the committee ball during House floor debate.

While capitalites may damn the seniority system that made Natcher the District bogeyman, they may also have it

to thank for eventually getting him out of their hair: There is talk that next year Natcher may become chairman of the agriculture appropriations subcommittee, a post that would give him an even greater say over what Uncle Sam does for Kentucky-which concerns him far more than the District of Columbia. Natcher replies "no comment" to these reports.

Serving on the Labor-HEW and the Agriculture subcommittees, Natcher is in a key position to funnel all sorts of federal largesse to his district and to the state of Kentucky as a whole. The dams, the rural-electric and soil-conservation programs, manpower training, tobacco research and dozens more federal-aid projects in the state live and die by what Natcher and his colleagues do with appropriations requests.

"His district will be watered over with dams one of these days," said an old friend of Natcher's on Capitol Hill the other day, referring to the congressman's zealous pursuit of public-works projects.

This is the sort of remark that draws a good-natured response from Natcher, well aware that he's being accused of the most flagrant kind of pork barreling. "They say, 'What else do you want for Kentucky?'" the congressman said one day as he discussed his committee work. "I always say, 'Well, we're 100 years behind...Reparations, that's what we want.'"

In a sense, that deeply held feeling for the welfare of his state has been an impediment of Natcher's obtaining greater political glory for himself. He has had the opportunity to run for governor and for U.S. senator, but turned it down on the grounds that he didn't want to sacrifice his Appropriations Committee seniority.

Since the Appropriations hearings all are held in secret, men such as Natcher work in relative obscurity. The public learns of their actions only by reading voluminous after-the-fact records or through their contacts with the press.

Customarily, Appropriations members don't do much talking for the record. Natcher publicly does as little talking with reporters as any of the members, particularly if they happen to be Washington reporters who want to know more about his position on subways vs. freeways.

The monastic reserve that keeps him above the fray has given rise to all sorts of suspicions among Washingtonians that Natcher is linked to conspiratorial highway and automobile lobbies that want to push freeways down the city's throat.

As the furor over subways and freeways has intensified in the past several years (Natcher again has frozen next year's subway money), more and more efforts have been made to trace the

supposed ties between Natcher and the special-interest gangs.

Magazines and newspapers have assigned investigators to the subject. The Washington Post last year sent a reporter to Bowling Green to check out Natcher, As was the case with others who had tried, the reporter came up with blanks -- not even the slightest suggestion of impropriety on Natcher's part.

What investigators come up with, as is confirmed by people who like and dislike Natcher, is a puzzling pastiche of a man who, if not eccentric, is at least a tincture of what is commonly thought of as other century puritanical virtue and thrift.

Always conservatively attired and groomed to a fault, Natcher wears stiffly starched white shirts. He doesn't smoke; doesn't drink; is deeply devoted to his family; drives a well-used automobile. His thoughts, his triumphs and his defeats are recorded in a personal daily journal that next year will go into its 18th leather-bound volume. The books are kept in an office safe, and only members of the Natcher family are allowed to read them.

He has a mania for several things. One is attendance. He hasn't missed a single roll call since coming to Congress, and he once vowed that he would build such a perfect record that it would never be

toppled. He routinely reports to news-
men his cumulative attendance score at
each year's end, and is irritated if it
isn't printed.

Natcher's other mania is his work.
He arrives early each day and leaves
late, often coming to his Rayburn Build-
ing office on weekends, where he
immerses himself in a mountain of papers
in a tiny workroom. He handles his own
personal mail.

Remarking on Natcher's penchant for
work, a federal-agency official who
knows him said: "A friend of mine saw Rep.
and Mrs. Natcher on the boardwalk at
Rehoboth Beach one day and Natcher looked
completely bored, as though he couldn't
wait to get back to his office."

Politically, Natcher has another
side. He scrupulously avoids accepting
campaign contributions from anyone --
running his campaigns with his own money,
at least as far as he knows, a fact which
makes him a rarity. Rather loquacious
in private, Natcher is quick to condemn
those of his colleagues whose affairs
smack of impropriety, and he has let some
of them know how he feels.

Washington subway proponents find
facts such as those above hard to recon-
cile with their own devil theory of the
Congressman's insistence that both free-
ways and subways be built into a "bal-
anced" transportation system here.

What most don't realize -- and they would have no way of realizing, since Natcher doesn't talk -- is that his intractability most likely goes directly to his background and his reverence for Congress as an institution.

Many find it hard to believe when he says simply that the freeways must be built because Congress passed a law in 1968 directing that they be built. "As long as that law is on the books, I'm going to see that the District complies with it," he once told a reporter. That Washington should be free and independent of Congressional interference and control does not seem to occur to him.

At an early age Natcher was somehow inspired with the idea of the majesty of Congress. And for almost as long as anyone can remember, being a congressman was the central goal in his life.

He was born on Sept. 11, 1909, on a farm in rural Warren County. One of his earliest childhood memories is vintage Americana, and it perhaps says something about what he has made of his life.

In a reminiscent mood one day, he recalled how, as a youth, he and his brother Frank and other youngsters used to rush to the nearby farm of Col. Emmett Logan when the word would circulate that Henry Watterson, the famed editor of The Courier-Journal, was there for a visit.

Watterson and Logan would sit at a

cement table in a grove of beech trees, talking politics and occasionally nipping at a flagon of bourbon. The kids would sprawl under the trees and listen enraptured for hours to this worldly discourse.

Bill Natcher was infected with that. As a teen-ager he talked about someday going to Congress. By the time he was 17, he was working for the Democratic Party in the Hendricks Tobacco Barn Precinct, making a favorable first impression in that tough area.

After local public schools and graduation from his hometown Western Kentucky University, he borrowed money and worked part-time to pay his way to Ohio State University, where he won a law degree in 1933.

Natcher returned home to practice law in 1934. His daily journal discloses that from that moment on his most fervent wish was election to Congress. In 1936 and 1937, he was a federal conciliation commissioner in Western Kentucky. He became Warren County attorney in 1938, and held the post until 1950. Meanwhile, he served three years in the Navy during World War II and was an organizer and president of the Kentucky Young Democratic Clubs both before and after the war.

Although he was obviously a coming light in the party and although considered a leader for his political work with the Young Democrats, the Congressional

nomination he so dearly sought passed him by several times.

The Democratic powers-that-were, after the war, picked John A. Whitaker to run for the Second District seat, which he won. When Whitaker died in 1951, Natcher wanted to run, but again had to wait: Garrett L. Withers got the nod, and he, too, won election.

Withers won re-election to a full term in 1952, but he died in 1953. It finally was Natcher's turn and he was elected (unopposed, as was the case last Tuesday) to represent the Second District that year.

"They never sent a congressman from the Second District who wanted to come up here as bad as I did", he frankly told a reporter in 1953. He noted that his first campaign caused him to sweat off seven pounds as he traveled 3,800 miles in less than six weeks.

Since that time, he's had no serious political trouble in his ever-changing district. His closest call came in 1956, the year of the Eisenhower presidential sweep, when opponent R. B. Blankenship lost to him by about 2,000 votes.

Grayer now at the temples and 17 years older (he uses old photographs of himself and has dropped his birth date from his official biography), Natcher nevertheless moves at a youthful pace with

believe his 61 years. He still campaigns with fervor--when opposed, that is--and moves about Capitol Hill at a half-jog.

Constituents who come to his office find him eager to please them, and in addition to the glad hand he extends and the warm "My friend" greeting, find themselves showered with flattery.

A favorite ploy is to invite visitors to seat themselves in the enormous chair behind his immaculately arranged desk, a vantage point which allows one to survey the strategically placed photographs of Natcher with Lyndon Johnson, Natcher with Jack Kennedy, Natcher on the front page of The New York Times.

Newspapers are one of his favorite subjects (an uncle was a Cleveland sports columnist), and he keeps close tabs on what is said about him in print. One of the newest framed additions in his office suite is an entire front page of The Washington Star that carried his name in a banner headline.

Unlike many congressmen, Natcher does not send out regular press releases. But he maintains close contact with editors of weeklies in his district, who often print his year-end pronouncements verbatim. Editors are favored with phone calls or telegrams announcing projects he has arranged in their counties, and his office aides dutifully post the printed results in clipping scrapbooks.

Although not the dean of Kentucky's Delegation here (Reps. Carl Perkins and John Watts outrank him in tenure), Natcher often is reminiscent of a mother hen when it comes to looking out for the state's interests.

That occasionally has rankled the others, and Natcher has had some classic little private run-ins with members of the state's delegation, although the heated feelings are quick to fade away.

Natcher fumed when Perkins once referred to him in print as thinking he was Kentucky's "third senator," a remark that was soon forgotten. The others' kindly feelings toward him were well expressed by a Republican who said, "Bill Natcher is 10 feet tall."

Perhaps the best clue to the way Natcher operates could have been observed on election day last Tuesday. Natcher, who had no opposition, got up early Tuesday to cast his vote, and then got into his car and drove out into the Second District to meet and talk with his constituents. He promised himself that during his Congressional recess he would visit every one of his 20 counties."

Two weeks ago while I was at home Celeste called late one Sunday night and informed us that little William Natcher Jirles was in the hospital. It seems that for a number of days he was not eating right and was having difficulty in

Keeping his food down. X-rays disclosed the fact that he had a birth defect and this blockage was causing his trouble. Where the stomach empties into the small intestine there was a small obstacle and the surgeon in this section of Ohio who performs such operations, operates in the Zanesville Ohio Hospital. When Celeste called Virginia and I left within a matter of a few hours and drove to Cambridge, Ohio. We arrived Monday and the operation was performed Monday morning. When we got to the hospital, William Hatcher Jirles was in an isolette and was wired up for feeding intravenously. It was a little funny watching him trying to get his thumb in his mouth. They had his hands tied down so that he could not reach the wire and the contraption that was used to feed him. He would really get mad in making an attempt to get his thumb in his mouth. Virginia and I were delighted that the operation was successful and on Tuesday I drove back to Kentucky. Virginia remained in Cambridge and on Thursday the baby was dismissed from the hospital and is doing just fine. The doctor said that in a number of instances too much time passes and the baby almost starves, and thereby is so weakened that an operation is not successful. Another thing the doctor said that was right unusual was the fact that this type of a birth defect very seldom occurs with little girls and this surgeon's experience was always with boys, and in nine cases out of ten it was the first baby boy. Virginia and

I were delighted that everything worked out so well and that little William Watcher Jirles is now gaining weight and doing real good.

This newspaper in Louisville, Kentucky, the Louisville COURIER-JOURNAL really amazes me. In yesterday's "Passing Show" section we have another article concerning all of the Members of the House from Kentucky and the two Senators. Just for a change this is a real nice article and it is just so obvious what this newspaper is doing. For five years now the COURIER-JOURNAL has abused and criticized the Members of the House and the Senate from Kentucky because all of them, with the exception of Cooper and Perkins, refused to take their commands. This article I presume was written hoping that we from now on would release information to the COURIER and return to the old days that in my opinion will not take place. This article is entitled, "In Congress, Committee Work's the Name of the Game," and is as follows:

"When Republican U.S. Rep. M. G. (Gene) Snyder of Kentucky's Fourth District missed Vice President Agnew's visit to Louisville not long ago, it seemed that Snyder's priorities might be misplaced.

On the one hand, there was a chance to meet and hear the darling of the

Republican Party and bask in reflected glory. On the other, there was a committee meeting here--one of those innumerable closed-door sessions marked by all the excitement of a vacuum-cleaner salesmen's convention.

Snyder's decision to be at the meeting illustrates the way many an astute congressman meets his responsibilities, as he sees them, to the voters who sent him there.

They do it through diligent committee work.

What a congressman can accomplish for his district through committee work depends on the committee, of course, and on the clout he wields with its members. Senior members invariably have more clout. Committee chairmen sometimes find national legislation has special application back home. Chairmen of subcommittees sometimes use them as forums on special issues.

Kentucky's seven-member delegation is represented on a good spread of committees--Agriculture, Public Works, Appropriations, Ways and Means (taxes), Commerce, Banking, Education--with the result that a number of the state's interests are well looked after.

In addition, four members have seniority, and two others seem well on the way to compiling it.

On the Senate side, Kentucky's two senators are on the Public Works, Commerce, Judiciary, and Nutrition and Human Needs Committees, among others.

But the Senate isn't usually closely identified with local legislation, although Sen. John Sherman Cooper has been an able advocate of Kentucky flood-control projects.

The House delegation's experience suggests that there are four categories of accomplishment that committee work can produce:

Pushing legislation tailored to the needs of a representative's district. Usually this involves tangible projects—bridges, roads, dams—or subsidies. As we shall see, this was what Snyder was up to when he skipped the Agnew luncheon.

Fighting legislation harmful to an interest back home. Tobacco-state Congressmen seek on the one hand to preserve price support for tobacco farmers and on the other to dull the image of cigarettes as cancer producers.

Influencing a federal agency's decisions. The powerful are most able to succeed at this; federal bureaucrats, like anyone else, don't want to offend those who have power over them.

Promoting a national cause that has particular application back home. Seventh

District Rep. Carl Perkins, chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, has been accused of this. No other congressman from Kentucky or Southern Indiana is in quite the same position of influence.

What propelled Snyder back to the capital when Agnew was headed for Louisville was Snyder's desire to look after some special legislation for his Fourth District. The meeting he returned for was a session of the House Public Works Committee, of which he is a member. (He also was named recently to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.)

The committee's task was to go over the 1970 highway authorization bill for the final time -- to mark it up, in the language of Congress -- before approving it and sending it to the floor of the House for consideration.

Snyder's interest was to see that two provisions of the bill weren't tampered with in the polishing process. The provisions would make possible full federal financing (rather than 50 percent state) for two Ohio River bridges in Snyder's district.

His mission was accomplished; the bridges stayed in the bill, which will come before the House sometime during the lame-duck session that begins tomorrow.

Other examples of advocacy include Rep. Tim Lee Carter's successful efforts to win approval of four new hospitals in his Fifth District. Carter is a member of the House Commerce Committee and of its subcommittee on public health, which authorizes federal aid for hospital-construction projects.

Rep. William H. Natcher of Bowling Green has for a decade won funding for the University of Kentucky's Tobacco Research Center. It lies outside Natcher's Second District, but because of the tobacco farmers who live in the Second, the center is close to his heart nonetheless. Natcher serves on the Appropriations Committee and is the second-ranking Democrat on its agriculture subcommittee.

Tobacco is the first subject that comes to mind when one considers which interests Kentucky's delegation is quickest to defend. When the Commerce Committee held hearings last year on the relationship between cigarette smoking and health, Carter was a persistent and hostile interrogator of those who tried to link smoking and cancer.

When the agriculture appropriations bill came on the floor of the House this year, a New York congressman protested the subsidies for tobacco growers and said he would have offered an amendment to eliminate the aid if he thought it had any chance of passage.

Natcher, on the floor to help shepherd the bill to approval, leaped to the defense of the farmer and the industry.

Then there was the occasion in 1969 when Rep. John C. Watts, of Nicholasville, ambushed the Nixon Administration's plans to extend unemployment compensation to farm workers. When the matter came up in a closed session of the Ways and Means Committee, Watts produced seven proxies and his own vote to defeat the proposal. Watts' Sixth District, like much of the rest of Kentucky, is heavily agricultural.

Perkins no doubt is the master among the state's congressmen at influencing the decisions of federal agencies. During President Johnson's administration, when new emphasis was being laid on federal aid to the poor and to schools serving them, Perkins was in a readymade position to capitalize for his Seventh District--the mountains of East Kentucky.

As chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, he was able to help the administration carry out its legislative plans. The administration showed its appreciation.

In response to Perkins's request, it established a \$3 million vocational rehabilitation center in Paintsville, to serve, among others, crippled coal miners. When two four-county areas were in danger.

Of losing anti-poverty aid, Perkins intervened to rescue the four counties in his district.

In a larger context, Perkins advocacy of anti-poverty and aid-to-education programs for the nation was the same as advocating them for his district, where poverty and poor schools are common. An observer of Perkins' tactics on the committee once said, "He just used the committee legislation to get benefits for his own people in Eastern Kentucky."

Seniority, of course, is the key to power in Congress. Although the system may be reformed next year, currently the member of the majority party with the longest continuous service automatically becomes committee chairman.

Watts, Natcher and Rep. Frank A. Stubblefield of the First District, along with Perkins, have compiled substantial seniority in the House. Perkins has been a representative since 1949, Watts since 1951, Natcher since 1953 and Stubblefield since 1959. All are Democrats. (The Third District's GOP Rep. William O. Cowger is caught up in a contest over an apparent narrow loss of his seat to Democrat Romano L. Mazzoli.)

Watts ranks third among Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee and will move to second if Rep. Hale Boggs, now second on the committee is elected

Majority Leader and withdraws from committee assignments. But Watts' hopes for a chairmanship are dim; he is 68, and may be vulnerable two years hence to a challenge in his district from a vigorous younger Democrat.

Natcher, who is 61, is now the ninth ranked Democrat on the Appropriations Committee. He is already chairman of the District of Columbia subcommittee, a rather thankless job, but may take over the agriculture subcommittee in January. The recent death of Rep. Michael Kirwan, D-Ohio, chairman of the public works subcommittee, will necessitate some shifts.

Stubblefield, 63, ranks fifth among Democrats on the Agriculture Committee. He is chairman of the dairy and poultry subcommittee, which hasn't captured much public attention. (Stubblefield also is a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.)

Snyder and Carter, both Republican, seem on their way to longevity as House members. Both appear safe in their districts for as long as they care to remain in them, barring major redistricting or a gross neglect of political homework on their part. Snyder's continuous service dates back to January, 1967; he will be 43 in January. Carter, 60, entered the House in January, 1965.

Both now rank low on their committees, although Carter is the second-ranked Republican on the subcommittee on which he serves.

In the Senate, Cooper is senior Republican on the Public Works Committee and serves on the air-and-water pollution, flood-control, public-roads and economic-development (Appalachia) subcommittees. He is fourth-ranked Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Sen. Marlow W. Cook serves on the Commerce Committee (where he ranks seventh) and on its energy and natural resources, consumer, and aviation subcommittees. It was through his service on the committee that he led efforts to exempt the Cincinnati riverboat Delta Queen from federal fire-safety standards.

Cook also serves on the Judiciary Committee (he is fifth-ranked among Republicans) and on its subcommittees on constitutional amendments and on juvenile delinquency, and on two select committees, Nutrition and Human Needs, and Small Business.

There are, naturally, circumstances which can thwart even the powerful despite their committee position.

Sen. Cooper, pushing for a downstream site for a dam in the Red River Gorge, blocked funding for the upstream site backed by Watts and Perkins. But

Cooper couldn't get House approval of his plan until the Army Corps of Engineers backed down, under prodding from Gov. Louie B. Nunn.

And Perkins has found that with a Republican in the White House, things just aren't the same. Despite his opposition, and that of other Democrats, the Nixon Administration last year closed 59 Job Corps camps, including two in Perkins' district."

November 17, 1970

During the Recess Period the District Officials and the Department of Transportation decided to comply with the decision of the District Judge concerning the holding of a design hearing for the Three Sisters Bridge. This means that the design hearing must be held and the people would at that meeting have the right to express themselves as to the type of a bridge which is to be constructed. The construction of the bridge which has been underway now for a number of months was in accordance with the design approved by the Fine Arts Commission.

There were a number of surprises in the elections on November the 3rd. I did not believe that Senator Joseph Tydings of Maryland would be defeated notwithstanding the fact that everyone that I talked to wanted to see him defeated.

It seems as though the polls that were taken all showed him leading, and, in fact, the last poll showed that he would defeat Republican Glenn Beall, Jr. by about four to three. This victory must be right satisfactory to the Beall Family because Senator Tydings defeated old Senator Beall and now Glenn Beall, Jr., a Member of the House of Representatives, has defeated Senator Tydings.

Odin Langen, a Member of our Committee on Appropriations, was defeated and this was quite a surprise to a number of us. My good friend, Glenn Davis of Wisconsin, who is also a Member of our Committee and a right able Member, just barely squeaked through. He is a Republican and his District is a strong Republican District, but the fact that a Democrat was elected Governor and Senator Proxmire, a Democrat, who was running for re-election ran so far ahead of the ticket that it made it right difficult for the Republican House Members to survive.

The Republicans generally throughout the United States were kicked right hard in this election. We picked up 11 governorships and nine additional seats in the House. We lost two seats in the Senate but the Senate and the House still remain under the control of the Democrats.

There were 48 of us in the House of Representatives who were unopposed in November. Five of the 48 were Republicans and the balance were Democrats.

I met with the County and Home Demonstration Agents at a luncheon while I was home and after the luncheon they presented me with a beautiful plaque which cites the fact that I have worked hard for agriculture.

November 19, 1970

Beginning on Monday of this week a number of the newly elected members to the House have appeared on the House Floor. This is right unusual and has not happened since I have been a Member. Personally, I see no reason why they should not be permitted to come into the Chamber even before they are sworn in, but House rules are right stringent concerning just who may appear on the Floor of the House.

We all had the pleasure of seeing Mrs. Bella S. Abzug who defeated Leonard Farbstein and is large enough to defeat Joe Lewis. She belongs to one or more organizations that are considered communistic by the FBI and the New York Members do not hesitate to call attention to the fact that this woman will really be a problem. When I was first elected we had a man in the Congress from California by the name of Condon who could not pass the security test to witness an atomic bomb explosion. He was defeated the next time by his people. In speaking of New York, Allard K. Lowenstein who has claimed all along that he lead the move that brought about

Lyndon Johnson's capitulation was defeated by a man by the name of Norman F. Lent. Adam Clayton Powell's successor was present on the Floor and he looks something like Adam. His name is Charles B. Rangel. Richard L. Ottinger spent a little over \$4 million of his mother's money in his unsuccessful try for the Senate seat in New York and his successor in the House is a man by the name of Peter A. Peyser. Martin B. McKeally who served with me on the Board of Visitors at West Point last year failed for a number of years to even file an income tax report and he was defeated by John G. Dow, the Democrat who in turn was removed from Congress by McKeally. The redistricting in New York placed Button and Stratton in the same District and Stratton, the Democrat, succeeded in ousting Button. Richard D. McCarthy who was trying for the Senate seat in New York and failed in the primary will be succeeded by Jack F. Kemp.

There were no changes in Alabama, Arizona, or Arkansas. Howard W. Pollock failed in his attempt to win a Senate seat in Alaska and he will be succeeded by N. J. Begich. George E. Brown was defeated in his attempt to obtain the Senate seat in California and John V. Tunney, who won the Senate seat, will drop out of the House. Jeffrey Cohelan, a member of our Committee on Appropriations, will also drop out of the House.

Yesterday in the Gym, George E. Brown who was defeated in his attempt for a Senate seat in California, Tom Kleppe who was defeated in his race for a Senate seat in California, and George Bush who was defeated in his attempt for a Senate seat in Texas, were playing handball with Richard Hanna, a Member of the House from California. A number of the Members kidded Hanna a little and said he'd better watch out because if he attempted the same move that the others tried, he might not be around too long.

My neighbor across the hall in the Rayburn Building, Emilio Q. Daddario, was defeated in his attempt to be elected Governor of Connecticut. Daddario is a good House Member and I was sorry that he made this move. Lowell P. Weicker, just a fair Member in the House, succeeded in being elected to the Senate from Connecticut, and to cap the climax, Thomas J. Meskill, a Republican Member in the House, was elected Governor of Connecticut.

For years now the DuPont Family has controlled politics in Delaware and when the new Congress convenes in January, we will have Pierre S. DuPont IV as a new House Member. He was elected when Delaware's only Congressman, William V. Roth, Jr., succeeded in being elected to the Senate.

Probably the most bitter man in the House is William C. Cramer who really was

lead on a wild goose chase by the President. He failed in his race for the Senate in Florida, and now drops out of the House.

One of the able Members in the Congress is E. Ross Adair from Indiana and he was defeated by J. Edward Roush, a former Representative of the House, and a man who has been in and out several times. The redistricting in Indiana placed Roush in the Adair District and since he was not a Member of the House at the time of his race, he had two years to run against Adair.

William O. Cowper of Louisville, Kentucky was defeated by Romano L. Mazzoli and, so far, Cowper has not conceded.

On November 17 the Soviet Union landed an eight-wheeled moon-walker laden with flags, hammer, and sickle emblems and a portrait of Lenin on the Moon and this became the first man-made object to propel itself across the luna surface. According to the sketches that our people have and reports from Moscow the moon-walker crawled down a ramp from its luna lander and took up a position 20 yards away and began sending back television pictures of the luna surface. It was carried to the Moon by Luna 17, an unmanned space vehicle that blasted off from the earth on November 9 and soft-landed on the Moon in the area known as the Sea of Rains. It was equipped

with television and devices to scoop up rock samples and moon dust. According to the commentator, the vehicle was carried to the Moon surface in a compartment aboard its mother ship.

The Soviet Union has failed so far to land a man on the Moon. This is quite a change from the experience that we had on October 4, 1957, when the Soviet Union first placed a satellite into orbit.

During the latter part of the Johnson Administration, Ramsey Clark, the son of the former Attorney General and Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, served as Attorney General and in the opinion of the majority of the Members of Congress, was one of the weakest Attorney General's ever to serve in this country. Recently his published book on crime was released and in the book he criticized severely FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Clark maintained that Mr. Hoover was too much interested in personal glory and self-centered concern for his own reputation. Hoover then really blasted off. He held a press conference and said that Ramsey Clark was a jelly fish and softie. The 75-year-old Hoover said that Clark was the worst Attorney General he had encountered in 45 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and further stated that if there ever was a worse Attorney General than Robert F. Kennedy, it was Ramsey Clark because you

never knew when he was going to flop on an issue. Hoover maintained that Clark was worse than Bobby because at least Kennedy stuck by his guns even when he was wrong. I recall during the days when Clark was really in hot water as Attorney General, his mother stated upon being interviewed by one of the lady correspondents that early in life she nicknamed her son, Ramsey Clark, "Old Man River," because he just seemed to move along.

We have on the Floor today the Trade Act of 1970. We have eight hours of General Debate and the Bill comes out under a closed rule. It makes provision concerning textiles, leather, oil, and other imports, and upon adoption of the rule, it appears that the rule would be voted down. This Bill causes me considerable trouble. I believe in free trade but at the same time with conditions as they are today throughout the world, we certainly are entitled to fair trade.

For several weeks now excerpts from "A White House Diary" by Lady Bird Johnson have been carried in a Washington newspaper. Mrs. Johnson used a tape recorder and during the time that she kept her Diary recorded some 1,650,000 words. The book contains a little over 300 pages and in the main is right interesting. It does not compare with the Washington Dairy kept by Mrs. Bentley, the wife of a former Member of the House.

Mrs. Johnson's Diary, of course, pertains mainly to the President and to her two daughters. I have read the excerpts carried in the newspaper, hoping to get some good ideas for my Journal. My Journal, of course, is not the best journal that was ever kept, but does right well judging from the excerpts from "A White House Diary."

November 20, 1970

The Agriculture Bill of 1970 finally was agreed to in Conference and was sent to the President yesterday. This Bill reduces the subsidy payment ceiling making the total amount to be paid to any one farmer or organization \$55,000 instead of \$3 1/2 million and \$4 million under the Act of 1968. In addition, the Bill revised and extends for three years price support programs for cotton, wheat, and feed grains and incorporates a new set aside acreage reduction plan that the Administration feels will give farmers more freedom in deciding how to use land.

The Foreign Trade Bill passed the House last night 215 to 165. Opponents contended that the textile industry isn't as badly off as described and that this Bill would reverse a 40 year U.S. policy of liberalizing foreign trade. This is the first major trade bill that we have had before the House during the past eight years.

The cost of living is still rising and inflation is rampant. Several months ago in order to bring the economy in line and to stop the inflationary spiral, the Administration set in to make money hard to get and prime interest rates immediately jumped to 8½ percent. Tight money did not solve the problem and now President Nixon is indicating that he may convey to the Federal Reserve Chairman, Arthur Burns, the Administration's feeling that the Reserve has failed to follow a sufficient expansionary money policy. In other words, the brakes were applied and are still on and there must now be a letting up so that money will be a little easier to secure.

Walter J. Nickel, the former Governor of Alaska and now the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, is really quite a character. Several months ago he made a speech or two in which he discussed issues with Vice President Agnew and others concerning campus disorders and the reason why we were confronted today with this type of trouble. The Secretary was inclined to feel that we should listen more to the young people and attempt to reason with the problems confronting some of those who are causing the trouble on the campuses instead of just placing them all in the same category and insisting upon extreme punishment. During the campaign the President had rocks, bottles, and vegetables thrown at his car and in a fit of

anger, said that those causing this trouble were simply garbage. This did not agree with the statements that Secretary Hickel has been making over the country and here on the Hill we were not surprised to hear that Secretary Hickel was on the way out of the Cabinet. I recall when President Nixon introduced his Cabinet to the Nation on television, he said each of his choices were picked because he had a special quality and an extra dimension. Apparently now it has been discovered that Secretary Walter J. Hickel has, in addition, an unexpected extra dimension in that he won't leave the Cabinet quietly. He has said publicly during the past several days that President Nixon hired him and he would have to fire him. There are too many rumors circulating in Washington to the effect that Hickel is on the way out and this has continued now for several weeks with no rebuttal from the President. It may be that the President will simply have to fire this Cabinet Member.

The tornado and storm which took place in Pakistan several days ago killed well over 100,000 people. The toll as of today is 148,116 and may go as high as one-half million. Thousands of bodies along with thousands of bodies of cattle and livestock are strewn all over the country and, in fact, in certain sections there are so many that it is impossible for those living there to bury them all. Outside help is needed at this time and relief supplies are being sent in from a

number of countries throughout the world. The American Red Cross started a nationwide appeal for funds for what it says may be the worst disaster in history.

November 21, 1970

Tobacco is in more serious trouble today than at any time since the Surgeon General's Report was released in 1964. Beginning in January there will be no television or radio ads and the admonition on the cigarette packages is to be changed according to the recent law enacted by Congress. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare maintains vigorously that tobacco causes lung cancer and heart disease. Beginning several years ago the Department maintained that there was a casual affect but now the position taken by the Department is so firm that you would assume that the research underway has really proven that tobacco is a direct cause of cancer.

The Kentucky Farm Bureau this past week adopted a resolution unanimously calling for a poundage program instead of the present acreage allotment system. This resolution will now be sent to the Members of Congress from Kentucky with a request that legislation be enacted accordingly.

November 23, 1970

On Saturday night of last week our country ended two days of heavy retaliatory fighter-bomber raids on missile and anti-aircraft positions in North Vietnam. The raids ended at six o'clock p.m. and were in retaliation of the act of the North Vietnamese in shooting down one of our unarmed reconnaissance planes about two weeks ago. We must have blasted the very life out of one particular section in North Vietnam, just north of the Demilitarized Zone. The bombing took place south of Hanoi, but according to the North Vietnamese, some of the bombs struck the city and especially one of the prisoners of war camps where American prisoners were confined. It seems that at all times when we were bombing before, the North Vietnamese maintained that our bombing went right into the prisoners of war camps, which, of course, was not true. I do hope that we do not have to continue our bombing of any part of North Vietnam because this makes us further and further away from agreement at the Paris Peace Talks.

November 25, 1970

The freeway-rapid transit impasse is still with us and now three committees of the House have taken a positive stand concerning this matter. Just for a change the weight has suddenly been removed from my poor little thin back.

The story in the Washington Post yesterday is entitled "Build Freeway or Lose Extra Cash, City Told" and is as follows:

"A House District Subcommittee voted yesterday to force the city to build the North Central Freeway before it can receive an additional \$15 million for this year's budget.

In approving a bill to increase the city's revenue by about half what Mayor Walter E. Washington sought, the Subcommittee added a requirement that the city first comply with all provisions of congressional highway legislation.

The House version of the pending Highway Act of 1970, which would require construction of two controversial freeways here -- including the North Central artery from Silver Spring -- was sent from the Rules Committee yesterday to the House floor for a vote later this week.

The revenue bill approved by the House Subcommittee was also weighted down with other new provisions that would transfer the city's Lorton, Va., prison complex to federal control, subsidize the city's private medical schools, and renew the city's nearly exhausted authority to borrow money for construction projects.

The bill now goes to the full House District Committee for action next week.

If it passed, it will go to a House-Senate conference for reconciliation with a Senate bill that would give the city \$26.7 million in additional money and that contains no freeway rider.

Mayor Washington had no comment on the House revenue measure. He has been pressing for approval of the \$26.7 million increase to the city to cover an anticipated \$13 million deficit this year and to restore programs cut out of the city budget. Congress had trimmed the current budget by \$189 million last July because additional revenue and borrowing power had not yet been approved to pay for the spending requests.

The \$15 million increase in the House District Subcommittee bill would give the city a total payment of \$120 million this year. But the Subcommittee voted, 7 to 3, to freeze the money until the mayor certifies that work is under way on all D.C. projects required by congressionally enacted highway legislation.

A similar rider on last year's D.C. revenue bill provided the final pressure on the D.C. City Council to agree to construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and several related freeway projects, as ordered by Congress in the 1968 Federal Highway Act. (Work on the bridge has since been suspended by a court order.)

The new rider put into the D.C. revenue bill yesterday was proposed by

Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.). It would withhold the additional \$E5 million unless the city obeys the 1970 Highway Act.

Voting against the provision were Reps. Gilbert Gude (R-Md.), Andrew Jacobs, Jr. (D-Ind.) and Henry P. Smith (R-N.Y.)

Broyhill's rider would force the city to build the North Central Freeway if the 1970 Highway Act were finally passed in the form sent to the House floor yesterday. This bill, which authorizes highway programs nationally, includes provisions ordering construction of both North Central and a spur connecting with Interstate Rte. 95 to Baltimore.

If the D.C. provision survives a likely challenge on the House floor, probably Wednesday, the House version of the bill must still be reconciled with the Senate version.

The Senate voted last month to omit any local requirements and to repeal the 1968 act's requirements, which also affect Washington.

Key sponsors of the 1970 road bill, led by Chairman George H. Fallon (D-Md.) of the House Public Works Committee, told the Rules Committee yesterday that they had to step in to end "foot-dragging" and indecision on the road projects by Washington city officials.

Three cities of the bill-- Reps.

Gude, Fred Schwengel (R-Iowa) and Donald S. Fraser (D-Minn.)--sharply disagreed.

Schwengel, a Public Works Committee member, has joined Rep. Richard D. McCarthy (D-N.Y.) in a blistering dissent to the Committee's formal report that will accompany the road bill to the House floor.

"The . . . bill provides the basis for continued blackmail of the District of Columbia," they wrote, concluding:

". . . It will be the mechanism for holding the Metro (subway) system hostage for the completion of these destructive freeways."

Rep. William H.atcher (D-Ky.), chairman of the D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee and an ally of the Public Works Committee leadership, has withheld \$34.2 million in subway funds from the city's current budget, saying it would be restored if road work proceeds.

He took a similar stand last year, granting money only after President Nixon assured him that work would start on the Three Sisters Bridge. That permitted subway groundbreaking to occur Dec. 9.

Gude, also testifying yesterday before the Rules Committee, said the D.C. provision on North Central may prove futile. Growing opposition by Maryland legislators and the incoming Montgomery

County Council to building the road's Maryland section may result in "Congress . . . directing the construction of a road to nowhere," he said.

In addition to the increased federal payment, the D.C. Subcommittee's revenue bill would also impose a 2 per-cent sales tax on rentals from linen services. The tax would raise an additional \$300,000 a year.

Dropped from the bill was a request by the mayor to increase the local gasoline tax from 7 to 8 cents a gallon that would have raised an extra \$1.5 million a year. Rep. Don Fuqua (D-Fla.) chairman of the Subcommittee, said the request was rejected because the gas tax in suburban Maryland and Virginia is only 7 cents a gallon.

The proposal to turn the city's prison complex in Lorton, Va., over to the federal government constitutes the second time this year the House Committee has acted against what it calls "an attitude of permissiveness" in the D.C. corrections department. A similar transfer provision was included in the House version of the D.C. crime bill, but was dropped from the final bill approved by a House-Senate conference. The bill also includes a provision to help the George Washington University Medical School and the Georgetown University Medical and Dental Schools out of what the schools say is a desperate financial situation.

It would allow the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to grant the schools up to \$5,000 a year for each medical student and up to \$3,000 a year for each dental student.

The city government's virtually exhausted power to borrow money from the federal treasury to pay for construction projects such as schools and playgrounds would be renewed for another three years under the bill. The city budget office estimates this would provide about \$100 million in loans over the next three years.

Other provisions added to the bill would prevent the city from raising its minimum wage (now \$2 per hour) more than 10 percent above the national minimum (now \$1.60 per hour); order a pollution study of the Potomac River; require that \$350,000 in federal land grant money now given to Federal City College be split between it and the Washington Technical Institute, and increase the maximum load for trucks traveling in the city from 45,000 to 65,000 pounds."

The story from the EVENING STAR is entitled "Fate of Funds for D.C. Tied to Roads Bill," and is as follows:

"The fate of the federal payment to the District was tied to that of the North Central Freeway today as both highway and city revenue bills progressed toward action on the House Floor.

A House District subcommittee approved a revenue bill yesterday that would withhold federal payment to the District until the city complies with the order to build the North Central route proposed in the present House version of the 1970 Highway Bill.

The Rules Committee cleared the way yesterday for House floor action on the bill by waiving a House rule that prohibits ordering construction of a specific road in general legislation.

The revenue bill, in addition to tying the federal payment to freeway construction, also would take control over the Lorton penal complex away from the D.C. corrections department and give it to the Justice Department.

By a split vote, the subcommittee approved the rider introduced by Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.), that would block release of the federal payment until Mayor Walter E. Washington certifies that construction has started or that the work on the Three Sisters Bridge and less controversial roads authorized in the 1968 Highway Act has been delayed only because of court action.

Also, the Broyhill rider would require that in order for the city to obtain the federal payment the mayor must certify that work has started on any other roads ordered in subsequent legislation such as the pending highway bill with the North Central provision.

Although the Broyhill rider would apply to the entire federal payment, \$105 million of it already has been appropriated to the city. Thus, all that would be affected by the rider this year would be the proposed increase of \$15 million or any additional increase that might come out of a final conference on the bill.

A Senate-passed version of the highway bill would permit the city to build only the roads it wants. When the House passes its version, the expected differences will be settled in a joint House-Senate Conference.

If the highway bill in its final form, does not contain the North Central construction measure, the city would not have to begin work on the road to obtain the federal payment.

Mayor Washington declined to comment on the revenue bill until he studies it further.

\$15 MILLION AT ISSUE

In revenue matters, the bill would increase the federal payment by \$15 million to \$120 million a year. A Senate-passed revenue bill would have the federal payment based on 30 percent of the city's tax collections -- a formula estimated to increase the federal payment to \$130.4 million. The revenue bill, too, probably will wind up in a House-Senate Conference.

Although the subcommittee rejected a proposal to increase the city gasoline tax by one cent in order to prevent its going higher than similar levies in the suburbs, it did add to the bill a proposal for a new 4 percent tax on rented laundry and linen. It was estimated this would bring in from \$300,000 to \$1 million a year.

The bill also would extend to 1973 the city's authority to borrow from the U.S. Treasury. It expired this year.

The revenue bill also authorizes the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to give Georgetown Dental School up to \$3,000 per student and George Washington University Medical School up to \$5,000 per student. Officials of both schools have warned that without federal assistance they may have to close.

No vote was taken by the subcommittee on the Lorton provision which was contained in the original revenue bill introduced by Rep. John L. McMillan, D-S.C., District Committee chairman. But the Lorton measure was part of the total bill approved by the subcommittee.

Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., said he will work to delete the Lorton section when the bill comes before the full District Committee on Tuesday. However, committee approval of the bill is expected to be only a formality before it

goes to the House floor. A similar Lorton measure was in the D.C. crime bill but was deleted before passage of the crime legislation.

Gude, along with Reps. Andrew Jacobs Jr., D-Ind., and Henry P. Smith III, R-N.Y., voted against the Broyhill rider.

House opponents of the North Central Freeway order will have to obtain a vote of the House to overturn the Rules Committee action if they wish to bring up a point of order during the floor debate to object to the road-building provision on parliamentary grounds that it violates House rules.

The Broyhill rider increases pressure on the city to build the controversial freeway that would run through Northeast Washington to Silver Spring. The House District appropriations subcommittee has refused for the second year in a row to release subway funds because of its dissatisfaction with freeway construction.

A similar Broyhill rider last year led to release of the federal payment only after the City Council agreed to proceed with construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and other roads in action that helped release the funds to permit subway construction to begin.

Rep. Don Fuqua, D-Fla., subcommittee chairman, said the report on the revenue

bill will suggest that Federal City College tuition of \$25 per student be increased to bring it more in line with tuition charged by other area schools."

November 27, 1970

President Nixon fired Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel on Wednesday. Secretary Hickel got a bad start and then took issue with the President concerning the young people in this country and especially unrest on our campuses. He directed a letter to the President but released the letter before it was received by the President and this started the feud which culminated the firing of the Secretary. Secretary Hickel is a resident of Alaska and at the time of his appointment, was serving as Governor of Alaska. Last week he made a public statement that the President hired him and would have to fire him. His wish was granted on Wednesday. Mr. Hickel stated after his meeting with the President at the White House that he had been fired and that he would leave Washington not with a shot in his back but with an arrow in his heart.

Immediately after firing Hickel, President Nixon announced that Rogers C. B. Morton, the brother of Thurston Morton, and a sitting Member of the House of Representatives would be recommended in January to fill the Hickel vacancy. Rogers Morton wanted this assignment at the beginning of the Nixon

Administration and appeared to me to be a little disappointed over his failure to receive the nod. We all like Rogers MORTON in the House and he will be missed. Since his District is a Democratic District, a Democrat will now be sent up from the Eastern Maryland shore.

A knife-wielding man dressed in a priest's cassock attacked Pope Paul VI in an apparent assassination attempt yesterday in Manila. Steven Cardinal Kim of South Korea was cut on the hand when he stepped between the Pope and the attacker at the Manila Airport. The police seized Benjamin Mendoza Amor, 35, an artist from Bolivia, and he was immediately stripped of his gray priest clothing and roman collar. The Pope is on a tour of a number of the Far Eastern countries and it is indeed fortunate that the Cardinal was alert and quickly stepped between the Pope and the would-be assassin.

November 30, 1970

Senator Fulbright of Arkansas is probably the most controversial Member of the United States Senate. As Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has engaged in a battle with this Administration, and also with the Johnson Administration over the war in Vietnam. He is very much against our participation in any war in the Far East or in the Middle East and is against foreign aid for any purpose for the

countries that are now about ready to fall into the Soviet trap. This weekend Senator Fulbright said that Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird mis-represented the facts about the recent bombing on the outskirts of Hanoi, but did so as a part of the process by which the military establishment runs nearly the whole country. The Senator went on to say that he would not ever call anybody a liar in public except by inadvertance. Laird not only misrepresented the facts but the Department of Defense and the Secretary do this all the time, according to the Senator. With \$80 billion a year to spend, this is a great indicator of strength, muscle, and might, and Senator Fulbright believes that the Department of Defense operates under the premise that it is permissible to tell a lie to save our country by being publicized as having made a mistake and when the news media finds out that it was a lie, simply admit it, relying upon the old maxim that it is all right to tell the lie to save our country.

This man Fulbright always amazes me and, of course, if he was from most any other State, would never have lasted long enough to become Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

December 1, 1970

The official census for the United States for 1970 was released yesterday and the total is 204,765,770. The overall

Gain in the United States is 13.3 percent over the 1950 census figure of 179,323,175. In percentage terms the 1960 - 1970 growth is lower than any other in the Nation's past except for the depression decade of the 30's when the number of Americans grew only 7.3 percent. The big growth States were California with an increase of 4.2 million people, which makes this now the largest State in the United States, and Florida with an increase of 1.8 million bringing the State total to 6.8 million. In percentage terms, Nevada with a 71.3 percent increase, Florida with a 31.1 percent increase, and Arizona with 36.1 percent increase, led the way.

Kentucky does not lose a seat this time but we must redistrict the State in order to balance out the population over the seven Congressional Districts. States like Alabama, Iowa, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wisconsin lose seats in the House. The official census for 1970 for Kentucky is 3,219,311 and the census for 1960 was 3,038,156. This is an increase of 181,155 or 6 percent increase.

December 4, 1970

This man, Agnew, really is a bull dog. When he makes up his mind apparently he has difficulty in making any quick changes. We had no difficulty on the

House side in selecting the members of the Little Hoover Commission and the President had no difficulty, but when it got down to the Senate, then that was a different matter. An article appeared in the WASHINGTON POST entitled, "Membership Dispute Stalls Panel on Efficiency in D.C." This article is as follows:

"There is "dire and emergent need" for a study to improve the efficiency of the "mushrooming" D.C. city government, Congress declared more than two months ago when it authorized a special commission to make such a study.

Envisioned by its sponsors as a "little Hoover Commission," the 11-member special study group would root out examples of inefficiency, waste and duplication. Its work was to be completed within a year.

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business" of the District, the lawmakers proclaimed.

But the commission itself has yet to be formed because of a dispute over who has the authority to name the members.

The disagreement over who should choose the final four members of the commission now involves the vice president of the United States, one Senate

Committee chairman, one Senate Subcommittee chairman, two other senators and four District residents.

The commission's first report on how to streamline the city government is due in less than four months.

Enacted as part of the bill giving Washington a nonvoting congressman, the commission was to consist of 12 members named within a month.

Four members -- two congressmen and two District residents -- were to be selected by House Speaker John McCormack (D-Mass.) on the advice of District Committee Chairman John L. McMillan (D-S.C.) and Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.), chairman of the House District Appropriations Subcommittee. The House delegation was appointed Oct. 20.

Two days later, President Nixon announced his four selections -- two federal government officials, one District resident and former D.C. Deputy Mayor Thomas W. Fletcher.

The remaining four members -- two senators and two District residents -- were to be named "jointly" by Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, Senate District Committee Chairman Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.) and Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), chairman of the Senate District Appropriations Subcommittee.

Tydings said he agreed to a request from Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) that the Republicans pick the Republican senator for the commission. Tydings and Proxmire then sent the names of two senators and two residents in a letter hand-delivered to Agnew Oct. 23.

The two senators were Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) and William B. Spong Jr. (D-Va.), both members of the District Committee. None of the participants would reveal the names of the two residents sent to Agnew.

Agnew's office, said the Vice President concluded that "jointly" meant he should name someone so he sent the names of two other residents to Tydings and Proxmire. The offices of both Tydings and Proxmire said they had not heard from Agnew at all.

Agnew's press secretary, Victor Gold, gave this account yesterday of what happened next:

"The Vice President offered to compromise. He sent a letter to Senate Minority Leader Scott Nov. 17 saying that he would accept one of their citizen choices if they would accept one of his... But they (Tydings and Proxmire) are being obdurate and saying they want the whole ball of wax... It's not our delay, it's theirs. It's their hangup if they won't take one of ours after we took one of theirs."

John T. McEvoy, staff director of the Senate District Committee, replied for Tydings: "The Vice President is making a molehill out of a molehill."

Gold added that the Vice President was not objecting to the individuals chosen by Tydings and Proxmire but was "saying that he has the right and the duty to appoint at least one." The selection process has reached an impasse, Gold said, unless the two senators decide to "be reasonable."

Tydings himself said later that he would have to consult with Proxmire about any changes in the names..

Proxmire said: "We made our recommendations and I'd rather not say anything else about it until the whole thing is settled."

The panel gets its name from a study commission formed about 40 years ago by President Hoover to study the federal government."

The District of Columbia Committee in the annual 1970 Revenue Bill also made certain provisions concerning the freeway system in our Capital City. In an article which appeared in the EVENING STAR entitled, "Revenue Bill For D.C. Sent To Full House," we find the following:

"In a series of split votes today, the House District committee approved proposals which would tie the city's annual federal payment to construction of controversial freeways and take control of the Lorton penal complex away from the city government.

The proposals are contained in the 1970 city revenue bill which the committee reported out to the House floor today.

By a vote of 11 to 8, the committee defeated a motion introduced by Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., which would have kept control of Lorton in the District Department of Corrections. As reported out to the floor, the bill would hand Lorton over to the Justice Department.

MOTION TO DELETE FAILS

A motion by Rep. Andrew Jacobs, Jr., D-Ind., to delete tying the federal payment to freeway construction failed by a vote of 13 to 8.

The bill would increase the annual federal payment to the District to \$120 million from \$105 million. But portions of the fiscal 1971 payment not yet appropriated would be withheld if the city refused to follow an order to build the North Central Freeway now pending in the House-passed version of the 1970 federal aid to highway bill. Some of the current payment to the city already has been appropriated.

In another revenue matter, the bill

will replace a 4 percent sales tax on linens with a 2 percent rental tax. Committee officials estimated this would provide the city with \$200,000 in revenues, since most hospitals and hotels lease their linen.

The Senate-passed District revenue bill would increase the federal payment to more than \$130 million a year under a formula based on city tax collections.

Also, the bill extends the city's authority to borrow from the U.S. Treasury to 1973. The authority had expired this year.

Joining Gude and Jacobs in fighting to delete the Lorton and freeway provisions of the bill were Reps. Peter Kyros, D-Maine; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., D-Mich.; Henry P. Smith III, R-N.Y.; Ancher Nelson, R-Minn.; Brock Adams, D-Wash., and Donald M. Fraser, D-Minn.

The same eight also tried, unsuccessfully, to delete all of the bill's provisions other than revenue measures.

The highway bill, containing the North Central building order is now in a joint House-Senate conference, since the Senate passed version of the highway measure would permit the District to build only the freeways it wants.

Congress cut the current District budget of nearly \$700 million by \$120

million in July because additional revenue and borrowing power had not been authorized yet. Since then, the city has asked Congress for a supplemental appropriation of \$96.1 million.

A proposal to take control of Lorton away from the city was also in the D.C. crime bill that had passed the House this year but was deleted in a joint House-Senate conference.

Those favoring the Lorton measure have complained of a lack of discipline in the city's prison facilities.

The revenue bill also would authorize a \$6.2 million appropriations for the medical and dental schools at George Washington and Georgetown Universities.

It also would provide that land-grant college funds made available to the District must be shared equally by Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute.

A projected \$300,000 in additional revenue would also be raised by a proposal in the bill to increase the maximum weight of trucks traveling in the city from 45,000 pounds to 65,000 pounds as a result of fees that truckers must pay.

The freeway rider continues the doubtful status of subway funds for the city.

Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., Chairman of the District Appropriations Subcommittee, has withheld \$34.2 million in subway funds because of his dissatisfaction with the state of the freeway construction."

For five years now I have never believed that a 97 mile rapid rail transit system could be constructed in our Nation's Capital at a cost of \$2½ billion. Each year I have inquired about the cost and have always received the same answer which was that certainly it could be constructed for this amount. During the Supplemental Hearings the officials of the rapid rail transit system appeared before the Subcommittee that I am Chairman of, and again I inquired as to the cost. A portion of the colloquy is as follows:

"MR. NATCHER. General Graham, as you know, since 1955 this committee has been considering matters pertaining to a balanced transportation system for the District of Columbia. I recall as a member of this subcommittee I made the recommendation in the year 1955 to pay the District's share of the survey costs which brought about the mass transportation survey that was presented to the President in the year 1959. That survey, General Graham, as you probably know, recommended a balanced system of transportation consisting of freeways, rapid transit, and a change in the bus operation

here in the District of Columbia.

Beginning in 1955 and coming on down to the year 1964 when they first brought to the House a bill providing for rapid transit which, as you know, was recommitted due to the fact that the cost and overall program for rapid transit was not explained to the House in such a manner that the House would accept it.

Then we had the bobtailed system that took place in 1965 which provided for a \$431 million cost for a 25-mile system, with \$100 million to be paid by the Federal Government, \$50 million by the District of Columbia, and the balance in bonds.

OVERALL COST OF RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Beginning at that time, General Graham, on this committee a number of us have inquired from time to time as to the overall cost of the rapid transit system. I know as well as you do that the act passed in 1969 provided for a 97-mile system at a cost of \$2.5 billion.

I have inquired of you and others each time that you have appeared before our committee and, General Graham, even before you took over as the General Manager of the Authority, as to whether or not you people still maintain that a 97-mile subway system for the District of Columbia and the Metropolitan Area

can be constructed for \$2.5 billion, not just this year, but last year, the year before, and on back beyond that time. I never have believed that you could build this rapid transit system for \$2.5 billion and have said so each year.

General Graham, do you still say to this Committee that \$2.5 billion will construct the 97-mile rapid transit system that you have in mind and the one authorized in 1969 by the Congress?

OVERALL COST TO EXCEED \$2.5 BILLION

GENERAL GRAHAM. I think for the first time, Mr. Chairman, I can indicate that it is going to cost more, because for several months we have been engaged in new capital cost studies and new net income analysis studies which will pin down the various components of the cost. We are about to culminate the studies and about to give the results to our Board of Directors and get their help in putting together a new financial program.

I cannot tell you at this time what the new capital costs will be, but it appears that it will be substantially higher than the \$2.5 billion of costs."

December 7, 1970

This week we will take up the Supplemental Appropriations Bill for

Fiscal Year 1971. I will recommend that the \$34 million for the rapid transit system be deleted. Secretary Volpe of the Department of Transportation decided that regardless of the fact that the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees in the budget for Fiscal Year 1971 for the District of Columbia deleted the \$34 million hoping that this would help us solve the rapid transit-freeway impasse, directed the Office of the Management and Bureau to make a loan of \$57 million to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. This was a mistake.

At the time the Highway Act of 1970 was on the Floor, I made the following statement:

"MR. CHAIRMAN. There is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system in our Capital City. In order to meet the tremendous day by day growth of traffic the Highway Program must be carried out along with the present rapid rail transit system that is now under construction.

Our Committee on Appropriations has repeatedly made this statement over the years, and we not only believe this to be true but are willing to make any and all recommendations which will bring about a proper rapid rail transit system and a freeway system for the District of

Columbia. Our Committee's position that there is a place for both a free-way system and a rapid transit system in our Capital City is still unchanged. It has been expressed over the years both during the Hearings, in its Reports, and on the Floor of the House.

In the year 1955 I recommended to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget that the District's share for the mass transportation survey be paid. Here we have the beginning of the program which finally brought about the Rapid Rail Transit Program. This was many years before those who want to destroy the Freeway Program and thereby have caused difficulty with the construction of the Rapid Rail Transit System entered the picture.

In the year 1948 we had the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Study which was made at a cost of \$505,000 by the Highway Departments of Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia.

In 1950 we had the comprehensive plan for the Nation's Capital and its environs by the National Park and Planning Commission.

In 1952 we had the Highway Improvement Program by the Highway Departments of Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia with the cost for this project

included in the \$505,000 which was the overall cost of the 1948 Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Study.

In 1955 the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Study made by the Highway Departments of Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia cost \$561,000.

The Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region in 1959 made by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council cost \$450,000.

The National Capital Planning Commission was created in 1952 and beginning in 1955 we had the Four Year Study which was sent to the President of the United States in 1959. This Study was designated the Mass Transportation Survey and was the most comprehensive and cooperative of all previous planning in the sense that all jurisdictions took part. This study involved both mass transit and highways and the most up to date information and analysis methods were used. This Survey was authorized by the 84th Congress with instructions that the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Council jointly should conduct a survey of the present and future mass transportation needs of the National Capital Region. The results of that study were

reported to the President in 1959.

This Report found that the present and future needs of the National Capital Region required a balanced system of transportation consisting of highways, express buses, and rapid rail transit. The Report recommended that as a first step the regulation of the existing privately owned bus carriers should be unified and centralized on a regional basis.

The need for a freeway concept involving an all-out beltway and inner loop and connecting radials was recognized in the comprehensive plan of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in 1950. This was six years before the enactment of the 90 - 10 Interstate Financing formula.

On August 2, 1947, pursuant to directions from Congress which specified that there should be designated within the continental United States a national system of interstate highways to connect the principle metropolitan centers, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency approved a national system of interstate highways but withheld a portion of mileage for later distribution in and around the urban centers. On September 15, 1955, the Commissioner of Public Roads distributed this urban mileage. In 1955 the Highway Departments of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia

initiated system layouts in accordance with highway legislation. The concepts followed the freeway plans current at that time in the District of Columbia.

The freeway projects adopted for the District of Columbia and approved for construction were:

1. Northeast Freeway - Eight studies
2. North Central Freeway - Six studies
3. Palisades Parkway - Six studies
4. Three Sisters Bridge - Eight studies
5. Fourteenth Street Bridge - Staff studies
6. Potomac River Freeway - Eight studies
7. South Leg - Seven Studies
8. North Leg, West - Seven Studies
9. North Leg, Central - Seven studies
10. North East, North Central Freeway - Eight studies
11. North Leg, East - Six studies
12. East Leg - Six studies
13. Intermediate Loop - Five studies

Eighty-two studies for the thirteen **Projects.**

When the urban mileage was distributed by the Commissioner of Public Roads in 1955, the Public Works Committee of the House that is now being criticized by a few people assisted the Highway

Department of the District of Columbia and the District Officials with their request for projects which had previously been approved by the District Government. Not only in 1955, but every year when mileage for cities was up for decision by the Commissioner of Public Roads or the Bureau of Public Roads, the Public Works Committee of this House fully protected the interests of our Capital City. The action of this Committee was proper in every respect.

The thirteen elements composing the Freeway Program were not selected by the Public Works Committee and at no time from the year 1955 down to this day has this Committee selected any of the freeway projects for the District of Columbia.

The overall highway programs for the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland since 1955 were planned with the understanding that the approved Interstate Highway projects in the District of Columbia would be constructed.

After a number of comprehensive plans and studies were approved we finally started appropriating funds for our Freeway Program in the year 1957. The Rapid Rail Transit System had not been authorized at this time.

We then passed through ten turbulent years up to the year 1968 when the

Highway Act of 1968 was enacted by the Congress and signed into law by the President. During this ten year period the Public Works Committee made no move to take part in the Freeway - Rapid Rail Transit Impasse. If there is a Committee in the House that had more right to attempt to straighten out the Impasse that has developed than the Committee on Public Works, I am unable to name the committee.

After the Chairman of the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, and a few others decided that the Freeway System must be stopped in order to secure enough support for the authorization of the Rapid Rail Transit System, and further to carry out their wishes to simply destroy the Freeway Program, the Public Works Committee brought to the Floor of the House and passed the Highway Act of 1968. At this time the District Officials were dragging their feet and were indicating at every turn that the Freeway System must be stopped. The Public Works Committee in the Highway Act of 1968 placed the following provisions:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Sec. 23 (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any court decision or administrative action to the contrary, the Secretary of Transportation and the Government of the District

of Columbia shall, in addition to those routes already under construction, construct all routes on the Interstate System within the District of Columbia as set forth in the Document entitled "1968 Estimate of the Cost of Completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the District of Columbia" submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Transportation with, and as a part of, "The 1968 Interstate System Cost Estimate" printed as House Document Numbered 199, Ninetieth Congress. Such construction shall be undertaken as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this Act, except as otherwise provided in this Section, and shall be carried out in accordance with all applicable provisions of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Section the Government of the District of Columbia shall commence work on the following projects:

- (1) Three Sisters Bridge, I-266 (Section B1 to B2).
- (2) Potomac River Freeway, I-266 (Section B2 to B4).
- (3) Center Leg of the Inner Loop, I-95 (Section A6 to C4), Terminating at New York Avenue.
- (4) East Leg of the Inner Loop, I-295 (Section C1 to C4), Terminating at Bladensburg Road.

(c) The Government of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of Transportation shall study those projects on the Interstate System set forth in "The 1968 Interstate System Cost Estimate", House Document Numbered 199, Ninetieth Congress, within the District of Columbia which are not specified in Subsection (b) and shall report to Congress not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Section their recommendations with respect to such projects including any recommended alternative routes or plans, and if no such recommendations are submitted within such 18 month period then the Secretary of Transportation and the Government of the District of Columbia shall construct such routes, as soon as possible thereafter, as required by Subsection (a) of this Section.

(d) For the purpose of enabling the District of Columbia to have its Federal-Aid Highway Projects approved under Section 106 or 117 of Title 23, United States Code, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia may, in connection with the acquisition of real property in the District of Columbia for any Federal-Aid Highway Project, provide the payments and services described in Sections 505, 506, 507, and 508 of Title 23, United States Code.

(e) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to acquire

by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise, real property for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior in exchange or as replacement for park, parkway, and playground lands transferred to the District of Columbia for a public purpose pursuant to Section 1 of the Act of May 20, 1932 (47 Stat. 161; D. C. Code, Sec. 8-115) and the Commissioner is further authorized to transfer to the United States title to property so acquired.

(f) Payments are authorized to be made by the Commissioner, and received by the Secretary of the Interior, in lieu of property transferred pursuant to subsection (e) of this section. The amount of such payment shall represent the cost to the Secretary of the Interior of acquiring real property suitable for replacement of the property so transferred as agreed upon between the Commissioner and the head of said Agency and shall be available for the acquiring of the replacement property.

The District of Columbia Committee in the 1970 Revenue Bill also made an attempt to help settle the impasse which had developed in the Freeway - Rapid Rail Transit programs. In the Bill from this Committee we find the following provision:

SEC. 903. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year under Article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue

Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, Sec. 47-2501a-47-2501b) until the President of the United States has reported to the Congress that (1) the District of Columbia Government has begun work on each of the projects listed in Section 23(b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 and has committed itself to complete these projects, or (2) the District of Columbia Government has not begun work on each of those projects, or made or carried out that commitment, solely because of a court injunction issued in response to a petition filed by a person other than the District of Columbia or an Agency, Department, or Instrumentality of the United States.

Prior to the time the District of Columbia Committee and the Public Works Committee attempted to help settle the Freeway - Rapid Transit Impasse, we passed through ten hectic years. Just to cite a few of the events that took place during this period we had:

First, well over \$10 million invested in plans for an Interstate System by the District that were not used and were filed away.

Second, over \$200 Million has accumulated in Federal and District of Columbia funds to be used in the Freeway Program as soon as this Impasse is settled.

Third, Chairman of the National Capital Transportation Agency for a number of years made every move possible to destroy the Freeway System.

Fourth, The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission moved heaven and earth to destroy the Freeway Program and finally the Washington Newspapers demanded that this Chairman not be reappointed.

Fifth, in 1964 the House recommitted the Bill authorizing the construction of a Rapid Rail Transit System due to the fact that the cost was not adequately presented to the House and the total mileage was also indefinite as presented.

Sixth, in 1965 the National Capital Transportation Act provided for a twenty-five mile rapid rail transit system at a cost of \$431 million with \$100 million to be Federal and \$50 million to be the District of Columbia share and with the balance evidenced by bonds. The bonds were to be retired out of the fare box.

Seventh, the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 authorized a Regional Transit System at a total cost of \$2.5 billion with \$1,147,044,000 to be in Federal Grants, \$216,500,000 to be the District of Columbia share and with the suburban jurisdictions paying \$357,000,000 the balance of \$835,000,000 would be raised through revenue bonds

issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Eighth, in the year 1966, which was after the authorization for the construction of the rapid rail transit twenty-five mile system, the House refused to appropriate funds for the rapid rail system until the Freeway Impasse was solved. After the District of Columbia appropriation bill for that year passed the House the National Capital Planning Commission and the District Officials finally agreed to start the Freeway System and in Conference with the Senate our Committee on Appropriations receded and agreed to release the money for the rapid rail transit system. After this action took place a lawsuit was filed which requested that the Freeway System be brought to an end. This suit was filed and in February of 1968 the Freeway System was stopped by the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Ninth, then we have the Highway Act of 1968 enacted.

Tenth, on April 28, 1969, President Nixon in his Message to the Congress on the District of Columbia, stated in part as follows:

"Mass Transit must be part of a balanced transportation network. A subway will not relieve local governments of the duty to modernize and improve their

highway systems and other forms of transportation, so that all citizens have an adequate choice as to how they travel. Clearly the Impasse that has arisen between proponents of road and rail transportation in the Washington Metropolitan Area has contributed little to the progress of either. There are, however, hopeful signs that a fair and effective settlement of these issues will be reached in the near future. It is in the interest of all those involved--central city dwellers, suburbanites, shoppers, employees, and visitors alike--that this be done."

Eleventh, on August 11, 1969, I received the following letter from President Nixon:

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

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

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

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

With cordial regards,

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON*

Twelfth, On September 24, 1969,

Our Committee on Appropriations recommended that Rapid Rail Transit Funds be released and shortly thereafter actual construction of the Rapid Rail Transit System started. A few weeks following our action in releasing construction funds for Rapid Rail Transit, another suit was filed in Federal Court.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Judging from some of the statements that have been made you would assume that only the District of Columbia Committee, the Public Works Committee, and the Appropriations Committee want a Freeway System constructed in our Capital City. All down through the

years, Washington's two leading newspapers have consistently stated that a balanced system of transportation is necessary for our Nation's Capital which would consist of a Freeway - Rapid Rail Transit System.

On July 14, 1968, the SUNDAY STAR in an editorial entitled "Freeway Letter" stated in part as follows:

"Mayor Washington and City Council Chairman Hechinger have urged the Senate-House Conferees to strike from the Highway Bill language which would require the District to proceed with the construction of a freeway system. We think the mandatory language should be kept in the Bill and that it should be approved by Congress.

Without such a directive there is little likelihood that work on the freeways will go forward. And lacking an adequate freeway system, combined with rapid transit, the economic life of this City is bound to stagnate. Those who have succeeded in stalling freeway construction for so long are not so much opposed to particular items in the plan; they are against any new freeway facilities. They will kill the whole thing if they can."

The WASHINGTON POST in an editorial which appeared in the June 21, 1968 issue entitled "D. C. Freeway Network"

stated in part as follows:

"The House Public Works Committee has wisely included the long-stalled District of Columbia Freeway projects in its Omnibus Federal Highways Bill. If this legislation is passed, the District will have a mandate to go ahead with its controversial freeway network without further wrangling. At this point many objective observers find it impossible to believe that any law will end the dispute. But there is a powerful argument for Congress to go as far as it can in making the policy decision even if it cannot at this time resolve all the controversial details.

In our view the Potomac Expressway to connect with the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Maryland side of the River, the North Central Freeway, the Three Sisters Bridge and completion of the Inner Loops are essential to give this City a modern transportation system."

Again, on July 5, 1968, the EVENING STAR in an editorial entitled "Freeways and Parking" stated in part as follows:

"Representative Klyczynski, Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, was right on target when he told his colleagues that "Washington as a living, operating city will cease to exist" without freeways. In our opinion, this cannot be successfully disputed,

Certainly not by rhetoric of the case variety. A completed freeway pattern is an essential element of the balanced transportation system planned for this community. The Senate approved provisions in its own Bill to ease the impact of freeways on residences and businesses that might be affected. We hope this signified an intent to deal realistically and forthrightly with a problem which will have calamitous consequences for this city if it is not resolved in the immediate future."

On July 27, 1969, the WASHINGTON POST in an editorial entitled "A Helicopter in Every Garage" stated in part as follows:

"So we come down to the nitty gritty - the Three Sisters Bridge and the North Central Freeway. Secretary Volpe says he is going to meet with "all concerned parties" and work "toward a complete solution." That's where he was many weeks ago when President Nixon asked him to do something about the problem. Tied up in this controversy is the fate of Washington's urgently needed mass transit system. The House of Representatives is unlikely to release money to go ahead with the subway system until the Administration clearly signals its intent to carry out the 1968 Highway Act ordering a go-ahead for Three Sisters and a comprehensive 18-month study of the North Central Freeway."

On June 30, 1968, the SUNDAY STAR in an editorial entitled "Congress Must Act" stated in part as follows:

"The necessity for Congress to end the ridiculous controversy over Washington freeways by compelling the completion of a moderate, national highway system has been evident for a long, long time. This week, at last, the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to begin that process. Its Members should not hesitate to do so.

Fortunately, the House Public Works Committee has given assurance that the issue will be faced by inserting a District freeway mandate in the High-priority Administration Bill - scheduled for debate tomorrow - to extend and broaden Federal Aid to highway programs throughout the country.

It is hard to think of a more fitting legislative vehicle. For the National Bill contains long-needed reforms, especially in terms of expanded Federal assistance to persons displaced by Highways, which have a direct pertinence to the District dispute.

A fight on the House Floor nevertheless seems assured, since three Committee Members already have filed a minority report against the District mandate. It seems to us, however, that their arguments have added nothing new to the tired old tirades of those people who

seem to believe that the best way to deal with automobiles is to ignore them."

The Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Trade of the District of Columbia are very much in favor of a balanced system of transportation for our Nation's Capital consisting of a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system. Within the last few days I received a letter from the President of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade which states in part as follows:

"As you may know, we strongly endorse the balanced transportation program which the Congress has finally supported. We believe it is quite essential to the economic future of the National Capital that these funds be cleared during this session of Congress so construction can proceed on the subway and freeways. We are greatly concerned that any further delay may accelerate the already serious erosion of confidence in the economic future of this City."

The majority of the people who pay the taxes necessary to operate our Capital City are for a balanced system of transportation. Those people who love and respect this City want this impasse settled and they want it settled now. They do not agree with the statement made several years ago by one of the dissidents that there shall be no more exits or entrances into our city.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Public Works Committee. I hope that the Committee will pass this Bill as it was presented to the House and permit the Public Works Committee to take the Bill to Conference so that an agreement can be reached which will be for the best interests of our Capital City and for the best interest of a balanced transportation system."

December 8, 1970

The Hearings on the Supplemental Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1970 were released to the Press today and lo and behold the WASHINGTON POST finally decided to use most of what transpired before my Subcommittee. They very carefully omitted the fact that for a period of six years now I have warned the District officials and those in charge of the subway that \$2½ billion would not build this system. The article carried in this morning's paper is entitled, "Metro Cost Rises, Could Cut System." This article is as follows:

"Inflation and higher interest costs are likely to add "some few hundreds of millions of dollars" to the authorized \$2.5 billion cost of Washington's Metro subway system, its top executive has told Congress.

In testimony given Nov. 24 and released last night, Jackson Graham, general manager of the Washington

Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, told the House District Appropriations Subcommittee that the changes will require "putting together a new financial program" for apportioning the higher costs.

Subcommittee chairman William H. Natcher (D-Ky.) speculated that the cost might reach \$4 billion and warned that the money problems may require a severe cutback in the length of the 98-mile network.

". . . Unless there is a change in the over-all situation, as I see it today," Natcher declared, "we may end up with about a 45- or 46-mile rapid transit system . . ."

Restating his support for freeways along with the subway, Natcher continued: "If the Congress should simply say with all of the demands that are confronting the American people, we are not going to carry this amount up any more at this time, then we would have to cut it back.

"I am hoping that we can resolve this problem and move it on and build this system . . . It is a serious mistake for anyone to try to block a balanced transportation system."

Graham did not respond to the curtailment warning.

In the closed hearing, he asked Natcher's subcommittee to include in the year's final supplemental money bill \$34.2 million in D.C. funds withheld earlier, Natcher gave no encouragement.

Metro officials presented the same request a few days earlier to a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee.

Although the Metro authority had \$366 million in its treasury at the end of October, its officials say lack of the \$34 million has created severe and potentially fatal trouble.

DANGER OF COLLAPSE

Graham said the potential added cost was disclosed in a new financial analysis which soon will be presented to the authority's board of directors. Even without the cost increase, Graham said, the uncertainty of appropriations threw the financial program so far out of kilter that it already is in danger of collapse.

Although much digging, erecting of steel and pouring of cement is under way all over downtown right now for the Metro, it would produce only ditches and tunnels and station sites through which no tracks or trains would run if the present financial impasse is not broken.

To Washingtonians, these tribulations of the Metro Authority sound like old stories that, in the past, invariably

had happy endings. After funds were held up, somebody always managed to ride to the rescue.

Yet it is precisely these alternating crises and rescues--an "off-again, on-again appropriation experience," in the words of Graham -- that have created the present threat.

"Because of the uncertainties with regard to our funding, the initial sale of revenue bonds (needed to finance one-third of the system's \$2.5 billion cost) has been seriously jeopardized," Graham told both Senate and House Appropriations subcommittees recently in appealing for a release of the \$34 million.

NATCHER ROLE

One of those to whom Graham was talking was Natcher, who earlier this year was principally responsible for withholding the \$34 million.

If, as anticipated, Natcher refuses the funds, the issue will be resolved by the new Congress and a probable new subcommittee chairman next year.

Although Natcher is likely to move to a new subcommittee chairmanship on the Appropriations Committee, he made it clear to Graham that he plans to maintain his interest in Washington's freeway-subway controversy.

Natcher and his allies in the House have insisted that, as the price for subway appropriations, the city expand and expedite its interstate freeway construction program. City officials insist all congressional requirements have been fully met.

Last year, after direct intervention by President Nixon, funds were released by Natcher. They arrived just in time to permit the subway's groundbreaking on schedule Dec. 9.

Metro's most recent rescue was engineered amid much fanfare by Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe, who made a federal loan of \$57 million to Metro and thereby took a calculated risk that the bypassed lawmakers will not wreak some retribution.

Natcher has refused to discuss the loan with newsmen, but others who have talked to the congressman say he is furious with Volpe.

The loan will prevent a gap from developing in the Metro construction schedule, permitting it to obligate funds until more money begins to flow from other sources early in 1971.

Among the major projects financed from loan funds will be the first of Metro's two Potomac River tunnels, from Foggy Bottom to the Rosslyn section of Arlington.

In Metro's peculiar arithmetic, however, Volpe's \$57 million adds up to significantly less than the \$34 million withheld by Congress. Here is why:

The Metro authority's financial plan, an integral part of the subway system's authorization as approved by Congress, contemplates funds from four sources -- the federal government, the District of Columbia, the suburbs and the proceeds from Metro's own revenue bond issue.

If the plan is to work, the dollars from these various sources must be blended in precise, carefully timed order, much as a chef follows a complicated recipe.

For every \$1 that D.C. and the suburbs contribute, the federal government has promised to add another \$2, but only after the local funds are received. For every \$3 from these combined sources, Metro itself plans to sell \$1.50 in revenue bonds, to be repaid from fare collections between the years 1983 and 2027.

(In actual dollars, the ultimate total figures are \$208.7 million in congressional appropriations from D.C., \$246.9 million from the Maryland and Virginia suburbs, \$1.1 billion from the federal government and \$835 million from Metro bonds.)

METRO DISQUALIFIED

By withholding \$34 million in D.C. funds, Congress has disqualified Metro from collecting the federal contribution of twice that amount, \$68 million. This totals \$103 million, nearly twice the sum of the Volpe loan.

The loan does not qualify Metro for collecting the federal assistance. Moreover, the loan is supposed to be repaid in six months from future congressional appropriations which could be never.

Despite the D.C. funding lapse, the suburbs have continued their contributions without interruption and are scheduled to provide another installment totaling \$37 million in January. This will release \$75 million in additional federal funds.

When this money flows into Metro's treasury, the grand total for the fiscal year -- from suburban and federal contributions and the Volpe loan -- will reach \$225 million.

This is far short of the \$274 million in government-contributed capital funds contemplated for this year in the Metro financial plan. Moreover, Metro hoped to sell \$106 million in revenue bonds late in the spring. As Graham testified, that plan may have to be dropped.

CONSTRUCTION SLOWDOWN

The result, Metro comptroller Schyler Lowe has told the authority's board of directors, is that the earmarking of funds and the subsequent award of contracts must be curtailed.

Clearly this means that the construction of the 98-mile system, now under way in downtown Washington, will be slowed down.

This would push farther into the future the start of operations, now scheduled in stages between 1973 and 1979, and delay the collections of fares that Metro must depend upon to repay its revenue bonds.

And if bond buyers cannot be assured of repayment as promised, they won't buy the bonds -- the crucial point that general manager Graham was making in his testimony.

The Metro authority's current commitments would build only what amounts to a concrete-lined ditch from Union Station to Rock Creek Park, plus some surface right-of-way north of Union Station -- minus a couple of short gaps in the vicinity of Dupont Circle.

No cars, no tracks, no electrification, no computerized train control, no fare collection equipment have been ordered, although the first steps have

been taken toward the procurement of some of these. The 330 cars along may eventually cost \$115 million.

By law, however, the Metro cannot even call for bids, let alone award a contract, unless it has enough money in its treasury or otherwise directly available to pay each of the bills as they fall due. The money must be earmarked and is untouchable for other purposes.

The Metro authority was obligated at the end of October to pay off \$126.5 million in construction contracts alone, some of which will stretch over the next two years. Other obligations cover the costs of engineering, architectural work, real estate acquisition and myriad other requirements.

Metro officials, hoping for a permanent solution to the problem rather than another temporary rescue, refuse to speculate on the possible course of future events.

Nobody, for example, has publicly raised the spectre of what would happen if only the segment of subway now being built were completed--providing a downtown shuttle of dubious worth--or if the work were halted at some later stage short of the full 98-mile system.

The legal complexities alone would be enormous, since the suburbs have

floated bond issues that contemplate specific routes reaching out from Washington.

"While the cost of rapid transit for the nation's capital is high and, with delays encountered, may become higher," Graham told the congressional subcommittees in his recent testimony, "the cost of letting the program go down the drain is incalculable."

December 10, 1970

We almost spent the night here last night. We had the Railroad Strike Legislation before the House and we adjourned finally after passing a bill about 1:30 a.m. The bill that we passed provided for a five percent pay increase retroactive to January 1, and a 32 cents increase retroactive to November 1. Instead of a 45 day period which was mandatory for continuing negotiations, the bill that we passed provided for a deadline of January 23, 1971. For some reason or other we now are passing legislation providing for wage increases in private industry. The deadline for going out on strike was midnight and, notwithstanding the bill that we passed, the National Railroad Strike began as of midnight. The President signed the bill at 2:10 a.m. and complained considerably about the type of legislation and the fact that Congress had not passed labor legislation that he proposed last February.

We will take up the Supplemental Appropriations Bill today on the Floor and this is the bill that corrects to some extent Secretary John Volpe of the Department of Transportation. The article that appeared in the EVENING STAR is entitled, " Fund Killed For Metro, College," and is as follows:

"The House Appropriations Committee today approved a \$54.9 million supplemental appropriation for the District that would contain no funds for subway construction, Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute.

The local budgetary measure was contained in a national supplemental appropriation bill sent to the House floor by the committee.

President Nixon and the District government had asked that the city receive a \$96.1 million supplemental appropriation.

The biggest portion of the \$41.2 million cut in the request was money asked for subway construction.

No explanation was given for the refusal to recommend appropriation of the already-authorized \$34.2 million District share of subway construction funds for the present fiscal year.

NATCHER'S VIEWS

But Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., chairman of the District appropriations subcommittee, has made it clear on previous occasions that he is unhappy with freeway construction in the city and does not want the subway money released until he considers a "balanced transportation system" is under way.

Natcher refused earlier to agree to release the subway funds in the city's initial appropriation for this year. The District appropriations proposed by the full committee are those suggested by the Natcher subcommittee. In a report, the subcommittee said it will give further consideration to money for Federal City College and the technical institute "if additional revenue becomes available."

Federal City College had to deny admission to about 3,200 students in the fall due to a lack of funds. The college had hoped to admit some of them early in 1971 if its supplemental appropriation request of \$3.4 million was granted.

The technical institute, too, had hoped to use its requested supplemental appropriation of \$1.5 million to admit a number of students that it had to turn away in September, as well as to relieve some overcrowding.

\$636 MILLION FOR CITY

Congress already has approved a city budget of \$636 million--\$189 million less than the District requested.

Of the \$49.5 million in operating funds requested by the city, the committee approved \$44.3 million of this, nearly \$40 million would help pay salaries of policemen, firemen and teachers.

The committee rejected a request for an additional federal payment appropriation of \$3.9 million that would have been contingent on pending revenue legislation.

But \$12.1 million of authorized but yet unappropriated federal payment was recommended for release to the city.

The committee also recommended \$3.8 million for court reorganization that had been ordered in earlier legislation.

It recommended a \$1.2 million appropriation for the Washington aqueduct to permit emergency pumping of water from the Potomac River estuary.

A request from the D.C. Corrections Department for \$813,000 to restore buildings damaged in a disturbance at Lorton Reformatory during a May power blackout also obtained committee approval. The committee also recommended appropriations

of \$2.6 million to pay for construction by the school board of a special learning center at 3rd and R Streets, N.W.

In other sections of the bill related to the District, the committee rejected a request of \$1.2 million proposed to buy the old Providence Hospital site as an addition to the Capitol grounds. "There are no specific plans for the use of this property which is not immediately contiguous to the existing Capitol grounds," the committee said.

The committee approved a proposed appropriation of \$50,000 for a study of site and construction plans for the future John W. McCormick Residential Page School."

The article that appeared in the WASHINGTON POST is entitled, "Metro System Grant Denied by House Unit," and is as follows:

"For the second time this year, the House Appropriations Committee yesterday refused to grant \$34.2 million to continue building the regional subway system.

The decision to deny the money came at the urging of Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles District money requests, as part of the Committee's

action on a catch-all supplemental funds bill.

Also rejected was the city government's request for \$4.9 million for Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute. The Appropriations Committee said it would consider the request for the two schools later if additional funds to pay for it are voted in a separate revenue bill now being considered by the House.

The Committee did approve more than \$41 million for the city, almost all of it earmarked to pay for salary increases for policemen, firemen and teachers enacted last summer.

The supplemental money bill now goes to the House floor for action later this week and then to the Senate.

Natcher first deleted the \$34.2 million in D.C. subway funds from the current city budget last July because of the city government's refusal to commit itself to building the North Central Freeway.

A similar impasse involving last year's subway money was resolved after the City Council agreed to build the Three Sisters Bridge and related projects called for in the 1968 Highway Act, and when President Nixon assured Natcher that the city was moving ahead with the

projects. Construction of the bridge has since been temporarily halted by a court order.

Natcher said yesterday he had "no comment, other than what's in the bill."

Denial of this year's money will not stop subway construction already under way. The Metro authority, with the aid of a \$57 million loan from the Department of Transportation, expects to continue awarding contracts through June, 1971.

The city government had asked to spend the money for FCC and WII, which had to turn away more than 2,000 students this fall, in anticipation of new funds begin voted in a revenue bill. The Appropriations Committee said it would give "every consideration" to a later request for the schools "if additional revenue becomes available." The schools had hoped to have the funds in time for the start of the January, 1971, school term.

The Appropriations Committee turned down a request by the architect of the Capitol for \$1.2 million to buy the old Providence Hospital site at 3rd and D Streets SE for possible use as the location of a new Capitol police academy."

December 11, 1970

Over six years now the merchants in our Capital City have known that without

a reasonable freeway system the downtown section will soon wither up and die. Yesterday the House passed the Appropriations Supplemental Bill and we left out the \$34 million requested for rapid transit. The odds are that this will be the final decision after the Bill passes the Senate and goes to Conference. Now the merchants have finally decided after six long years to come out from under the bushes and make noises. An article appeared in this morning's WASHINGTON POST entitled, "Merchants Push City Freeways." This article is as follows:

CRITICISE MAYOR, ASK NIXON'S AID

"Washington business leaders joined together yesterday to give strong new public support for the entire system of proposed freeways for Washington, including the embattled North Central Freeway.

The businessmen called on President Nixon to bring city officials who are opposed to some freeway projects together with congressional freeway advocates to resolve their long-standing differences.

They blamed the mayor and the city government for stalling on freeway building here and thus threatening congressional funding of subway money and other city revenue. The mayor's office had no comment yesterday on the charge.

The businessmen, representing hundreds of business leaders in the District, were convened by Miles L. Colean of the Federal City Council. The Board of Trade, Board of Realtors, D.C. Chamber of Commerce, and Washington Savings and Loan League were also among those represented.

They acted yesterday after it had been learned that a compromise may be reached on Capitol Hill that would delay a congressional order to build the North Central Freeway at least another year.

The businessmen said they support both the pending House version of the Highway Act of 1970, which would require construction of the freeways, and a rider placed in the D.C. revenue bill Nov. 23 that would withhold \$15 million in city revenue until it complies fully with present and pending highway legislation.

Sources on Capitol Hill reported yesterday that a possible compromise on the House bill, now in a Joint Senate-House Conference Committee, could stall the construction of North Central for another year while additional studies are made.

President Nixon's support for building the controversial Three Sisters Bridge last year forced the mayor and City

Council to go ahead with the bridge despite widespread community opposition. (Construction has now been suspended by a court order.)

That action also freed money that permitted work to get underway on the city's subway system. Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.), chairman of the D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee, had been holding up the funds until the roadwork began.

The House Appropriations Committee, at Natcher's request, is now refusing to grant \$34.2 million to continue building the subway system until the city complies with present highway legislation.

The businessmen were all members of the Joint Committee on Transportation, which has been actively supporting both subways and freeways for Washington since the mid 1950s. It had not made a public plea for more freeways for some time, however, and had never criticized the mayor.

Present at yesterday's press conference were Yates Cook, executive vice president of the Federal City Council; Richard E. Steen, Knox Banner and Robert Gray, officers of Downtown Progress; John W. Gill of the Washington Board of Realtors; Thomas P. McLachlen and Charles Coon of the Metropolitan Washington Board

of Trade; Theodore R. Hagans, Jr., Vice President of the D.C. Chamber of Commerce; Thornton W. Owen of the D.C. Savings and Loan League, and John D. Thompson of Vijon Realty Company.

Colean said the group could not be considered a highway lobby. Most of the men talked of a "balanced transportation system," a phrase used by President Nixon when he brought pressure on the D.C. government to get started on freeways last year.

Thompson, a housing consultant, prepared a recent study saying that 65 families would be displaced by the proposed North Central Freeway.

He said a freeway plan for the city could only go forward in conjunction with preparation of adequate housing for displaced persons. Others present at the conference agreed.

Thompson said interviews with families who would be displaced by the freeway revealed that they don't mind moving if they can live nearby and if adequate housing is ready."

December 12, 1970

This lame duck session is rapidly becoming a serious problem. For instance President Nixon now says that unless his welfare reform legislation is acted upon

before we adjourn, he will call a special session of Congress. Among the lame ducks are some four or five members in the Senate and a number in the House who are very much in favor of the President's reform legislation. Some of those who will be sworn in at the next session of Congress are not too strong for this type of legislation. Another instance of just where we are occurred yesterday in the Senate when Senator Albert Gore, one of the lame ducks, started offering a series of amendments to the Foreign Aid Authorization bill and then insisted upon a vote to recommit the bill. He is very much opposed to soft loans throughout the Southeast and to Latin America and has given every indication that he will continue his gentlemanly filibuster on through to final adjournment of this Congress. This Foreign Aid Authorization bill contains \$500 million to Israel and is right important notwithstanding the fact that all of the equipment and material, which totals \$500 million, has heretofore been delivered and this is in the nature of a long term loan which balances the books and probably will never be repaid.

The Evening Star again placed Secretary John Volpe in the right category. The Secretary was in my office when I received a message that he had already committed himself to

make a \$57 million loan and that the press releases had been prepared and he was then sitting in my office inquiring as to whether or not I would oppose such a loan if he finally decided that it was the proper action to take. Volpe is a fast talking little Italian, and is just as insincere as they come. The editorial that appeared in yesterday's Evening Star is entitled "Transportation Chaos" and is as follows:

In a concerted appeal, the District's principal business organizations, white and black alike, yesterday asked President Nixon to intervene personally in the political impasse which threatens to bring the Washington area's transportation program to a complete halt.

The plea could hardly have been better timed. Again this week, the House Appropriations Committee has withheld funds vitally needed for the regional subway system. In a related move, the House is considering a legislative proposal designed to break the stalemate over freeway construction by holding the city's general federal-aid funds hostage. And in still another arena, House-Senate conferees on the national highway bill also are engaged in a District freeway dispute - the outcome of which is not apt to resolve the crucial subway conflict one way or another.

According to one administration official, the President's basic desire is to maintain a "low profile" on District affairs, preferring to afford city officials as much autonomy as possible to deal with its problems. As the transportation debacle has intensified, however, the administration's "profile" has sunk so low as to become virtually invisible, and this is the one issue on which such a hands-off policy makes no sense.

Speaking for the Washington business coalition, urban expert Miles L. Colean asserted yesterday that the present state of chaos is largely the result of a breakdown in effective communications between the administration, Congress and the city government. That is precisely the case. It is hardly an unfamiliar dilemma. A year ago, with the subway program about to slip down the drain, the city government was similarly unable to come to grips with congressional demands for freeway construction progress. Then, as now, Mr. Nixon's transportation secretary, John Volpe, was no help. That crisis passed only as the result of the President's direct negotiations with congressional leaders; nothing less than that will suffice now.

Through intervening, Mr. Nixon also has an opportunity to advance the

cause he has espoused time and time again during the past two years, that of a balanced system of rapid transit and highways to serve the National Capital Area. In recent months, especially, the dialogue over freeways has become so distorted by rhetoric that the facts of the argument are barely mentioned. Yet, as Colean asserted, "either we wake up to the need for a transportation network which makes this metropolitan area one large economic community," or "we are going to witness the further strangulation of this great city and the incredible entrapment of those unfortunate inner-city residents too poor to leave."

December 14, 1970

An editorial appeared in the WASHINGTON POST entitled, "Metro: Nothing But Holes in the Ground?" In this editorial we find a statement which says that the testimony between me and General Graham is also on the editorial page. For some reason or other the good ole WASHINGTON POST omitted a portion of the colloquy between me and General Graham but at least included that portion when the General stated -- "I think for the first time, Mr. Chairman, I can indicate that it is going to cost more. For several months we have been engaged in new

capital cost studies and new net income analysis studies which will pin down the various components of the cost. At the time we put these figures together in late 1967 we were assuming a five percent rate of construction escalation compounded per year and allowed several hundred million for that. We are assuming an interest rate at that time of five percent for our revenue bonds. Putting it all together, it came out to \$2.5 billion. We could not foresee at that time that construction costs would go up in this inflationary spiral, largely due to the wage agreements that were not for just one year but extending into the future for two or three years. We could not foresee the rise in the interest rates. It appears now that this new capital cost will be some few hundreds of millions of dollars in excess of the \$2.5 billion estimate. The two big things are the inflation on construction costs and the continued high interest rates."

The editorial is as follows:

"There are holes in the ground in several places around this city now which make it quite clear that a rapid transit system is being built. Judiciary Square and G Street, for example, are in a mess and the first signs of construction have reached as far as Connecticut Avenue. In a normal city, this would mean that Metro was well on its way and that we

all could sit back and look forward to riding on its first trains in less than three years. But Washington is not a normal city and it is quite conceivable that the holes which have been created in Metro's financial arrangements will doom the system as it is now planned and, indeed, may even leave this metropolitan area with nothing to show for its years of work but holes in the ground.

If you think that is an overly pessimistic appraisal of the trouble that Metro is in, take a few minutes and read the exchange printed elsewhere on this page between Metro's general manager, Jackson Graham, and Congressman Watcher. Two conclusions flow inexorably from that exchange. One is that Metro cannot complete the job it has started with its present financing. The other is that Mr. Watcher doesn't want Congress to accept any of the responsibility for this situation, although it is a situation which has been created primarily by the House of Representatives.

Four things have gone awry so far in the financing plans of Metro. Two of these are national problems which everyone knows about -- construction costs have gone up faster in the last two years than anyone predicted and the interest rate is well above what Metro had expected to pay when it borrows \$835 million. The other two things are purely local problems arising out of the

freeway hassle and the insistence of the House of Representatives that subway funds be held hostage for freeway construction. The House decision to hold up these funds delayed construction of the subway for more than a year during a period when costs were rising rapidly. Beyond this, the on-again, off-again, approach of the House to funds for the subway has undermined the confidence that the investors who are supposed to buy those \$835 million revenue bonds have in the ability of Metro to meet its obligations. According to the financial experts, this has already raised the interest rate that Metro must pay for that money -- thus making the system more expensive -- and may have even made the bonds unacceptable to the money market. Indeed, who would want to invest his savings in the construction of a project that can be turned on and off by a whim of a Congressman because of something he doesn't like that has nothing to do with the project? Taken together, the delay in construction and the degradation that has caused in the bonds will cost Metro, at a conservative guess, a quarter of a billion dollars.

Mr. Natcher's response to Gen. Graham upon hearing this grim news was that if the system runs over \$2.4 billion it will simply have to be cut back. And that probably sounds reasonable to Congressmen who are used to dominating the projects they fund. But cutting back Metro

is not that simple and Congress ought to understand it. How do you cut back this system? Cut off one of the two lines in Montgomery County" Then what do you do about the interstate agreement establishing Metro? Or the bond issues authorized by the suburban communities? Cut out the air conditioning? And then who would ride it? Cut off some of the stations? And what would that do to the number of riders?

The simple fact is -- and Congress ought to understand this, too -- that the game it has played with Metro's money has come close to destroying a rapid transit system for this area and has broken faith with the two million people who live in Maryland and Virginia and have obligated themselves to put up \$150 million for this system. Congress has done this in the name of penalizing the District of Columbia for refusing to building the freeway network that many members of Congress want built. While we sympathize with the frustration these Congressmen feel about the freeway program and while we wish that program was settled once and for all, one way or another, we think it is unspeakable for Congress to protest its powerlessness on one program by destroying another program. What was a tolerable, if unfair, short-range tactic two years ago has become a strategy for destruction.

In the normal course of life, people are required to bear the consequences of

their acts. If you dig a hole in the ground, you have a responsibility for seeing that no one falls in. Since Congress had dug the biggest hole in Metro's financing, it has a moral obligation (if not to the citizens of the District whom it is attempting to penalize, then surely to the citizens of Virginia and Maryland) to see that the system does not fall in. It is simply not enough for Mr. Natcher and his colleagues to say, "I am hoping that we can . . . build this system," while doing what they can to make building this system impossible."

Some of my rich friends started out as Democrats and now they are strong Republicans. All of their money, of course, was made during the Democratic Administration when we had low unemployment and when our Gross National Product was going up by leaps and bounds. Now I receive letters from these nice people complaining about spending money and our National Debt. It reminds me somewhat of the rugged individual that I read about not long ago. This was a young man who lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus, participated in the free lunch program, played in State Parks, swam in the city pool. He entered the Army and upon discharge, kept his national life insurance. He then enrolled in the state university, working part time in

the State Capitol to supplement his G.I. check.

Upon graduation he married a public health nurse, and bought a farm with an FHA loan, and then obtained a Small Business Administration loan to go into business. A baby was born in the County Hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of another G.I. loan and obtained emergency feed from the government.

Later he put part of his land into the Soil Bank. His parents live comfortably on the ranch with their social security and old age assistance checks. REA lines apply electricity. The Department of Agriculture helped clear the land. The County Agent showed him how to terrace it. Then the government paid part of the cost of a pond and stocked it with fish. He was guaranteed a sale for his farm products by a Federal Agency. Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked money which a government agency insured.

Then one day he wrote his Congressman: "I wish to protest excessive government spending and high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

December 15, 1970

President Nixon has made another change

in his Cabinet. Former Governor John B. Connally of Texas, a Democrat and a strong ally of Former President Lyndon B. Johnson, was named Secretary of the Treasury yesterday. He will succeed David M. Kennedy who has served as Secretary of the Treasury since the Administration of President Nixon started. This is simply a bid for Texas in 1972 and a shift of responsibility in one of the most controversial Cabinet positions from the Republicans to the Democrats. It will be much easier for John Connally to appear before the Committees in Congress with all of our unemployment, inflation, rising cost of living, and unsettled economic conditions than a Republican.

The Senate included the \$34 million in the Supplemental Appropriations Bill yesterday and now we will go to Conference.

Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico is an old man now and in bad health. He started out as a Member of the House and then was selected to serve as Secretary of Agriculture. After serving as Secretary of Agriculture, he returned to New Mexico and was elected to the Senate. Recently he has completed a book entitled, "Outsider in the Senate." In this book he claims that while serving as Secretary of Agriculture in the Truman Administration he was offered a payoff by Senator Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma to become

involved in profiteering on the farm commodity market. Senator Thomas was long time Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and he was defeated in 1960. Senator Thomas died five years ago at the age of 89 and is not here to contest the statements in the book recently published by Senator Anderson. According to Senator Anderson, he received a call from Senator Thomas requesting that he meet him outside the Agriculture Department building and in company with an un-named third party. In strolling along the Mall he was offered the proposition involving the farm commodity market. According to Senator Anderson he was very much incensed over the offer and inquired as to whether or not the other two men would be willing to walk with him over to the Justice Department and to repeat their offer to the Attorney General.

I have known Senator Anderson now since I have been a Member of Congress and was amazed to hear that he would place such a story in his book. Not only because Senator Thomas is not here to defend himself but the fact that he would admit that an offer was made to him really amazes me.

I would not only be incensed but I would be hurt to think that anyone would place me in a category whereby they believed that I would accept such an offer. This kind of a story will not inure to the benefit of Senator Anderson.

Senator Anderson goes on in his book and explains why it was that he and Senator Thomas who was Chairman of the Agriculture Committee could not get along and the good Senator from New Mexico maintains it was due to the fact that he refused to accept Thomas' offer. This is right hard for me to believe.

December 17, 1970

We go into Conference with the Senate this morning on the Supplemental Appropriations Bill for 1971. In this bill the Senate included the \$34,178,000 for rapid transit and the House deleted the amount. This matter will have to be resolved today.

An editorial appeared in yesterday's **EVENING STAR** entitled, "Three-Ring Circus." This editorial is as follows:

"Anyone who is sanguine about Congress untangling every detail of the legislative snarl over the District's transportation mess during these last days of the session ought to have his head examined. Still, this being the season of miracles, substantial progress in that direction is possible, as the result of flurries of House-Senate activity on not one front, but three.

The first ray of hope broke through the other day when Representative Broyhill withdrew an amendment to the city

revenue bill, designed to hold all further federal payment appropriations hostage to District compliance with congressional freeway-building demands. With that wacky bit of legislative blackmail gone, the District can breathe a little easier and at least one House-Senate battle has been averted.

Last Monday, accused on the House floor of "chickening-out" on a "pet project," Broyhill denied the charge, contending that his blackmail pitch was no longer necessary. It was made unnecessary, he said, by his understanding that House-Senate conferees on the national highway bill had arrived at some compromise language which would put the District of Columbia "in compliance" with the law on local freeway building. "I hope," Broyhill added, "that we are correct in this understanding."

Well, we hope so, too. For unless the highway bill conferees do reach such an agreement, the freeway impasse will remain as frozen as ever, and furthermore there is every likelihood that the District's urgently needed subway appropriations also will remain in limbo, with disastrous results for the entire rapid transit program.

The fate of the subway funds, just to complicate the picture a little more, rests in the hands of a third set of House-Senate conferees, handling a

disputed local appropriation measure. While the Senate has voted to include subway money within that bill, the House voted to the contrary. And its primary spokesman, Representative Natcher, is showing no signs of budging as long as he thinks the District's freeway-building performance is at odds with the language of national highway legislation.

That is why the conference on the new national highway bill is so important to the District. As reported in the news accounts, the House conferees are pushing a provision authorizing further study of the controversial North-Central Freeway. In the hope that this might free the deadlocked transit funds, and afford a longer look at the whole freeway dispute, the Senate conferees certainly should go along."

December 18, 1970

Yesterday the House and Senate Conferees deleted the \$34,178,000 requested for the rapid transit system here in Washington. Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia was Chairman of the Conference and on the Senate side we had Senators Holland of Florida, Ellender of Louisiana, McGee of Wyoming, Pastore of Rhode Island, Stennis of Mississippi, Hruska of Nebraska, Young of North Dakota, Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, and Allott of Colorado. The Chairman of the House

conference was George Mahon, the Chairman of our full Committee. When we reached the item pertaining to mass transit, I gave an explanation as to why this money was not approved at this time and there was not a dissenting vote. The money was removed from the Bill, and in yesterday afternoon's EVENING STAR we had an article entitled "Conferees Agree to Study of North Central Freeway." This article is as follows:

"House-Senate conferees today agreed to order a 12-month study of the controversial North Central Freeway but the action came two hours too late to obtain the release of District subway funds in this session of Congress.

Two hours earlier another House-Senate conference committee had given in to the wishes of the House and decided not to include the \$34.2 million of frozen subway funds in the final supplemental appropriations bill for the city.

However, the action of the highway conferees may convince Rep. William H. Natcher, D-Ky., chairman of the House District appropriations subcommittee, to agree to release of the already authorized subway money when Congress reconvenes next month.

Natcher block release of the subway money after claiming that the District was disobeying the wishes of

Congress by not starting to build the North Central.

Now, however, the ordering of a new study of the road may convince him that the District is complying with the Highway Act and should, as a result, be entitled to subway money.

The study agreed to by the highway conferees today does not say that the North Central Freeway to Silver Spring must be built.

Natcher was among the conferees meeting on the appropriations measure. The House had withheld the freeway money, but the Senate measure had included it.

In addition to the freeway study, the highway conferees also ordered a year's study of the East Leg of the Inner Loop, north of Bladensburg Road, and a year's study of the North Leg which would link the planned Potomac River Freeway and the Center Leg which is already under construction.

The highway bill as it passed the House, had ordered the District to build the North Central within 30 days but the Senate version had included a provision permitting the city to build only the roads it wanted by repealing part of the 1968 Highway Act.

REPEAL DELETED

Under the compromise reached today, the Senate's repeal of the 1968 legislation was deleted, along with the House's order to build the freeway.

Until Congress releases the District subway money, however, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority will not be able to spend another \$68.5 million in federal matching funds which were contingent on the city's \$34.2 million share.

WMATA now is operating with an emergency \$57 million loan from the U.S. Department of Transportation. Subway officials say the loan permits them only to continue awarding subway contracts through this month.

The money conferees agreed to give the District a \$54.9 million supplemental appropriation which includes \$40 million to help pay salary increases for policemen, firemen and teachers, \$3.8 million for District Court reorganization, and \$325,000 for the new "Little Hoover Commission," to investigate the efficiency of the District government."

In this morning's WASHINGTON POST there is an article entitled, "Hill Rejects \$34 million Metro Fund." This article is as follows:

"House-Senate conferees agreed yesterday to refuse the \$34.2 million sought as the District's share in the current fiscal year for continued construction of Washington's Metro subway system.

A freeway dispute that led the House to bottle up the funds in the first place was compromised just two hours before the refusal yesterday. Instead of ordering the proposed North Central Freeway built, the conferees ordered it studied. But prospects for release of the subway funds had all but vanished in the final days of the congressional session.

The appropriations conferees still could reconsider but this was regarded as unlikely.

The \$34.2 million was the amount the city had to get from Congress and commit to subway construction before it could keep the construction program on schedule for fiscal 1971.

Work on the subway will continue. More than \$100 million worth of construction contracts are already in effect in downtown Washington.

But congressional refusal to release the District of Columbia's contribution toward this fiscal year's construction program could have a slowing

domino effect on the project, which also is being financed by suburban and federal contributions.

The refusal is expected to force a cutback of at least \$45 million in new contract obligations during the first six months of 1971.

Metro officials have also warned that it probably would doom the planned sale late this fiscal year of \$106 million in revenue bonds, to be repaid from future fare collections. Operation of trains on the first six miles of the eventual 96-mile line probably would be delayed beyond the planned start in late 1973.

The House previously had withheld the \$34.2 million. The Senate had voted it. The Senate conferees yielded yesterday to Chairman William H. Natcher of the House D.C. Appropriations Subcommittee.

"We just couldn't prevail," said Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), chairman of the Senate Subcommittee. "There was just no way of persuading the House."

Rep. Natcher had said in House speeches that subway money would be withheld until the city completely obeys 1968 and 1970 highway laws.

That dispute, centering on freeways, was compromised soon after the appropriations conferees acted. Another conference committee, on public works, completed a compromise version of the Federal Highway Act of 1970. It calls for a full new study of the North Central Freeway instead of requiring its immediate construction, as the House had demanded earlier.

If this conference report is enacted by the full House and Senate and the study is undertaken, the city apparently would be complying fully with the highway laws of 1968 and 1970.

Also to be studied as part of the same project would be two related links-- a branch of the North Central forming part of Interstate Highway 95 to Baltimore, and a southeastward extension toward the Robert F. Kennedy stadium.

In return, Senate conferees yielded in their effort to repeal the requirement to build the Three Sisters Bridge and other D.C. provisions of the 1968 law.

The final public works bill also provides for a separate study of the North Leg of the proposed Inner Loop Freeway connecting Foggy Bottom to the area north of Union Station.

The measure also keeps intact the 1968 authorization for the South Leg of the Inner Loop past the Lincoln Memorial and Tidal Basin.

The appropriations bill that omits the \$34.2 million for the subway does grant the city \$55 million for other purposes. Most will pay for salary increases for policemen, firemen and teachers.

The city also would receive a special \$3.7 million federal payment for first-year costs created by the D.C. crime act, and \$325,000 for the "Little Hoover Commission."

December 19, 1970

In the closing days of this Congress we are confronted with six separate filibusters which are underway in the Senate. When the Majority Leader calls up the Welfare Bill, a filibuster starts and then when the Bill is set aside and the Appropriations Bill which contains additional funds for Cambodia is called up, another filibuster begins with different participants. A great deal of publicity has been given the Senate during the past several weeks as a result of these filibusters and the image that the Senate is creating is certainly not good. Majority Leader Mike Mansfield in attempting to end the filibusters, met in a rare 92-minute secret session

of the Senate last night to discuss ways to speed up business and to avoid a legislative crisis. This is the first secret meeting of the Senate that has been held in four and one-half years. Mansfield and Republican leaders expect to confer with President Nixon today over a legislative must list and determine whether Mr. Nixon would be willing to put aside till next year the Social Security, family assistance, and textile import proposals. If the President does agree, it means that these bills will then have to go back through the Committees and be passed over again which will require well over a period of a year.

We may adjourn on Tuesday night and if we do, we will have three-day recesses until this, the Second Session of the 91st Congress, finally adjourns on January 3rd. The resolution which we adopted last week provides that we will reconvene on January 21, 1971. We will have our Caucus on January 20th, and agree on the election of a Majority Leader and The Speaker. Carl Albert will be the Speaker and the Majority Leadership's contest now is between Sisk of California, O'Hara of Michigan, Udall of Arizona, Hayes of Ohio, and Boland of Massachusetts. So far no one of the candidates has enough votes to win, and there are a great many Members in the House that are inclined to draft some good Member for this position. I forgot to mention Boggs of Louisiana.

December 21, 1970

We will make every effort to adjourn by six o'clock tomorrow, but it now appears that our chances are very slim. We have in Conference with the Senate the Defense Appropriations Bill, Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill, Transportation Appropriations Bill, and Supplemental Appropriations Bill. There are one or two items in each of these Bills which so far have not been resolved. In the Supplemental Appropriations we have the item pertaining to \$24 million for Cambodia.

After one of my dear friends on the Senate side leaked the fact that the Senate had receded and agreed with the House in knocking out the \$34,178,000, the editorials started. The one in the EVENING STAR is entitled, "Natcher's Choice," and is as follows:

"If there were ever a legislative decision which demanded reconsideration to avert irreparable harm, the refusal of House-Senate conferees to recommend a \$34.2 million appropriation for the Washington area's subway system is such a case. We appeal to the conferees to have another go at this dilemma before it's too late.

The subway funds, as everyone must know by now, have been withheld time and time again at the insistence of

Representative Natcher, in dissatisfaction with progress on District freeway projects demanded by Congress in the Federal Highway Act of 1968. And indeed, the transit money had been placed in even greater political jeopardy by a recent Senate attempt to strike any reference to District freeways from national highway legislation.

At a separate conference on amendments to the 1968 highway act last Thursday, however, that Senate move did not prevail. Instead, the highway act conferees drafted a sensible compromise provision -- approved by the House late yesterday -- calling for further study of the most controversial District projects, including the North Central Freeway.

By a misfortune of timing, this compromise was reached about two hours after the House-Senate conferees on a District appropriation measure had decided to withhold, once again, the subway funds. But as we understand the current situation, the report of the appropriation conferees has not yet been sent to the House or the Senate. And if that is the case, could the subway decision not be reviewed in light of the new compromise language on freeways, which puts the District in compliance with the law?

Certainly the subway program merits at least that slight consideration. The

regional transit authority now is living precariously on an emergency loan from The Department of Transportation. According to its officials, the fiscal uncertainties may already have forced a delay in construction bond sales scheduled for next April, and are threatening the program's entire financial structure. The \$34.2 million District appropriation would be matched by \$68.4 million in federal funds already available. These dollars are vital to keep the program from slipping even farther behind.

We share Representative Natcher's desire for a rational solution to the freeway imbroglio, but it is amply clear that holding the transit funds hostage will not advance that goal. It could serve at this crucial point only to injure, perhaps fatally, the subway network which everyone, Natcher included, agrees that the Nation's Capital needs to survive."

The WASHINGTON POST, of course, had an editorial which really wrestles with the truth. This is par for the course and the title of this editorial is "Default on the Subway". The editorial is as follows:

"By again refusing to allow the District of Columbia to pay its share of the money needed now to construct this area's rapid transit system, the Congress of the United States has broken a commitment it made, knowingly and solemnly, to

the states of Maryland and Virginia. It has, in effect, doublecrossed the two million people who live in the suburbs of this city and has seriously jeopardized the future of rapid transit in the whole area. It has done this because the House of Representatives has been hornswaggled by Representative Natcher and his friends, a band of men who are so angry about the freeway situation here that they are willing to dishonor commitments and themselves and Congress in order to demonstrate their power.

The rapid transit system which is supposedly being built here is based on an interstate compact between the District, Virginia and Maryland. Congress approved that compact in 1966. Subsequently, it approved an agreement between the District and the Virginia and Maryland suburbs to construct a particular transit system costing a particular amount of money. By doing so, Congress committed itself to finance that system in two ways. One was by providing matching grants for funds raised by the jurisdictions involved. The other was by appropriating the money for the District's share, \$208.7 million. The suburbs committed themselves to raise \$358.6 million. The suburbs are meeting their commitments as they come due and Congress has always met the first half of its commitment. But it delayed in 1968, 1969 and now again in 1970 to meet the second half.

We pointed out a few days ago that by engaging in this on-again, off-again conduct, Congress has increased the costs of building the system and has almost killed the possibility of a public sale at a reasonable interest rate of the \$835 million revenue bonds which are a key part of the over-all financial program. These are the practical considerations that make us wonder whether the system can ever be built. Beyond them, however, is the moral consideration. Why doesn't Congress feel an obligation to uphold its word? How would members of Congress feel if, say, Arlington were the one signer of the agreement that defaulted on its promise? We can easily imagine the screams that would come up from Capitol Hill about the moral and legal implications of such an act. But, of course, it is Congress that stands in default.

Given the way in which Congress is treating this matter, we suggest that any state and any community ought to be wary of a congressional promise to build a rapid transit system, or, for that matter, anything else. Oh, we know the answer is that Congress is meeting its obligation by providing the matching funds. But that was only half of what it said it would do. It has failed to meet the rest of its commitment--renege, if you will, on its promise -- because a group of spiteful men can find no other way in which to impose its wishes on the

unrepresented citizens of the Nation's Capital. Those citizens will suffer, of course, but so will two million citizens of Maryland and Virginia as well as the reputation for trustworthiness of the Congress of the United States."

In closing out the year of 1970 we had a number of major news stories. The major events in this country and abroad and the news stories that received the most attention concerned the following matters:

1. Terrorist hijackings in the Middle East.
2. Campus shootings at Kent State and Jackson State.
3. Joseph Yablonski, official of United Mine Workers, and his wife and daughter murdered in their home.
4. Inquest into the death of Mary Jo Kopechne.
5. Political kidnappings in Quebec and Latin America.
6. Women's liberation movement expands.
7. My Lai trials.
8. Major strikes: General Electric, Post Office, General Motors.
9. Explosion aboard Apollo 13 and its safe return.
10. President Nixon's search for a Supreme Court justice and the Senate's rejection of Judges Carswell and Haynsworth.

11. The trial of the Charles Manson family.
12. The wave of terrorism across the nation.
13. San Rafael court killings.
14. Two U.S. generals seized and then freed by Russia.
15. Biafra surrenders.
16. Wichita State and Marshall football plane crashes and probes.
17. Santa Cruz family is slain.
18. Nixon restrict biological warfare weapons.
19. Agnew's outspoken speaking tours.
20. The November elections.
21. The United States intrudes in Cambodia in a new phase of the Indochina war.
22. Jordanian civil war.
23. Peruvian earthquake.
24. Nasser dies.
25. De Gaulle dies.
26. The Chicago Seven trial.
27. The economy: inflation and recession.
28. Pollution becomes national issue.
29. Widespread integration in southern schools.
30. Kansas City Chiefs win Super Bowl.
31. Conservatives unseat Labor in Britain.
32. Other . . .

December 22, 1970

The Supreme Court ruled yesterday that Congress has the constitutional power to permit eighteen years old and over to vote for President and Members of Congress. The Court struck down the same law as unconstitutional as it attempted to grant the same right in State and local elections. On each issue in the decision which affects 11 million young Americans, the vote was five to four. Justice Hugo L. Black cast the deciding votes. He sided with Congress as to Federal elections and with the States over the authority to set age limits in State and local elections.

It now appears that we will adjourn tonight until either December 28 or January 2nd. This Congress adjourns sine die on January 3rd and certainly has been a hectic one.

So far I have not missed a vote this Congress and if I succeed in maintaining this record until the Congress finally adjourns on January the third, I will still have a perfect voting record. I was sworn in as a Member of Congress on January 6, 1954, and have never missed a vote since that time.

December 23, 1970

We adopted the Supplemental Conference Report in the House last night and

the \$34,178,000 was left out of the Bill.

We adjourned until Tuesday, December 29, 1970.

December 28, 1970

I am still of the opinion that President Nixon will not run for re-election in 1972 unless he is positive that he will win. Conditions are such today that if the election were held at any time during the next four months he would be defeated. This Administration will soon reach the half-way mark in its four year term and by any stretch of the imagination, the first two years have been anything but impressive. Few administrations have come to office with more challenge or more promises, chief among them of course was the promise to bring the country together. Very few administrations have so quickly damaged their own image. One of the most encouraging moves this Administration promised was the winding down of the war in Vietnam. That effort, however, has been clouded considerably by the entry into Cambodia and resumption of bombing raids into North Vietnam. This Administration promised to halt inflation without risking workers' jobs and to handle the economy in such a way as to keep it strong and growing. Today unemployment is higher than it has been at any time during the past 10 years and the cost of

living continues to spiral upward each quarter. The National economy has stumbled from bad to worse throughout the past two years and instead of more jobs there are fewer jobs. Instead of less inflation there is more inflation. The business sector is anything but optimistic or confident. Instead of bringing this country together, this Administration has from the start made a number of moves which have separated the people more than ever. The Agnew attacks which climaxed in the Fall elections this year certainly caused trouble and most of his speeches were smeared with a broad brush of demagogues. This Administration promised candor and has become anything but candid. We have had shifting and confusion in regard to Cambodia, backing and sliding on school desegregation, purges at Interior and Treasury and inept shuffling of U.N. Ambassadors. It seems to me that President Nixon has dealt with politics of issues but not the issues themselves. He has created quite an image as National Committee Chairman but has established no record to speak of as Chief Executive of the United States and all his people. When former Secretary Hickel warned of problems on our campuses and with young people generally, he was immediately slated to be fired. In all fairness to the President, Hickel's manner of presenting his views to the President was not good.

Today the American people desperately want leadership which will consolidate their energies, promote confidence, and give the people general a feeling that the Ship of State is on course and headed for its destination. After two years this Administration's hand on the helm is lax and the ship is merely churning from wave to wave and very much off course.

Since President Nixon has been in office I have gained considerable respect for him which I did not have prior to his election. I had hoped, regardless of politics, that inheriting as he did so many problems he would make a good President. He has not established this kind of a record and again I say that he will not be defeated for the office of President because unless conditions change considerably, he will take the same kind of an out that Lyndon B. Johnson took prior to the 1968 elections.